

The Meeting of the Desborough Town Council held at the Library, High Street, Desborough on Tuesday
16th February 2016

PRESENT

Councillors: Cllr M Tebbutt (Chairman), Cllr D Howes, Cllr J Pearce, Cllr R Marlow, Cllr D Soans, Cllr R Brooks, Cllr J Putt, Cllr A Matthews, Cllr K Sills, Cllr R Cutsforth

Clerk: James McKechnie

Also in attendance: Members of the Public

1	<p>Chairman’s announcements The Chairman welcomed all those present and confirmed the health and safety/housekeeping issues for the building and asked for mobile phones to be put on silent.</p>
2	<p>Apologies for absence – Cllr A Turigel (family commitments) & Cllr J Derbyshire (Mayoral Duties) It was RESOLVED to accept these apologies (proposed by Cllr Tebbutt and seconded by Cllr Matthews)</p>
3	<p>Declarations of Interest by Councillors - Cllr Soans stated that he sat on the Planning Committee at Kettering Borough Council (KBC).</p>
4	<p>Report from Working Party Cllr Tebbutt reported the following: <u>OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION KET/2016/0044</u></p> <p>Desborough Town Council Objection to the above Application; -</p> <p>The Site Specific Proposals, Local Development Housing Allocations is still work in progress, thus development of this site should be refused.</p> <p>The status reported to the Planning Policy Committee on 30th January 2014 states: -</p> <p>“Further additional work is required in relation to DE/210 to address the issues and concerns raised the impacts of the development and mitigation measures will need to be addressed before progression of the site.”</p> <p>This status was confirmed at the update on Housing Land Supply given to the Planning Policy Committee Meeting on 27th January 2016 as follows: -</p> <p>“DE/210 identified at 30th January 2014 Planning Policy Committee as a site where further work is required before concluding whether the site would be progressed as a housing allocation.”</p> <p>The application site includes a large area between Rothwell Road towards the church which has not been included in the Housing Allocation Proposals, the application is thus invalid and should be refused.</p> <p>Evidence has been provided by Desborough Town Council in its submission to the recent consultation in September 2015, (in respect to this site and part of DE/210), to the Site Specific Proposals Local Development Document “Historically and Visually Important Open Space” which confirms their designation as ‘HVI’.</p> <p>The site should therefore be discounted and the application refused.</p> <p>Cllr Pearce reported the following:</p> <p><u>OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION KET/2016/0044</u></p> <p>Point 12 of the application form asks: Is your proposal within 20 metres of a watercourse (eg: river, stream, or beck)? To which the applicant has responded NO.</p> <p>The River Ise runs in an easterly direction along the southern boundary within 20 metres of the</p>

Chairman

Date

proposed development...Running south at the western end of the survey area was a stream measuring between 0.5m and 1m wide...Further south the channel widened to approximately 2m. A second stream formed the eastern boundary with a moderate to fast flow...The channel was approximately 1 – 2m wide.

The above is quoted from the Preliminary Ecological Assessment submitted with the application. The river and streams and their proximity to the proposed development are also mentioned in many of the other reports/assessments also submitted with the application.

We therefore conclude that this misrepresentation invalidates the application form and by default the Planning Application.

The proposed development contains the area from the rear of the Grade 1 listed St Giles Church, stretching down to the B576, known locally and here after referred to as The Damms. This area has not been reviewed, identified, or included in the Local Development Document. Neither is the area included with in the emerging Desborough Neighbourhood Plan. The inclusion of The Damm's means the proposed development conflicts with local plans, and as per the National Planning Policy Framework (here after referred to as NPPF) no. 12, the development should be refused.

Desborough Town Council recently requested that The Damms, and the adjoining Ise Valley be designated a Historically and Visually Important Open Space which would protect this entire area from development. Inclusion of The Damms and the Ise Valley in the proposed development, therefore means the proposed development directly conflicts with NPPF no. 76.

The proposed development, conflicts with NPPF no. 73: Access to high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and recreation.

The proposed development, conflicts with NPPF no. 74: Existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields, should not be built on.

The proposed development contradicts NPPF no. 100: Inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk.

The proposed development contravenes NPPF no. 109: The planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment.

The proposed development contravenes NPPF no. 110: In preparing plans to meet development needs, the aim should be to minimise pollution and other adverse effects on the local and natural environment. Plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value.

The proposed development contravenes NPPF no.112: Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, local planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of a higher quality.

The proposed development conflicts with NPPF no. 114: Local planning authorities should:

- set out a strategic approach in their Local Plans, planning positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure.

