

**North Northamptonshire Area Planning Committee
(Thrapston)
3 May 2022**

Application Reference	NE/21/00379/FUL
Case Officer	Patrick Reid
Location	Land Opposite Elizabeth Close Elizabeth Close Raunds
Development	Construction of up to 35 affordable dwellings, with associated drainage, access and landscaping
Applicant	C/o Agent
Agent	Aitchison Raffety - Mr Andrew Gray
Ward	Raunds
Overall Expiry Date	4 June 2021
Agreed Extension of Time	4 June 2022

Appendices:

1 - Appeal Decision 3259241 (LPA ref. 18/01109/FUL) - 10 dwellings, including access, parking, landscaping and associated infrastructure – Appeal Allowed 25/01/21

2 - Appeal Decision 3277823 (LPA ref. 20/00347/OUT) Land rear of Hillside, Raunds – 21 dwellings and access – Appeal Allowed 19.01.2022

Scheme of Delegation

This application is brought to committee because it falls outside of the Council's Scheme of Delegation because Raunds Town Council are in objection to the application and the recommendation is for approval.

1. Recommendation

1.1 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 as requested by the LLFA, and subject to the completion of a Section 106 Legal Agreement by 4 June 2022 (or other date to be agreed), or refusal of planning permission if the S106 is not completed within the agreed timescale, 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.

2. The Proposal

2.1 It is proposed to construct up to thirty-five dwellings and an associated access. The submitted proposal comprises a total of thirty dwellings. An access would be built off Brick Kiln Road toward the eastern side of the site and the access road would lead up centrally through the site, culminating in a turning head.

2.2 The houses proposed comprise sixteen available for social rent and fourteen for shared ownership. The housing mix is as follows:

Social Rent	Shared Ownership
1 bedroom x 4	
2 bedroom x 5	2 bedroom x 3
3 bedroom x7	3 bedroom x 11
Total = 16	Total = 14

Each dwelling would have dedicated off-road parking. The layout of the parking spaces is a mixture of being located in front of the houses beside the highway, as well as in small parking courts.

- 2.3 The layout of the site centres around an access road that enters the site toward the eastern corner before extending up the central part of the site, with housing on both sides. The road would be sufficiently wide for two vehicles to pass and would have a 2m wide pavement on each side. The houses would generally be set back from the road, with the parking arrangement including a combination of parking to the fronts of the houses, as well as in three small car parks. One plot (20) would have its parking spaces to the side. Other than the road and parking spaces, the outside space would include private amenity space for each dwelling as well as public open space.
- 2.4 The communal outside space would include an area of grass which would measure around 34 square metres (sqm). At the front of the site would be a grass/vegetation covered area that would measure around 750 sqm and would accommodate a buried attenuation crate for drainage. The front boundary is proposed to be occupied by hedging to the west of the vehicular access, similar to the western boundary that borders the vehicular access to the commercial units. The landscaping also includes a number of trees within the site to the front of some of the houses as well as on the area of open space between plots 28 and 29.
- 2.5 The proposed dwellings would be two storey and would be constructed primarily in red bricks. Render would be used on 11 of the plots. The roof material would include two tile types, terracotta and smooth grey tiles.

3. Site Description

- 3.1 The site is located towards the northern part of Raunds, a settlement classified as 'Market Town' in the Joint Core Strategy (2016). The site is situated to the north of Brick Kiln Road, which runs in a general east-west orientation with the majority of the settlement to its south. The context of the site is a mixture of residential, commercial and undeveloped land. To the south of Brick Kiln Road is residential development. To the east is residential properties albeit either recently constructed, or currently under construction. The housing is accessed via Brawn Drive which has a junction on the bend in the road of Brick Kiln Road.
- 3.2 To the north of the site is a commercial development comprising a mixture of business and industrial uses. The land to the immediate west is the access road leading to the industrial site. Beyond the access road is undeveloped agricultural land. To the south of the site is a residential cul-de-sac called Elizabeth Close. To the south-east of the site is a commercial/industrial development served off Enterprise Road.
- 3.3 The site itself is undeveloped grassland that is broadly rectangular in footprint. It does not appear to be in use for growing crops or grazing animals or any active agriculture. Its southern and western boundaries that are shared with adjacent roads, are marked by mature hedging. The eastern boundary is not defined by hedging and currently is marked by temporary construction fencing whilst the adjacent site is developed. The topography of the land is varied as the gradient increase from south to north. The commercial units to the north are visible from the site due to an

absence of boundary screening.

- 3.4 The site is within 3km of the Upper Nene Valley Gravel Pits Special Protection Area. It is not within or adjacent a Conservation Area and there are no listed buildings in the immediate vicinity although the church is visible from the land. The site is within Flood Zone 1 (least likely to flood).

4. Relevant Planning History

4.1 *Land to the east:*

14/02000/REM - Reserved matters for the erection of 230 (two hundred and thirty) residential units pursuant to outline application 11/01747/OUT proposed sustainable urban gateway to Raunds comprising employment (Use Classes B1,B2 and B8); residential (Use Class C3); new vehicular and pedestrian access and associated road infrastructure, public open space and landscaping, including flood alleviation measures.(All matters reserved except for access) dated 07.12.12 – Approved (08.01.15)

- 4.2 The site itself has no relevant planning history, however the following applications relate to land located within close proximity to the site:

Land North of Raunds, Fronting Brick Kiln Road, North Street, Brooks Road and Midland Road, Raunds

09/01626/OUT - Outline application: Proposed Sustainable urban addition to Raunds comprising residential (Use Class C3); residential care facilities (Use Class C2); business (Use Class B1); storage and distribution (Use Class B8); new vehicular and pedestrian access and associated road infrastructure, public open space, landscaping (including flood alleviation measures), and conversion of existing buildings to provide residential (Use Class C3) and/or community facilities (Use Class D1) (All matters reserved except for access) – Appeal Allowed 28.07.2011

- 4.3 12/01889/VAR - Variation of Condition 4: Removal of the access between Brooks Road and the eastern part of the site so that access to and from this eastern parcel is via Midland Road only. Approved plan CS24675/T/108 to be substituted with revised plan CS-0593-T-001, pursuant to Application 09/01626/OUT - Approved 05.03.2013

- 4.4 14/01082/REM - For appearance, landscaping, layout and scale pursuant to 12/01889/VAR - Approved 17.10.2014

West End, Land north of Brick Kiln Road, Raunds

- 4.5 11/01747/OUT - Outline Application proposed sustainable urban gateway to Raunds comprising employment (Use class B1, B2 and B8); residential (Use class C3); new vehicular and pedestrian access and associated road infrastructure, public open space and landscaping, including flood alleviation measures - Approved 07.12.2012

- 4.6 14/02000/REM - Reserved Matters Application for the erection of 230

residential units pursuant to outline application 11/01747/OUT - West End Land north of Brick Kiln Road, Raunds - Approved 08.01.2015

- 4.7 18/01744/OUT - Outline application for up to 10 dwellings, including access onto Brick Kiln Road - Approved 07.06.2019

Other relevant cases in North Raunds:

- 4.8 Appeal Decision 3259241 (LPA ref. 18/01109/FUL) - 10 dwellings, including access, parking, landscaping and associated infrastructure – Appeal Allowed 25/01/21
- 4.9 Appeal Decision 3277823 (LPA ref. 20/00347/OUT) Land rear of Hillside, Raunds – 21 dwellings and access – Appeal Allowed 19.01.2022

5. Consultation Responses

A full copy of all comments received can be found on the Council's website [here](#)

5.1 Raunds Town Council

(Initial comments received on 35 dwelling scheme prior to amendments)
Objection for reasons summarised as follows:

- Members agreed that although affordable housing is desirable, the proposed increase in housing numbers contravenes Paragraph 4.9 of the Raunds Neighbourhood Plan 2017. Raunds has taken its share of housing and there is no requirement for additional dwellings to be allocated;
- There is no open space provision included within the site boundary and the development does not promote good design. It is an over development of the site with cramped amenity space. This is contrary to policies R1 & R2 of the Raunds Neighbourhood Plan 2017 and 8(d) of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy, 2016;
- The road layout does not show visibility splays at the proposed access and the turning head does not allow the safe manoeuvre of larger vehicles without encroaching the footway;
- Concern at proximity with Elizabeth Close and Brawn Drive;
- Concern at the number of parking spaces not meeting the Parking Standards (2016);
- Concern that the development would add to flood risk.

