

# **BOROUGH OF KETTERING**

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

### **Meeting held – 16<sup>th</sup> October 2018**

**Present:** Councillor Shirley Stanton (Chair)  
Councillors Anne Lee, Paul Marks, Clark Mitchell, and Mark Rowley,  
David Soans, Lesley Thurland and Greg Titcombe

**18.PC.34**      **APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Davies and Moreton. It was noted that Councillors Marks were acting as substitute.

**18.PC.35**      **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillors Rowley, Stanton, Thurland and Titcombe declared a personal interest in item 5.4 and indicated that they would leave the meeting room during consideration of this application.

**18.PC.36**      **MINUTES**

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meetings of the Planning Committee held on 4<sup>th</sup> September 2018 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

**\*18.PC.37**      **ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

None

**\*18.PC.38**      **APPLICATIONS FOR PLANNING PERMISSION**

The Committee considered the following applications for planning permission which were set out in the Head of Development Control's Report and which were supplemented verbally and in writing at the meeting. Eight speakers 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 Full Application: 4 no. interconnecting tipis, and associated development to create a temporary (5 year period ending 31 October 2023) event venue with activities between 1 March and 31 October at the Rickyard Suite, The Elms, Isham Road, Pytchley</p> <p>Application No: KET/2018/0419</p> <p><u>Speakers:</u></p> <p>Rodger Collins, Third Party objector to the proposed development attended the meeting and raised concerns stating that the proposed access point for the development was dangerous due to the lack of visibility and speed of the adjoining roads. Mr Collins also stated that the proposed application would be detrimental to local residents due to the intolerable noise generated by events at the venue.</p> <p>Cllr Alan Lodge of Pytchley Parish Council attended the meeting and spoke as Parish Councillor raising concerns regarding the overwhelming volume of events that could take place should the application be approved. Cllr Lodge stated that the constant noise pollution from the application site would be unacceptable for residents in Pytchley.</p> <p>Cllr Jim Hakewill attended the meeting and spoke as Ward Councillor for the proposed development and raised concerns due to the unacceptable volume of additional traffic that would be using the site in addition to the heavy traffic that use the village as a rat run for the A43 &amp; A509. Cllr Hakewill also raised concerns regarding the destruction of hedgerow thus displacing habitats for a number of species.</p>	<p>Members received a report which sought Planning consent for the use of the land for events and parking and the provision of associated structures consisting of 4 interconnecting tipis, toilet block and storage facility for a 5 year period. Events were to have run between the 1 March and 31 October each year over that period. Outside of that period the 4 tipis would have been removed whilst the toilet block and storage facility would have remained.</p> <p>It was heard that the application included works to create an improved access to the Isham Road and an upgraded agricultural track.</p> <p>The Planning Officer addressed the committee and provided an update which stated that the Ward Councillor had made Officers aware of correspondence between them and the Wildlife Trust. In summary the Wildlife Trust had advised the Councillor that they consider insufficient information had been submitted. No comment from the Trust had been submitted in relation to the application to the LPA.</p> <p>The update also stated that National Planning Practice Guidance advised that local planning authorities should only require ecological surveys where clearly justified and assessments should be proportionate to the nature and scale of a proposal and likely impacts. A badger survey had been submitted with the application and was acceptable. Officers consider that an adequate level of information had been submitted.</p> <p>The application included the removal of hedgerow to accommodate access and visibility splays. The applicant had advised Officers that they wished to amend this and only proposed to remove hedgerow to accommodate the point of access. The hedgerow was to be lowered where necessary to 0.9m within the visibility splays.</p>

Kevin Shapland, Applicant for the proposed development attended the meeting and addressed the committee, stating that where necessary they had attempted to address any concerns that were brought before them from local residents, Mr Shapland also stated that a number of consultation events had taken place to encourage local residents to communicate with the developer.

Officers therefore recommended that should Committee be minded to approve the application, that (1) condition 15 is amended as below and (2) it is subject to the applicant submitting an amended plan showing this amendment.

