

Interim Planning Committee – Daventry District Area – 21st April 2021



Minutes of the **Interim Planning Committee – Daventry District Area** held remotely on the 21st April 2021 at 6.15 p.m. (concluded at 8.00 p.m.)

PRESENT:

Councillor Steve Osborne – Chairman
Councillor Kevin Parker – Vice-chairman

Councillors:

Alan Chantler	Malcolm Longley
Daniel Cribbin	Peter Matten
Stephen Dabbs	Ken Ritchie
Rupert Frost	Ian Robertson
Jonathan Harris	David Smith
Cecile Irving-Swift	Mark Wesley
David James	

Also in attendance: Councillors Adam Brown and Johnnie Amos

P.23/21 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

No apologies for absence were received.

P.24/21 DECLARATION OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS

No declarations of interest were declared and no party whipping arrangements were declared.

P.25/21 PLANNING APPLICATIONS WITHDRAWN, DEFERRED OR DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

The Chairman announced that no applications had been withdrawn, deferred or determined under delegated powers.

P.26/21 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Consideration was given to the report detailing planning applications for consideration (previously circulated, report reference: P.240421/1, page nos. 3 - 74).

RESOLVED:

That, subject to the variations set out below, the advice set out in the report now submitted be agreed.

Interim Planning Committee – Daventry District Area – 21st April 2021

DA/2020/0478 LONG BUCKBY – Outline application for construction of 16 dwellings with associated vehicular access, parking and landscaping (access and layout not reserved) – Land off Blincow Road

The Principal Planning Officer advised that the outline application detailed the access and layout of the site only and drew Members' attention to the list of late representations. The provision for secondary education would no longer be collected through the legal agreement but through the Community Infrastructure Levy. Northampton Clinical Commissioning Group had advised that there was insufficient capacity in the local health care system to accommodate more residents and therefore contributions for health care would be required. The application was before Members because authorisation for the legal agreement was sought. No objections had been received from statutory consultees or the Parish Council.

Mr Wiggins, the Agent, spoke in favour of the application.

The Chairman, as local ward Member, proposed that the application be approved as per Officer's advice. The proposition was seconded by Councillor Malcolm Longley.

Councillor Stephen Dabbs queried whether the contribution to the library service would go to the library or the parish council, whether the site would include the provision of charging points for electric vehicles and whether the Highway Authority were happy with the revised drawings referred to in the report. The Principal Planning Officer advised that the library contributions would be sent to where they were required, the electric vehicle charging points would be for the reserved matters application and the applicant had resolved the outstanding issues with the Highway Authority.

Councillor Jonathan Harris did not have any objections to the application in principle and welcomed the retention of the trees on the boundary, however as the scheme would result in habitat loss he considered that a landscaping scheme should be required.

Councillor Ken Ritchie queried the funding provision to the library service and whether this was a hangover from the old regime of Northamptonshire County Council. The Principal Planning Officer advised the library service continued to be provided and therefore contributions were necessary. If the library service ceased to exist then the contributions would be reconsidered. The Council's Legal Advisor concurred that the library contributions were a policy requirement.

The Chairman advised that the library group in Long Buckby were responsible for its management and the Parish Council only paid the lease on the library, therefore the funding would be provided to the library group.

The proposition to approve the application was put to the meeting and declared carried unanimously.

RESOLVED:

That the application be approved as set out in the report, subject to additional conditions regarding surface water drainage and that financial contributions towards healthcare be provided to the CCG and NHSE.

DA/2020/0860 WALGRAVE – Outline planning permission for the construction of a detached annexe to be used as ancillary use to the main dwelling (all matters reserved other than access) (resubmission of DA/2020/0182)

The Development Control Manager outlined the application for a detached annexe to a property accessed from a narrow lane. The main dwelling was large and linear in form and followed the line of a former stone wall that used to form the village boundary. The application had been amended and it would now lay wholly within the confines of the village as set out on the village map in the Part 2 Local Plan. The surrounding land of the property was partly used as garden. The Highway Authority supported the application as long as the annexe remained ancillary to the main dwelling.

Mrs Stroman, the Agent, addressed the Committee.