(subsequent comments received in response to amended plan): Objection for reasons summarised as follows:

- Reduction in units is noted but all reasons for objection from previous remain;
- Unclear on S106 agreement position.

5.2 Neighbours / Responses to Publicity

Four representations have been received, all of which four are in objection. The issues raised are summarised below:

- In combination with recent development nearby, the development would cause disruption on Brick Kiln Road;
- Impact on wildlife;
- Loss of space used for dog walking;
- Increase in traffic;
- Access should be taken from an existing site/road off Brick Kiln Road to reduce number of junctions;
- Impact on local amenities;
- Impact on flooding on Brick Kiln Road is possible.

5.3 Local Highway Authority (LHA)

Comments summarised as follows:

- The LHA finds both the 25 metres forward visibility and tracking at the access of the site acceptable. Therefore, it is confirmed no further observations or objections to this application (comments on 35 unit scheme);
- query the crossover arrangement serving the spaces for plot 18. Please note that the maximum length allowed for Dropped Kerbing, before Tapered and Full Height Kerbing are required, is 12 metres;
- It appears vehicles parking in the spaces for plot 10 may have difficulty accessing the highway at 90 degrees. Private accesses are required to meet the public highway at 90 degrees in order to maximise visibility when existing.

5.4 Housing Strategy and Enabling Officer

Comments summarised as follows:

- Support proposal. As the proportion of low-cost home ownership units had now increased, ideally would prefer to see some of the shared ownership units provided as rent to buy if this would be possible. Understand however, for the Applicant it would not be economically viable;
- It is pleasing to see some comments from previous response taken on board. In particular that on the latest floor plan for the 3 bed 5 person bungalow that a wet room has now been added;
- The 3 bed 5 person house should be accessible, with a ground floor bedroom and shower room;
- 1 bed maisonettes. We would expect to see the ground floor units to be provided with a shower instead of a bath to increase accessibility options
- Strongly support this scheme as there is a high level of need for all of the types of affordable housing proposed. We believe that the

proposed tenure and size mix provides for a sustainable scheme.

Current snapshot of need is:

- Currently there are 90 people from Raunds requiring an Affordable dwelling to rent;
- 170 are on the North Northamptonshire register with Raunds recorded as their first choice for rent;
- All dwellings currently being built have been allocated to a person/household. The need identified above (90 and 170) has no housing supply coming forward to meet it as that permitted is already being built out/allocated, apart from 13 one and two bed flats;
- There is a significant unmet need for affordable housing to rent in Raunds;
- Shared ownership properties are also needed but are not recorded on the register.

5.4 Environmental Protection

No objections to the application. Should permission be granted, conditions and an informative are recommended.

5.5 Lead Local Flood Authority

Comments summarised as follows:

Objection due to insufficient information and the following reasons:

Having reviewed the applicant's submitted information located within Drawing 19013-DS02 entitled Private Drainage Strategy dated 6th November 2020 prepared by Welland we would advise that there is insufficient information available to comment on the acceptability of the proposed surface water drainage scheme for the proposed development.

It is noted that the submitted surface water drainage information fails on grounds (specified in the full comments).

Overcoming our concerns:

Our concerns can be overcome by submitting surface water drainage information which covers the deficiencies highlighted above.

Officer comment: It should be noted that the above comments are in relation to the originally submitted scheme for 35 dwellings. Revised drainage details have been submitted by the applicant and the LLFA has been re-consulted. Any response will be reported on the Committee Update Report and are expected prior to the date of the Area Planning Committee.

5.5 Northamptonshire Police

Comments received summarised as follows.

No objection to the scheme in general. Concerns raised in reference to Secured by Design principles to original 35 unit scheme

- Windows, doors and locking safety recommendations;
- Shared rear access alleyways must be gated and be installed as near as possible to the front building line. Ideally these should be transparent (metal railing or hit and miss timber) and lockable;
- Plot 1: Ideally should have an active room window to the side overlooking the POS. Level with the front building line, adjacent to the side footpath should be a knee rail fence to extend to the rear boundary wall, on the POS side of this knee rail and abutting the rear of plot wall should be low hedging/dense defensive planting;
- Plots beside parking areas ideally should have windows that overlook the parking areas;
- Cycle storage should be secure;
- Each dwelling elevation that contains a doorset must be lit (Low energy dusk to dawn luminaires are the most appropriate).

5.6 Environment Agency

No comments/observations as it does not meet their commenting criteria.

5.7 Anglian Water

Comments summarised as follows:

Surface Water: There are assets owned by Anglian Water or those subject to an adoption agreement within or close to the development boundary that may affect the layout of the site. Anglian Water would recommend an informative if permission is granted.

Wastewater Services: The foul drainage from this development is in the catchment of Raunds Water Recycling Centre that will have available capacity for these flows.

Used Water Network: This response has been based on the following submitted documents: 19013-DS02 "Private Drainage Strategy" dated November 2020. The sewerage system at present has available capacity for these flows. If the developer wishes to connect to our sewerage network, they should serve notice under Section 106 of the Water Industry Act 1991.

5.8 Archaeology

No objection subject to a condition to secure archaeological work. The scheme would comprise trial trenching in the first instance, to be followed by further investigation as required based on the results of the trial trenching. This work should be secured by the standard Northamptonshire archaeological condition.

5.9 Ecology

Having reviewed the ecological documents supplied, satisfied that no licences or mitigation will be required provided the measures outlined in sections 4 and 5 of the Ecological Appraisal report (FPCR, dated January 2021) are followed. A condition is therefore recommended for a CEMP as set out in BS42020:

A LEMP will also be required to ensure the new plantings are well maintained. Given the nature of the habitats on site and the type of development, this can be a pre-occupation condition.

5.10 Natural England

The proposal is within the zone of influence of the Upper Nene Valley Gravel Pits Special Protection Area (SPA), and therefore is expected to contribute to recreational disturbance impacts to the bird populations for which the SPA has been notified. Mitigation for these impacts is available via a financial contribution towards a strategic mitigation project, set out within the associated SPD.

5.11 Waste Manager

Comments summarised as follows:

- The red tyre lines are within the road - although it is on the limit;
- The swept path for the refuse truck is acceptable and has been checked with the waste contractor.
- There is ample kerbside for residents to present standard bins.

