

Minutes of a meeting of the Area Planning Committee Thrapston

At 2.00 pm on Thursday 30th June, 2022

Held in the Council Chamber, Cedar Drive, Thrapston

Present:-

Members

Councillor Jennie Bone (Chair)	Councillor Gill Mercer (Vice Chair)
Councillor Kirk Harrison	Councillor Geoff Shacklock
Councillor Bert Jackson	Councillor Michael Tye
Councillor Barbara Jenney	Councillor Lee Wilkes
Councillor Dorothy Maxwell	

Officers

Carolyn Tait (Planning Development Manager)
 Amie Baxter (Principal Development Management Officer)
 Patrick Reid (Senior Development Management Officer)
 Jasbir Sandhu (Interim Lead Planning Management and Enforcement Manager)
 Brian Ogden (Senior Tree and Landscape Officer)
 Jamie Parsons (Senior Planning Lawyer)
 Louise Tyers (Senior Democratic Services Officer)

Also Present

Hannah Wilson – Anglian Water

11 Apologies for non-attendance

Apologies for non-attendance were received from Councillor Roger Powell and Councillor Michael Tye attended as substitute.

12 Members' Declarations of Interest

The Chair invited those who wished to do so to declare interests in respect of items on the agenda.

Councillors	Application	Nature of Interest	DPI	Other Interest
Gill Mercer	NE/21/01330/REM & NE/21/01309/REM Land at St Christopher's Drive, Oundle	Had previously been advised that she was unable to consider the outline planning application as she was a member of the former ENC Planning Policy Committee.		Yes

13 Informal Site Visits

Councillor Bert Jackson declared that he had visited both of the sites on the agenda.

14 Minutes of the meeting held on 8 June 2022

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the Area Planning Committee Thrapston held on 8 June 2022 be confirmed as a correct record and signed.

15 Planning Application NE/21/01330/REM - Land Between St Christopher's Drive and A605 Oundle Bypass, Oundle

The Committee considered a reserved matters application for approval of design, parking, layout and landscaping for the Extra Care facility comprising of 65no apartments, communal and support facilities pursuant to 19/01355/OUT - Outline planning application for the erection of up to 65 dwellings and an extra care facility of up to 65 units on land at St Christopher's Drive, Oundle, (All matters reserved except access).

The Senior Development Management Officer presented the report which detailed the proposal, description of the site, the planning history, relevant planning policies, outcome of consultations and an assessment of the proposal, providing full and comprehensive details.

It was recommended that planning permission not be granted until the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) had given its advice.

Requests to address the meeting had been received from Tony Robinson, an objector; Councillor Rupert Reichhold on behalf of Oundle Town Council; Councillor Charlie Best, a Ward Member; Peter Smith, the Applicant and Stuart Liles, the agent and the Committee was given the opportunity to ask questions for clarification.

Mr Robinson addressed the Committee and stated that this was a monstrous building in the wrong location. It was not in keeping with the existing area and being three stories would overlook properties on St Christopher's Drive. The proposed balconies would overlook into gardens and there would be a lack of privacy which a six-metre fence would not provide an answer. In winter mornings the building would cast a shadow over surrounding properties. Pile driving and the protection of existing properties had not been discussed and must be prohibited. The development was in the wrong location and there were other options.

Councillor Reichhold addressed the Committee and stated that Anglian Water needed to ensure all of their sewer apparatus was kept up to strength to the satisfaction of the LLFA. The site was prone to flooding and with climate change this would become greater. He had asked that senior officers from both Anglian Water and the LLFA attend this meeting. It was noted that officers were waiting for assurances from the LLFA and had these now been received.

Councillor Best addressed the Committee and stated that with regards to parking, the Housing 21 statement was based on three of their other sites which were located in urban areas with available public transport. There had been no consideration of the

number of parking spaces at shift changes. 36 parking spaces was not a reasonable number. There was very poor public transport supporting the area. The proposed development was too big for the site. With regards to the acoustic barrier, after a period of time it would become the responsibility of the residents, but it should be the responsibility of the developer in perpetuity.

