

BOROUGH OF KETTERING

PLANNING POLICY COMMITTEE

Meeting held: 27th January 2016

Present: Councillor Mike Tebbutt (Chair)
Councillors Linda Adams, Duncan Bain, Ruth Groome,
Jim Hakewill, Cliff Moreton, Mark Rowley and Derek
Zanger.

15.PP.19 APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Freer and Mills.

It was noted that Councillor Adams was acting as a substitute for Councillor Mills.

15.PP.20 MINUTES

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 4th November 2015 be approved and signed as a correct record by the Chair.

An update arising from the minutes was noted as follows:-

15.PP.16: The Biodiversity Supplementary Planning Document for Northamptonshire had now been adopted.

15.PP.21 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Hakewill declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in Item 6 (Housing Land Supply) in respect of an area of land in Braybrooke. He indicated that he would leave the meeting room during discussion on this item.

Councillor Tebbutt declared a personal interest in Item 6 as a member of Desborough Town Council.

Councillors Ruth Groome and Derek Zanger declared a personal

interest in Item 6 (Housing Land Supply) and Item 7 (A Borough-wide Renewables Fund – Supplementary Planning Document) as members of Burton Latimer Town Council.

(Having declared a disclosable pecuniary interest, Councillor Jim Hakewill left the meeting room during discussion on the following item)

15.PP.22 HOUSING LAND SUPPLY

A report was submitted which informed Members of the latest established position with regards to meeting Kettering Borough's housing land supply requirement.

During discussion, it was noted that the target was a borough-wide rolling five-year housing land supply and was not broken down to the level of individual settlements. One of the responsibilities of the Committee was to identify sufficient land to allocate, to meet the requirements identified in the Core Spatial Strategy. Each North Northamptonshire local authority had a five-year housing land target based on the Emerging Joint Core Strategy. The fact that the Borough can demonstrate a five year housing land supply should provide a degree of comfort but, the settlement figures identified in the Joint Core Strategy are minimum targets and it is important for the Council to supply land beyond those requirements specified.

It was felt to be helpful, in future, for the Committee to see a map containing individual sites, green spaces, historical and visually important spaces, etc. This would be especially relevant in the case of Desborough and Rothwell where neighbourhood plans were being progressed. It was agreed that officers would see if such a plan could be produced in future.

RESOLVED that:-

- (i) the latest housing land supply information be noted; and
- (ii) sites for allocation and subsequent consultation through the Site Specific Proposals LDD Part 2 Local Plan be agreed through future meetings.

**A BOROUGH WIDE RENEWABLES FUND
SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT**

A report was submitted which informed Members of the Council's resolution to create a Borough Wide Renewables Fund, and which sought to agree a Supplementary Planning Document for consultation to help guide the management of the fund.

Members were advised that a report had been presented to the Council's Executive in September 2015 seeking agreement to establish a Borough Wide Community Fund resourced from contributions from renewable energy installations. The Executive had resolved to agree the funding scheme on the basis of three guiding principles and had requested the Planning Policy Committee to take soundings, develop and approve a Supplementary Planning Document setting out the agreed approach to the Renewables Fund to be applied to the Borough of Kettering.

The three guiding principles agreed by the Executive were as follows:-

- Fund held in Trust by the Borough Council and redistributed on a transparent and equitable basis across the Borough
- Priority for allocating funds be set at a radius of two miles
- Any renewable installation bids from within two miles of the installation have priority status for the allocation of funding

The percentage allocation for the distribution of the funds was also agreed by the Executive.

The Supplementary Planning Document, once agreed, would need to be approved by full Council. Members were of the opinion that the document should be subject to an eight-week public consultation period rather than the four weeks suggested in the report.