5.12 Key Services (Education, Libraries, Broadband) and Northamptonshire Fire and Rescue Service

Comments summarised as follows

Financial request for contributions for mitigating the demand of the development on Early Years Education, Primary Education, Secondary Education and Libraries. It is request amounts be secured via a S106 Agreement. The education demand is anticipated to be 6 primary age pupils, 4 secondary and sixth-form pupils. Early years provision is not clear as this is under review.

- If there is a lack of Early Years capacity, £64,190;
- Primary Education of £100,808;
- Secondary Education of £91,742;
- Libraries of £6,146.

5.13 Independent Viability Assessor

Comments summarised as follows:

- The 100% affordable housing scheme is marginally viable;
- A nominal contribution of C£20,000 could be made towards S106 contributions.

6. Relevant Planning Policies and Considerations

6.1 Statutory Duty

Planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

6.2 National Policy

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2021)

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

National Design Guide (NDG) (2019)

6.3 North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS) (2016)

Policy 1 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Policy 2 – Historic Environment

Policy 4 - - Biodiversity and Geodiversity

Policy 5 - Water Environment, Resources and Flood Risk Management

Policy 8 – North Northamptonshire Place Shaping Principles

Policy 9 – Sustainable Buildings and Allowable Solutions

Policy 11 – The Network of Urban and Rural Areas

Policy 13 - Rural Exceptions

Policy 28 - Housing Requirements

Policy 29 – Distribution of New Homes

Policy 30 – Housing Mix and Tenure

6.4 Raunds Neighbourhood Plan 2011-2031 (made 2017)

Policy R1 – Ensuring an appropriate range of sizes and types of houses

Policy R2 – Promoting good design

Policy R3 – Flexibility and adaptability in new housing design

Policy R4 – Car parking in new housing development

Policy R5 – Open space provision

Policy R10 – Traffic and transport in Raunds

Policy R16 – Built and natural environment

Policy R19 - Upper Nene Valley Gravel Pits Special Protection Area (SPA)/Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)

Policy R20 – Movement and connectivity

6.5 Emerging East Northamptonshire Local Plan Part 2 2011-2031 (LPP2) (Submission version March 2021)

EN1: Spatial development strategy

EN2: Settlement boundary criteria – urban areas

EN5: Development on the periphery of settlements and rural exceptions housing

EN10: Enhancement and provision of open space

EN12: Health and wellbeing

EN13: Design of Buildings/Extensions

EN14: Designated Heritage Assets
EN30: Housing mix and tenure to meet local need
EN31: Older people's housing provision
EN32: Self and custom build housing

6.6 Other Relevant Documents

Northamptonshire County Council - Local Highway Authority Standing Advice for Local Planning Authorities (2016)

Northamptonshire County Council - Local Highway Authority Parking Standards (2016)

East Northamptonshire Council - Domestic Waste Storage and Collection Supplementary Planning Document (2012)

East Northamptonshire Council - Trees and Landscape Supplementary Planning Document (2013)

East Northamptonshire Council - Nene Valley Gravel Pits Special Protection Area Supplementary Planning Document (2016)

7. Evaluation

The key issues for consideration are:

- Principle of Development
- Housing Mix
- Design and Visual Impact
- Impact on Neighbouring Amenity
- Private Amenity of the dwellings
- Highway Matters
- Environmental Matters
- Flood Risk and Drainage
- Ecology
- Heritage and Archaeology
- Landscaping
- Waste Management
- Planning Obligations
- Emerging Part 2 Local Plan

7.1 Principle of Development

7.1.1 The planning policy context for determining the principle of the development is defined in the policies of the JCS, and the Raunds Neighbourhood Plan (NP) provides the basis for establishing the principle of development. Finally, the emerging East Northamptonshire Part 2 Local Plan and the NPPF are material considerations. Another source of material considerations are appeal decisions. These can provide guidance and indications as to how the Planning Inspectorate have interpreted relevant local and national planning policies, legislation and considerations.

7.1.2 Policy 28 of the JCS sets the housing requirements for the area and divides these into the former borough and district areas. For East Northamptonshire, the requirement for the plan period is 8,400

dwellings. Policy 29 of the JCS sets the basis for the distribution of new homes across the area. It expresses that new housing will have a strong focus on the Growth Towns, followed by the Market Towns. Table 5 accompanies Policy 29 whereby the settlements are put into a hierarchy. Raunds, classified as a Market Town, has a housing requirement given as 1,060 dwellings.

- 7.1.3 Policy 30 of the JCS relates primarily to the mix and tenure of housing units within developments. Its contents vary on their focuses which include the size of dwellings in terms of the number of bedrooms that units shall provide, internal space and affordable housing triggers and percentages of open market developments. Policy 13 of the JCS is focussed on rural exceptions, and it sets the basis by which new development may be permitted 'in the rural area', as an exception to the spatial strategy set out in Policy 11. The latter Policy (11), sets a broad division of 'urban' and 'rural' areas. Part 1 (b) sets out that the Market Towns, of which Raunds is one, '*will provide a strong service role for their local communities and surrounding rural areas with growth in homes and jobs to support regeneration and local services, at a scale appropriate to the character and infrastructure of the town*'. Part (c) sets out that new housing will be provided in line with Policy 28.
- 7.1.4 The Neighbourhood Plan (NP) includes Policy R1 relating to housing provision. It sets out that new developments will be expected to meet the future needs of Raunds. The Policy does not set out particular criteria in relation to a location or setting of a site.
- 7.1.5 Alongside the policies within the NP, there is supporting text. Paragraph 4.9 relates to housing and it is noted that the NP does not include any site allocations as by that time there had been planning permission for 1,058 dwellings, nearly the 1,060 required by Policy 28 of the JCS. The text notes that 'Instead, the Neighbourhood Development Plan examines the following housing issues', then listing six bullet points. Bullet point two of these includes that future residential development should be restricted to infill sites or town centre development. Other bullet points refer primarily to matters of design.
- 7.1.6 The text at note 4.9 is not part of a Policy. Whilst it is part of the NP, its nature is more to set the background of how and why the policies of the NP have been included. Appeal decisions have directly addressed this point and this will be addressed later in this report.
- 7.1.7 Recent appeal decisions can provide information as to how the policies of the JCS and NP are to be interpreted with regard to housing developments in Raunds.

Recent appeal decisions:

Appeal Decision 3259241 - 10 dwellings, including access, parking, landscaping and associated infrastructure – Appeal Allowed (25/01/21)

- 7.1.8 Appeal decision ref. 3259241 was issued on 25 January 2021 and

relates to a proposed development of 10 dwellings on land also north of Brick Kiln Road. The site subject of that appeal is approximately a third of a mile away from the site subject of this application, both at the north of Raunds. Paragraphs 25 to 27 of the Appeal Decision discuss Policy 11 of the JCS and the housing policies of the Neighbourhood Plan. The following wording of the Inspector is included at paragraph 26 of the appeal decision:

'Due to various planning permissions having been granted for residential development at Raunds in recent years, the RNP does not identify additional land for housing. Nevertheless, the proposal would not, to my mind, represent significant additional growth. Indeed, it would be in a location and at a scale appropriate to the character and infrastructure of the town. The proposal would suitably respond towards meeting the future needs of Raunds and of the wider local area, not least through the provision of affordable housing (in a form supported by the Council's Housing Officer) and market dwellings of a variety of types and sizes with an emphasis placed upon smaller house types.'

7.1.9 The appeal scheme shares similarities with the current proposal insofar as they both relate to land in the north of Raunds, adjacent housing development on undeveloped and unallocated land. The Appeal Decision was issued in a near identical planning policy context albeit the NPPF has had the 2021 revision, and the Part 2 LP has been submitted for examination.