Councillor Cecile Irving-Swift proposed that the application be approved but that the word 'incidental' be amended to 'ancillary', Councillor Ian Robertson seconded the proposal. Further to an enquiry, the Development Control Manager advised that everything within the red line was residential so if the garden was extended into the agriculture land to the north of the site, a change of use application would have to be made.

Councillor Ken Ritchie noted that a significant part of the justification for the application was the personal circumstances of the applicant. Although he considered that housing needs should be taken into account, the proposed annexe was not insubstantial and was adjacent to a large main dwelling. Councillor Robertson considered that the annexe was not large but agreed that the main dwelling was. The Development Control Manager highlighted that the policy in the village allowed for development within the village confines, so it complied with policy, the circumstances of the applicant provided additional weight. Councillor Alan Chantler pointed out that a live-in carer was required and that was why 2 bedrooms were proposed to be provided in the annexe.

Further to discussion, the Development Control Manager highlighted that if the application had been for a separate dwelling that was not ancillary, the Highway Authority would have raised objections.

The proposition to approve the application as per Officer's advice was put to the meeting and declared carried with 14 voting in favour and 1 abstention.

RESOLVED:

That the application be approved as set out in the report.

DA/2020/0980 DODFORD – Change of use of land to use as a residential caravan site for one Traveller family with one mobile home and one touring caravan, laying of permeable hardstanding and installation of new septic tank – Land at Weedon Lane

The Development Control Manager outlined the application and advised that it had been considered as a site for a Traveller family. The Council had already met the requirements for the provision of such sites and the application had been considered on its own merits. Conflict had been identified with policy HO9 of the Local Plan, in respect of access and highway safety, accessibility to local services, the impact on the landscape, the local infrastructure and the Grand Union Canal Conservation Area. Members were shown photographs which illustrated the relationship between the site and the view from the A5 and the towpath. The site was not considered suitable for a traveller site and Officers recommended refusal.

Interim Planning Committee – Daventry District Area – 21st April 2021

Mr Newton spoke on behalf of the Parish Meeting.

Councillor David James agreed with the concerns raised by Dodford Parish Meeting and Weedon Parish Council and proposed that Officer's advice to refuse the application be accepted. The proposition was seconded by Councillor Rupert Frost.

Councillor Adam Brown, one of the local ward Members, speaking with the consent of the Chairman, supported the recommendation and noted the concerns raised by the Highway Authority, the visual impact of the proposal and that the Council's planning obligations to the travelling community had been met at the current time. Councillor Johnnie Amos, another local ward Member concurred.

Councillor Ken Ritchie, raised concerns regarding the comments made by Dodford Parish Meeting and Weedon Parish Council as they referred to the traveller site at Stowe on the A5; he considered that this was discrimination and that the applicant was being questioned if they belonged to a social group. The Chairman stated that he had listened carefully to the speaker and did not think they had spoken out of turn and highlighted that the parish of Stowe was geographically near to the parish of Dodford.

Councillor David James pointed out that each application should be considered on its merits and the site at Stowe was not relevant to this site; however similar applications were often compared. Councillor Kevin Parker added that the site was in open countryside and the application was contrary to policy. Councillor Mark Wesley noted that the site at Stowe would not influence his decision on the application being considered.

Further to an enquiry from Councillor Irving-Swift, the Development Control Manager advised that if Members accepted Officers' advice to refuse the application, the applicant had a right of appeal. The caravan was located at a different site currently and Officers would discuss how the matter would be considered going forward.

On being put to the meeting, the proposition to refuse the application was declared carried with 12 voting in favour and 3 abstentions.

RESOLVED:

That the application be refused as set out in the report.

DA/2021/0018 STOWE NINE CHURCHES – Demolition of part of stone wall boundary, construction of garage, formation of new vehicular access and re-building of stone boundary wall (part retrospective) – Home Farm, Francis Row, Upper Stowe

The Principal Planning Officer advised that the stone wall boundary had until recently been adjacent to eighteenth century farmhouse and had retained the earth on the garden side.