Condition 15 (existing condition on page 3 of the agenda):

Excluding those works required to construct the point of access, as shown on the approved plans, the existing hedgerows within and adjacent to the site and the access shall be retained in perpetuity and shall not be cut down, grubbed out or otherwise removed. The existing hedgerows adjacent to the proposed improved site access which are located within the vehicular visibility splays (identified in condition 8) shall be retained at a height not exceeding 0.9 metres measured above the adjacent carriageway level. Any hedges removed without such consent or which die or become severely damaged shall be replaced in the next planting season with hedging plants of such size and species as approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Following the update and report presented by the Officer members raised concerns regarding the insufficient parking provisions and the detrimental effect the development would have on surrounding villages and roads.

Following debate it was proposed by Councillor Rowley and seconded by Councillor Mitchell that the proposed development be **REFUSED** on the grounds of the location and impact on the countryside and lack of amenities to and on the site.

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

1. The proposed development by virtue of its location within the open countryside erodes the rural character and beauty of the area and introduces an alien and incongruent feature which erodes the character and beauty of the countryside. The absence of utilities further demonstrates that the site location is unsuitable and unsustainable for the development proposed. The development as a whole is an unsustainable intrusion into the open countryside which fails to respect the inherent importance of the open countryside contrary to Policy 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy 3 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy.

*(Members voted on the proposal to refuse the application)*

*(Voting: For Refusal; 7 Against 0)*

*The application was therefore*  
**REFUSED**

<u>Proposed Development</u>	<u>Decision</u>
<p>*5.2 Full Application: First floor side extension at 6 Parklands Close, Loddington for Mr N Roberts</p> <p>Application No: KET/2018/0579</p> <p><u>Speakers:</u></p> <p>Mr Hamilton, Third Party objector to the proposed development attended the meeting and raised concerns regarding overdevelopment which would lead to a large amount of natural light being lost due to the proximity of the proposed development to his dwelling.</p> <p>Lisa Griffin, attended the meeting and addressed the committee as the applicant for the proposed development, stating that they had used the 45 degree test to ensure that the proposed development was complying with planning regulation and that there would be no adverse effect on the restriction of natural light.</p>	<p>Members received a report which sought full planning permission for the erection of a first floor side extension above the existing garage, to the following maximum dimensions: 6.5m width, 5.2m depth, 4.7m to the eaves and 6.6m to the ridge of the roof.</p> <p>Members agreed that the proposed development was satisfactory and saw no issue with approving the application as per the officer's recommendation.</p> <p>It was agreed that the application be <b>APPROVED</b> subject to the following conditions;-</p>

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this planning permission.
2. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match, in type, colour and texture, those on the existing building.
3. The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the approved plans and details listed in the table below.

*Members voted on the officers' recommendation to approve the application*

*(Voting: For: 6; Against 1)*

*The application was therefore*  
**APPROVED**

<u>Proposed Development</u>	<u>Decision</u>
<p>*5.3 Full Application: Two storey rear and single storey front extensions with detached shed at 72 Pennine Way, Kettering for Mr J Lenaghan</p> <p>Application No: KET/2018/0629</p> <p><u>Speakers:</u></p> <p>Yvonne Coles, Third Party objector to the proposed development attended the meeting and raised concerns regarding the close proximity of the development to her boundary which would lead to an unsatisfactory overhang onto her land. It was also stated that the applicant had made clear that the work was to be carried out by himself.</p>	<p>Members received a report which sought consent for a porch to the front, a detached shed to the rear and a rear extension comprised of two storey and single storey elements. This would have provided increased living space to the ground floor with downstairs shower and toilet and an enlarged bedroom to the first floor.</p> <p>The Planning Officer addressed the committee and provided an update which stated that the description had been amended to include the porch - "Two storey rear and single storey front extensions, front porch and detached shed to rear".</p> <p>Members made enquiries regarding the percentage increase in floor space due to the extension and raised concerns regarding the possibility of back land development due to the size of the exterior shed.</p> <p>It was heard that the shed would have to remain ancillary to the main dwelling house</p> <p>It was agreed that the application be <b>APPROVED</b> subject to the following conditions ;</p>

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this planning permission.
2. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match, in type, colour and texture, those on the existing building

*Members voted on the officers' recommendation to approve the application*

*(Voting: For 4; Against 2; Abstention 1)*

*(Councillor Mitchell abstained from the vote)*

*The application was therefore*  
**APPROVED**

*(Councillor Stanton declared an interest in the following item and vacated the chair during consideration; Councillor David Soans took the Chair)*

