

## IRTHLINGBOROUGH TOWN COUNCIL



MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE HELD ON  
TUESDAY 11<sup>TH</sup> JANUARY 2022 AT 7.00 PM AT THE COMMUNITY CENTRE, FETTLINEDINE ROAD, NN9 5XF

PRESENT: Councillors S Boyer, C Collis-Neale, C Cross, D Maxwell, R Powell, T Walton and P Boyer (Ex Officio)

ALSO PRESENT: David Maddock and Alan Mayes – co-opted members and 2 members of the public

### AGENDA

61. APOLOGIES – TO RECEIVE AND ACCEPT APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCES RECEIVED IN ADVANCE OF THE MEETING

No apologies were received.

62. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST – TO RECEIVE DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTEREST AND OTHER INTERESTS AND THE NATURE OF THOSE INTERESTS RELATING TO ITEMS ON THE AGENDA.

Councillor D Maxwell stated she had visited all the sites

63. MINUTES – TO APPROVE AND SIGN AS A CORRECT RECORD THE MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 14<sup>TH</sup> DECEMBER 2021.

**RESOLVE PLN/01(22)/55** – that the Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting Tuesday 14<sup>th</sup> December 2021 be approved and signed as a correct record of proceedings.

64. MATTERS ARISING – TO NOTE ANY MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 14<sup>TH</sup> DECEMBER 2021.

Nothing was raised.

65. PLANNING APPLICATIONS - TO CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING APPLICATIONS:

A) NE/21/01691/LBC – ALTERATIONS AND CONVERSION OF EXISTING 2 STOREY DWELLING HOUSE AND DETACHED WORKSHOP INTO 4 SELF-CONTAINED FLATS AT 62 HIGH STREET, IRTHLINGBOROUGH

Chairman:

Date:

A member of the public was invited to address the meeting in connection with related applications A) and B).

The gentleman was a resident of the High Street. He was objecting to the application to convert the six bedroom listed building into four flats. The application implied the house was not suitable to be retained as a family house. He disagreed with this statement advising that the previous owners had not only raised their own six children in the property but had also raised numerous foster/adopted children in the property too. He brought members attention to the fact that the new owner had started to strip out the property without permission. His actions had been stopped by the Conservation Officer. He also stated that the property was older than the application indicated. He considered that parking would be a greater issue if the property was divided into flats than it would be as a family house. He felt that every effort should be made to preserve the house in its current form and all avenues should be explored to this aim. Need to protect the towns heritage and Conservation area.

The Chairman thanked him for his comments.

Councillor D Maxwell felt the conversion into four flats was overdevelopment. She was disappointed to learn that the new owner had started to strip out the property and some heritage aspects had been removed. There were no parking facilities and very little outside space – she was shocked to see that the applicant had included in the application the suggestion that the residents could use the Rest Gardens in the High Street as their outside space. Another thing that troubled her was the proximity to the Indian restaurant and the extractor fan from the property which would produce noise and air pollution.

Alan Mayes stated that the best use for the listed building was its original use as a large single dwelling. Conversion of the property would have a detrimental impact on the building. It was overdevelopment which could result in eight or more cars for which there was no parking provision at all. There was very little amenity space for the proposed four flats. The High Street did not need any more flats and the town needed to maintain a variety of dwellings.

Councillor C Cross accepted it was a large property but felt the conversion into four flats would not provide spacious enough living accommodation. She wished to see the property remain as a single dwelling and the towns heritage and conservation areas preserved.

David Maddock highlighted some inaccuracies in the applications statement, saying that Irthlingborough is mentioned in the Domesday book, the application implied that it is not. He felt that the archaeological report had been rushed and as such was very basic. He also raised concerns about the bicycles, their access would be straight on to the raised footpath which is very narrow. The rubbish bins would have to be brought through the narrow alleyway to the side, this would impact pedestrians using the footpath.

Councillor T Walton was against the development she felt that the town needed to keep its heritage and maintain the balance of different types of properties that it currently has. She would like to see the new owner be required to reinstate the interiors heritage features.

Councillor S Boyer objected to the application and was sad the building had been vandalised inside without permission.

Chairman:

Date:

Councillor D Maxwell would also like planning enforcement to make provision that the internal heritage features that had been removed prior to permission being granted be re-instated.

Councillor P Boyer agreed with all points raised and wished to see the property remain in its current form as a large single dwelling.