In March 2019 planning applications for the demolition of the boundary wall and the construction of an underground garage were refused by the Planning Committee. An appeal against the Council's decision was dismissed by the Planning Inspector as they had agreed that it would cause harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset and the character and appearance of the local area. At the 18th November 2020 meeting of the Planning Committee, Members had authorised Officers to serve an enforcement notice to secure the removal of the unauthorised garage that had been built, to reinstate the land to its former level and reinstate the stone boundary wall, as the works that had been undertaken were a clear breach of planning and listed building control.

Interim Planning Committee – Daventry District Area – 21st April 2021

The applications to be considered sought part retrospective permission for the demolition of part of the stone boundary wall, the construction of a garage and formation of new vehicular access and re-building of part of the stone boundary wall. These applications had not been subject to any pre-application discussions. The applicant had now omitted one of the garage doors from the plans but the pedestrian gate would be retained. The Principal Planning Officer reminded Members that the public benefits of the application must be demonstrated to outweigh the harm to the heritage asset and the Planning Inspector had not considered that they would. The proposal would materially change the wall and the enclosed garden and result in a loss of original fabric of the wall.

Mrs Carter spoke on behalf of the Parish Council and Mr Waine spoke in favour of the application.

Councillor Adam Brown, one of the local ward Members, speaking with the consent of the Chairman, spoke in support of the Parish Council and emphasised the efforts that the applicant had gone to in order to reduce the harm to the curtilage listed wall. The nature of the wall had changed following its demolition and when it was demolished it had become apparent that significant work had been undertaken to it over the years. The wall was not in a prominent location in the village and in his opinion it had limited heritage value.

Councillor Johnnie Amos, one of the local ward Members, speaking with the consent of the Chairman, acknowledged that the wall had been breached but considered it would be pragmatic to approve the application. The Parish Council supported the application and it would allow four vehicles to be parked off the highway verge and improve safety as the house was on a sharp corner.

Councillor Ian Robertson considered that the harm to the listed heritage asset would not be outweighed by the public benefits of parking off the verge.

Councillor Alan Chantler, as the Heritage Champion of the former Daventry District Council, stated that the application was against policy and against regulations. The wall was part of the curtilage of a listed structure and the application would cause significant harm. Members had refused the application previously and should do so again.

Councillor David James agreed with the Parish Council and noted that it was not always possible to use the original materials when re-building historic walls. Councillor James considered that the application would result in less than substantial harm and that the public benefit of additional parking outweighed any harm.

Councillor Ken Ritchie considered that there would be some public benefit as a result of the application but the village was quiet and not congested. The regime for the protection of listed building ensured that they were protected for the public benefit and the Planning Inspector had already refused the application. Councillor Kevin Parker added that the Planning Inspector had concluded that the benefits would not outweigh the harm and works had been carried out contrary to this finding.

Councillor David James considered that it was a subjective opinion as to whether harm would be caused by the scheme. There would be a public benefit in the increase in parking spaces. If the original wall was rebuilt many of the original stones would break.

Interim Planning Committee – Daventry District Area – 21st April 2021

Councillor Cecile Irving-Swift proposed that Officer's advice to refuse the application be accepted and added that approving the application would set a dangerous precedent. The proposition was seconded by Councillor Kevin Parker.

The Principal Planning Officer highlighted that if the application were approved it would result in the re-grading of the bank, which the Highway Authority had objected to as it would undermine the integrity of the highway.

Councillor Ken Ritchie considered that it was not a matter of opinion as experts had concluded that the impact on the heritage asset would be unacceptable.

The Council's Legal Advisor pointed out that the Committee had previously refused the application when two parking spaces were proposed to be provided. Now one parking space was proposed to be provided.

On being put to the meeting the proposition was declared carried with 10 voting in favour, 4 against and 1 abstention.

RESOLVED:

That the application be refused as set out in the report.

DA/2021/STOWE NINE CHURCHES – Listed building consent for demolition of part of stone wall, to be reconstructed using new stone to form the front fact of a new garage with associated new vehicular access – Home Farm, Francis Row, Upper Stowe

Councillor Cecile Irving-Swift proposed that Officer's advice to refuse the application be accepted. The proposition was seconded by Councillor Kevin Parker and on being put to the meeting was declared carried with 10 voting in favour, 4 against and 1 abstention.

RESOLVED:

That the application be refused as set out in the report.

.....Chairman