The proposed development conflicts with NPPF no.117: To minimise impacts on biodiversity and geodiversity.

The proposed development conflicts with NPPF no. 118: When determining planning applications, local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity:

The proposed development conflicts with NPPF no. 120: To prevent unacceptable risks from

pollution and land instability, planning policies and decisions should ensure that new development is appropriate for its location.

The proposed development conflicts with NPPF no. 121: Planning policies and decisions should also ensure that:

- the site is suitable for its new use taking account of ground conditions.

The proposed development conflicts with NPPF no. 123: Planning policies and decisions should aim to:

- identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason.

The proposed development conflicts with NPPF no. 126: Local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment.

The proposed development contravenes NPPF no. 129: Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset)

The proposed development conflicts with Northamptonshire Transportation Plan Priority 4: Creating a naturally resilient Northamptonshire (including a network of accessible and connected green spaces). Initiatives include: Northamptonshire ‘green arc’ (‘biodiversity corridor’) package including tree-planting and managing natural floodplains.

The proposed development conflicts with

North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (here after referred to as NNJCS), Policies 2 Historic Environment, Policy 3 Landscape Character, and Policy 4 Biodiversity and Geodiversity in their entirety.

Recent research documented in the Financial Times increases the chance of extreme flooding by 43% as the warming climate holds larger quantities of moisture leading to heavier rainfall. Flood Risk Assessment 4.1.23 refers to areas of the proposed development where the flood risk is already Medium/High.

The proposed development therefore conflicts with NNJCS Policy 5, Water Resources, Environment and Flood Risk Management:

sections A - Development should, where possible be avoided in high and medium flood risk areas,

and section B – Development should meet a minimum 1% (1 in 100) annual probability standard of flood protection with allowances for climate change.... both in relation to development and the measures required to reduce the impact of any additional run off generated by that development to demonstrate that there is no increased risk of flooding to existing surrounding properties.

The proposed development conflicts with NNJCS Policy 7, Community Services and Facilities:

section B – Providing accessible greenspace in accordance with Natural England’s Accessible Natural Greenspace Standards...and the Woodland Trust’s Woodland Access Standard....

The NNJPU Urban Case Study identified the Ise Valley as offering the most potential for creating GI links, already contained the Ise Valley Sub-Regional GI Corridor, and with the River Ise to the South, also noted that parts of the site fall within flood zone 2 and 3. The Outline Ecological Mitigation Strategy submitted as part of the proposed development identified the site as being wholly within the Ise Valley Sub-Regional GI Corridor.

Therefore, the proposed development conflicts with NNJCS Policy 19 The Delivery of Green Infrastructure:

section A – managing development and investment to secure a net gain in green infrastructure through:

- i) Establishing multi-functional greenspaces within the GI network, ii) Providing, where opportunities exist, new wildlife habitats facilities and routes to enhance assets and the linkages between them, iii) Supporting the strategic green infrastructure priorities of The Nene and Ise Valleys (policy 20) and the Rockingham Forest (policy 21).

section B - Safeguarding identified sub-regional green infrastructure corridors by:

- i) Not permitting development that compromises their integrity and therefore that of the overall green infrastructure network.
- ii) Using developer contributions to facilitate improvements to their quality and robustness
- iii) Investing in enhancement and restoration where opportunities exist.

This also means the proposed development conflicts with NNJCS Policy 20, The Nene and Ise Valleys will be priorities for investment in green infrastructure to strengthen biodiversity and landscape character, support a prosperous local economy, provide leisure and recreational opportunities and support the revitalization of towns and the protection and enhancement of their surrounding countryside.

section F – Improve strategic recreation trails along the length of the Nene Valley and developing these in the Ise Valley.

section G – Identify opportunities and proposals for floodplain and river re-naturalisation, de-culverting within urban areas and river habitat improvements.

The proposed development also conflicts with NNJCS Policy 21, The Rockingham Forest will be regenerated to increase carbon storage, strengthen biodiversity, landscape character and green infrastructure, support a prosperous rural economy and provide appropriate leisure and recreational opportunities.

section D – Protecting or enhancing tourism and recreation attractions and supporting new green infrastructure and heritage attractions, of a type and scale that can be accommodated by existing or new infrastructure and which strike an appropriate balance between visitor numbers and biodiversity, landscape, local amenity and heritage interests.

section E – Enhancing green links in accordance with Policy 19 to enable residents of towns and villages easy access to the forest on foot horseback or bicycle.