*(Having also declared personal interests, Councillors Rowley, Thurland and Titcombe left the meeting room during discussion on and determination of the following application,)*

<u>Proposed Development</u>	<u>Decision</u>
<p>*5.4 Full Application: Construction of children's play equipment in rear garden at 3 Wollaton Close, Kettering for Mrs J A Stokes.</p> <p>Application No: KET/2018/0659</p> <p><u>Speakers:</u></p> <p>Julia-Anne Stokes, attended the meeting and addressed the committee as the applicant for the proposed development, and stated that the children's climbing frame in question was to be used by young children and was not aware that planning permission was needed. The applicant also stated that there was no privacy intrusion associated with the proposed development.</p>	<p>Members received a report which sought full planning permission for the erection of children's play equipment in the rear garden. The structure consisted of three platforms (0.3 metres, 0.7 metres and 1.22 metres above the existing ground level) of which the highest is fully enclosed with timber to all sides and an acrylic roof over), a slide from the 0.7m high platform and dual swing set.</p> <p>The Planning Officer addressed the committee and provided an update which stated that condition 1 had been updated for clarity. The new wording was as follows:</p> <p>"The structure hereby approved shall be removed unless within 3 months of the date of this permission it is installed as shown on plan nos. KET/2018/0659/3a, 4a, 5a, 6a, 7a and 8 received by the Local Planning Authority on 13/09/2018. The approved 1.22 metre high platform must be fully enclosed to all sides and above and accessed internally via a ladder as shown on the approved plans. Once installed, the structure shall be permanently retained in that form or completely dismantled and removed."</p> <p>The update also stated that 2 no. neighbour representations had been received from Nos. 1 and 5 Wollaton Close in support of the application. Their comments include: the structure was in keeping with the area, was built to a high quality and they have no issue with privacy.</p> <p>It was heard that these representations did not introduce any new matters, and were dealt with within the officer's report.</p> <p>Members agreed that the proposed application was acceptable and that there were no concerns raised.</p>

	It was agreed that the application be <b>APPROVED</b> subject to the following conditions:-
--	---

1. The structure hereby approved shall be removed unless within 3 months of the date of this permission it is installed as shown on plan nos. KET/2018/0659/3a, 4a, 5a, 6a, 7a and 8 received by the Local Planning Authority on 13/09/2018. The approved 1.22 metre high platform must be fully enclosed to all sides and above and accessed internally via a ladder as shown on the approved plans. Once installed, the structure shall be permanently retained in that form or completely dismantled and removed.
2. The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the amended plan numbers detailed in the table below.

*Members voted on the officers' recommendation to approve the application*

*(Voting: For 3; Against 0)*

*The application was therefore*  
**APPROVED**

*(Councillor Stanton re-joined the Committee and took the chair)*

*(Councillors Rowley, Thurland and Titcombe also re-joined the Committee)*



<u>Proposed Development</u>	<u>Decision</u>
<p>*5.5 Full Application: Two storey side and rear extensions and single storey rear extension at 10 Epping Close, Barton Seagrave for Mr &amp; Mrs T Eaton &amp; K Lumsden</p> <p>Application No: KET/2018/0676</p> <p><u>Speakers:</u></p> <p>None</p>	<p>Members received a report which sought Planning Permission for a two-storey extension to the side (south) of the dwellinghouse, which also extended partially to the rear incorporating a small gable projection, and a mono-pitch roofed single storey rear extension which extends across the whole of the rear (east) elevation.</p> <p>Members were in agreement that the proposed development was satisfactory and that no concerns were raised.</p> <p>It was agreed that the application be <b>APPROVED</b> subject to the following conditions:-</p>

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this planning permission.
2. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match, in type, colour and texture, those on the existing building.
3. Notwithstanding the provisions of Article 3 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no additional openings permitted by Schedule 2, Part 1 Class A shall be made at ground or first floor level in the north elevation of the building.

*Members voted on the officers' recommendation to approve the application*

*(Voting: Unanimous)*

*The application was therefore*  
**APPROVED**

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

*(The meeting started at 6.30pm and ended at 8.18 pm)*

Signed: .....

Chair

CJG

(Planning No. 9)  
16.10.18