

Development Control Committee

Tuesday 10 May 2016

7.00 pm in the Council Chamber, The Cube, Corby

Present: Councillor – Latta, Chair

Councillors Addison, Caine, Eyles, Riley, Brown, Cassidy, Rutt, and Sims

47. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Goult.

48. Declarations of Interest

Members were asked to declare any personal interests they may have in the business to be discussed and/or indicate whether this was prejudicial or non-prejudicial, the nature of any interest, and whether they intended participating in the relevant agenda item. There were no declarations.

49. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

RESOLVED that:-

The minutes of the meeting held on the 8 March 2016, copies of which had been circulated to Members, be received and agreed as a correct record. Minutes to show that the meeting closed at 7.15pm.

50.1 16/00068/REM **23 dwellings, part of parcels R15e (i), R15e (ii) and R18 (a) Priors Hall development, Stamford Road, Weldon, Corby for EDG Property**

The Major Projects Officer presented a report on an application relating to a site which fell into Zone One of the Priors Hall development. The application was for 23 dwellings located to the South Western Gullet of the Northamptonshire County Wildlife Site.

Reserved Matters permissions had been granted for these parcels and the surrounding ones and a part-implemented permission remained for these parcels.

Relevant Policies had been considered and consultation had taken place with County Highways, Environment Agency, NCC Lead Local Flood Authority, Police Crime Prevention Officer, Weldon Parish Council, ENDC, Nth. Northamptonshire JPU, Northamptonshire Wildlife Trust, Inexus and CBC Environmental Quality, responses were contained within the report.

Relevant site notices had been posted, Public Notice in Evening Telegraph and Neighbour Notification letters, only one objection had been received.

The site is just over half a hectare; therefore the density of dwellings proposed was within the numbers used for the land budget use. There were a total of 4 dwelling types which would ensure that the development retained a definite character. The approved Design Code provided a high density development within the character area and the statement of Design Code accompanying the application demonstrated how and why the density use accorded with the Design Code. Overall the design and detailing would be consistent with the 'Park Edge' character and as such was considered to be acceptable.

The scheme would incorporate four existing garages built as part of a previous permission giving plots 3-6 garage access to the rear with a provision for parking to the front of the dwellings.

A condition had been added requiring further information on landscaping, particularly species of proposed shrubs but the scheme already submitted was considered acceptable at this stage.

It was concluded that the development as proposed accorded with the relevant 'Saved Policies' of Corby Borough Local Plan and the policies contained within the NNCSS, it was also in compliance with the Priors Hall Design Code for Zone One. Therefore the application could be approved subject to the conditions below.

Councillors considered the design unattractive and similar to properties currently being demolished, they were concerned about the size of the garden at Plot B1 which was a 4 bedroom house and asked how the balconies would be private space if they were connected. The Major Projects Officer stated the walls were 1m high.

Councillors were also concerned that currently houses were not built with the disabled in mind and this should be considered, there was no parking for disabled owners, insufficient parking for homes with more than two cars or space for children to play. Chair hoped that officers had taken note of these concerns for future consideration.

Councillors felt that the properties were not aesthetically pleasing and had no humanity, the lighting and refuse bins were of concern, should be building homes to take pride in. The flat roofs raised concerns. Comments were made regarding the size of the garages and members asked why the Design Code was being ignored.

One member stated that although he did not like the design this was about the development as a whole, he would recommend for approval but if the application was rejected he asked how this would affect the Planning Authority.

The Major Projects Officer explained that an Inspector would look at the Design Code, Extant Permission, whether the application was in keeping with the surrounding area, the garages would be considered and the garden size. The Member thanked the officer and asked what the possible outcome would be.

The Principal Solicitor outlined that Appeals take different forms and highlighted a current Appeal and the costs involved. Members said it was not always about the cost.

Chair explained that if the Committee were minded to refuse the application they would need proper planning reasons.

The HoS Planning and Environmental Quality suggested that Members were exercised about the scheme but officers had worked hard to ensure a good scheme, design was personal taste and the application did comply and was based on a similar design elsewhere. Bin storage would always be an issue and there was no provision on this land for open space, however there was open space in other areas of the Zone, there was adequate off road parking and this complied with other areas in the wider development, plot B1 had been deemed to be adequate when the roof terrace was taken into consideration.

HoS sought to draw Members attention to what had been said regarding material grounds for refusal.

Chair reiterated what had been said by officers saying Members needed to think about this.

Members moved to refuse the application on the grounds of density but the Principal Solicitor advised that this might not be sustainable; the Principal Planner advised that it needed to be linked to policy so cramped form of development.

Members felt they were being asked to go against what they believed was right, Councillor Addison suggested that the application be deferred and that the developers listen to the Committees concerns.

At this point Chair said that as the applicant was present he would allow him to address the Committee briefly.

Mr Neil Etchington addressed the Committee saying he was disappointed to hear the Committees views; he had available CGI pictures if the Committee would like to see them. His team had worked with CBC officers on this design, his company had won several awards most recently RIBA Award. It was not possible to do something everyone liked but these dwellings were fully compliant, there were passages from the back to the front of the properties and perhaps some of the information given during the report was misleading. The terraces would have living walls separating them not 1m walls, there was land directly opposite for children to play on. Mr Etchington thanked the Chair for letting him speak.

Councillors said they felt let down by the presentation and would like to reconsider their decision for refusal as they felt they had not made an informed decision now that new information was available. Members asked that in future they be provided with a pack including photographs and plans for all applications.

Councillor Sims sympathised with Committee and due to the confusion moved to defer for further information, Councillor Addison seconded and the motion was carried.

RESOLVED that:-

The application be deferred for further information to be brought to Committee at the June meeting.

50.2 16/00081/REG3 Demolition of 14 garages and associated works Easton Walk, Corby for Corby Borough Council

The Planning Officer presented a report on the demolition of 14 garages at Easton Walk adjacent to the rear of properties on High Street; the application was before Committee as it was a Corby Borough Council application.

Relevant policies had been considered and consultation had taken place with Northamptonshire Highways, CB Property, Environmental Services, CBC Asbestos Team and Northamptonshire Crime Prevention, comments were contained within the report.

Neighbour Notification letters had been sent and a site notice posted, no objections had been received.

The garages were in a state of disrepair and were being vandalised as they were not being used. It was intended to demolish them and leave hardstanding for the use of local residents. The rear wall of each block would be replaced with 1.8m fencing to retain the privacy of residents on Easton Walk and the existing access to Easton Walk would be retained. One boundary would be 1m high allowing surveillance of the garages to reduce the perception of crime or anti-social behaviour.

The proposal did not change the use of the site from car parking; therefore there would be no impact from the proposal with regard to parking.

Councillors asked if there were any plans to mark up parking spaces to make it easier for people parking.

RESOLVED that:-

The application be approve subject to conditions

1. The development hereby permitted shall be commenced no later than three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 (as amended) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. No development shall take place outside of the following hours without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority.

08:00 to 18:00 hours Mondays to Friday

08:30 to 13:30 Saturdays

and at no time on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

Reason: In the interests of the residential amenity of the nearby occupiers and accord with Policy 13 of the North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy.

Reason for Approval:

Subject to the conditions above the proposed development is considered to be an acceptable form of development that does not adversely impact on the appearance of the area or the residential amenity of the nearby properties. The proposal is considered to comply with policy 13 of the North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy.

Statement of Applicant Involvement:

The application raised no significant planning concerns which required the involvement of the applicant.

51. Close of Meeting

The meeting closed at 8.10 pm.