### **BOROUGH OF KETTERING**

### PLANNING POLICY COMMITTEE

Meeting held: 19th April 2018

Present: Councillor Michael Tebbutt (Chair)

Councillor Ash Davies, Ian Jelley and Mark Rowley

Also Present: Councillors June Derbyshire and James Hakewill

### 17.PP.32 APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Adams, Groome and Smith.

### 17.PP.33 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor James Hakewill declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in Item 5 on the agenda as a landowner in Braybrooke and indicated that he intended to speak on this aspect of the item in his private capacity rather than as a ward councillor, and he would leave the meeting room during any discussion thereon.

Councillor James Hakewill also declared a personal interest in Item 5 on the agenda as a ward councillor.

### **17.PP.34 MINUTES**

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting of the

Committee held on 27<sup>th</sup> March 2018 be approved and signed as a correct record.

### 17.PP.35 RIGHT TO SPEAK

Councillor Hilary Bull (Broughton Parish Council) indicated that she wished to speak on Item 5 on the Agenda.

Councillor James Hakewill (Slade Ward) indicated that he wished to speak on Item 5 on the Agenda, both as a ward councillor and in his private capacity.

## 17.PP.36 <u>SITE SPECIFIC PART 2 LOCAL PLAN: BACKGROUND PAPERS</u>

A report was submitted which sought Members' approval of a series of background papers to support the preparation of the Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan (SSP2) Draft Plan for consultation.

The report was updated at the meeting in respect of the following:-

- Settlement boundaries update (April 2018): Summary of main changes to draft settlement boundaries since September 2015
- Settlement boundaries update (April 2018): Table Corrections
- Settlement boundaries update (April 2018): Plan Corrections in respect of Geddington and Great Cransley
- Rural Settlement facilities background paper (April 2018)
  Plan Corrections in respect of Broughton

The aim of the report was to provide Members with an update on the background papers which had been prepared to date to support the SSP2 and which sought the Committee's endorsement prior to the preparation of the draft SSP2.

It was noted that a point raised at an earlier meeting in respect of the Cranford settlement boundary had indicated that a wider review was needed to ensure consistency across the Borough.

Consultation on the draft SSP2 would take place in June/July 2018 and the background papers would be made available alongside the draft Plan. The SSP2 would form part of the North Northamptonshire Development Plan, which would guide the provision of sustainable growth in Kettering Borough.

Councillor Hilary Bull of Broughton Parish Council addressed the Committee under the Council's Right to Speak Policy, putting forward three points of clarification in respect of the inclusion of a paddock referenced as Site RA/127. Councillor Bull advised the Committee that, since the last meeting, a planning application that had been submitted for the site had been refused for a number of reasons. A request was made for a further meeting with officers as it was asserted that updates contained in a report to a 2015 meeting of the Committee had not been captured. The status of the village is infill housing only, unless this is considered a specific exceptions site.

Councillor Bull was thanked for her representations. Although the planning application referred to had been refused on a number of grounds, future applications may not fail. It was pointed out that it had been agreed in October 2017 that the allocation of areas of land for housing in Broughton should be maintained until such time as the Neighbourhood Plan was adopted. The village boundary would then be amended and the paddock element of the site would not be identified within the village boundary, or as an exceptions site. Through a policy approach it was recognised that the infill element picked up windfall sites. If a site came forward as an allocation, this would represent an extension to the village boundary.

It was agreed that officers would check any anomalies in relation to the 2015 boundary and also that updates had been captured.

Debate ensued on the forthcoming consultation in relation to the progression of the Neighbourhood Plan. It was agreed to add a footnote to the document to refer to the Neighbourhood Plan.

Councillor James Hakewill addressed the Committee as Ward Councillor for the Slade Ward in relation to Broughton, and questioned whether there was any reason why the village boundary could not be drawn to replicate the emerging Neighbourhood Plan.

In response, the Committee noted that this could potentially mislead and further confuse the position in relation to the Neighbourhood Plan and the priority it was given. If the Neighbourhood Plan was not successful, it made it more difficult to review the boundary and site allocations at the presubmission stage, having not included it in the draft plan consultation. The good progress made with the Neighbourhood Plan was acknowledged, whilst recognising that Kettering Borough Council had responsibility to continue the Local Plan process and to ensure Broughton did not find itself in a policy vacuum. Representations could be made before the statutory consultation took place later in 2018.

