

Minutes of a meeting of the Area Planning Committee Thrapston

At 5.30 pm on Wednesday 13th July, 2022

Held in the Council Chamber, Cedar Drive, Thrapston

Present:-

Members

Councillor Jennie Bone (Chair)
Councillor Kirk Harrison
Councillor Bert Jackson
Councillor Barbara Jenney

Councillor Gill Mercer
Councillor Roger Powell
Councillor Geoff Shacklock
Councillor Lee Wilkes

Officers

Carolyn Tait (Planning Development Manager)
Dean Wishart (Principal Development Management Officer)
Peter Baish (Senior Development Management Officer)
Patrick Reid (Senior Development Management Officer)
Jamie Parsons (Senior Planning Lawyer)
Troy Healy (Principal Planning Manager)
Ben Smith (Democratic & Elections Manager)

18 Apologies for non-attendance

It was noted that Councillor Michael Tye was substituting for Councillor Dorothy Maxwell.

19 Members' Declarations of Interest

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

No declarations of interest were made.

20 Informal Site Visits and Communications

Councillors declared that they had made the following informal site visits:-

Councillor	Agenda Item/s	Application Number/Site/Communications
Jennie Bone	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One informal site visit
Kirk Harrison	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A number of informal site visits Interaction with three local residents and via email
Bert Jackson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5 7 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NE/21/01482/FUL 4-6 Alfred Street, Rushden NE/21/01505/FUL

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 102 Nene View, Irthlingborough • NE/21/00379/FUL Land Opposite Elizabeth Close, Raunds
Barbara Jenney	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NE/22/00168/FUL 26 Fairmead Crescent, Rushden and correspondence with a neighbour via email
Gill Mercer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 • 8 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NE/21/01482/FUL 4-6 Alfred Street, Rushden • NE/22/00168/FUL 26 Fairmead Crescent, Rushden
Roger Powell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 • 7 • 10 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NE/22/140/FUL 39 Old Dry Lane, Brigstock • NE/21/01505/FUL 102 Nene View, Irthlingborough • NE/21/00379/FUL Land Opposite Elizabeth Close, Raunds
Geoff Shacklock	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 • 6 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NE/22/00493/ADV 0P0038 TL0389 Cotterstock Road, Oundle • NE/22/00298/FUL 9 Rock Road, Oundle • One applicant contacted the cllr
Michael Tye	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 • 10 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NE/21/01482/FUL 4-6 Alfred Street, Rushden • NE/21/00379/FUL Land Opposite Elizabeth Close, Raunds
Lee Wilkes	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Various correspondence via email

21 Change to the Order of Business

The Chair informed members of the Committee that she had agreed to a change in the order of business, with Item 6 (9 Rock Road, Oundle) being brought forward for consideration after Item 2 and Item 10 (Land Opposite Elizabeth Close, Raunds) to be considered after Item 5.

The Chair also informed members of the Committee that she had accepted an urgent and exempt item of business for discussion at the end of the meeting. The item was in relation to the removal of permitted development rights, with the reason for urgency being that the need to consider the item was not known until the previous day and that it could not wait until the next meeting.

22 Planning Application NE/22/00298/FUL - 9 Rock Road, Oundle

The Committee considered a request by officers for deferment of consideration of the application to a future meeting due to inaccuracy of the proposed plans highlighted following dialogue with the agent.

It was proposed by Councillor Gill Mercer and seconded by Councillor Geoff Shacklock that consideration of the planning application be deferred.

On being put to the vote, the motion for deferment was unanimously carried.

RESOLVED:

That consideration of the application be deferred to a future Committee meeting unless the re-assessment of the application changes the recommendation. A recommendation to refuse can be issued under delegated powers.

23 Planning Application NE/22/140/FUL - 39 Old Dry Lane, Brigstock

The Committee considered an application for the erection of two one and a half storey fronted, cottage style detached dwelling houses on garden land currently associated with 39 Old Dry Lane, Brigstock.

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 be granted, subject to the conditions set out in the report.

A request to address the meeting had been received from Russell MacPhee, the applicant, and the Committee was given the opportunity to ask questions for clarification.

Mr MacPhee addressed the Committee and stated that the application was in keeping with the village design, noting that the hill sloped upwards gradually and that the overall height of the building was reduced by having the upstairs in the roof area.

The Chair invited the Committee to determine the application.

Members noted that the existing road was very narrow but that fire and refuse trucks could get up and down it. Officers confirmed that the rooms in the plan met the minimum sizes set out in the national space standard and that the road was adopted.

It was proposed by Councillor Gill Mercer and seconded by Councillor Geoff Shacklock that planning permission be granted.

On being put to the vote, the motion for approval was carried, with 8 votes in favour and 1 against.

RESOLVED:-

That planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions (and reasons) numbered in the report.

24 Planning Application NE/22/00493/ADV - 0P0038 TL0389, Cotterstock Road, Oundle

The Committee considered an application for the installation of three stack gantry signs, eight flag signs and associated signage to the sales garage to advertise the new Bovis housing development on Cotterstock Road, Oundle.

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.

The Chair invited the Committee to determine the application.

Members noted that the applicant did not propose to light up any of the proposed signs.

It was proposed by Councillor Gill Mercer and seconded by Councillor Lee Wilkes that advertising consent be granted.

On being put to the vote, the motion for approval was unanimously carried

RESOLVED:-

That advertisement consent be granted, subject to the conditions (and reasons) numbered in the report.

25 Planning Application NE/21/01482/FUL - 4-6 Alfred Street, Rushden

The Committee considered an application to convert the existing loft space to a single one bedroom flat.

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 be granted, subject to the conditions set out in the report.

A request to address the meeting had been received from Nicola Thompson, the agent, and the Committee was given the opportunity to ask questions for clarification.

Ms Thompson addressed the Committee and stated that it was highly likely that the occupier of the flat would use alternative travel than that of car, noting that there was no parking space allocated to it, following request for it to be removed at the request of highways.

The Chair invited the Committee to determine the application.

Members noted that the proposed flat was in a sustainable area and that on those grounds, the fact that there was no parking space was valid in planning terms and could not be the subject of a condition for approval.

It was proposed by Councillor Kirk Harrison and seconded by Councillor Barbara Jenney that planning permission be granted.

On being put to the vote, the motion for approval was carried, with 8 voting in favour and one against.

RESOLVED:-

That planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions (and reasons) numbered in the report.

26 Planning Application NE/21/00379/FUL - Land Opposite Elizabeth Close, Raunds

The Committee considered an application for the construction of up to 35 affordable dwellings, with associated drainage, access and landscaping.

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 be granted, subject to the conditions set out in the report.

Requests to address the meeting had been received from Andrew Grey, the agent and Dorothy Maxwell, an objector and the Committee was given the opportunity to ask questions for clarification.

Mr Gray addressed the Committee and stated that there was no objections raised in terms of drainage, or any technical consultees, no objections in respect of noise and air quality, and that the proposed developer contributions for the development had been increased from £30k to £130k. The applicant had not felt it appropriate to add a play area to the development as there was an open space nearby, and finally, considered that significant weight should be afforded to the sustainable development the application provided for the area.

Mrs Maxwell addressed the Committee and stated that the application was for 34 homes, 14 under shared ownership, and that the development was next to an industrial estate. She considered the developer contributions should be £200k, that there were not enough school places to accommodate the development, and that local NHS dentists and doctors had no spare capacity. Alongside the fact there was no play area proposed, Mrs Maxwell requested the Committee to refuse permission for the development.

The Chair invited the Committee to determine the application.

Members noted that the number of homes proposed in the application was now 30, down from 35. Members queried the continued disparity between the amount of development contributions the applicant was willing to provide (£130k), compared to that considered necessary (£200k), a shortfall of £70k.

Members also queried whether fire hydrants should be included in the development, with the agent confirming that the applicant would be willing to include them.

