



SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

South Northamptonshire Local Area Planning Committee

Thursday 11 August 2022

Page	Title
(Pages 3 - 10)	Public Speakers Committee Updates

If you require any further information about this agenda please contact Richard Woods, Democratic Services via the following:

Tel: 01327 322043

Email: democraticservices@westnorthants.gov.uk

Or by writing to:

West Northamptonshire Council
The Forum
Moat Lane
Towcester
NN12 6AD

This page is intentionally left blank

West Northamptonshire Council
List of Public Speakers for South Northamptonshire Local
Area Planning Committee – Thursday 11 August 2022

Item Number	Parish/Town Council	Objector	Applicant/Agent
5 – WNS/2022/0071/MAO Land North of Blenheim Rise, Kings Sutton	David Wood – Kings Sutton Parish Council	Thomas Patterson – Local Resident	Steven Kerry - Applicant

This page is intentionally left blank



South Northamptonshire Local Area Planning Committee

UPDATES

for the planning applications to be discussed at the

Planning Committee

(11 AUG 2022)

Planning Committee

Committee Updates

The schedule below details those letters etc. that have been received since the Committee reports were drafted:

Application Details:	Item No.
<p>Case Officer: Tom Ansell</p> <p>Presenting Officer (if different)</p> <p>Parish: Kings Sutton</p> <p>Application No: WNS/2022/0071/MAO</p> <p>Development description:</p> <p>Outline planning permission for residential development of up to 32 no. dwellings with all matters reserved except access. Including affordable housing, together with creation of new areas of open space, a new access off Hampton Drive, landscaping and all enabling and ancillary works.</p> <p>Location: Land North of Blenheim Rise, Kings Sutton, Northamptonshire</p>	

Ecology

The applicant has submitted a NatureSpace report and associated Impact Map, to follow on from the recommendations in the ecological surveys submitted to support the application. The Ecology Officer has reviewed this report and is satisfied with its contents.

NatureSpace has provided a list of conditions and informatives that must be included on any subsequent approval. In the event the committee were minded to approve the application, the conditions set out in the response (which can be seen in full on the Council's website) should be included on the decision notice in full.

Clinical Commissioning Group

The CCG has provided a response, advising that there is insufficient capacity in the local primary healthcare system to absorb the anticipated increase in demand created by a new housing development of up to 32 dwellings.

The CCG has requested a contribution of **£16,268.95**, based upon calculations looking at the likely increase in number of additional consultation hours that will be required. This is based on the Dept. of Health calculation in HBN11-01:Facilities for Primary and Community Care Services.

In the event the committee approve the application, the above contribution must be added to the list of obligations provided in Paragraphs 8.161 – 8.179.

Applicant queries on committee report

The applicant submitted an email on 8th August, following publication of the committee report. This email is available for view on the Council's website. These raise a number of queries/questions in respect of the committee report and its contents. The queries are addressed briefly below. The documents referred to in this response are also available on the Council's website.

Refusal reason [archaeology]

The agent queries the archaeological reason for refusal, citing the remaining part of the archaeological officer's response within which a pre-commencement condition is recommended. Officers have not been able to contact the archaeological officer for further comments.

However, the response submitted on 11th Feb (and available on the Council's website) is clear; the advisor considers a phased programme of evaluation works should be undertaken (involving appropriate non-intrusive methods), and that this evaluation phase of works should be undertaken in advance of determination of the application to obtain an informed view on the archaeological potential of the site. In the absence of any evidence of such a phased programme being carried out pre-determination to the satisfaction of the archaeological advisor, Officers have no choice but to refuse the application on the grounds of insufficient information.

Distance of railway station from site

The applicant contends (referencing Google maps) that the railway station is an approx. 13-minute walk from the site, not 15 minutes as alluded to in the report. 15 minutes is not considered to be an unreasonable figure to use as an average, considering all types of users, assuming a relatively average walking pace.

The weight that should be applied to the Middleton Cheney appeal decisions

The agent seeks quantification of the weight afforded to the Middleton Cheney appeal decisions. Officers afford low to moderate weight to this material consideration, tilted towards the 'low' end of the scale. Paragraph 8.47 of the

committee report (as well as preceding paragraphs) set out the differences between the settlements that justify this position.

Absence of affordable housing data

The applicant contends that, notwithstanding the contents of the report (Paragraph 8.66), the affordable housing statement and addendum submitted with the application do provide a picture on whether the affordable housing situation has improved or worsened since the Middleton Cheney appeals were allowed.