Reassurance was consequently given that, as and when the Broughton Neighbourhood Plan was adopted, this element would be substituted by the Neighbourhood Plan, but this position had not yet been achieved.

Mr James Hakewill then addressed the Committee in his capacity as a landowner at Braybrooke, reasserting his declaration made at the beginning of the meeting and indicating that he would leave the meeting room during any subsequent debate.

Councillor Hakewill circulated an aerial photograph which indicated Braybrooke village boundary and also delineated an

area of land on which he wished to address the Committee. He gave an account of the history of the site and asserted the view that the boundary which had been applied differed from that drawn in the past. There appeared to be a lack of clarity on why this had happened. The site in question was now untidy and unkempt and in his opinion was land which could be built upon.

#### (Councillor Hakewill left the meeting room)

During debate it was noted that the same rules in respect of the boundary had been followed in the case of Braybrooke as for other villages in the Borough. It was agreed that representations should be made during the consultation process, which would be brought back to the Committee in due course, and that any changes to the village boundary at Braybrooke should not be made at this time.

### (Councillor Hakewill rejoined the meeting)

Councillor Hakewill then addressed the Committee as Ward Councillor for Slade Ward in relation to the Rural Facilities background paper, clarifying a number of anomalies in relation to facilities in Great Cransley, Harrington, Braybrooke, Mawsley, Rushton and Thorpe Malsor.

During debate it was noted that the term "settlement" was taken as meaning a village and not the parish. It was agreed to accommodate the facilities clarifications, but not to make changes to village boundaries at this meeting. Clarification was subsequently also given by members of the committee in respect of various facilities in Sutton Bassett, Geddington, Weekley, Little Oakley and Newton, including employment sites.

Following further debate, it was agreed that wording would be added to make clear that employment sites would be added in at a later date and also the tables would be reviewed to consider how facilities were categorised and if any descriptors led to confusion, such as churches, which should be referred to as places of worship; and the inclusion of private members clubs in the public houses category.

It was noted that the consultation in June/July was non-statutory.

### **RESOLVED**

that the update provided on the Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan Background Papers be noted and

• the Town Centres and Town Centre Uses

- Background Paper (April 2018) be endorsed
- the Market Town Centres health Check Update Background paper (March 2016) be noted
- the Settlement Boundaries Background Paper (April 2018) be endorsed
- the Rural Settlements Facilities Background Paper (April 2018) be noted

all of the above to be inclusive of comments and amendments made and agreed by the committee at the meeting and those included on an update attached as Appendix "A" to these minutes.

# 17.PP.37 <u>DRAFT REVISED NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK</u>

A report was submitted which informed Members of the draft Revised National Planning Policy Framework and which sought agreement to some initial comments for submission.

It was noted that the closing date for comments was 10<sup>th</sup> May 2018 and the government had indicated that, subject to the results of the consultation, the new NPPF would be published during July.

Given that the consultation still had a number of weeks to run, and understanding of the implications of proposals contained within the consultation was still evolving, it was proposed that officers be given authority to agree Kettering Borough Council's final response in consultation with the Chair of the committee. The report set out key areas for comment and draft responses.

During debate it was felt that the Joint Planning Unit's views should be taken into consideration on some elements of the response and particular reference was made to Paragraph 14 of the revised NPPF, where it was felt that neighbourhood plan areas should be given protection against unplanned housing development for a longer period than that recommended, potentially 3 or 4 years.

Debate was also held on affordable housing percentages and concern was expressed regarding interpretation in relation to certain cases. Members discussed the implications of pooling developer contributions and the Community Infrastructure Levy and it was felt that the Council had key points to make in this

respect as new regulations did not help the Council in terms of pooling. There was also a need to explore whether or not the introduction of a Community Infrastructure Levy was a viable path to take. However, it would not be possible to do this before the consultation deadline of 10<sup>th</sup> May.

### **RESOLVED** that:-

- (i) the content of the report be noted and the broad principles of Kettering Borough Council's draft response be agreed as indicated in Chapter 2 of the report; and
- (ii) authority be delegated to the Head of Development Services, in consultation with the Chair and Deputy Chair, to agree the Council's final response for submission.

(The meeting started at 6.30 pm and ended at 8.27 pm)

Signed		
	Chair	

ΑI