Distances to key local services, as listed within the Transport Assessment have been re-calculated from the very centre of the development using Google Earth following pedestrian routes as stated in the Transport Assessment. The re-calculated figures show the following:

Facility/Service	Re-calculated distance	Distance stated in Assessment
Havelock Junior School	1038m	504m
Doctors Surgery	1206m	310m
Library	1216m	320m
Dentist	1311m	480m

Indoor Bowls	1323m	590m
Rec. Ground	684m	425m
Broadlands shop	610m	140m
Rushton Rd Play area	932m	450m
Bus Stop Rothwell Rd	939m	300m
Post Office	1093m	600m

The re-calculated information shows that the site is located a considerable distance from the majority of key services and falls outside of the ‘Acceptable Walking Distance for Pedestrians’ as set out in ‘Providing for Journeys on Foot’. It is therefore highly unlikely that these journeys will be made on foot. We conclude from this that the vast majority of trips to and from the development will be by private car.

The Trip Modeling for both entrances to the proposed development have failed to take account of this. Although the morning school traffic could be included in the AM Trip Modeling, school traffic has not been accounted for during the PM Trip Modeling thereby invalidating the results.

The Transport Assessment states: The Site is well situated to benefit from a good level of bus services the closest bus stops located to the site are situated on the B576 Rothwell Road and Broadlands. A table is provided showing the frequency of the buses, the no.19 and the X43, with mention also being made of being able to catch these two buses to Market Harborough Station and Kettering Station.

According to the current timetable, valid until at least 2nd March 2016, the X43 to Market Harborough Station can only be caught outside the Library at 7.10am or 7.14am. There are no further services to the Station until after 5.30pm. The X43 does not go to Kettering Station. The summary of bus services within the Transport Assessment fails to make clear that the X43 from Desborough is not a continuous service to Northampton. Timings of the first bus are also inaccurate, as are the location of where the bus can be caught from.

The earliest that the no.19 to Kettering (identified within the Transport Assessment as where the majority of residents travel to) can be caught from Broadlands is 9am. If the service is required before that time, you must walk to the Library. The no.19 does not go to Kettering Station.

The first no.19 to Corby is caught from Broadlands at 7.51am, 2.19 hours after the summary of bus services states. The last bus to Corby is at 18.06, 4.51hours earlier than the summary of bus services states.

Taking all of this into account, we therefore conclude that the vast majority of trips to and from the development, whether to key services/facilities within Desborough or within the wider area, will be by private car.

Therefore, contrary to the conclusion of the Transport Assessment (3.9) the proposed development is NOT supportive of Strategic Policy 3 or 8 of the Northamptonshire Transport Plan, it also conflicts with Strategic Policy 22 Seeking to reduce the impact that motor vehicles have on the local environment.

The proposed development also contradicts NPPF 32 The opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up, and, Safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people.

The Flood Risk Assessment and the Geo-Environmental Report appear to contradict themselves on the issue of the existence of Groundwater.

The Flood Risk Assessment when assessing foul flows from the site has calculated for a maximum of 257 dwellings, however the proposed development is for 304 dwellings.

	<p>4.1.30 of the Flood Risk Assessment states that there is a risk of flooding to the site from sewers.</p> <p>As such it cannot be said with absolute clarity that the development should not be precluded on the grounds of Flood Risk and drainage as the rate of foul flow has not been accurately calculated.</p> <p>It is not clear that any construction controls are in place during the construction of the development.</p>
5	<p>Representations from members of the public – James Atkins addressed the Council outlining concerns for the safety of children, increase in traffic. Maurice Kiff addressed the Council asking them to object to this application. Kevin O’Brien addressed the Council asking them to object to this application. John Evans addressed the Council expressing concerns on the lack of green space, lack of GP appointments and that it would be better to build houses on the north side of the town. Suzanne Edwards representing the LADS Group asked if everyone could sign a letter to Kettering Borough Council.</p>
6	<p>Planning Applications The following applications have been received</p> <p>KET/2016/0044 - Central England Co-operative Ltd - Desborough (Land to South of), Desborough, - Outline Application: Residential development of upto 304 dwellings with associated access, infrastructure, public open space, nature areas and surface water management measures.</p> <p>Cllr Soans expressed concerns with the lack of mitigation during the construction of the development.</p> <p>Desborough Town Council unanimously RESOLVED (proposed by Cllr Howes and seconded by Cllr Pearce) to object to the Planning Application as outlined in agenda point 4 and to include the issue of construction mitigation.</p>
7	<p>Date of next meeting and items for the agenda: Thursday 18th February 2016 commencing at 7pm, Desborough Library, High Street, Desborough.</p>
	<p>THE MEETING CLOSED AT 7.49PM</p>