Mr Smith addressed the Committee and stated that the application was for a specialised extra care scheme. There was a rapidly aging population in North Northamptonshire and the development was supported by the Council's Strategic Housing Team. It was not a care home but helped to retain people's independence and reduce social isolation. It was a high-quality scheme which would relieve pressure on publicly funded accommodation. North Northamptonshire Council would retain nomination rights.

Mr Liles addressed the Committee and stated that the position of the extra care facility had already been established, along with the number of stories at the outline stage. There would be a positive frontage to the development with the form split into smaller blocks. The roof line would be broken by gables and other features. At the pre-application stage, the principle of development had been accepted and the scheme had been refined to address the comments made. In July 2021, there had been consultation through Oundle Town Council, where again changes had been made. It would be a modern, spacious development using local materials.

The Chair invited the Committee to determine the application.

Members raised concerns about parking and how many spaces would be available. Concern was also raised about the acoustic barrier and its future maintenance. It was noted that the matters which the LLFA were still to advise on were the attenuation tanks and safety. The Committee had previously been advised that a sum of money would be given to Anglian Water for infrastructure but there was now no mention of that in the report.

In response, officers explained that there would be 36 parking spaces which would not be allocated. The Travel Plan had taken this into account and car ownership with residents was expected to be low. A bus stop would also be provided. The Local Highways Authority had assessed the application and found it to be acceptable. Regarding the barrier, it was commonplace for management companies to take over the open/public space, which the barrier would be part of and it would be maintained for the lifetime of the development. With regard to the outstanding matters with the LLFA, the applicant had provided a response which was now waiting for a response from the LLFA. These were small matters which could be dealt with under delegated powers.

On behalf of Anglian Water, Hannah Wilson advised that the pumping station was not designed for adverse weather conditions. Their role had been to assess the connection to the network for surface flows and the development was acceptable for existing and new flows without capacity conditions. It was the LLFA's responsibility to comment on the surface water strategy. The size of the proposed tanks was a matter for the developer and the LLFA. For Anglian Water, the surface flow was acceptable. With regards to infrastructure, there would be a charge for each connection, and this would be pooled and spent on growth. The development had been assessed and the infrastructure charge would not be spent on site mitigation as it was not required. The pumping station has had a full service. There had been flooding when there had been

a storm event, but that could not be prevented. Anglian Water could not request betterment from the developer.

It was proposed by Councillor Barbara Jenney and seconded by Councillor Bert Jackson that reserved matters approval is not granted until the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) had given its advice.

On being put to the vote, there were seven votes for the motion and one against, therefore the motion was carried.

RESOLVED:

That reserved matters approval is not granted until the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) is satisfied that the two outstanding matters relating to the structural integrity of the attenuation tanks and the safety of the tanks if ground water levels rise have been satisfactorily addressed. Once the LLFA is satisfied that these matters have been satisfactorily addressed, 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 reserved matters approval be granted for the proposed development, grant reserved matters approval subject to the conditions as listed in the report and those on the Committee Update Report or substantially similar conditions; or
- If the outstanding matters cannot be resolved by 5 July 2022 (or other date to be agreed) and the LLFA recommends that reserved matters approval be refused, then refuse reserved matters approval on the grounds of drainage, with the wording to be agreed with the Chair and Vice Chair of the Area Planning Committee.

Officers to update the members of the Area Planning Committee regarding the final outcome once a decision is issued.

The meeting adjourned at 3.35pm and reconvened at 3.45pm.

16 Planning Application NE/21/01309/REM - Land Between St Christopher's Drive and A605 Oundle Bypass, Oundle

The Committee considered a reserved matters application for approval of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale pursuant to application number 19/01355/OUT – Outline planning permission for the erection of 65 dwellings and an extra care facility of up to 65 units.