It was proposed by Councillor Gill Mercer and seconded by Councillor Bert Jackson that planning permission be granted.

On being put to the vote, the motion for approval was carried, with 7 votes in favour, and 2 against.

RESOLVED:-

- a) That planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions (and reasons) numbered in the report and with an additional condition to secure fire hydrants, and the completion of a Section 106 Legal Agreement by 24 August 2022.
- b) That should the Section 106 Legal Agreement not be completed by 24 August 2022 that it be delegated to the Director of Place and Economy to refuse planning permission.

27 Planning Application NE/21/01505/FUL - 102 Nene View, Irthlingborough

The Committee considered an application for the construction of 7 dwellings, demolition of existing building and associated works including formation of vehicular accesses, highway improvements works, residents parking and landscaping (Revised resubmission to 20/01587/FUL)

The Principal 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 be granted, subject to the conditions set out in the report.

A request to address the meeting had been received from Ian Brightwell, an objector, Councillor Dorothy Maxwell on behalf of Irthlingborough Town Council and Roy Hammond, the agent for the applicant. The Committee was given the opportunity to ask questions for clarification.

Mr Brightwell addressed the Committee and stated that the proposed site did not suit the volume of development, parking and traffic it would generate, with the current availability of 25 parking spaces in the area, reduced to 18 as a consequence. He also queried the proximity of the development to the nearby church, that it was in a conservation area, that the homes would be 2.5 storeys tall compared to the existing 2 storey dwellings. He added that Nene View was a through road to a further eight dwellings, and that more cars would lead to more problems for residents.

Councillor Wilkes queried a reference to 9 inches in the address. Mr Brightwell confirmed this was in relation to the boundary of his property and the development, which he considered too close.

Councillor Maxwell addressed the Committee and stated that the revised application before it had only one less home in it. She stated that the Irthlingborough Conservation area was important, and that the development would have an adverse impact upon it. Councillor Maxwell considered there were parking issues and that ambulances and fire engines would struggle to get up and down the main road following development. She also considered the height of the proposed homes, at 2.5 storeys was out of proportion to the existing terraces that would neighbour the development. Councillor Maxwell requested that the application be refused for the above reasons, for the safety of residents and in the interests of residents who lived next door to a Grade 1 listed church.

Mr Hammond addressed the Committee and stated that in the revised proposal, the views of residents had been carefully considered. The proposal had increased the size of the access road, the pavement, green space and would reinstate the front wall to 79% of its existing height. Mr Hammond professed the benefit of a currently derelict site being brought back into use, that there were no highways objections and that the proposal met the government's desire for new homes. He also noted that planners had not substantiated concerns raised in regard to conservation.

Councillor Wilkes queried the ridge height of the proposed buildings and Mr Hammond responded that they would be lower than the existing terraces, partly due to the slope between the buildings and partly due to the floor to ceiling height of the floors in the new development being smaller.

The Chair invited the Committee to determine the application.

Members noted that there was significant tree screening to the south of the proposed development, and that use of the existing stone in the stone wall would be used as far as possible in reinstating it arising from development.

It was queried whether there were any ecology implications for the development. The planning officer responded that as this was not a major development, like for like replacement of biodiversity could not be required. However, the re-imposition of some soft landscaping had been requested by officers and accepted by the developer.

It was proposed by Councillor Gill Mercer and seconded by Councillor Bert Jackson that planning permission be granted.

On being put to the vote, the motion for approval was carried with six voting in favour, two against and one abstention.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions (and reasons) numbered in the report.

28 Guillotine Motion

The Chair drew members' attention to the fact that in order to consider the final two items of the agenda that evening, a vote would need to be taken to continue the meeting beyond the three hour guillotine, as set out in meeting procedure 10 of Part 3.2 of the Constitution.

It was proposed by Councillor Kirk Harrison and seconded by Councillor Gill Mercer that the meeting continue to the conclusion of business.

The motion was carried unanimously.

RESOLVED:-

That in accordance with meeting procedure rule 10 of Part 3.2 of the Constitution, the meeting continue beyond the three hour guillotine to conclude the business set on the agenda.

