

BOROUGH OF KETTERING

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Meeting held – 17th April 2018

Present: Councillor Shirley Lynch (Chair)

Councillors Ian Jelley, Cliff Moreton, Mark Rowley, David Soans, Lesley Thurland, Greg Titcombe, and Keli Watts

17.PC.63 **APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Ash Davies. It was noted that Councillor Ian Jelley was acting as substitute for Councillor Davies.

17.PC.64 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Moreton declared an interest in Item 5.1 as ward councillor.

***17.PC.65** **ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

None

***17.PC.66** **APPLICATIONS FOR PLANNING PERMISSION**

The Committee considered the following application for planning permission which was set out in the Head of Development Control's Report and which was supplemented verbally and in writing at the meeting. Five speakers, which included a Ward Councillor, attended the meeting and spoke on applications in accordance with the Right to Speak Policy.

The report included details of applications and, where applicable, results of statutory consultations and representations which had been received from interested bodies and individuals, and the Committee reached the following decisions:-

<u>Proposed Development</u>	<u>Decision</u>
<p>*5.1 Outline Application (EIA): Up to 214,606 sqm gross external area for class B8 warehousing & distribution, ancillary class B1(a) offices, with associated access, internal roads, parking, landscaping and drainage at Kettering South (land at) (Off A509 north of Isham), Kettering for DB Symmetry Ltd.</p> <p>Application No: KET/2017/0616</p> <p><u>Speakers:</u></p> <p>Clive Hallam, Third party objector to the proposed development attended the meeting and addressed the committee as a resident of Isham and raised concerns regarding the lack of infrastructure associated with the proposed development. The speaker also stated that approval would undermine the JCS and the decision should be referred to the Secretary of State.</p> <p>Cllr Alan Lodge of Pytchley Parish Council attended the meeting and spoke as Parish Councillor raising concerns regarding the ongoing traffic problems associated with surrounding villages. Cllr Lodge stated that although the Parish Council was not objecting to the proposed development, the Item should be deferred until the Isham Bypass was constructed.</p> <p>Cllr Barry Hobbs of Isham Parish Council attended the meeting as a representative for the Parish and raised concerns regarding the lack of speakers allowed at Committee and the road infrastructure issues associated with the development. Cllr Hobbs also stated that the Isham Bypass was essential to the development.</p> <p>Cllr Jim Hakewill attended the meeting and spoke as Ward Councillor for the proposed development and raised concerns regarding the lack of time</p>	<p>Members received a report which sought outline planning permission with only access being considered for up-to 214,606sqm of B8 warehousing and distribution together with ancillary B1 (a) offices and associated works. Access was proposed to be taken off the A509 toward the sites south-western corner, close to and to the north of an existing mini-roundabout.</p> <p>The Planning Officer addressed the committee and provided an update which stated that it was proposed by Officers to delete the word 'unnecessary' from the recommended HGV Delivery Route Management Plan condition (condition 30).</p> <p>It was heard from the update that the applicant had provided a Head of Terms and that additional letters from Isham Parish Council had been received which included a series of points on why the proposal should be refused. Broughton Parish Council had also provided a letter raising concern regarding the use of minor roads being used for HGV traffic in particular and request mitigation measures prior to commencement.</p> <p>Members also heard that the Wildlife Trust maintained their objection and that in addition ten letters of support (primarily from Kettering residents) and one further objection letter had also been received from a resident of Burton Latimer.</p> <p>Members were informed that the updates were not considered to introduce any new matters that would result in a change to the findings of the report.</p> <p>Members raised concerns regarding potential risks and harmful impact associated with the increase in traffic flow that would be generated by this proposal on roads that were already considered by Members to be at capacity. Members also questioned what potential mitigation measures would be in place to manage any issues or traffic management plans.</p> <p>It was heard by Members that if approved,</p>

given to speakers who were wishing to raise issues to the committee. Councillor Hakewill then raised further objections to the proposed development due to concerns regarding the mitigation schemes for local villages and due to the application being proposed prior to the implementation of the Isham Bypass.

Peter Frampton, Agent for the Applicant attended the meeting and addressed the committee, stating that the application had been through a robust testing method to ensure a high quality development was delivered. Mr Frampton also stated that the development would ensure 2800 jobs along with major contributions to local infrastructure.

the site would include an estates management team that the Council would liaise with to discuss measures including signage to the site and the HGV routing plan.

Members agreed that although they were not objecting to the proposed development in principle, major concerns remained as to level of proposed mitigation and infrastructure problems associated with it.

Members asked for clarification as to whether the JCS policy required the completion of the Isham Bypass before this proposal could come forward. Officers confirmed that this was not a requirement of the JCS. Members however remained of the opinion that although this was the policy position, the current proposal even with the associated mitigation measures being proposed by the applicant would generate harmful impacts on neighbouring settlements until the Isham Bypass was in place.

Members asked Officers view on deferral. Officers advised that there was nothing to be gained by a deferral.

Members were then informed by the legal representative that if the application was approved then the Secretary of State would have the option to call it in for consideration which would usually result in a public inquiry. If the application was refused then the applicant would have the right to appeal and that appeal would probably be dealt with by a local public inquiry.

It was proposed by Councillor Titcombe and seconded by Councillor Moreton that the application be refused due to the detrimental and unacceptable effect on surrounding villages the proposed development would have as a result of the additional volume and type of traffic that would be generated by the proposal.

It was agreed that the application be **REFUSED** for the following reasons:

The highway mitigation measures proposed are not considered to sufficiently minimise the transport impacts of the proposal on neighbouring settlements, particularly toward Isham where the A509 is currently at or otherwise close to capacity. As such, the proposal would have a harmful impact on the amenities of occupiers within neighbouring settlements as a result of the significant amount of traffic movements associated with the proposal. The proposal therefore is in conflict with Policy 37 (m) of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (2011-2031) and is inconsistent with the Core Planning Principles (point 4) of the NPPF.

Members voted on the motion to refuse the application

(Voting, For 6; Against 1)

The application was therefore
REFUSED

**(The Committee exercised its delegated powers to act in the matters marked *)*

(The meeting started at 6.30pm and ended at 8.01pm)

Signed:

Chair

CJG