Councillor C Collis-Neale objected to the application agreeing with points raised.

**RESOLVE PLN/01(22)/56** - that a response of **OBJECTION** on the following grounds: -

1 Overdevelopment – the application is to convert one single dwelling into four small dwellings. Irthlingborough Town Council feel this is overdevelopment and wish to see the property remaining in its current form maintaining a balance of different types of properties in the High Street and the town

2 NPPF 199

When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset’s conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

3 NPPF 197

In determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of: a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation; b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

4 NPPF 200

Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional.

5 Lack of parking provision – the property provides no parking provision or vehicular access at all. There is no unrestricted on road parking in the near vicinity either.

6 General impact on the High Street

7 Impact on Conservation area

8 Neighbouring business - large extractor fan on neighbouring restaurant business will cause noise/air pollution. – This will have more impact on the four small dwellings than on the current dwelling due to the proposed increase in general living areas and their proximity to the neighbouring building.

should be submitted against planning application NE/21/01691/LBC

B) NE/21/01690/FUL - ALTERATIONS AND CONVERSION OF EXISTING 2 STOREY DWELLING HOUSE AND DETACHED WORKSHOP INTO 4 SELF-CONTAINED FLATS AT 62 HIGH STREET, IRTHLINGBOROUGH

As item A)- NE/21/01691/LBC – related listed Building Control application.

**RESOLVE PLN/01(22)/57** - that a response of **OBJECTION** on the following grounds:

1 Overdevelopment – the application is to convert one single dwelling into four small dwellings. Irthlingborough Town Council feel this is overdevelopment and wish to see the property remaining

Chairman:

Date:

in its current form maintaining a balance of different types of properties in the High Street and the town

2 NPPF 199

When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

3 NPPF 197

In determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of: a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation; b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

4 NPPF 200

Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional.

5 Lack of parking provision – the property provides no parking provision or vehicular access at all. There is no unrestricted on road parking in the near vicinity either.

6 General impact on the High Street

7 Impact on Conservation area

8 Neighbouring business - large extractor fan on neighbouring restaurant business will cause noise/air pollution. – This will have more impact on the four small dwellings than on the current dwelling due to the proposed increase in general living areas and their proximity to the neighbouring building.

should be submitted against planning application NE/21/01690/FUL

C) NE/21/01754/FUL – PROPOSED SITING OF A CARAVAN/MOBILE HOME FOR ANCILLARY RESIDENTIAL USE AT 21 DRAYTON ROAD, IRTHLINGBOROUGH

The applicant was invited to address the meeting in connection with this application.

Firstly, the applicant wished to raise her concerns regarding a visit earlier in the day to the property without any prior warning, visit request or appointment being made by a Councillor. The Councillor had then proceeded to question her elderly mother about the application. It had also had an impact on her professionalism at work having had to leave a meeting to deal with the matter She considered this was inappropriate, breached confidentiality and protocol.

Had a request to view the site been made she would have made herself available to accommodate a visit.

In relation to the application, she outlined the reasons/need for the additional accommodation and informed members it would replace a garage currently situated in the same area.

She indicated there had been some confusion over whether the development fell within permitted development or a full application was required. Having first been advised it would come under permitted development then being asked to submit a full planning application. Due to this Planning Officer Mr Baish was currently communicating with her in regard to two applications.

Chairman:

Date:

Eight members had no objection, one was against.

One member had procedural concerns in connection with the application and voted against.

**RESOLVE PLN/01(22)/58** - that a response of **NO OBJECTION** should be submitted against planning application NE/21/01754/FUL

D) NE/21/01795/LBC – INTERNAL VENTILATION DUCTING FIXED TO THE WINDOW. NO CHANGES PROPOSED EXTERNALLY. LOCATION: DIAMOND BUSINESS CENTRE ATTLEY WAY IRTHLINGBOROUGH

No external or internal changes to the listed buildings structures were to be made as the ventilation unit will be independent and left exposed. This also means the ventilation unit can be removed in future without damage if need be.

The application has been made to enable the dental practice to meet new legislation brought in for dental surgeries.

