**BOROUGH OF KETTERING**

**PLANNING POLICY COMMITTEE**

**Meeting held: 23rd June 2014**

**Present:** The Mayor

 Councillor Mike Tebbutt (Chair)

Councillors Lloyd Bunday, Ash Davies, Terry Freer, Ruth Groome, Jim Hakewill, Alan Mills, Jan Smith and Mark Rowley.

**Also Present** Councillors James Burton, Russell Roberts, Karl Sumpter, Lesley Thurland and Derek Zanger.

**15.PP.01 APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Bain and Moreton.

The following substitutes were noted:-

Councillor Davies for Councillor Bain

Councillor Smith for Councillor Moreton

**15.PP.02 MINUTES**

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 3rd March 2015 be approved and signed as a correct record subject to the resolution on Minute No. 14.PP.31 (Managing Renewable Energy Facilities in Kettering Borough) being included before the additional comments recorded in the last paragraph on page 2 of the minutes.

**15.PP.03 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Hakewill declared a personal interest as an objector to the Joint Core Strategy in respect of an area of land in Braybrooke.

**15.PP.04 NORTH NORTHAMPTONSHIRE JOINT CORE STRATEGY – CONSULTATION ON FOCUSED CHANGES JUNE 2015**

 A report was submitted which provided Members with an update on the Joint Core Strategy, and sought agreement to a response to the consultation on focused changes ahead of submission to the Secretary of State.

 It was noted that, at this stage, there was no statutory requirement to respond to individual representations. However, advice had been received that it would be helpful to confirm the Joint Planning Unit's position on the main issues ahead of the Examination. Many of the focused changes were relatively minor and none of the changes fundamentally changed the strategy of the Joint Core Strategy.

 Members noted that of the substantial changes listed in the report, only three directly affected Kettering Borough. These were:-

* Policy 26: Renewable and Low Carbon Energy
* Policy 31: Gypsies and Travellers
* Policy 38: Rothwell North SUE

 Prior to debate on the three policies listed above, members discussed the inclusion of the Weekley/Warkton Avenue (We/Wa) in a list of key strategic infrastructure requirements, In respect of the We/Wa. It was noted that the WeWa was referred to in Policy 16 of the Pre-submission JCS as a piece of road infrastructure required for the A43/A14 as part of the Kettering East SUE. Members also questioned the reduction of HGV parking site distance from the strategic road network from 5km to 2km. It was noted that this had been an error and had now been corrected.

 Policy 31: Gypsies and Travellers

 Discussion was held on the duty for local authorities to co-operate with each other on planning applications that affected another local authority’s area. It was noted that Cllr Bunday had requested to speak on the recent application for a Gypsy and Traveller site when it was put before the planning committee of Daventry District Council, but his request had been declined. Members noted that in terms of inter-authority dialogue over issues such as Gypsy and Travellers and the Mawsley Wind Turbine, Kettering Borough Council lead the way and initiated discussions. There was a duty to demonstrate that dialogue had taken place, and the Council could demonstrate that it had taken the lead in this respect. However, speaking at Planning Committees was not a legal right, and it would be at the discretion of the individual local authority.

 Policy 38: Rothwell North SUE

 Members’ attention was drawn to Fig. 28 in the Appendix to the report, which detailed the reduction to the Rothwell North SUE boundary to reflect the boundary of the current planning application for the development.

 It was noted that a specific policy setting out development principles for the site had not previously been incorporated in the Joint Core Strategy, or consulted upon. This had been an oversight as the application was long-standing and expected to have been determined prior to the current stage of the Joint Core Strategy. To ensure consistency with other proposed allocations it was necessary to introduce a new Policy 38.

 Discussion was held on accessibility and the main barriers to connectivity as shown on the plan, particularly in relation to Montsaye School, the timing of the strategic road link between the A6 and B576 and the method of controlling traffic at the B576 end of the link road. The link road was felt to be crucial to the development and members felt it was desirable to embed this into the Strategy in advance of development taking place.

 It was noted that a series of criteria regarding the link road were included in the addendum of proposed changes, including a requirement for the delivery of the new A6 junction at an early stage in the development to prevent traffic congestion on existing routes. Members were advised that it was more usual to determine timing of delivery of infrastructure through conditions at the planning application stage, when the developer would have to provide evidence to satisfy the Highways Authority through modelling and surveys.

 Members also expressed concern that the boundary change meant that the area to the east, further towards Shotwell Mill Lane, previously earmarked for development, would not now come forward and development would actually take place to the west, which could have an impact on the amount of traffic using Bridge Street. It was felt that residents of Rothwell had stated a preference for development to take place to the east through consultation.

 It was noted that the boundaries were included in the Rothwell and Desborough Urban Extensions Area Action Plan. In terms of capacity the site could accommodate 700 houses, and 1,200-1,500 if extra land to the east of the development came forward. However, the plan was for 700 houses and a further 300 dwellings through the Site Specific Document, with the plan highlighting the potential for access to the east and western side of the town.

 Members were advised that the focused changes now before the committee did not determine where development would take place beyond this allocation, as this would be identified through the Site Specific Document. The Joint Core Strategy only identified large strategic sites with a threshold in excess of 500 houses.

 It was noted that the Planning Policy Committee was scheduled to look at the Site Specific Document later this year, when there would be an opportunity to identify smaller sites.

**RESOLVED** that the contents of the report be noted and the comments indicated in paragraphs 2.11, 2.14 and 2.18 be endorsed as the Council’s response to the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy Focused Changes consultation.

(Voting For 5; Against 0; Not Voting 2)

*(Councillor Hakewill declared a personal interest*

*In the following item as a Member of Northamptonshire County Council)*

**15.PP.05 MINERALS AND WASTE LOCAL PLAN UPDATE – ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION**

 A report was submitted which informed Members of the Northamptonshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan Update – Issues and Options consultation on the locations for Minerals and Waste Development and which sought agreement to a formal response from Kettering Borough Council.

 It was noted that a total of 21 industrial locations had been identified where waste management was considered to be acceptable in principle, two of which were in Kettering Borough (Telford Way and Pytchley Lodge).

 Debate was held on the management of waste and concerns about the potential for it to self-ignite in certain circumstances. However, it was noted that new methods of composting made this unlikely.

 Members expressed concern about the risk of odour and it was felt that sites should be located away from housing developments.

**RESOLVED** that members endorse the comments set out in the Appendix to the report as the Council’s response to the MWLP Update – Issues and Options consultation, subject to an amendment to Issue 4 to state that waste management sites should be located away from existing or planned housing developments.

*(The meeting started at 7.00 pm and ended at 8..40 pm)*

*Signed ……………………………………………….*

*Chair*

AI