

## Planning Sub Committee - 29 January 2008

### Agenda Update

#### 5.1 **KET/2006/1140**

A14 (Land to the South of), Rothwell

The following amendments to the report are required:

1. Reason for Refusal 1 should read: -

The proposed development is located in open countryside on land which under the sustainable development approach and locational requirements outlined in PPS1 and PPS7 and the Sequential Test outlined in RSS Policy 2 should be only be considered for development after land (well served by public transport) within and adjacent to urban areas has been developed. This proposal is therefore contrary to PPS1, PPG4, PPS7, RSS Policy 2, 3, 4 and policies 2 and MKSM Policy 4 of RSS8, policy 7 and 103 of the Local Plan for Kettering Borough, and policy GS5 of the Northamptonshire County Structure Plan policies 10 and 12 of the emerging Core Spatial Strategy which seek to resist development in the open countryside.

2. In the second reason for refusal add 'policy GS5 of the Northamptonshire County Structure Plan' after policy SD1 of the Northamptonshire County Structure Plan

3. In the third reason for refusal insert the word 'as' between the words 'known' and 'Rothwell' (2nd line).

4. In the fourth reason for refusal add 'policy GS5 of the Northamptonshire County Structure Plan' after PPS7.

5. The second paragraph under Proposed Development should read '5, 575m<sup>2</sup> of B1 (Business), 8,315m<sup>2</sup> of B2 (General Industrial)'.

6. Under Planning Policy RSS8 add: Policy13 (Spatial Priorities for Development in the Southern Sub- Area) and 22 (Regional Priorities for Employment Land), MKSM Strategic Policy 3: Sustainable Communities, MKSM Northamptonshire Policy 1 (The Spatial Framework) and MKSM Northamptonshire Policy 4: Corby, Kettering and Wellingborough, with particular reference to Paragraph 125). After Policy 14 of the Core Spatial Strategy should be the title of the policy 'General Sustainable Development Principles'.

Comments received since the writing of the Committee Reports:

In response to the Committee Report the applicants have sent a letter to all members of Planning Sub-Committee B stating why they consider the application should be approved.

As members will have seen the letter it is not copied here in full. A copy is available on file.

The applicants state that the only change in the adopted Development Plan since the resolution to grant planning permission is the adoption of RSS8. The Local Planning Authority considers that RSS8 represents a significant change in planning policy since 2003. RSS8, along with the saved policies from Northamptonshire County Structure Plan and the Local Plan for Kettering Borough Council is the Development Plan for the area. It has been tested by the Inspector and adopted as policy. RSS8 sets out a sequential locational criteria (Policy 2) for development within the whole region, this principle was also tested at the Inquiry and has been adopted. The emerging policies in the CSS interpret this principle at a local level and are contained within the report and the reasons for refusal because they are strong material considerations.

The applicants further state that the proposal should be granted planning permission as it has the support of Rothwell Town Council and that the site is in a sustainable location. The Local Planning Authority does not consider that the site is in a sustainable location, particularly in comparison to Rothwell North, the site identified as the RSS preferred option, for which an application is currently under consideration. The A14 lies between the application site and the town of Rothwell and this is a considerable physical and barrier for people to cross, for example the removal of the dedicated footbridge from the development proposal means that those who might walk or cycle to the site will be sharing the route with vehicular traffic, which is undesirable. The Rothwell North site does not have similar barriers between it and the town of Rothwell.

Orton Parish Meeting has sent an e-mail to all Councillors of Planning Sub - Committee B. As members will have seen the e-mail it is not copied here in full. A copy is available on file. The e-mail confirms their (and they say Loddington and Thorpe Malsor parishes) continued opposition to the development.

They consider that the proposal to use the road junction at the east end of the site for buses and emergency vehicles only will have a massive impact on Orton, Loddington and Rothwell, with vehicles from the Northampton and Broughton direction coming through the villages or Rothwell.

They state that the environmental damage caused by the proposal has been grossly underestimated and state that the area is an important habitat containing crested newts, bats, barn owls, possibly water voles and long-stalked cranesbill, a plant rare in Northamptonshire.

Cllr Perry and Hakewill

With reference to the above application which is to be discussed at tonight's planning meeting as item one on the agenda. Please could you include in the update that Cllr Victoria Perry and Cllr Jim Hakewill support the Officers recommendation on this application.

## 5.2 **KET/2007/1062**

2a Victoria Street, Kettering

Amenity provision for the residential units on site includes bin and cycle storage which will be located to the rear of the site. Outdoor amenity space is limited to small balconies for the two flats situated to the rear of the development. Although private outdoor space is lacking, it is considered that due to the town centre location of the proposed development, the residential units are located in close proximity to public open space in and around the immediate area which are within walking distance. Therefore in this instance and for this particular location, lack of amenity provision is deemed acceptable.

## 5.3 **KET/2007/1107**

86 & 88 Polwell Lane (land to the rear of), Barton Seagrave

Cllr Russell Roberts objects to the development on the grounds of "over-development"

Condition 8 to read: "the bathroom windows on the eastern flank wall of house 1, and the northern flank wall of house 5, shall be non-opening and glazed with obscure glass and shall thereafter be permanently retained in that form.

Page 31, 4th paragraph, line 3, should read: "This is in accordance with"...

Page 31, last paragraph, line 4, should read: "kitchen window at ground floor"...

## 5.4 **KET/2007/1115**

The Pheantry, Pipewell, Kettering

No Update

## 5.5 **KET/2007/1159**

3 Chase Hill (land to the rear of), Geddington

An objection has been received from the Parish Council on the grounds that the proposed development abuts a narrow road with difficult access.

A further neighbour objection has also been received. An objection is raised on the following grounds:

The existing road is not designed to cope with the additional traffic that will be generated by the development.

·Delivery lorries cannot manoeuvre safely due to Chase Hill being a narrow road (they cannot turn around and have to reverse onto Queen Eleanor Road).

The proposed dwelling will have a detrimental visual impact on the appearance of the

area. The proposed dwelling will exacerbate the negative effect that the dwelling at 1a has had on the attractiveness of the area.