The addendum provided by Tetlow King Planning refers to the West Northamptonshire Housing and Economic Needs Assessment 'HENA', produced by GL Hearn and dated July 2021. The HENA highlights a need for 231 affordable dwellings to be delivered per annum to meet the forecast need over the 2020/21 to 2050/51 period. The monitoring period for 2020-21 advises that 56 additions were made to affordable housing stock, meaning a shortfall of 175 units was generated in one year.

The Middleton Cheney appeals were allowed in April 2021, although the appeal hearing was prepared for and heard before this. Nonetheless, no monitoring data has been provided in respect of years 2021-2022, so the Officer's assertion of not having figures covering the time *since* the appeal was heard and determined is technically correct. However, the applicant is also correct to point out that the figures provided to the Council show, according to the findings of its own HENA, that the Council has, in its most recent year, undersupplied its delivery of affordable housing stock. While a shortfall is acknowledged in the report, the figure above of 175 units is not mentioned.

The Tetlow King Planning documents have been available for inspection on the Council's website since receipt.

Inconsistencies in weight applied to affordable housing provision

The applicant highlights inconsistencies in how the Officer has assessed the weight to be afforded to affordable housing provision (Paras 8.67 vs 8.108). The former appears to question whether significant weight should be applied to the provision of affordable housing, whereas the latter affirms that significant positive weight *should* be applied.

It appears to Officers that the conclusion reached by the Inspector in respect of Middleton Cheney appeals was assisted by the noted undersupply of affordable housing coupled with the sustainability appraisal they undertook of Middleton Cheney specifically (i.e., it formed part of the very site-specific circumstances). Paragraph 8.67 is querying, perhaps in need of further context, whether the same undersupply of affordable housing should be afforded the same weight, given the Council's conclusions that Kings Sutton is not comparable to Middleton Cheney in sustainability terms.

To conclude, the provision of affordable housing should be afforded significant positive weight, as affirmed by paragraph 8.108. However, the significance of this weight, in the view of Officers, is not coupled with, or assisted by, a comparable conclusion on the sustainability of Kings Sutton vs Middleton Cheney. Therefore, in the absence of comparable site-specific circumstances, the weight, despite being 'significant' and 'positive' is insufficient to overcome the conflict with the development plan in the view of Officers.

Moderate adverse landscape impacts

The applicant argues that there is no evidence in the quoted appeal decision (Rothersthorpe) that the Inspector considered moderate adverse effects on the landscape to be 'significant'.

The Rothersthorpe Inspector considered the site's location in open countryside and its development to cause 'moderate adverse' impacts, and this weighed (albeit moderately) against the application in the Inspector's planning balance conclusions (paragraph 44 – APP/Z2830/W/18/3206346).

With Kings Sutton, the loss of the field and the encroachment of built form into the open countryside is considered to cause a moderate adverse impact, and this is significant in weighing against the application, together with the technical development plan conflict, when assessed against the weight afforded positively to the provision of affordable housing.

Plant/pumping station

The applicant advises there is no plant or pumping station on the 'parameters plan'. Officers have erroneously identified a rectangle on the indicative plan as a pumping station, making this assumption due to its proximity to the attenuation basin. As the plan is indicative, this is not considered to be a significant issue.

Absence of planning balance exercise

The agent contends that an explicit planning balance exercise, listing the factors that weigh in favour those that weigh against the scheme, is absent from the report. They consider the extent of harm on landscape/character grounds is not quantified. They argue that no mention is made of weight to be applied to the provision of market housing, economic benefits, flood mitigation and significant ecological gains (10%).

Officers have not provided in written form a quantified planning balance exercise, itemising each matter described above. However, the report is considered to represent a suitable appraisal of the scheme before the Council, with detailed analysis of the key material considerations that the agent considers weigh significantly in favour of the application (i.e. comparability with Middleton Cheney as a PSV, undersupply of affordable housing).

Paragraphs 10.1 to 10.10 summarise the report's conclusions, with 10.8 advising...

'The Council must determine the application in accordance with the development plan, and in this instance the scheme is contrary to the policies within this plan. The harm caused through the conflict with the development plan is therefore considered to outweigh any material considerations that might weigh in the scheme's favour. The principle of development is unacceptable at a fundamental level, and as such should not be supported.'