7.1.10 The appeal decision indicates that the housing policies allow for new housing in Raunds where the site is suitably located and of an appropriate scale. It also indicates that the benefits of the housing toward meeting the future needs of both Raunds and the wider area of both market and affordable housing.

7.1.11 The relevance of the appeal decision for the current site indicates is that an undeveloped site on the edge of Raunds can be considered policy compliant provided it is of a suitable scale and is otherwise sustainably designed. Therefore, whilst the Town Council has objected to the proposal on the basis of Raunds not requiring more housing to meet its JCS requirement, it is reaffirmed that the figures specified in the JCS are a minimum. It is a matter instead of assessing the particular merits of a scheme including of its scale, accessibility and other merits and considerations as part of a wider planning balance assessment. Policy 11 of the JCS and the NP

Appeal Decision 3277823 (LPA ref. 20/00347/OUT) Land rear of Hillside, Raunds – 21 dwellings and access – Allowed 19.01.2022

7.1.12 In regard to the principle of housing in Raunds, paragraph 17 is relevant in which the Inspector states the following:

'Paragraph 4.9 of the NP states that as Raunds has met its housing requirement there is no need to allocate additional land for housing. Nevertheless, housing figures set a minimum requirement. As such, this

would not preclude the delivery of further sites for housing that accord with the objectives of the Framework.'

- 7.1.13 In that case the site was occupied by commercial buildings and use and in that sense was different to the current site. That factor weighed in favour of the scheme in reference to the transport impact as the vehicular movements were calculated to be less than the proposed development. Whilst the site has been developed, the similarities with this scheme are that they are of a similar scale (21 and 30 dwellings) on land that is not allocated, in the same/current policy context. From this appeal decision, it demonstrates that a site within the NP area for Raunds can come forward for housing without being allocated. It also indicates that the Part 2 LP at its current stage, does not alter this position.

Policy 11 of the JCS

- 7.1.14 Policy 11 (c) sets out that '*Any proposals for significant additional growth should be tested and supported through Part 2 Local Plans or Neighbourhood Plans.*' The question of whether the proposal represents '*significant additional growth*' is therefore considered. It is noted from the NP that Raunds has a population of 8,641 (2011 census) and 3,500 homes. It is noted that the figures today in 2021 are likely to be greater than this due to development that has occurred since the NP was written. As a general tool of assessment, the proposed up to 35 dwellings is considered in relation to the existing 3,500+ in the settlement. As an approximate guide, the proposal represents less than a 1% increase in the number of dwellings. This mathematical assessment of 1 or less percent indicates the development does not represent '*significant growth*'. This is one measure of considering whether the proposal represents significant growth in the context of the settlement to which it would adjoin. Relating this back to the January 2021 Appeal Decision (Appendix 1) whereby a development of 21 dwellings was considered to be compliant with Policy 11, it would be consistent to conclude the proposed up to 35 dwellings does not conflict with Policy 11. Additionally, the proposed layout is for 30 dwellings on a relatively modestly sized piece of land and as such is not considered large or significant in the context of the town of Raunds. There would need to be demonstrable evidence that the housing proposed would represent significant growth for a conflict with Policy 11 to be concluded. Other material considerations are assessed in this report but in scale terms, the residential development is considered consistent with the development plan.
- 7.1.15 To consider whether the proposal of up to 35 dwellings represents '*significant*' growth, the context of the site, primarily the settlement, is a key factor. In addition, it is necessary to consider whether the proposal of 30, or up to 35, is significant, in isolation. The nature of the development, comprising 30 dwellings that are a mix of '*smaller*' dwellings including 1, 2 and 3 bedroom units, is considered not significant in terms of strategic planning for a settlement. In the context of Raunds and the scale of the settlement, the number of dwellings, their

scale and the physical context of the site leads to the conclusion that the proposal does not conflict with criterion 1 (c) of Policy 11 of the JCS.

- 7.1.16 Officers have considered whether the proposal is more appropriately considered against Policy 11 or 13 of the JCS. In relation to Policy 11, it refers to growth of the Market Towns, including Raunds. The wording places no limitation or criterion on sites having to be within the settlement. Instead, the wording indicates that growth can occur on the either in or on the edge of the settlement. The wording of 1, (c) and the limitation of 'significant growth' would suggest that allowances are made for development for Raunds that can be on the edge. The Appeal Decision at Appendix 1, for 10 dwellings on the edge of Raunds on undeveloped land, was found to be in compliance with Policy 11 by the Inspector. Policy 13 is not applicable based on this line of reason.
- 7.1.17 In addressing Policy 13 'Rural Exceptions', it is noted that it relates to the 'rural areas'. Part 1 (a) refers to sites on the edge of an established settlement that must be a 'village'. As Raunds is classified as a 'Market Town', the Policy is not relevant to this location. Policy 13 is focussed on rural sites away from any settlements, as well as those on the edge of villages. In this case, it is not applicable.

East Northants Part 2 Local Plan

- 7.1.18 In March 2021 the Council submitted its Part 2 Local Plan (LPP2) for examination. It is still going through this process and the latest progress is the issuing of proposed modifications, in December 2021. The LPP2 is a material consideration that is to be attributed a limited level of weight, given that its policies are subject to change and it is not adopted. There is the potential that its policies may change, be removed or the plan not be adopted in its entirety. It is therefore a consideration but not part of the adopted development plan.
- 7.1.19 Draft Policy EN1 builds on the JCS policies and sets out that for Raunds, as an 'urban area', development is to be 'focus upon urban reimagination, to support job creation, regeneration and to secure and enhance the local service base'. EN2 goes on to establish that 'infill development' will be supported in the urban areas. It is not considered the site represents infill and the proposal is subject of other considerations, including Policies 11, 28 and 29 of the JCS.
- 7.1.20 Table 16 of the LPP2 analyses the extents of completions and commitments for housing across the urban areas, including Raunds. The table confirms the commitments for Raunds are four dwellings in excess of the minimum 1,060 required across the plan period. The primary policy of the LPP2, concerned with principle, therefore is EN1 and its wording under (b). This wording makes provision for new development and that the focus will be on 'urban reimagination', where a scheme does not represent infill. Wording in the Schedule of Main Modifications (December 2021) for supporting text sets out the following:

'Table 16 shows that as at 1 April 2020 JCS housing requirements for Higham Ferrers and Thrapston are being met, through housing completions (1,799 dwellings) and housing commitments (1,563 dwellings). A minimal residual requirement has been identified for Raunds (4 dwellings), but other emerging and brownfield site proposals identified in the 2020 Annual Position Statement (total 88 dwellings) are more than sufficient to address the housing requirements for the town.'

- 7.1.21 In considering the contents of the LPP2 and its current stage, it does not preclude new housing coming forward where it is sustainable. There is to be a 'focus' on urban reimagination and the policy does not specify beyond this. Whether the site and proposal are part of this is open to interpretation. The site is immediately beside a larger site that is being developed on the north of the town and given its physical context wedged between the access road serving the commercial units, may represent such a site. As part of the northern residential expansion of Raunds, the proposal may represent a reasonable use of land that would be well related to the wider adjacent scheme. It is therefore concluded that the contents of the LPP2 are supportive of the proposal in principle.