29 Planning Application NE/22/00168/FUL - 26 Fairmead Crescent, Rushden

The Committee considered an application for the demolition of an existing summer house and erection of 2 bed end terraced house.

The Principal 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 be granted, subject to the conditions set out in the report.

Requests to address the meeting had been received from Doreen Dance, an objector and the Committee was given the opportunity to ask questions for clarification.

Ms Dance addressed the Committee and stated that there was strong local opposition to the proposed development with her now having 42 signatories against it. She considered that the development of the additional dwelling did not consider the impact on the neighbours, community and the local environment. The development was already surrounded by residential dwellings and it was not right to create an end of terrace on what was currently a row of semi-detached houses. Ms Dance was also concerned with the demolition works and major traffic disruption the development would bring.

The Chair invited the Committee to determine the application.

Concern was raised that the proposed development would be out of keeping with the immediate environment and could be considered as over-development in providing a terraced feel to the road. Officers responded that it was considered the corner plot was currently quite open and that if the dwelling was built, the area would still retain its general character and so it was considered it would not come to harm. Some concern was also raised about parking and the potential for cars driving round the bend being impeded. It was noted that Highways had proposed a number of conditions in mitigation of this concern.

It was proposed by Councillor Kirk Harrison and seconded by Councillor Roger Powell that planning permission be granted.

On being put to the vote, the motion for approval was carried, with 5 in favour, one abstention and one against.

RESOLVED:-

That planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions (and reasons) numbered in the report.

30 Planning Application 20/00954/FUL - Land Known as The Poplars, Brick Kiln Road, Raunds

The Committee considered an application for full planning permission for the erection of 14 dwellings and associated works.

The Principal 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 be granted, subject to the conditions set out in the report.

Request to address the meeting had been received from Matt Collerson, agent, for the applicant and the Committee was given the opportunity to ask questions for clarification.

Mr Collerson addressed the Committee and stated that the three concerns previously raised had all been fully addressed, and there were no outstanding issues or technical objections. He considered the new mix of housing was more appropriate than that of the previously presented application. In the current scheme there was better access, footpath connections, improved housing mix inclusive of three-bedroomed homes, development contributions for education and it was fully compliant with the local plan.

The Chair invited the Committee to determine the application.

A concern regarding the closeness of the revised access point to that of an existing access point to allotments was raised as it could be construed as dangerous for pedestrians.

It was proposed by Councillor Gill Mercer and seconded by Councillor Michael Tye that planning permission be granted.

On being put to the vote, the motion for approval was carried, six voting in favour, and two against.

RESOLVED:-

That planning permission be granted subject to conditions and the completion of a Section 106 Legal Agreement by 2 September 2022 (or other date to be agreed).

That should the Section 106 Legal Agreement not be completed by 2 September 2022 (or other date to be agreed) that it be delegated to the Director of Place and Economy to refuse planning permission.

31 Exclusion of the Public and Press

The Chair proposed that under Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded for the remaining item of business on the grounds that it involved the likely disclosure of exempt information, in respect of the following:-

‘Removal of Permitted Development Rights’
(as defined by paragraph 6 of Part 1 of Schedule 12 A of the Act)

and that, in all circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

RESOLVED:-

That the public and press be removed from the remainder of the meeting due to the likely disclosure of exempt information.

32 Urgent Exempt Item - Removal of Permitted Development Rights

The Committee considered an urgent, exempt request for an immediate Article 4 Direction related to a building in the North Northamptonshire area.

The report was considered in exempt session in accordance with Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972, paragraph 6 of Part 1 of Schedule 12 A.

Following discussion and on being put to a vote, the motion was unanimously carried.

RESOLVED:-

That the making of an immediate Article 4 Direction in respect of the referenced location and removal of the permitted development right be approved, subject to the reasons set out in the exempt report.

33 Close of meeting

The Chair thanked all who had been in attendance and closed the meeting.

The meeting closed at 9.25 pm

Chair

Date