During debate on the draft SPD members made the following comments:-

- A paper copy of the draft document should be sent to each Parish Council
- The two mile radius may be difficult to work in practice as adjacent parishes not in the Borough may have boundaries closer than two miles

- There is no mention in the document of the scale of development which would trigger a payment to the fund
- Could anything prevent a landowner who lived within the two mile radius bidding into the scheme if a renewable initiative was developed on their land?
- Town Centre Regeneration could be funded from renewables in Burton Latimer, Rothwell and Desborough
- The document does not mention village centres or village incentives
- The policy should be exclusive to outside Kettering Town
- There are sites already in existence which would include Kettering in the two mile radius
- People directly affected should have preference in funding allocations
- There is confusion over how the scheme would actually work
- Could a town or parish council agree its own criteria for funding if it so wished by setting up a trust?
- It seems the scheme as it stands is unworkable if towns and parishes can negotiate their own arrangements, which would suggest that there is no need for a SPD
- Burton Latimer negotiated its own fund through Northamptonshire Community Foundation which also has access to other funds
- Government guidance is that decisions on fund allocation rests with the community living in the vicinity of wind farms
- In small areas there may be more funding available to communities than can be usefully spent. We should adopt a scheme that will bring in the maximum funding to the borough as a whole
- The money could be used for traffic-calming schemes in villages

During the debate, members noted that the fund was intended to maximise the compensation to communities that were most affected by renewable energy sites. However, if there were no settlements within a two mile radius of an installation, there would be no one entitled to benefit from the fund. The guiding principles put forward by the Executive ensured that the fund would be opened up to the rest of the Borough and maximise the benefits for those most affected, even if they lived outside the two mile radius but they could be amended as part of the consultation process if necessary.

It was noted that bids into the fund would be from constituted groups and organisations only. The proposals excluded individuals from submitting a bid. Adoption of the SPD would have no bearing on where a developer located an installation

and was not a mechanism to make them pay, but rather to encourage those installing renewable energy sites to make a contribution to the community, subject to negotiation. If adopted, the SPD would sit outside the planning process but would provide an opportunity for local communities to have some leverage. The policy could not prevent other councils from having their own arrangements, but these could prove to be a burden for parish councils to administer. The SPD would help developers understand from the outset what is expected of them, and the Borough Council could act on behalf of Parish Councils and other community organisations in negotiations to maximise available funding.

Members felt that the wording of the document as submitted should be considered again by officers in consultation with the Chair of the Committee before it was agreed for public consultation.

RESOLVED that the Kettering Borough Wide Renewables Fund SPD be agreed for public consultation subject to any necessary adjustment as a result of debate in consultation with the Chair of the Committee.

(Councillor Moreton left the meeting at 8.40 pm)

15.PP.24 CONSULTATION ON PROPOSED CHANGES TO NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY

A report was submitted which informed Members of the proposed changes to the National Planning Policy Framework and sought agreement to a response to the consultation on behalf of Kettering Borough Council.

The proposals covered the following areas:-

- Broadening the definition of affordable housing to expand the range of low cost housing opportunities
- Increasing the density of development around commuter hubs, to make more efficient use of land in suitable locations
- Supporting sustainable new settlements, development on brownfield land and small sites and delivery of housing agreed in local plans
- Supporting the delivery of starter homes
- Some transitional arrangements for the changes set out in the consultation document

Affordable Housing

Members expressed concern that new affordable housing in the Borough had reduced over the years. It was felt the proposals did nothing to direct a developer to building anything other than homes that could be built to the biggest profit margin. This was especially the case for bungalows, for which there was a big demand but few were being built. It was also felt that the proposed changes should not damage any existing arrangements already negotiated through Section 106 agreements.

New settlements

It was felt that Deenethorpe was only an area of opportunity at the present time and was not an allocation.

There should be mention of the collective working on generating a garden community.

Supporting housing development on brownfield sites and on small sites

It was unfortunate that many of the Borough's sites were not classified as brownfield sites, for example former quarrying sites.

Ensuring housing delivery on allocated sites

There was a need to find ways of applying pressure on developers to bring forward sites instead of 'land-banking'.

It was noted that discussions had been held with government ministers on the concept of a 'use it or lose part of it' message to developers, which would mean that if a developer did not begin building on a site within a specific period of time it would be released to the local authority for starter homes. There is a need to be consistent and weave this into the response.