Conclusion on principle

- 7.1.22 The proposed affordable housing is considered to be consistent with Policy 11 of the JCS. This is supported by the recent appeal decisions cited. The proposal does not conflict with housing provision policies of the NP and it is found to be consistent with the emerging LPP2. For the reasons set out, the proposal is considered to be acceptable in principle.

7.2 Housing Mix

- 7.2.1 Policy 30 of the JCS sets out how developments should provide a mix of dwelling sizes and tenures. The proposal comprises a mixture of 16 social rent, ranging from 1 to 3 bedrooms, as well as 14 shared ownership houses which would be a mixture of 2 and 3 bedroom units. Part (a) of Policy 30 places emphasis on the need for developments to accommodate smaller households (1 to 3 bedrooms). The proposal meets the aim of providing 'smaller' dwellings.
- 7.2.2 Part (d) requires that private sector developments include a provision of affordable housing. For Raunds the requirement for the inclusion for affordable housing is 15 dwellings. As the proposal is entirely for affordable housing, the minimum requirement is met and exceeded.
- 7.2.3 The Council's Housing Strategy Officer has commented in support of the application, expressing that there is a need for both social rent and shared ownership. A preference for a greater extent of social rent was

made, but the Applicant has indicated this would not be economically viable. As the scheme has already reduced from 35 to 30 units, the economic element of the scheme has reduced significantly and the proposed mix has been required to make the development viable.

- 7.2.4 The housing need has been detailed by the Council's Housing Officer and the evidence indicates that there is a need for 90 affordable homes for residents of Raunds. This figure increases to 170 properties when the number of residents of North Northamptonshire specify that their first choice of affordable home to rent is in Raunds. The 170 total does not necessarily mean that all of those residents are currently in Raunds or have a local link. The comments from the Housing Officer also refer to the supply of homes in Raunds and it is advised that there is little supply expected to come forward beyond 13 one-bedroom flats. The affordable housing has been allocated to new residents and the 90 on the housing waiting-list are not catered for by developments currently coming forward in Raunds.
- 7.2.5 The unmet need specified is a snapshot in time but it is the more accurate and reliable information to base an assessment on. The Council's Housing Officer has advised that there is a need for 90 affordable housing units in Raunds and beyond 13 flats, there is no indication of supply. The proposal would provide 14 dwellings to rent that would be a valuable contribution towards this need. Additionally, 16 shared-ownership units would be added to the area's affordable housing stock. Due to the level of unmet need and the number of units proposed, this is considered to weigh considerably in favour of the proposal.
- 7.2.6 The matter of the site being entirely affordable is a further consideration particularly as it exceeds the Policy 30 requirement of 30% of dwellings to be affordable. Supporting paragraph 9.37 in the JCS notes that the figure set by the JCS is the 'maximum reasonable amount...having regard to the viability of the development scheme'. This indicates the figure aspirationally would be higher, but for plan marking purposes, to set a higher percentage would be contrary to economic evidence that indicates developments would not be viable at a higher level. In this case however, the development viability is different or untypical insofar as it is proposed to be part funded by a central government grant for the delivery of affordable housing.
- 7.2.7 Grant funding for the development of affordable housing on the site is an integral and fundamental element of the economics of the proposed development. It is understood that the mix of social rent and intermediate affordable housing provides the balance of being economically viable, taking account of the grant funding, whilst not including market housing due to the reduction in grant that this would cause. An increase in either the percentage of social rent, or the inclusion of market housing, are understood to be unviable. Therefore, the submitted housing mix is understood to be potentially the only mix that would be deliverable. To seek to alter the mix is understood to result in an undeliverable scheme.

7.2.8 In conclusion, the housing mix provides far in excess of the target affordable housing required by Policy 30. It therefore meets the 30% affordable housing target and exceeds it. A housing mix to include market housing would provide a more balanced tenure split, but the provision of 100% affordable where there is demonstrable need in Raunds is considered a planning benefit to the public. There is no significant identified harm in a 100% affordable housing mix and the development viability indicates this is the only arrangement that would be deliverable. Based on the reasons given, the mix is considered to comply with Policy 30 and is acceptable.

7.3 **Design and Visual Impact**

7.3.1 The assessment of the site has included a review from the Council's Design Officers on the earlier 35 unit scheme. Following that process, feedback was provided to the Applicant and the amended 30 unit scheme was submitted. Other than a reduction in the houses on the site, other changes include the addition of open space on the eastern part of the site, a reduction of parking spaces beside the road and the inclusion of more road-sided planting. These changes are considered to be positive alterations.

7.3.2 In assessing the design, it is necessary to acknowledge its constraints that place limitations on the layout of its development. One aspect that was queried was whether vehicular access could be taken from the adjacent road to the east which is part of the next door development. It was confirmed that this is not possible as that road is not adopted. It is therefore a necessity that access be taken off Brick Kiln Road.

7.3.3 From Brick Kiln Road, the placement of the open space/drainage attenuation feature to the front will provide a visual gap and would be less harsh than housing close to the road. The orientation of the housing across the site is to address the internal road and the setting back of the western units (plots 1 to 10) is considered a positive design feature.

7.3.4 The reduction in width of the site toward the north is managed by bringing the houses closer to the highway. The space available manages to provide the off-road parking required as well as external amenity space for each dwelling, as well as a turning head to adoptable standards. The utilisation of the space is considered an appropriate layout given the constraints of the site.

Connectivity

7.3.5 Pedestrians will be able to exit the site and cross Brick Kiln Road to walk to the town centre in around a 10 minute walk. Pedestrian movement will also be possible through the adjacent housing development to the east. Having two pedestrian approaches is considered a positive approach.

Open Space

- 7.3.6 In 2011 the former East Northants Council adopted the Open Space SPD. Whilst this is still a material consideration, it has since been advised by the Council's Planning Policy Team that the calculation set out in the emerging LPP2, based on more up to date evidence, has more relevance in its use.
- 7.3.7 Based on the submitted 30 dwelling scheme, the open space calculation would total around 0.302 hectares, based on the five types specified ranging from parks and gardens to allotments. The total provision on the site, comprising the land to the frontage and between plots 28 and 29, totals around 0.15ha. This calculation is based on an average of 2.4 persons per household, totalling 72 residents, across the development. This total is less than the LLP2 standards.
- 7.3.8 The extent of open space is less than the emerging plan seeks for Raunds, which has higher aims than the other settlements. It is acknowledged that the current layout has provided more open space and reduced the number of dwellings, thereby improving the balance between dwellings and open space provision. Nevertheless, based on the LPP2, the on-site provision would be less than should be accommodated to serve the residents and this weighs against the development.
- 7.3.9 Policy R5 of the NP requires that developments accord with the Open Space SPD (2011). For the reasons set out above, the SPD is considered to be out of date. The contents of Policy R5 otherwise do not alter the open space position set out above.

Landscape Impact

- 7.3.10 The site is not subject of a landscape designation and is enveloped by housing development on its east, commercial units to its north and the vehicular access on the west. It is not considered to be of particular visual benefit beyond being free from built form. Its open grassland nature does not indicate any active agricultural use. The commercial units to the north mean it is not of particular significance in respect of wider landscape views.
- 7.3.11 From Brick Kiln Road, the development would appear as modern style housing, not dissimilar to that to the east. It would appear as part of the wider development to the east as there will be no separation between the two and the materials would be similar. The open space and hedging at the front would provide an element of softening the appearance from this area.
- 7.3.12 The placement of the rear of the gardens to border the commercial road is considered appropriate as this is largely a functional space for movement. The internal arrangement makes provision for tree planting and ensures housing addresses the street, which is considered positive. Additionally, the scale of the housing is considered appropriate as to not be overly dominant in the edge of town location.

