



LATE LETTER/S' LIST

**North Northamptonshire Area Planning Committee
(Wellingborough)**

15 September 2021

Report of the Executive Director Place and Economy

NW/21/00486/FUL Address -9 High Street, Earls Barton

Amendment to condition 2 – the received dated on the amended plans in the planning committee report is incorrect. The correct date is set out below:

Condition 2

This consent is based on drawings;

Site Location and Proposed Site Plan 19-144-20 Revision A- Received 20 July 2021;

Proposed Plans and Elevations 19-144-22 Revision A - Received 20 July 2021;

Proposed Garage Plans and Elevations 19-144-23 Revision A - Received 20 July 2021;

Reason: To define the permission and to conform with the requirements of The Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) (Amendment No. 3) (England) Order 2009.

Recommendation

It is recommended that planning permission is granted subject to the conditions set out in the report and the wording of condition 2 is amended as set out above.

NW/21/00592/FUL Dungee Corner, Harrold Road, Bozeat

Consultee

Bozeat parish council - object to this application.

“The Parish Council consider that this application is not significantly different from the previously refused application (reference WP/20/00648/FUL) and it does not address the concerns raised in our objection. The comments raised on the previous application therefore apply equally to this application and are:

We are particularly concerned about the safety of access onto Harrold Road in such close proximity to the Dungee Corner junction. The national speed limit applies on Harrold Road which is a road where the police regularly set a speed trap, particularly when Santa Pod holds events. Because of the frequency of accidents at the junction Bedford Borough Council has recently implemented additional safety measures and we consider that it is important that they are included in the consultation for this application.

As a consequence of these factors we suggest that should the application be granted permission, the access should be altered so that it is moved as far away as possible from the Dungee Corner junction. We also suggest that a new road sign be installed prior to the new access to warn drivers that there is a left-hand driveway where vehicles may access/egress. Both measures will alert following traffic and mitigate any confusion that may occur by the new left hand turn prior to the Junction.

Safety aside we do not consider that the scheme meets the criteria to qualify under Policy 13 of the JCS and paragraph 80 of the NPPF. This requires that design should:

- Be truly outstanding or innovative, helping to raise standards of design more generally in rural areas;
- Reflect the highest standards in architecture;
- Significantly enhance its immediate setting; and
- Be sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area.

We feel that this proposal fails to significantly enhance its immediate setting and note that although the applicant's Landscape Impact Assessment states in its conclusion that there would be significant beneficial change to the landscape as a result of the scheme, this is not supported by the contents of the report which at best finds a moderate positive impact in some circumstances.

The Inspector at the appeal of the previous application (WP/16/00670) found that that scheme "*would prevent rather than allow worthwhile glimpses of the meadow beyond*" and we feel that the same would be the case with the building, gates and boundary treatments proposed in this scheme.

We also feel that despite taking themes from more distant buildings, the scheme is at odds with the character of the nearby host property. The LIA does not assess the relationship between these two buildings.

We request that the application is decided by the planning committee".

Rebuttal Letter from Design Midlands dated 10.08.2021

A letter of has been submitted from Design Midlands in rebuttal to the officer recommendation. The letter appended states that in the final review from May 2021 the panel considered,

"The approach to the site; the 'reveal' design concept; the scale, mass and form of the proposed dwelling, the position of the garage, and the choice of materials palette are all supported. However, it is suggested that additional supporting information would assist in communicating the design concept and narrative for what the Panel believe is a strong scheme, and a scheme capable of meeting the stringent criteria of Paragraph 79 of the NPPF."

Officer comment: Whilst the views of the Design Midlands advisory panel are noted and have been included in the applicants submission, it is for the local planning authority to determine whether a proposal complies with planning policy and in this case paragraph 80 (e) of the NPPF. This has been extensively discussed in the officer report from page 57 to page 70 with the conclusion at paragraph 7.88 to 7.91 stated below,

"Conclusion regarding NPPF paragraph 80 (e)

7.88 The proposed development is not considered to meet the exceptional quality required by paragraph 80 (e) of the NPPF and policy 13 (2) (a) of the JCS. The

design is not truly outstanding, reflecting the highest standards of architecture and would not help to raise standards of design in the rural area. The design concept of 'reveal' is not carried through into the whole development. The scale, massing and design of the two-storey section which sits directly in line with the large unsympathetic entrance gate with the garage and garden building forward of the frontage all result in a lot of visual built form which does little to accord with the locality.

7.89 The design utilises local materials but the urban style vehicular entrance gate is not appropriate to the rural setting.

7.90 The development does not raise standards in rural areas. The submitted plans and landscape appraisal fails to demonstrate that the development will significantly enhance its immediate setting. The development would introduce a large building into the open setting, with a large urban style gate within a rural hedgerow. The angular design and large number of shuttered windows are not sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area. The previous dismissed appeal is a material planning consideration, along with the consideration given by officers in report to the planning committee to the previous withdrawn application. The previous reasons for dismissing the appeal and reasons officers considered the last application unacceptable have not been overcome through this application.

7.91 In addition to paragraph 80 (e) of the NPPF the application would need to meet all relevant Development Plan policy. The relevant policy considerations are set out below”.

Recommendation

The Council does not consider the rebuttal letter from Design Midlands or the late representation from Bozeat parish council raises any new matters and considers the officer report and recommendation to committee covers these matters.

10.08.2021

Design:Midlands Design Review of Reveal House at Dungee Corner

Design:Midlands work with local authorities, the commercial sector, developers, communities and design professionals to help create better neighbourhoods, buildings and spaces across the Midlands region. We specialise in providing targeted and bespoke design support services including managing the regional design review panel as cited in Paragraph 131 of the NPPF (2021).

The Design:Midlands design review panel comment on a wide variety of schemes ranging from public buildings, masterplans, housing of all scales including isolated homes in the open countryside preferably at the pre planning application / design development stage when there is greater opportunity for positive constructive dialogue. The Panel is made up of wide range of experts from the built environment field who provide expert, independent, impartial advice in keeping with the 10 Principles of Design Review. Design review meetings take the form of a site visit of the proposed scheme, a presentation by the design team, followed by comments from the Panel. A letter is then produced detailing the comments made by the panel on the scheme.

The Design:Midlands Design Review Panel undertook a design review of the proposed Reveal House scheme at Dungee Corner in November 2019, followed by a desktop design review in August 2020 and a Tabletop design review in May 2021.

The Panel comprised two architects and a landscape architect who were chosen to provide the design expertise and skills required to assess a scheme against the criteria of Paragraph 79 of the NPPF (now Paragraph 80). Two members of the Panel have designed and gained planning permission for schemes for isolated homes in the open countryside (formerly Paragraph 79 and 55) while the third Panel member undertook an assessment of scheme granted permission against this criteria. The Panel members provided input throughout the project (3 panel members for the design review and 2 panel members for the desktop and tabletop reviews) to ensure continuity and consistent advice.

The design review reports should be read as a whole and provide an accurate record of the comments raised by the Panel, how the design team and clients have responded to the comments and how the scheme developed during this time. In the final review May 2021 the letter stated:

‘The approach to the site; the ‘reveal’ design concept; the scale, mass and form of the proposed dwelling, the position of the garage, and the choice of materials palette are all supported. However, it is suggested that additional supporting information would assist in communicating the design concept and narrative for what the Panel believe is a strong scheme, and a scheme capable of meeting the stringent criteria of Paragraph 79 of the NPPF.’

Additional work has been undertaken by the Design Team following the above review prior to submitting the planning application.



Yours sincerely,

Dharmista Patel
Design Panel Manager
On behalf of the Design Midlands Design Review Panel