Supporting starter homes on underused commercial and employment land

Encouraging starter homes in mixed use commercial development

In both the above situations, Members stated they would be happy with areas above first-floor being converted rather than sitting empty.

It was agreed that paragraph 3.40 of the report should be

changed to correct a typographical error (*afford to "be afforded"*) and additional wording added to the end of the paragraph as follows:-

" ... and could cause conflict between residential amenity and employment uses in the future."

It was also felt to be important to protect employment land in rural areas.

In relation to paragraphs 3.47 and 3.48, it was noted that exception sites had been found in the past, and could work. It was suggested that sites in Stoke Albany and Wilbarston could be looked at.

Members felt that it would be useful to develop a case study around exception sites, which would incentivise other villages to do the same thing. Local people had benefited from such sites, and could include social housing for affordable rent to enable local people to remain in the area.

Transitional Arrangements

It was noted that the Building Regulations were being updated as a result of the government withdrawing the regulations on sustainability codes. However, this was subject to separate legislation and could not be included as part of this consultation response.

RESOLVED that the contents of the report be noted and the comments summarised in paragraphs 3.1 to 3.53, together with comments summarised during the debate, form the response of Kettering Borough to the consultation .

15.PP.25 MINERALS AND WASTE LOCAL PLAN UPDATE – DRAFT PLAN CONSULTATION

A report was submitted which informed Members of the outcome of the Northamptonshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan Update – Issues and Options Consultation which fed into proposed changes to the Draft Plan. The report also sought agreement to a formal response from Kettering Borough Council to the Northamptonshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan Update: Draft Minerals and Waste Plan for Consultation.

It was noted that paragraph 5.61 had been removed as any sites must comply with and refer to the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy regarding noxious fumes.

RESOLVED that the preferred approach of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan Update be noted and the comments contained in Appendix 2 of the report be endorsed and submitted in response to the Minerals and Waste Local Plan Update – Draft Plan for Consultation.

15.PP.26 **PROPOSED JUNCTION IMPROVEMENTS AT NORTHAMPTON ROAD/SHEEP STREET – STATION ROAD/BOWLING GREEN ROAD, KETTERING**

A verbal report on the above scheme was given to the Committee, and it was noted that MGWSP would be attending the Kettering Town Forum on 1st February to present the plan.

Members were advised that the following issues had been looked at in developing the traffic scheme:-

- Value for money – the scheme represented good value in comparison to other schemes that had been looked at
- The junction had been modelled to 2026 and was found to have a good capacity
- Resurfacing of Station Road and part of Bowling Green Road would be undertaken as part of the scheme
- Modelling had excluded the Toucan crossing, but the impact of including it would not cause problems with the traffic flow
- High PSV surfacing had been specified
- Temporary traffic lights would be installed during the duration of the works, planned to commence in February 2016 and last for 14 weeks
- If the Committee wished to express their views or had any queries, this could be done through Simon Richardson

The scheme was presented to members and explained in detail. Members welcomed the design of the scheme. The following comments were made and it was agreed that these would be submitted to MGWSP.

- There was concern at the limited publicity given to the scheme, particularly given the disruption to be caused to local residents. Could A5 leaflets be delivered to

properties in the immediate area and neighbouring streets affected to notify them of the scheme and the imminent works? One councillor offered to deliver the leaflets if delivery was considered a constraint to notifying local residents

- It may be helpful to display the scheme in the nearby Library
- Will the Toucan Crossing be provided with sensors to detect whether users are still crossing?
- There was a concern over the ease at which vehicles could right-turn out of Headlands: has this movement been thoroughly tested? Would the introduction of a yellow-hatched no waiting box help resolve any problems at the Headlands junction?
- Are the solid pink lines on the scheme plan to indicate pedestrian railings? This would appear likely to overcome concerns over pedestrians following desire lines and crossing the junction at dangerous points
- The removal of traffic lights was considered positive

(The meeting started at 7.00 pm and ended at 9.45 pm)

Signed
Chair

AI