

## COUNCIL MEETING – 16 OCTOBER 2018

### REPORT OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

17 September 2018

Present: Councillors Carr, (Chairman), Skittrall, (Vice-Chairman), Anslow, Ekins, Emerson, G Lawman, Maguire, Patel, Walia and V Waters.

Also present: Mrs V Jessop (Assistant Director/Committee Manager), Mrs A Wilcox (Principal Environmental Health Manager), Mrs S Bateman, (Senior Planning Officer), Mr M O'Donnell (Team Leader Health Protection) and Mrs C A Mundy, (Democratic Services Officer).

(Councillors Griffiths attended as an observer. Mr A Piper, Mr M Swann and Mr T Shaw attended as officers observing.)

#### 1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

**RESOLVED** to note that apologies for absence were received from Councillors Bell, Graves, L Lawman, Partridge-Underwood, and Watts.

#### 2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

**RESOLVED** to note that in accordance with the Localism Act 2011, the council's code of conduct and the council's constitution, the following declarations were made.

<b>Name</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Reason</b>
Carr	Minute 6 - Irchester, Knuston and Little Irchester Neighbourhood Plan	Registerable – Member of steering group.
Ekins	Minute 5 - Local Plan - Appendix 1	Other – knows one of the contributors as an acquaintance
Emerson	Minute 6 - Local Plan - Appendix 1	Other – knows and has helped one of the contributors

#### 3. CONFIRMATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE HELD ON 11 JUNE 2018

The minutes of the development committee of 11 June 2018 were received.

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the development committee of 11 June 2018 be approved.

#### **4. REVIEW OF BOROUGH WIDE STREET TRADING ARRANGEMENTS**

The annexed circulated report of the director of place and strategic growth was received on the proposal to update the street trading restrictions and to seek approval to consult thereon.

Appended to the report were the following:

- Appendix A - map of current consent pitches in the town centre;
- Appendix B - map of current consent pitches within the rest of the borough;
- Appendix C - draft street trading policy and conditions

The report explained that street trading was historically managed by two separate teams, with Wellingborough Norse managing the market and town centre areas and the licensing team managing street trading elsewhere. It was proposed that in future the licensing team would take on all street trading functions across the borough and regularise the application process and conditions attached to each consent.

It was also proposed that there be a significant change to current street trading arrangements with the implementation of a borough wide consent area.

There were seven street trading consent pitches in Market Street and Orient Plaza, these areas are the subject of a licence from the county council which is currently under renegotiation. The report also detailed the current arrangements across the rest of the borough.

Within the report was a summary comparison of the key merits/demerits of a licence regime versus a consent regime. Officers recommended that option five being a borough wide consent restriction be implemented with only current designated pitches and further pitches allocated upon application and individual consultation for requested locations.

The basis for this option was that it:

- Introduces borough wide consistency and control of street trading;
- Includes both existing and potential new development within the regime;
- Permits existing pitch holders to continue trading in their current location;
- Permits applications for new pitches to be considered and consulted upon thus encouraging small business growth in a managed way;
- Permits the most flexibility in management of street trading

If members wished to proceed with this option the street trading policy would be consulted on.

Members discussed the report in more detail raising some queries over current and future street trading and asked what the costs were expected to be and

why these hadn't been detailed in the report. Officers explained that the costings were expected to be similar to those currently charged and would be based on cost recovery and had not been detailed in this report as they would be the subject of a report to resources committee.

Members agreed that the option recommended by officers for a consent restriction be consulted on and also commended the report and hard work of the officers in bringing this to committee.

**RESOLVED** that:

- (i) approval be given to the adoption of option five;
- (ii) approval be given to initiate the statutory procedure of giving notice of intention to vary the current resolution in respect of street trading;
- (iii) approval be given to undertake a 28 day consultation on the draft policy and conditions;
- (iv) it be noted that a further report, would be submitted following the consultation with summary feedback and a finalised draft policy for approval.

## **5. LOCAL PLAN – RESPONSES TO MODIFICATIONS**

The annexed circulated report of the director of place and strategic growth was received in relation to representations received on the proposed modifications to the Plan for the Borough of Wellingborough (PBW).

Appended to the report were the following:

- Appendix 1 - representations received to main modifications;
- Appendix 2 - proposed responses to representations received to
- proposed modifications to the policies map

(Councillor Emerson left the room during discussions on this item.)

The chairman permitted Mr Wilson of James Wilson Associates to address the meeting on behalf of his clients, Mr and Mrs Reynolds of The Rookery in Hardwick. He spoke in relation to garden land, in the ownership of Mr and Mrs Reynolds, and asked that consideration be given to this being removed from land designated as local green space land (LGS).

The senior planning officer, with the permission of the chairman, circulated a plan of the area; she explained that the land in question was designated as LGS as it made a positive contribution to the conservation area and character of the village. The boundary follows a fence line, which is evidenced in aerial photos since 1999 and was considered to be a defensible boundary. It also demarcates the garden from the wider area which differs in character.

Members concurred that this should remain as detailed in the plan.

**RESOLVED** that approval be given to the responses to the representations received in relation to the main modifications.

(Mr Wilson left the meeting. Councillor Emerson returned to the meeting and Councillor Carr, having declared an interest on the following item, passed the chairmanship of the meeting to his vice-chairman, reserving his right to speak.)

## **6. IRCHESTER, KNUSTON AND LITTLE IRCHESTER NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**

The annexed circulated report of the director of place and strategic growth was received to recommend the adoption of the Irchester, Knuston and Little Irchester Neighbourhood Plan.

The plan had been prepared by the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group and Irchester Parish Council and had been the subject of a referendum on 12 July 2018, which had resulted in the community's endorsement of the plan. The final step was for this to be formally 'made' by the council.

Appended to the report were the following:

- Appendix 1 - Irchester, Knuston and Little Irchester Neighbourhood Plan;
- Appendix 2 - Draft decision statement;
- Appendix 3 - List of extant development plan policies.

Councillor Carr addressed the meeting and expressed his thanks to the parish council and all the volunteers who had worked on bringing the neighbourhood plan forward resulting in the referendum agreeing the plan, which would ensure that the right houses were built in the right places for the people in the community. He then left the meeting.

Councillor Maguire, ward councillor for Irchester, also thanked the parish council and volunteers for their work on the Neighbourhood Plan. He did, however, express his concern at the very low turnout of 22.94% on referendum day and considered that the public had not been engaged sufficiently in the process, with a number of parishioners not understanding what the referendum was about. He was also concerned about the suggested sites of Austin Close and James Street as detailed in appendix three. He faced complaints from his constituents on a daily basis over the lack of facilities, which the development of an alternative site could bring. He also considered that each planning application should be judged on its own merit and felt that bungalows and one bedroom flats were needed. The school was at full capacity as was the Doctors' surgery and he considered these concerns should also form part of the Neighbourhood Plan.

Other members concurred with these thoughts but commented that the public could not be forced to vote and had been engaged with leaflet drops and a lot of information available to them prior to the referendum.

The senior planning officer confirmed that each application would be considered on its merits but the Neighbourhood Plan, as part of the development plan, would be the starting point in the decision making process. The sites identified would become priority sites when the plan was made.

- R1 RECOMMENDED** that approval be given to the Irchester, Knuston and Little Irchester Neighbourhod Plan being formally made to become part of the borough's statutory development plan.

Chairman

The meeting concluded at 7.50pm.