7.3.13 Taking account all matters of the design of the 30 dwelling scheme, it is considered the resultant development would be in character with the surroundings and would appear as an appropriate extension to it. A shortage of on-site open space weighs against the proposal, but it is not considered to cause visual harm to the development. Functionally it may be less than optimal in open space, but this matter will need to be weighed against other aspects of the scheme as a whole in the planning balance.

7.4 **Impact on Neighbouring Amenity**

7.4.1 The closest dwellings are those under construction to the east, which would be closest to plots 18 to 28. The adjacent dwellings would have their back gardens backing onto the proposed dwellings back gardens, meaning they would share a boundary in this location. The separation between the houses would be around 18 metres from elevation to elevation. This separation is at the lower end of what would be an acceptable relationship but is considered sufficient space between opposing windows.

7.4.2 Plot 28 would have its rear elevation around 11.3m from the side of a dwelling on the adjacent site. The side elevation of that adjacent dwelling would have a first floor window but it would serve a hallway and as such is not visually sensitive. The relationship between the two properties is considered to cause no material loss of privacy.

7.4.3 To the east of plots 29 and 30 would be a 2.5 storey care home, with a separation of around 17m between walls. The distance and relationship would be similar to that of the dwellings further north and it is considered sufficient to not cause an unacceptable loss of privacy on the residents of the care home.

7.4.4 The housing to the south would be a considerable distance from the proposed dwellings and as such no harm would occur to its amenities. Therefore, based on this and the findings in relation to the housing to the east, the proposal is considered acceptable in amenity impact terms.

7.4 **Private Amenity of the dwellings**

7.4.1 Policy 30 of the JCS requires that new dwellings meet the National Space Standards. The floorspace of the dwellings are a requirement of this, as well as details relating to the size of bedrooms. The development proposed includes a number of house types containing either 1, 2 or 3 bedrooms.

7.4.2 The floorspaces of the dwellings range from 50 sqm for the 1 bedroom units, to 109 sqm for the largest of the 3 bedroom units. All of the units meet or exceed the minimum requirement. The bedroom dimensions and the storage space proposed also meet the standards.

7.4.3 Each dwelling is proposed to be provided with private garden space primarily to the rear in addition to some at the front. The exception being

the four 1 bedroom maisonettes that are shown to have external space which is to be shared between. The size of the garden spaces vary from relatively large on the west side to smaller on the east, particularly at plots 21 and 22 at around 8m in length. The garden sizes are relatively modest but would be similar to those on the adjacent development.

7.4.4 There is no specific policy calculation or requirement that sets out dimensions of garden spaces for dwellings. The spaces shown would be useable and would provide private external space for residents. It is therefore considered that the occupants would have use of such space to their benefit and the proposal is acceptable in this regard.

7.5 Highway Matters

7.5.1 The proposal has been through design alterations during the course of the application process. This resulted in the LHA confirming they have no objections to the proposal as earlier queries about the distance to Elizabeth Close and the internal layout have been addressed.

7.5.2 Concern has been raised by the Town Council to the earlier 35 unit scheme based on similar concerns as those initially noted by the LHA. Since then and with the amended scheme, the LHA have confirmed they find the proposal acceptable in highways terms.

7.5.3 In terms of parking provision, a total of 60 spaces are proposed across the site. This includes 10 off-street visitor parking bays, in addition to the on-street space. Each dwelling would be served by the appropriate number of spaces (one or two) depending on its number of bedrooms. As such, the parking provision is considered acceptable.

7.6 Environmental Matters

7.6.1 The Council's Environmental Protection Team have provided comments not objecting and recommending conditions be applied that would ensure the measures submitted in the submitted environmental documents be followed, in relation to air pollution. Such condition is considered reasonable, should planning permission be granted.

7.7 Flood Risk and Drainage

7.7.1 On the initial 35 dwelling scheme, the LLFA responded advising that insufficient information had been provided. Subsequent information was submitted and the LLFA were reconsulted, but no response has been received. This matter has been chased to ascertain the acceptability of the proposals in this regard.

7.7.2 It is considered that to enable the granting of planning permission, confirmation from the LLFA of the suitability of the drainage proposals should be confirmed. Therefore, it is considered that any resolution to grant permission should be reliant on the acceptable response from the LLFA. In order to expedite a decision upon receipt of LLFA comments, the recommendation is one that allows officers to either approve or

refuse planning permission without the need to bring the application back to Committee for consideration. However, if any amendments are needed to make the scheme acceptable in terms of surface water drainage, then the recommendation is that the application is brought back to committee for consideration in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair.

7.8 **Ecology**

7.8.1 The application has been subject of consultation comments from the Council Ecologist, in which they have raised no objection and have recommended a condition relating to the biodiversity aspects of a construction environmental management plan. It is considered reasonable that such condition be applied.

7.8.2 In respect of the site being within 3km of the Upper Nene Valley Gravel Pits SPA, the associated SPD requires that developments of dwellings made appropriate mitigation for the impact of its population on the bird population of the area. The Agent has confirmed that the relevant amount is agreed to be secured via a S106 Agreement.

7.9 **Heritage and Archaeology**

7.9.1 St Peter's Church is visible from the site in part due to the topography of the land and the height of the church. Due to the separation and the context of the surroundings, there is considered to be no harm on its setting.

7.9.2 The Council's Archaeologist has recommended a condition for works, should permission be granted. This appropriate is considered proportional and appropriate.

7.10 **Landscaping**

7.10.1 The landscaping plan provided illustrates the planting to be provided around the site, including trees and hedgerows. It is considered appropriate that these details be secured by condition.

7.11 **Waste Management**

7.11.1 Comments were received from the Waste Manager on the earlier 35 unit scheme but not the 30 unit revision. Concern was raised about turning space for a waste vehicle. Subsequent to this, the amendments altered the road layout including the turning head. It is noted that the LHA do not object and the turning head would be built to adoptable standards. Therefore, whilst no response has been received, it is considered that the new arrangement provides sufficient turning space for a waste vehicle.

7.11.2 There is space beside the roadside around the development for the

presentation of waste bins. The dwellings also would have space either to their front, side or rear for the bin storage.

7.12 **Planning Obligations**

7.12.1 The application has been accompanied by a viability assessment which has been assessed by an independent viability assessor. The independent assessment has concluded that a contribution of £20,000 can be accommodated by the development. It is noted that the development is for 100% affordable housing and in that regard significantly exceeds the requirements towards this form of housing tenure provision. The submission notes that the reduction in the number of the dwellings from 35 to 30 also significantly affected the economics of the development..

7.12.2 As it has been independently concluded that the development can accommodate a maximum of £20,000 in S106 obligations whilst remaining economically viable, it is considered appropriate that such amount be used towards appropriate mitigations.

7.12.3 The planning obligation requests significantly exceed the £20,000 that is economically viable. The requests across different levels of education, namely Early Years, Primary and Secondary Education are detailed earlier in this report. The greatest demand is anticipated to be for Primary Education. In addition, a request for a library contribution has been made albeit significantly less than for education. In terms of how the obligations are used, it is recommended that the obligations be proportionally divided amongst the four areas. This equates to contributions divided as follows:

Early Years: £4,878.44;
Primary Education: £7,661.41
Secondary Education: £6,972.40
Libraries: £467.10
Total = £19,979.34

7.12.4 The Agent has indicated they are in agreement with including planning obligations to a sum of £20,000 towards planning obligations, to be secured by S106.

7.13.5 In considering the level of planning obligation that can be accommodated which is less than has been advised would mitigate for the level of demand on infrastructure, particularly education, regard is given to the potential for the inclusion of open market housing. The Applicant has advised that the scheme is only economically possible and viable due to a significant level of grant funding towards the provision of affordable housing. If their scheme were to include market housing and reduce the number of affordable units, the funding grant would reduce and make the scheme unviable. Therefore, whilst the level of obligation is less than that requested, the development of the site would not come forward with more than what is proposed.

- 7.13.6 It is a matter in the weighting exercise as to how the benefits of the proposal are to be considered against the detrimental impacts, such as the impact upon local educational services. Economically however it has been demonstrated that the site's accommodation of 30 dwellings in the social and intermediate mix proposed, whilst including public open space, can not viably accommodate further planning obligations than those proposed.

8. Other Matters

- 8.1 Neighbour comments: four objections were received raising concerns raised earlier in the report. The matters of access and ecology are addressed above. In terms of the reference to the use of the space for dog walking, it is noted that the site does not have a right of way across the site and any such use is informal. It also is not designated as open space in any development plan and its use for dog walking does not have planning policy backing.
- 8.2 Equality: the application raises no matters of equality concern.
- 8.3 Health Impact Assessment: Paragraph 92 of the NFFP states planning policies and decisions should aim to achieve healthy, inclusive and safe communities and, specifically, criterion c) of this seeks to enable and support healthy lifestyles. The site is considered to be in a sustainable location which would enable residents to access services and facilities by foot. The scheme is considered to accord with these aims.

9. Conclusion / Planning Balance

- 9.1 The proposed development would provide 30 affordable dwellings in a sustainable location on the edge of Raunds. The development has demonstrated acceptable access and parking arrangements and has been designed to make appropriate provision for public open space and to be sympathetic to the surroundings. It is considered the design ensures acceptable levels of private amenity for the proposed dwellings and those nearby. The provision of 30 affordable dwellings towards meeting the authority area's need is considered to carry significant positive weight and the location is considered to be suitable for residential development in access and sustainability terms. The Council's Housing Strategy Officer has advised of a current waiting list of Raunds residents for affordable housing to rent of 90 dwellings and that there is little housing coming forward to meet this. There is a significant need locally for affordable housing and the 16 units to rent would represent significant public benefit towards this current unmet need. The 14 intermediate units represents further public benefit and the housing provision towards unmet need is given significant weight.
- 9.2 Whilst the benefits of the development including the social and economic benefits are noted above, the planning obligations that can be

accommodated are less than has been requested, particularly in relation to education services to accommodate the residents of the site. The viability assessment has confirmed that the scheme can accommodate a sum of around £20,000 which can contribute towards the mitigations. Additionally, the on-site public open space provision is less than the target amounts referred to in the Emerging LPP2 and this weighs against the proposal.

- 9.3 The impact on local education services by the development is likely to be significant due to the demand to be caused by the provision of 30 dwellings, as indicated in the consultation response. This weighs against the development in the balancing exercise. The additional demand on local education facilities, and libraries, would not be fully mitigated by the planning obligations provided and as such would have a negative impact.
- 9.4 In balancing this, the benefits of the development are weighed against the impacts deemed negative, particularly the level of planning obligations proposed. The benefits of the provision of 30 affordable houses in the authority area where there is an unmet need is considered to carry significant weight. The development utilises land that is not designated for any active or landscape use, is not practically located for agriculture and is of limited public benefit. The development of the land and the benefits of the housing provision are considered to carry significant weight.
- 9.5 In the balancing exercise, it is taken into account that the development would provide 30 affordable dwellings, in excess of the 30% Policy requirement. In this regard, the proposal makes an over-provision of affordable housing to the public benefit. In balancing the benefits of the development against the cited negative impacts, it is considered that the benefits, particularly the contribution of 30 affordable dwellings in a sustainable location, are considered to demonstrably outweigh the cited negatives. The nature of development finance for the affordable housing scheme proposed have been taken into consideration and the matter of deliverability is key in the consideration. On balance, the benefits of the provision of needed affordable housing units in the sustainable location are considered to result in the balance weighing clearly in favour of the proposal.

10. Recommendation

- 10.1 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 as requested by the LLFA, and subject to the completion of a Section 106 Legal Agreement by 4 June 2022 (or other date to be agreed), or refusal of planning permission if the S106 is not completed within

the agreed timescale, 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.

11. Conditions / Reasons for Refusal

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended.

- 2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

- Raunds Site E Existing Site Plan A ref. 19013-S001 rev, C;
- Raunds Site E ref. 19013-SK051 Rev. S;
- Proposed Floor Plan & Elevations House Type 43 ref SK043 rev. B;
- Proposed floor plans & elevations House Type H ref. SK00G rev. B;
- Proposed landscape plan ref. 19013-LAL01 rev. H;
- Proposed Street Scene ref. SK0SS rev. B;
- Proposed floor plans & elevations House Type D ref. SK00d rev. B;
- Materials Schedule Site E ref. 19013-MAT rev. A;
- Proposed Floor Plans & Elevations House Type 21 ref. SK021 rev. A;
- Proposed Floor Plan & Elevations House Type 22 ref. SK022 rev. A;
- Proposed Floor Plan and Elevations House Type 42 ref. SK042 rev. B;
- Proposed Floor Plans & Elevations House Type 19 ref. SK019 ;
- Proposed Floor Plans & Elevations House Type 19A ref. SK019A rev. A;
- Proposed Floor Plans & Elevations House Type 43 ref. SK043;
- Proposed Floor Plan & Elevations House Type 44 ref. SK044;

Reason: To define the terms of the planning permission and to ensure that the development is carried out as permitted.

- 3 The development hereby permitted shall be implemented in accordance with the proposals, implementation and monitoring measures set out in the Ecological Appraisal dated January 2021. These biodiversity measures shall be retained in perpetuity.

Reason: To safeguard ecology and biodiversity in accordance with Policy 4 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy 2016

4. The landscaping works set out on 'Proposed Landscape Plan' ref. 19013-LAL01 rev. H, shall be carried out prior to the first occupation of any part of the development hereby permitted or in accordance with a programme to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. 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 similar size and species as those originally planted, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written approval to any variation.

Reason: To ensure the landscaping is undertaken and maintained in suitable time relating to the occupation of the dwelling.

- 5 The drainage works for the hereby approved development shall be undertaken in accordance with the following submitted details prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted:

- Drainage Strategy ref. 19013-DS02 rev. C received 7 December 2021;
- Drainage Design Report received 7 December 2021; and
- Flood Risk Assessment received 7 December 2021.

Reason: To ensure the drainage works are undertaken in accordance with the approved details.

- 6 Prior to the development above the slab level, full details of the external materials, including samples and product details, for the development hereby approved shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details and retained in perpetuity.

Reason: To safeguard the visual amenity of the area in accordance with Policies 2 and 8 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy 2016.

- 7 No development shall take place (including demolition, ground works, vegetation clearance) until a construction environmental management plan (CEMP: Biodiversity) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The CEMP (Biodiversity) shall include the following.

- a) Risk assessment of potentially damaging construction activities.
- b) Identification of "biodiversity protection zones".
- c) Practical measures (both physical measures and sensitive working practices) to avoid or reduce impacts during construction (may be provided as a set of method statements).
- d) The location and timing of sensitive works to avoid harm to biodiversity features.
- e) The times during construction when specialist ecologists need to be

present on site to oversee works.

f) Responsible persons and lines of communication.

g) The role and responsibilities on site of an ecological clerk of works (ECoW) or similarly competent person.

h) Use of protective fences, exclusion barriers and warning signs.

The approved CEMP shall be adhered to and implemented throughout the construction period strictly in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of ensuring the development has an appropriate ecological impact.

8 A landscape and ecological management plan (LEMP) shall be submitted to, and be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted. The content of the LEMP shall include the following.

a) Description and evaluation of features to be managed.

b) Ecological trends and constraints on site that might influence management.

c) Aims and objectives of management.

d) Appropriate management options for achieving aims and objectives.

e) Prescriptions for management actions.

f) Preparation of a work schedule (including an annual work plan capable of being rolled forward over a five-year period).

g) Details of the body or organization responsible for implementation of the plan.

h) Ongoing monitoring and remedial measures.

The LEMP shall also include details of the legal and funding mechanism(s) by which the long-term implementation of the plan will be secured by the developer with the management body(ies) responsible for its delivery.

The plan shall also set out (where the results from monitoring show that conservation aims and objectives of the LEMP are not being met) how contingencies and/or remedial action will be identified, agreed and implemented so that the development still delivers the fully functioning biodiversity objectives of the originally approved scheme.

The approved plan will be implemented in accordance with the approved details in accordance with a timetable to be agreed.

Reason: In the interests of ensuring the development has an appropriate ecological impact.

9 The parking spaces hereby approved on 'Raunds Site E. ref, 19013-SK051 rev. S, shall be used solely by the occupants of the dwellings hereby approved, and visitors, as specified on the plan. The spaces shall be made available prior to the occupation of the respective dwelling to be occupied. The visitor spaces shall be made available for parking prior to the occupation of the final dwelling. The parking spaces shall be retained and

maintained for the purposes of parking only for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: In the interest in ensuring the dwellings have sufficient parking and there is not an unacceptable demand for on-street parking.

- 10 Prior to commencement of the development hereby approved, details of the slab levels and finished floor levels of the buildings in relation to the existing and proposed ground levels of the site, the ground levels of the surrounding land and the slab and finished floor levels of the surrounding properties as well as identifying the proposed ridge height levels and the ridge heights of all neighbouring properties, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be constructed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure a satisfactory visual impact on the surroundings.

- 11 No development shall take place within the area of archaeological interest until the applicant, or their agents or successors in title, has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted by the applicant and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This written scheme will include the following components, completion of each of which will trigger the phased discharging of the condition:

(i) Approval of a Written Scheme of Investigation;

(ii) Fieldwork in accordance with the agreed Written Scheme of Investigation;

(iii) Completion of a Post-Excavation Assessment report and approval of an approved Updated Project Design: to be submitted within six months of the completion of fieldwork, unless otherwise agreed in advance with the Planning Authority;

(iv) Completion of analysis, preparation of site archive ready for deposition at a store (Northamptonshire ARC) approved by the Planning Authority, production of an archive report, and submission of a publication report: to be completed within two years of the completion of fieldwork, unless otherwise agreed in advance with the Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that features of archaeological interest are properly examined and recorded and the results made available, in accordance with NPPF Paragraph 205.

- 12 No development shall take place until full details of hard landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Subsequently, these works shall be carried out as approved in accordance with a timetable to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The landscaping details to be submitted shall include: (i) hard surfacing and other hard landscape features and materials.

Reason: To ensure the hard landscaping of the site is undertaken in appropriate materials for both functional and aesthetic reasons.

- 13 No demolition or construction work (including deliveries to or from the site) 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, Public Holidays or Bank Holidays.

Reason: To ensure the protection of the local amenity throughout construction works

- 14 During the demolition and construction phases the developer shall provide, maintain and use a supply of water and means of dispensing it, to dampen dust in order to minimise its emission from the development site. The developer shall not permit the processing or sweeping of any dust or dusty material without effectively treating it with water or other substance in order to minimise dust emission from the development site.

The developer shall provide and use suitably covered skips and enclosed chutes, or take other suitable measures in order to minimise dust emission to the atmosphere when materials and waste are removed from the development site.

Reason: To ensure the protection of the local amenity throughout construction works

- 15 Precautions shall be taken to prevent the deposit of mud and other debris on adjacent roads by vehicles travelling to and from the construction site. Any mud refuse etc. deposited on the road as a result of the development must be removed immediately by the operator/contractor.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity, highway safety and visual amenity of the area.

- 16 There shall be no burning of any material during construction, demolition or site preparation works.

Reason: To minimise the threat of pollution and disturbance to local amenity.

- 17 Prior to commencement of development above slab level, details of the proposed boundary treatments around the site shall be submitted to, and approved in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include the boundary treatments around the site and the boundaries between the land of the individual dwellings and adjacent land. The details shall include the materials, dimensions and positions and colours of the treatments. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of each associated dwelling and all boundary screening shall have been completed prior to the occupation of the last dwelling.

Reason: To ensure the development has appropriate boundary treatments for security and aesthetic purposes.

18 Notwithstanding the submitted details, no occupation of buildings shall take place until details have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority which demonstrates the following sustainability measures for the new buildings:

- a) Electric vehicle charging provision for each dwelling;
- b) Measures to limit water use to no more than 105 litres / person / day / and external water use of no more than 5 litres / person / day;
- c) Minimum standards for gas fired boilers;
- d) Sustainability measures (including, but not limited to, the sustainable use of energy, electric vehicle charging provision, bicycle parking, the use of responsibly sourced materials and measures to limit water use)

Development shall only take place in accordance with the approved details and all measures shall be available for use upon first occupation of each respective property.

Reason: In the interests of sustainability and to mitigate the impacts upon air quality in the vicinity

12 Informatives

1 Notification of intention to connect to the public sewer under S106 of the Water Industry Act Approval and consent will be required by Anglian Water, under the Water Industry Act 1991. Contact Development Services Team 0345 606 6087.

2 Protection of existing assets - A public sewer is shown on record plans within the land identified for the proposed development. It appears that development proposals will affect existing public sewers. It is recommended that the applicant contacts Anglian Water Development Services Team for further advice on this matter. Building over existing public sewers will not be permitted (without agreement) from Anglian Water.

3 SuDS. If the developer wishes Anglian Water to be the adopting body for all or part of the proposed SuDS scheme the Design and Construction Guidance must be followed. We would recommend the applicant contact us at the earliest opportunity to discuss their SuDS design via a Pre-Planning Strategic Enquiry. The Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) are a statutory consultee for all major development and should be consulted as early as possible to ensure the proposed drainage

6 Building near to a public sewer - No building will be permitted within the statutory easement width of 3 metres from the pipeline without agreement from Anglian Water. Please contact Development Services Team on 0345 606 6087

- 7 The developer should note that the site drainage details submitted have not been approved for the purposes of adoption. If the developer wishes to have the sewers included in a sewer adoption agreement with Anglian Water (under Sections 104 of the Water Industry Act 1991), they should contact our Development Services Team on 0345 606 6087 at the earliest opportunity. Sewers intended for adoption should be designed and constructed in accordance with Sewers for Adoption guide for developers, as supplemented by Anglian Water's requirements.
- 8 The Applicant has agreed to all pre-commencement conditions.