The Senior Development Management Officer presented the report which detailed the proposal, description of the site, the planning history, relevant planning policies, outcome of consultations and an assessment of the proposal, providing full and comprehensive details.

Following receipt of the LLFA comments, it was now recommended that planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions set out in the report and in the Committee Update Report.

Requests to address the meeting had been received from Rob Hill, a supporter; Tony Robinson, an objector; Councillor Rupert Reichhold on behalf of Oundle Town Council; Councillor Helen Harrison, a Ward Member; and Katie Dowling, the applicant and the Committee was given the opportunity to ask questions for clarification.

Mr Hill addressed the Committee and stated that drainage scheme had been submitted and considered at the outline planning stage and it was believed that all the issues had now been addressed. Anglian Water had confirmed that their system had capacity for the development. The drainage scheme matched the outline scheme.

Mr Robinson addressed the Committee and stated that several issues had not been considered at the meeting on 3rd May, including visitor parking, the self-build plots and other issues. The proposed site of the three self-build properties could not be delivered due to noise levels and was not viable. There had been no consideration of approximately 260 children using the pedestrian crossing. Site vehicles could cause infrastructure damage and safety issues. At the development already approved at Cotterstock Road, site vehicles were already not following the agreed route. With regards to Anglian Water, OFWAT had stated that they must improve.

Councillor Reichhold addressed the Committee and advised that he had nothing further to add to that he had already said on the previous application.

Councillor Harrison addressed the Committee and explained that several issues had not been considered at the meeting on 3rd May. She was also surprised that Anglian Water's position had now changed. 20 of the four-bedroom dwellings would not have the required third parking space. It was accepted that development would take place, but local people wanted the best development possible. If the extra care facility was able to reduce the number of stories from four to three, then the number of houses on this site could be reduced. The report stated that the development could not have both the required parking and tree-lined streets.

Ms Dowling addressed the Committee and stated that Anglian Water found the development acceptable with regards to capacity. The LLFA had now responded with no objections. All of the queries with the tree officer had been addressed and an acoustic fence would replace the existing fence. If NNC did not adopt the open space, details of the management company would be submitted prior to occupation of the first dwelling. There was a need for housing, in this sustainable area. The applicant had also sought legal advice.

The Chair invited the Committee to determine the application.

Members raised concerns about the parking for the development, particularly that 20 of the four-bedroom dwellings had no third parking space. The level of on street parking was unacceptable and would have an impact on the road network. If there were less dwellings on the site, more parking would be available. Members also queried the trees which had been agreed for the development and whether they could impact on the highway. Concerns were also raised about the possible noise levels of the proposed self-build plots.

In response, officers explained that with regards to parking, it was accepted that it was a matter of judgement. There were constraints on the site and with regard to tandem parking, the Committee were reminded that several appeals had been lost when this had been used as a refusal reason. For the trees, the NPPF encouraged the inclusion

of street trees. There had been an increase in the size of the soil pits which would give the roots more room and would not disrupt the highway surface. Outside of native species of trees, a number of fruit and nut trees had been encouraged. With the self-build plots, the advice from Environmental Protection was that the location of the plots would be acceptable and it was only the location, and not the design, being considered today.

On behalf of Anglian Water, Hannah Wilson advised that Anglian Water were working with OFWAT and the Environment Agency. When emergency overflows occurred, the Environment Agency take samples and Anglian Water were working to ensure that these overflows were not permanent. Flooding does occur in adverse weather conditions but was highly regulated.

It was proposed by Councillor Gill Mercer and seconded by Councillor Michael Tye that reserved matters approval be granted.

On being put to the vote, there were five votes for and three against the motion, therefore the motion for approval was granted.

RESOLVED:

That reserved matters approval be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the Committee reports and Committee Update Report.

17 Close of Meeting

The Chair thanked members, officers and the public for their attendance and closed the meeting.

The meeting closed at 5.00 pm.

Chair

Date