Members had no objections

**RESOLVE PLN/01(22)/59** - that a response of **NO OBJECTION** should be submitted against planning application NE/21/01795/LBC

E) NE/21/01725/FUL - DEMOLITION OF EXISTING FIRST FLOOR ANCILLARY RETAIL AREA, AND ERECTION OF TWO FLOORS CONTAINING 16 RESIDENTIAL UNITS WITH ASSOCIATED CAR AND CYCLE PARKING AND REFUSE STORE. LOCATION: 13 - 19 HIGH STREET IRTHLINGBOROUGH

Alan Mayes gave a brief summary of the recent planning history of 13 – 19 High Street. Four applications had been submitted recently.

One for change of use from retail to residential and conversion of the ground floor into eight flats - granted

One for the demolition of the existing first floor and replacement with two new storeys consisting of eight flats - granted

Two for new buildings within grounds to rear - one block of eight flats - one block of six flats – currently awaiting an appeal decision.

He indicated that this application was for demolition of first floor and replacement with two new storeys – this application was different from that already granted. Firstly, being for sixteen flats rather than eight. Secondly, this proposal also included two storeys above the existing single storey structure to the rear. The proposed height had also been increased from the previous application.

He stated that the sixteen proposed flats designed to be bedsits, were not going to encourage people to rent long term. The proposal to extend the two storeys over the existing single structure to the rear would have a significant detrimental impact on the neighbouring, locally listed building – the old Blacksmiths Cottage blocking out light to the rear of that property and the conservation area.

Members of the committee were invited in turn to give their comments:

Councillors P Boyer, C Collis-Neale, C Cross, D Maxwell, T Walton and co-opted member D Maddock all objected on the following grounds: -

- overdevelopment,

Chairman:

Date:

- the size /style of the flats,
- the intensification it would have on traffic movements St Peter's Way and High Street,
- detrimental impact on the High Street,
- detrimental impact on Conservation Area,
- detrimental impact on the neighbouring Blacksmiths Cottage,
- detrimental impact on the privacy of the Louisa Lilley Homes to the rear.

Councillor D Maxwell also indicated that the Building Society located in this parade of units were having problems with flooding which she felt needed to be investigated.

Councillor S Boyer felt the redevelopment of the site was inevitable. However, he felt sixteen flats was overdevelopment and the development was not sympathetic to the High Street or Conservation Area. He wished to see any development enhancing the town, of a better architectural design which would be seen as an asset to the town. He also had concerns as to whether the structure of the building was suitable to support three storeys.

**RESOLVE PLN/01(22)/60** - that a response of **OBJECTION** on the following grounds: -

- 1) NPPF 48. - Local planning authorities may give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans – this application conflicts with the emerging Local Plan
  - 2) Overdevelopment
  - 3) Size and quality of the living accommodation – the accommodation does not provide a comfortable living space.
  - 4) Style of flats – large number of small studio flats which could be predicted to result in a high turnover of residents not the Town Councils preferred choice. Less larger flats would be expected to achieve a more consistent community base.
  - 5) Detrimental Impact on Conservation area
  - 6) Detrimental impact on neighbouring Blacksmiths Cottage a locally listed building. – The proposal to build up two storeys above the existing single storey structure to the rear would block out sun to the rear of the Blacksmith Cottage.
  - 6) Impact on privacy of residents of neighbouring development Louisa Lilley Homes to the rear of the property
  - 7) Buildings foundations - concerns as to whether the buildings foundations are substantial enough to support the additional floor and accommodation.
- should be submitted against planning application NE/21/01725/FUL

1 Abstention

**66. NNC DRAFT STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT FOR THE PLANNING PROCESS  
CONSULTATION RESPONSE DUE BY FRIDAY 28<sup>TH</sup> JANUARY 2022**

It was agreed that a response should be sent from Irthlingborough Town Council as a whole but, that Councillors could also submit their own responses individually if they wished to.

Not all members had read the document enclosed in the meeting pack prior to the meeting and brought their comments.

In light of this and the approaching 28<sup>th</sup> January 2022 end date of the consultation, it was proposed that all members submit their comments to Councillor S Boyer by Friday 14<sup>th</sup> January 2022. Councillor S Boyer would then collate the responses and forward the comments to the Clerk to prepare and send a collective Council response.

Chairman:

Date:

**RESOLVE PLN/01(22)/61** – that the Clerk prepares and sends a response to the NNC Draft Statement of Community Involvement for the Planning Process Consultation.

Date of next meeting 25th January 2022 at the Community Centre, Fettleline Road, NN9 5XF

There being no further business the meeting closed at 8.12pm.

Chairman:

Date: