

**Application for Planning Permission**

<b>18/00617/DPA</b>	<b>Part change of use of the existing Public House car park to enable the erection of a three bedroom dwelling. Creation of a new access from School Lane to serve the dwelling and provision of a pedestrian link from the High Street, The Spread Eagle, 1 High Street, Cottingham.</b>
---------------------	---

**1. The Site and Surroundings:**

1.1 The application site is at present part of the car park to the Spread Eagle Public House; and is situated to the west of the junction of the High Street/Rockingham Road and School Lane; across the High Street/Rockingham Road from the junctions with Church Street and Corby Road. To the west of the site is no. 1 School Lane; to the south of the site are nos. 2, 4 & 6 High Street. No.1 High Street (i.e. the Spread Eagle PH), is in the same ownership as the applicant of application 18/00617/DPA. The site lies within Cottingham and Middleton Conservation Area. There are a few Listed Buildings to the southwest/south/southeast of the site; e.g. at 43 – 135m away: (i) no. 2 Church Street, (ii) no. 4 Church Street, (iii) no. 6 Corby Road, and (iv) no. 12 Corby Road, etc.

**2. Proposal:**

2.1 Planning permission is sought for:

- (i) Part change of use of the existing Public House car park to residential use
- (ii) Erection of a three bedroom dwelling
- (iii) Creation of a new access from School Lane to serve the dwelling
- (iv) Provision of a pedestrian link from the High Street
- (v) External materials: Dark slate (roof); and Red natural stone/ Brick (walls).

2.2 Accommodation schedule

<b>Building Type</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Number of Units</b>	<b>NDSA Space Standard (sqm)</b>	<b>GIA</b>	<b>Room-size</b>
3-bedroom detached House 5.4m/9.2 wide x 4.7/12.2m deep x 4.7m (eaves)/ 7m (ridge)	6-Bedspace House 2-Storey  GIA 102sqm  Room-size: 16/16/15(sqm)	1	123   11.5/7.5	Complies	Complies

**3. National Guidance, Development Plan Policy And Supplementary Planning Documents/Guidance:**

- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2018)
- Policy 1 (Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development) of NNJCS
- Policy 2 (Historic Environment) of NNJCS
- Policy 6 (Development of Brownfield Land and Land affected by Contamination) of NNJCS
- Policy 7 (Community Services and Facilities) of NNJCS
- Policy 8 (Place Shaping Principles) of NNJCS
- Policy 11 (The Network of Urban and Rural and Areas) of NNJCS

Policy 15 (Well-connected Towns, Villages and Neighbourhoods of NNJCS  
Policy 22 (Delivering Economic Prosperity) of NNJCS  
Policy 26 (Renewables and Low Carbon Energy) of NNJCS  
Policy 29 (Distribution of new Homes) of NNJCS  
Policy 30 (Housing Mix and Tenure) of NNJCS  
“Saved” Policy P10(R) of the Corby Borough Local Plan

3.1 Extract from *Cottingham and Middleton Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan. Supplementary Planning Document April 2016)*

The distinctive, **key characteristics of Cottingham can** be summarised as follows:

- Old settlement pattern on lower valley slopes, with an unstructured appearance below the parish church of St Mary Magdalene whose scale dominates the village
- The steep sided slopes of the side valley and the scarp contain the historic core of the village providing the appearance and character of containment
- A rural setting, dominated by its immediate landscape and views out across the Welland Valley
- Evidence of multiple phases of development and adaptation during the 18th and 19th Century
- Medieval street pattern, with gradually unfolding views leading to attractive groups of buildings along Church Lane, Water Lane and Blind Lane
- The long straight alignment of Rockingham Road with the vista highlighted by the former clothing factory
- The glimpses of the views within and looking out of the village creates a special sense of locality
- From within the village core, glimpses of the wooded scarp and church steeple. Elsewhere, long views across the valley
- Stone walls enclosing the road and providing a strong sense of place

The soft golden stone of the traditional building material laid in traditional form and pattern for walls, roofs and boundaries giving a visual harmony

4. **Site History:**

**16/00512/COU:** Demolition of outbuildings and conversion of Public House to Dwelling. Appeal dismissed 9.11.2017.

Details of the Spread Eagle PH (Application 16/00512/COU)

Dimension: 17.8m wide x 12.9m deep x 9m (ridge) high

Gross Floor Area (GFA): 186.3sqm (ground floor) + 115.4sqm (first floor) = 301.7sqm

5. **Consultation:**

EXTERNAL

5.1 **NCC Archaeology (comments received 17.10.2019)**

The application site is located on the north side of the High Street and south of School Lane. The site lies within the area of historic settlement and on the line of the Roman road from Leicester to Godmanchester, known as the Gartree Road. The site was marked as an enclosure on the 1825 enclosure map, and contained a large building on its northern frontage. There is the potential for remains of archaeological interest to be present on the site, albeit truncated by more recent activity. The NPPF, in paragraphs 189 & 190, stresses the importance of pre-application discussions in order to assess the significance of potential heritage assets. Normally the assessment would take the form of an evaluation prior to determination; however, in this case a

condition for a programme of archaeological works is recommended. The proposed application will have a detrimental impact upon any archaeological deposits present. This does not however represent an over-riding constraint on the development provided that adequate provision is made for the investigation and recording of any remains that are affected. In order to secure this please attach a condition for an archaeological programme of works as per NPPF paragraph 199 to any permission granted in respect of this application. The suggested standard condition is worded as follows:

Condition:

No development shall take place within the area indicated until the applicant, or their agents or successors in title, has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted by the applicant and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

**5.2 Northamptonshire Highways (Rev. E comments; 02/12/2019)**

**Recommendations:**

Presently the LHA cannot support the application. Should the LPA seek to approve it the LHA request that the following conditions be applied.

**Observations:**

Given the nature of the location, parking on the highway will, very likely, cause obstruction around the complex junction. The Parking Beat Survey, although not strictly to our specification, does evidence that the car park needs to provide 13 car parking spaces. The supplied plan 1883-30G evidences 12 spaces in the car park and 1 disabled parking bay at the Public House. Tracking has been supplied and evidences that the site is very tight and requires vehicles to be parked perfectly. The LHA requests that the LPA satisfies itself regarding this matter. The loss of the car park access from its existing location is welcomed however, and will reduce the turning movements. Parking bays are stated to meet the specified requirements of 2.5 x 5m. The disabled bay has been stated in text as having been re-located from the car park to the public house. The plan details that the bay is laid out with a hatched area down one side forcing the vehicle to the southern side of the bay hard against the adjacent loading bay. The bay should have no hatching, the only marking being the disabled figure. It must be ensured that windows, doors, water goods and foundations do not impinge upon the highway and that, therefore, works to the highway would not impinge upon the dwelling.

**Conditions:**

Presently the LHA cannot support the application. Should the LPA seek to approve it the LHA request that the following conditions be applied:

- Cycle parking should be covered, secure, overlooked and easy to use, laid out with a minimum 1.2m clear access including gate widths. No lifting of cycles should be required.
- No doors or windows shall be able to open outwards over the public highway, nor shall any household goods such as water pipes enter the public highway nor eaves project over the public highway on the proposed dwelling.
- Subject to the elements above, the site should be laid out in accordance with site layout plan 1883-30G.

Planning Permission does not give or imply permission for adoption of new highway or to implement any works within the highway and / or a Public Right of Way.

**5.3 Northamptonshire Highways (Rev. D comments; 17/10/2019)**

**Recommendations:**

Presently the LHA cannot support the application. Should the LPA seek to approve it the LHA request that the following conditions be applied.

**Observations:**

Given the nature of the location, parking on the highway will, very likely, cause obstruction around the complex junction.

The Parking Beat Survey, although not strictly to our specification, does evidence that the car park needs to provide 13 car parking spaces.

The supplied plan 1883-30G evidences 12 spaces in the car park and 1 disabled parking bay at the Public House. The plan evidences potential issues within the car park layout and the LHA request that tracking be supplied to evidence that the manoeuvres required can be attained. The loss of the car park access from its existing location is welcomed however, and will reduce the turning movements.

Parking bays are stated to meet the specified requirements of 2.5 x 5m.

The disabled bay has been stated in text as having been re-located from the car park to the public house. The plan details that the bay is laid out with a hatched area down one side forcing the vehicle to the southern side of the bay hard against the adjacent loading bay.

The bay should have no hatching, the only marking being the disabled figure.

It must be ensured that windows, doors, water goods and foundations do not impinge upon the highway and that works to the highway would not impinge upon the dwelling.

**Conditions:**

Presently the LHA cannot support the application. Should the LPA seek to approve it the LHA request that the following conditions be applied.

Prior to commencement of the development full tracking plans of the car park shall be submitted and approved in writing by the LHA.

Cycle parking should be covered, secure, overlooked and easy to use, laid out in accordance with the diagram below, with a minimum 1.2m clear access including gate widths. No lifting of cycles should be required.

No doors or windows shall be able to open outwards over the public highway, nor shall any household goods such as water pipes enter the public highway nor eaves project over the public highway on the proposed dwelling.

Subject to the elements above, the site should be laid out in accordance with site layout plan 1883-30G.

**5.4 Northamptonshire Highways (Rev. C comments; 30/09/2018)**

**Recommendations:**

Objection –

- Insufficient pedestrian visibility
- Dwelling impinges upon the highway set-back distance
- Cycle and PTW parking not evidenced
- Insufficient data

**5.5 Northamptonshire Highways (Rev. B comments; received 02/08/2019)**

**Recommendations:**

Objection –

- Sub-standard parking dimensions
- Insufficient pedestrian visibility
- Insufficient manoeuvrability within the car park
- Compromised pedestrian access from the car park to the business
- Dwelling impinges upon the highway set-back distance
- Cycle and PTW parking not evidenced

5.6 **Northamptonshire Highways (Rev. A comments; received 05/04/2019)**

Presently the LHA cannot support the application and require further information to fully assess the proposals.

**Observations:**

The application will reduce the existing public house car park from 23 to 15, 3 of which are separated for the new dwelling giving 12 for the public house.

The gfa of the PH is not given, NCC Parking Standards require;

Use	Vehicle	Cycle	Motorcycle/Scooter	Disabled
A4	1 space per 14sqm	1 space per 60sqm for staff plus 1 space per 60sqm for customers	1 space 1 1 per 20 car spaces (for 1 <sup>st</sup> 100 car spaces), then 1 space per 30 car spaces (over 100 car spaces)	10% of the total car parking spaces
152sqm	11	6	2	1

Given the nature of the location, parking on the highway will, very likely, cause obstruction around the complex junction. The loss of the car park access from this locality is welcomed however and will reduce the turning movements. The disabled parking bay is not to the previously stated dimensions and blocks access to the pedestrian walkway. No tracking is provided to evidence that a vehicle could enter and exit the last space adjacent to number 6 High St with all other spaces occupied.

Pedestrian visibility splays of 2 x 2m are required at all accesses, they are not shown on the car park. They must also be clear above 0.6m in height and this is not noted, a solid boundary can be seen in all of the splays. Structures must be no nearer than 1m to the rear of the highway boundary, this does not include boundary walls. The proposed dwelling does not achieve this in many areas. The rear of the highway boundary is the rear of the footway. A minimum of 0.6m may be permitted but it must be ensured that windows, doors, water goods and foundations do not imping upon the highway and that works to the highway would not impinge upon the dwelling. No details of the cycle and motorcycle / Scooter parking have been supplied.

5.7 **Applicant/Agent response to initial Highways comments (email of 13/12/2018)**

*I have not been informed what the correct GIA area is; to calculate the parking requirement, despite my last e-mails. I have stipulated 152sqm of trading area and my calculations, as with the pre-app, are on this basis. Including toilets, sales bar, kitchen and storage the overall GIA of the ground floor is 265sqm (sic: 301.7sqm), much of which does not accommodate any customers. This is not of course a new development and I would have thought this would be a guide only? I think that it is agreed that there is considerable benefit in highways safety to close off the access onto the corner of High Street, if there are any small compromises to be made within our proposal, I hope that this will be taken into consideration.*

*Parking: 152sqm equates to –*

*11 customer car parking spaces, one of which should be for ‘disabled’.*

*3 Staff cycles and 3 customer cycles to be located beside the Pub itself.*

*2 Motor cycle spaces also to be located beside the Pub.*

*Car parking bays are shown as a minimum 2.5m wide and adjusted this where spaces are next to walls. There are small pinch points and I await further comments on these. The 3 private bays: Central bay 2.5m wide and both end bays increased to 3.3m as requested.*

*Vehicular visibility of 2m x 43m has been added to the plan for confirmation.*

*“Structures may be no nearer than 1.0m to the highway boundary”*

*The whole site has stone (partly retaining) walls along the perimeter, except where access points are. Previously on this site there were pavement fronted terraced houses. Historically this is the correct alignment. If the character of the ‘conservation area’ is a concern, as it should be, then having the building tight as possible to the highway edge is surely a priority. We are 350mm at the closest points which will avoid any footings from being constructed under the highways land.*

*Site Drainage: The remaining access slopes up towards the highway and therefore no surface water will drain onto the highway at this point. The footpath at the bottom of the site can be constructed with a drain to avoid any surface water flowing across the highways pavement. The pedestrian access as previously stated is in fact drawn as 1.13m minimum (not 0.9m) which we feel is more than adequate.*

*Gradient: This is an existing and historic access which is surfaced in a hard bound material.*

**5.8 Northamptonshire Highways (Initial comments; received 24/10/2018)**

Recommendations:

Presently the LHA cannot support the application and require further information to fully assess the proposals.

Observations:

The application will reduce the existing public house car park from 23 to 15, 3 of which are separated for the new dwelling giving 12 for the public house.

*The gfa of the PH is not given, NCC Parking Standards require;*

<i>Use</i>	<i>Vehicle</i>	<i>Cycle</i>	<i>Motorcycle / Scooter</i>	<i>Disabled</i>
<i>A4</i>	<i>1 space per 14sqm</i>	<i>1 space per 60sqm for staff plus 1 space per 60sqm for customers</i>	<i>1 space + 1 per 20 car spaces (for 1st 100 car spaces), then 1 space per 30 car spaces (over 100 car spaces)</i>	<i>10% of the total car parking spaces</i>
<i>E.G. - 200sqm</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>1</i>

Given the nature of the location, parking on the highway will, very likely, cause obstruction around the complex junction. The loss of the car park access from this locality is welcomed however; and will reduce the turning movements. The car parking bays are too narrow, they must be no less than 2.5m wide, widened to 3.3m where a solid side boundary exists. For example, the 3 private bays should have a total width of 9.1m. Parking bays require 6m behind them in order to allow vehicles to manoeuvre in and out. Tracking is required to prove that this can be achieved by a large family car where the 6m cannot be achieved, widening bays may assist. Pedestrian visibility splays of 2 x 2m are required at all accesses, they are not shown on the car park. They must also be clear above 0.6m in height and this is not noted, a solid boundary can be seen in all of the splays. Vehicular visibility of 2 x 43m is required at all accesses taken from the carriageway kerb to the nearside kerb in both directions. In this location clear visibility to the junction stop line (at the nearside kerb) is acceptable to the east with 43m to the west. These splays must be clear above 0.9m height. Structures must be no nearer than 1m to the rear of the highway boundary. The proposed dwelling does not achieve this in many areas. The rear of the highway boundary is the rear of the footway. It is unlawful to drain private water into the highway. Neither of the accesses detail boundary drainage which should be within the private land. The pedestrian access from the car park is narrow, showing at sub 0.9m creating a dark, narrow alley which will be

unattractive to use and therefore not used. Accesses must have a gradient no steeper than 1:15 for the first 5m from the rear of the highway boundary. Accesses must be surfaced in a hard bound material for the first 5m from the rear of the highway boundary.

#### 5.9 **Cottingham Parish Council (received 8/10/2019)**

At a meeting held on 8<sup>th</sup> October 2019, Cottingham Parish Council failed to support the application for the following reasons:

- Entrance and exit to the car park are onto a narrow road, School Lane, which is partly one way. It is the Council's opinion that this road is too narrow to allow safe access from the car park.
- The design and spacing of the parking bays will require caution on behalf of drivers using them. It is likely that accurate parking will not be easily achievable.
- A space for disabled drivers impinges upon the garden of the house.
- The proposed pedestrian access from car park is not clear if it uses part of the current gap in the boundary or if it is sited closer to 2 High Street which would then need to remove part of the existing listed wall.
- The loss of car parking spaces creates the risk that at busy times, cars will park on the highway. Parking on School Lane is difficult and drivers will be tempted to park on the pavement because of the narrowness of the road. High Street is a major thoroughfare of the village and excessive parking will inevitably cause problems for traffic flow.
- An application for, 1 School Lane Cottingham to convert one four-bedroom house into two two-bedroom houses, 18/00845/DPA, was refused on the 2<sup>nd</sup> May 2019. The second of two objections stated that insufficient car parking space had been allocated. Had the application been accepted then cars would have been parked on School Lane. Similar criteria ought to apply to 18/00617/DPA.

The Council has noted the objections of the Northamptonshire Highways Department and concur with them.

We also concur with the concerns expressed in the archaeology report that the line of the old Roman road dictates that an archaeological investigation should be undertaken.

Should planning permission be granted, then we would ask that in line with Corby's emerging Part 2 Plan and the development of our own developing Neighbourhood Plan that permission is only granted for a house considered "affordable" that is at a price that is achievable for first time buyers.

#### 5.10 **Cottingham Parish Council (received 26/10/2018)**

At a meeting held on 24/10/2018, the Parish Council's Planning Committee failed to support the application. The reasons given were the wall is in Conservation Area therefore subject to appropriate restrictions. The reduction in the number of car parking spaces would lead to problems for customers of the Spread Eagle who may have to park on the highway. The plans appear little on the materials to be used leading questions about the development being in keeping with the surrounding area.

#### INTERNAL

#### 5.11 **CBC Environmental Health Officer (received 16.10.2018; contamination)**

I have no objection to make but would recommend the following be attached as a condition should consent be given:

#### **Reporting of Unexpected Contamination**

In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development that was not previously identified it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority. An investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken and where remediation is

necessary, a remediation scheme must be prepared which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme a verification report must be prepared, which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

**Reason:** To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors.

**5.12 CBC Environmental Health Officer (received 24.10.2018; noise)**

No comments.

**5.13 CBC Sustainability Officer (25.10.2018)**

I have no objection to make regarding this application. Only an observation that the planning and design statement is missing information regarding low carbon, home energy efficiency, technologies as laid out in NNJPU JCS adopted 2016. From looking at the plans, there is an opportunity to include air source heat pumps to heat the property, and solar thermal and/or voltaic on the roof of the south east and the south west elevation.

**5.14 CBC Conservation Officer (received 26/04/2019)**

The following comments relate to an application for the construction of a new build three-bedroom dwelling, complete with part of the existing Spread Eagle car park retained for use by the public house. The application site is situated within the existing car park on the junction of Church Street and High Street. The car park currently serves the pub located on High Street and is slightly detached from the main building, not being readily visually associated with the pub.

The subject site is located in a prominent location in the centre of Cottingham village, on a major road junction, with the proposed new dwelling clearly visible from the entry to the village. The subject site is surrounded by largely resident properties, with local limestone being the predominant building material, set under steep dual pitched roof, with the main entrance elevation facing onto the road side, with little or no front gardens. The existing car park is bounded by low local stone walls, typical of the area and one of the significant features of the character of the village and any loss should be avoided. The car park itself has been highlighted within the Conservation Area Appraisal as being a negative feature within the Conservation area and as such, its development is to be encouraged. However, the development needs to respect and reflect the local characteristics and typify Cottingham. The design needs to complement the surrounding buildings, in style, scale and mass and materials. The proposed dwelling has the front elevation facing east, comprising of a two-storey elevation in local stone, with symmetrically situated window and door openings, complete with traditional detailing to the cill and head, with a central entrance door onto the path. The roof is of traditional slates, complete with gable ridge chimneys. The dwelling increases to three storey as the land slopes away, downhill towards the west, with a more modest elevation facing onto School Lane with the roof line stepping down into the site and along the Lane.

From a conservation point of view small scale development of the car park is to be encouraged, in order to enhance the prominent node within the centre of the village. However, any development in this area, must be high quality and reflect the characteristics of the village. The proposed dwelling must retain the low level stone boundary walling, to the car park, which is characteristic of the site and the village at large. The proposed dwelling is of similar massing and scale to the surrounding cottages, in terms of overall size, eaves height, ridge height and overall proportions, whilst reflecting the changes in styles and proportions of the surrounding street scene. There is historic evidence of small scale cottages, previously demolished running from the junction along School Lane and the simple return of the dwelling and the roofscape reflects the character of these previously lost cottages.



The return along School Lane results in a narrow and therefore less imposing gable end complete with chimney being clearly visible on entry to the village. Thereby reinforcing the traditional street scene and reducing the visual impact of the new dwelling, retaining the narrow pinch point upon entry to School Lane. The low boundary wall is to be retained, encircling the car park and the dwelling. The proposed dwelling reflects the size and proportions of the simple functional cottage design of the centre of a 18th and 19th century village, set under natural slate. The public house, to which the existing car park is associated is an integral part of the village and it is to be retained as far as is practical, as such additional development, above and beyond the current application, within the car park would not meet with positivity as overdevelopment would soon outweigh any perceived harm by the retention of the remaining car park

#### *Recommendation*

I have no objection to this proposal and am generally in support of this proposed development subject to the following conditions: Physical samples of the external materials, brick and stone and slates. Sample panel of stone complete with mortar pointing. Joinery details of windows and doors.

### **6. Advertisement/Representations:**

Site Notice displayed 10.10.2018

Evening Telegraph advert published 16.10.2019

Twenty three (23) neighbour notification letters sent 4.10.2018

Twenty (20) representations received

### **6.1 Representations received**

#### *Design and Housing*

- Unless the proposed property is built exactly like the other adjacent houses; i.e. In Cottingham brick, or ironstone or a mixture of the two, it will be a total eyesore as would be situated exactly in the centre of the village in a conservation area;

*(Comment: relevant external materials condition suggested in case of approval).*

*(Agent: The proposed building is a mixture of Ironstone and brick 'to match locality').*

- The applicant has already had an application to have the Spread Eagle Pub turned into a dwelling refused; is this just a start to try and prove that this pub is not viable?

*(Comment: Arguably, potential income stream from current proposal would assist sustain Spread Eagle PH as a viable going concern).*

*(Agent: Continued trading and accounts will establish if the Pub is 'viable' or otherwise. This application clearly establishes that the Public House does not require the whole of the current car park and we propose that part of that car park is turned into the site for a new dwelling).*

- The development is out of character with the surrounding buildings;

*(Comment: The Conservation Officer noted that: (i) The car park itself has been highlighted within the Conservation Area Appraisal as being a negative feature within the Conservation area and as such, its development is to be encouraged; and (ii) I have no objection to this proposal and am generally in support of this proposed development subject to the following conditions: Physical samples of the external materials, brick and stone and slates. Sample panel of stone complete with mortar pointing. Joinery details of windows and doors).*

*(Agent: The development is quite clearly 'in character' with the surrounding buildings. It is in scale and character with other buildings around the cross and will use similar materials).*

- There is no need for a house of this size in the village, as there are several properties of this size, already on the market;  
(Comment: Noted).  
(Agent: When originally submitted this was to be the residence of the applicant and the matter was not relevant. Any future, speculative development will be subject to market forces which is not a matter for the LPA to consider).
- There is a dry stone wall around the car park which should not be knocked down;  
(Comment: Noted).  
(Agent: Not technically a 'dry stone' wall. When this application was first submitted this was to be replaced by the new, higher, stone and brick walls of the proposed house. This would have increased the impact of the walling on site, not reduced it. However, with the recent comments from Highways, the proposed building has been set back from the footpath and would allow a section of the perimeter wall to remain if this is required. It should be noted that additional stone walling is proposed to the rear of the 3no private parking spaces).
- We know that the long term ambitions of the current owners of the Spread Eagle pub is to turn it into a residential dwelling, having submitted a planning application to do just that in December 2016 (reference 16/00512/COU). This planning application was rejected at appeal in December 2017; with the Inspector recognising that the pub is an asset that is valued by the local community. As the pub car park is an integral part of this asset and crucial to its continued success, I would ask that this planning application to remove a significant proportion of the car park be considered by councillors at the Development Control Committee, and not by delegated decision as suggested on your website;  
(Comment: Noted).  
(Agent: 'We' do know that the applicant submitted a previous application to convert the Public House to residential. The appeal decision on that application is not relevant to this application as it is not proposed that the Public House closes. Highways confirm that the Public House does not require the current size of car park).
- Since re-opening in April 2018, the pub is once again becoming an integral part of the village community offering regular quiz nights, disco/karaoke, live music and hosting the ladies' skittles league. The proposed 12 spaces that will be left on the car park are totally inadequate for a pub of this size and will most definitely impact its business;  
(Comment: NCC Highways finds the proposed parking provision satisfactory).  
(Agent: Again, traffic surveys have shown that the full car is not required).
- The plans would involve the demolition of a significant stretch of very old stone wall and the erection of a long stretch of new wall, which is highly unlikely to blend in with the existing wall, thereby negatively impacting the village street scene right at the heart of the Conservation Area;  
(Comment: Actual material samples would be examined/considered on site by the Conservation Officer in case of approval; pursuant to implementation. Relevant condition suggested in case of approval).  
(Agent: There were 'very old' buildings on site but I doubt if this is the remains of those walls. The significance of these walls would alter with the removal of part of the vast tarmac car park that it barely disguises. As mentioned before, this would be replaced with more substantial walling. As also mentioned, lengths of this can now be retained with the repositioning of the new building and this is indicated on the coloured drawings now submitted).
- The destruction of the stone wall that surrounds the Spread Eagle Car Park should be resisted. This is the conservation area for Cottingham and Middleton. The Conservation

Appraisal 2016 state the stone walls should be preserved; that houses should be predominantly stone. The brick/stone ratio on the application plans is unclear and require clarification;

*(Comment: Noted).*

*(Agent: The extent of retained and new stone walls has been highlighted on the submitted drawings).*

- The design statement includes a map of 1883, which shows a building on the car park; this is totally irrelevant; as in 1883 no motor vehicles were around and this should be disregarded;

*(Comment: Noted).*

*(Agent: This is relevant and important background information. No reference has been made to use by motor vehicles).*

### Access and Parking

- We live in a beautiful village that has a very good community spirit, good connections with Corby; with customers coming to use the pub and our village shop. If parking becomes a problem, not only will visitors suffer but customers using the Community Shop/Café and of course the Spread Eagle;

*(Comment: Noted).*

*(Agent: This is a private car park and not for the purpose of the Shop. When the Public House was previously closed, the car park had been chained off to prevent any use for about 6 months or so).*

- This is a very busy star shaped cross roads with School Lane, High Street, Rockingham Road, Church Street and Corby Road all on this junction. The presence of yellow lines, precluding parking, exist on most of the approaches to the cross roads;

*(Comment: Noted).*

*(Agent: This is a highways issue not part of this application).*

- The car park is for the parking of vehicles not a building area;

*(Comment: Noted).*

*(Agent: The car park is currently an underused place to park vehicles for Patrons of the Pub. Any surplus land can be considered for alternative uses).*

- The pub is an amenity for the village with a car park to cater for its patrons;

*(Comment: Noted).*

*(Agent: The Pub does not require this size car park).*

- The centre of any village is important as a meeting place, and the village cafe supplies that need. It however has to be viable and the major restriction on parking will have a significant effect to its survival. The viability of the Spread Eagle may well also be affected (perhaps this is intended). Perhaps a limited trial blocking off the site and the area in School Lane where parking would not be allowed may well demonstrate the folly of this application;

*(Comment: Noted).*

*(Agent: This is speculation)*

- By placing the vehicle access for both the pub patrons and the proposed house onto School Lane, it increases traffic exponentially onto a very narrow lane, which is already congested, and the one-way system is already regularly flouted. This is a hazard to both vehicles and pedestrians;

*(Comment: NCC Highways Has considered the application and suggested conditions in case of approval).*

*(Agent: The public house car park already has access directly onto School Lane and we intend to continue this use. This is clearly a matter for Highways and the LPA to consider).*

- By reducing the car parking for the Spread Eagle's Patrons, it forces customers to use the adjacent roads where parking is already an aggressive issue, due partially to the extension of the double yellow lines. These roads - High Street, Church Street, School Lane, Rockingham Road, and Corby Road, already bear the brunt of visitors to the Shop, Church and Chapel, for which there has never been enough parking provision. We, in Church Street, are already burdened with increased car ownership putting huge pressure on the road for residents. This is especially galling as those with off street parking do not make use of it;

*(Comment: Noted).*

*(Agent: The requirement of parking for the Public House has been covered/explained above).*

- Vehicular access requested to be gained from School Lane is neither acceptable nor practical. The access requested by the application to facilitate three vehicles is at the very least, excessive. Vehicle access to proposed development should only be granted through one of the two already existing access points to the car park;

*(Comment: Noted).*

*(Agent: We agree that 3 spaces for the new house is generous and would gladly reduce this to 2 spaces, however that is what Highways have insisted on).*

- The car park lies within the new and recently approved Cottingham and Middleton Conservation area. School Lane is specifically mentioned in this brief, with special emphasis on the stone walling which form the boundaries of this Lane. These walls, along with the Granite sets which form the lanes Kerbing, again mentioned in the Conservation Report, should be preserved at all cost to preserve the traditional appearance of Cottingham. To allow the destruction of such a large part of the existing Granite kerbing, along with the stone wall and its attractive "Cock and Hen" Coping would be in defiance of conservation areas intent, which is aimed at the protection of the village heritage and its beauty;

*[Comment: Development in Conservation Area should conserve or enhance (but not degrade) character/appearance of the locality].*

*(Agent: Being within a 'conservation area' does not restrict all development or the protection of every existing feature. We feel that the proposed development does however respect the Cottingham Conservation Area. The LPA and their Conservation Team will determine the acceptability of the proposed development).*

- The junction adjacent to the car park, where planning is sought, is already suffering from severe congestion. At best an accident waiting to happen. Cars are already being forced to parking illegally. These actions occur daily and are due to the severe lack of, or total non-existence of car parking space. Allowing access to facilitate three vehicles to a development, will only add further congestion to School Lane, as two to three kerbside parking spaces would have to disappear. Customers of the village shop, people attending the Methodist Chapel and local residents, all suffer the same fate, congestion and illegally parked cars, blocking pavements and drives. Currently, some of visitors and residents find refuge from the lack of parking, only by utilizing the parking afforded by the Spread Eagle Car Park. Residential development in the Spread Eagle car park is a sure guarantee for more cars being parked illegally in this active part of Cottingham;

*(Comment: Noted).*

*(Agent: The effect of the proposed development on any existing highways issues is for the LPA and Highways to take a balanced view).*

- Public and current residential parking on School Lane has already turned the lane into a dangerous traffic area, for both vehicles and pedestrians alike. Due to current parking situations forced on residents, motorists needing to enter at the East End of School Lane, from either Rockingham or Corby Road, are forced to do so entering on the wrong side of the lane, often being forced into meeting traffic exiting the lane, HEAD ON;

*(Comment: These in the main are traffic and parking enforcement matters).*

*(Agent: This appears to be an existing highways matter. The effect of the proposed development on any existing highways issues is for the LPA and Highways to take a balanced view)*

- The proposed 12 spaces aren't enough to afford patrons parking or to generate future support for the Spread Eagle Public House. To request decreasing the number of parking spaces to only 12, cannot possibly show faithful intent, or a wish to run a successful business supplying food, music events and quiz nights. This application "Smacks" of an obvious attempt to let the business fail by providing inadequate parking facilities to potential patrons and hinder future business development;

*(Comment: Arguably, potential income stream from current proposal would assist sustain Spread Eagle PH as a viable going concern).*

*[Agent: The proposed 13 spaces (including 1 disabled parking space), 2 motor cycles and cycle racks have been agreed with highways].*

- The historical and rightful ownership of the Car Park should be determined, as many local and long term villagers feel it was left as a council asset under Kettering Borough Council, to be returned from use, if and when the Spread Eagle ceased to trade. This Point, many feel, requires further investigation. Should this in fact be the case, then the Car Park should be retained entirely as a village asset for village amenities and residents parking;

*(Comment: The applicant has completed Certificate A on the application form).*

*(Agent: The Applicant holds the title of both the Public House and Car Park. This is not a Planning issue.).*

- Should planning for the proposed dwelling be considered, then access and parking for the dwelling should only be permitted from within the existing internal walled boundaries of the current car park, and utilizing the current existing access points;

*(Comment: Noted).*

*(Agent: This is a statement of opinion).*

- The proposed 12 spaces that will be left on the car park are so tightly packed in that it is difficult to see how cars will be able to manoeuvre in or out of the spaces, or turn round in the car park, which would force cars to reverse out onto the narrow, one way, School Lane, leading to highways danger;

*(Comment: Relevant conditions to be applied in case of approval).*

*(Agent: Tracking has been supplied to Highways from reputable highway consultants to show how this works).*

- Under the proposed design, the car park and entrance would be hidden from view behind the new dwelling, meaning drivers would not be able to see if there were free spaces on the car park without actually driving into it, again forcing cars to reverse back out onto School Lane. This, and the reduced number of car parking spaces, would lead to more cars parking on the already congested roads at the centre of the village;

*(Comment: Noted).*

*(Agent: The proposed car park is deemed to be sufficient for the current enterprise).*

- The access required for the proposed off-street parking for the new property would reduce the space available for on street parking on School Lane. Parking is already extremely scarce around the centre of the village and any reduction in on-street parking could well have a negative impact on the community-run village store and café (another valued community asset) that is located on the opposite corner to the pub car park;

*(Comment: Noted).*

*(Agent: The effect of the proposed development on any existing highways issues is for the LPA and Highways to take a balanced view).*

- I note that the applicant has referred to a building being previously located on this site in the late 1800s. There was indeed a building on this site, but this (along with a number of other buildings around The Cross) were demolished in the mid-1960s with the sole purpose of widening the roads and improving visibility around the crossroads for the increasing traffic load. Reinstatement of a building on this site would therefore be a retrograde step, which will have a negative impact on visibility and road safety;

*(Comment: Noted).*

*(Agent: I cannot comment on the exact position of previous buildings, the relative location of new kerbs or the intent of the Authorities in the 1960's. The view of Highways today is that... 'The loss of the car park access from its existing location is welcomed...and will reduce the turning movements').*

- The car park has been used as such since 1965/66 (so for over 50 years). Please also note that School Lane itself (along with Corby Road and part of Ashley Road) runs along the route of the 'Via Devana' Roman Road from Huntingdon to Leicester;

*(Comment: Archaeology Officer has recommended relevant condition in case of approval).*

*(Agent: This is background information).*

- In terms of the history of this site, villagers who were living in Cottingham in the 1960s recall that the land on which the car park is located was previously owned by the Co-Op general store which stood on Corby Road, and that it was gifted to the then owners of the Spread Eagle for use as a car park on the proviso that, should the Spread Eagle cease to operate as a public house, ownership of the car park would revert to Borough or Parish Council ownership. This covenant was put in place in recognition of the value of this car park as an amenity for the village as a whole. Consequently, any development on the car park would prevent the return of this amenity in full, should the Spread Eagle ever be closed permanently. I believe Cottingham was then within Kettering Borough but this issue needs to be investigated thoroughly;

*(Comment: Noted).*

*(Agent: As mentioned before, the Applicant holds the title of the Public House and Car Park. This is not a Planning issue).*

- I am concerned that the reduction from the existing marked 25 public parking bays to the proposed 11 will threaten the viability of the Spread Eagle public house (Amenity). The narrow pedestrian alleyway between the pub and its car park will be relatively inconspicuous and unattractive to use, effectively separating the pub from its car park (Parking). In addition there is a significant prospect of more cars parking on the roads around the pub which is sited on a complex junction. Yellow lines have been painted around this junction which are routinely ignored and seemingly not enforced. Parked vehicles already obstruct my drive on occasions. Parked vehicles already comprise potential hazards/obstruction close to the junction itself (Highway considerations);

*(Comment: Noted).*

*(Agent: Again, 13 spaces, 2 motorcycles and bicycle racks. Instances of historic and possible future bad parking is parking enforcement matter).*

- How can the future of the pub be sustained by losing 50% of its customer parking and using limited on street parking;

*(Comment: Noted).*

*(Agent: This is because it does not need 25 spaces).*

- The proposed entrance to the remaining car park would be 100m away from the pub entrance, out of view and in a different street. How can this possibly be good planning and sustainable development? *(Comment: Noted).*

*(Agent: There are of course many examples across the country where car parks do not relate directly to the front door of the business. If signage is required this can be provided. We do not see what aspect of 'sustainability' is being questioned.*

## **7. Officer's Assessment**

### **7.1 Key Determining Issues:**

The main considerations in the determination of this application relate:

- Principle of development
- Partial loss of car park to the existing Spread Eagle PH
- Suitability of the site to accommodate the development
- Impact on amenities and the Conservation Area.

### **Conformity with the Development Plan and Material Considerations**

- 7.2 The NPPF attaches great importance to the design of the built environment, stating good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and should contribute positively to making places better for people. It stresses the need to plan positively for the achievement of high quality and inclusive design for all development. While it states that local authorities should not impose architectural styles or particular tastes, it reinforces that it is also important to consider local character and distinctiveness.
- 7.3 In addition to the specific NPPF requirements set out above, paragraph 39 stipulates that applicants will be expected to work closely with those directly affected by their proposals to evolve designs that take account of the views of the community. Proposals that can demonstrate this in developing the design of the new development should be looked on more favourably.
- 7.4 The application form at question 24 indicates that pre-application advice or assistance has been sought from the Council; albeit it is another matter whether the applicant adheres to the advice given. The NPPF from paragraph 39 extols the virtues of applicants engaging in pre-application discussion with the council to resolve any issues that may arise to help applicants avoid any unnecessary delays and costs.
- 7.5 Paragraph 118(d) states that Planning Decision should promote and support the development of under-utilised land and buildings, especially if this would help to meet identified needs for housing where land supply is constrained and available sites could be used more effectively (for example converting space above shops, and building on or above service yards, car parks, lock-ups and railway infrastructure). However, the current planning application has provided information on parking survey as evidence to broadly demonstrate that the existing car park is under-utilised; with which it is considered that the proposed partial loss of the car parking is acceptable as found by NCC Highways.
- 7.6 It is noted that representations received have objected to the proposals on various grounds highlighted above, including that the proposed development would be likely to: (i) discourage potential customers to the Spread Eagle PH from visiting the premises and thereby promoting demise of the Pub from loss of business; or (ii) lead to on-street parking to the detriment of

highway safety. The former is counter to actual parking survey findings; and the latter is checked by yellow line marking in the area which is a parking enforcement matter. Accordingly, only limited weight can be given to the raised highway/parking issue(s).

- 7.7 Also, the issue of ownership of the existing car park has been raised. The applicant has completed Certificate A in the application submission. In any case, it is considered that planning permission grant does not permit the developer to build on land without consent of the relevant land owner(s).
- 7.8 Finally, the raised issue of design is now considered. The Conservation Officer noted that: (i) The car park itself has been highlighted within the Conservation Area Appraisal as being a negative feature within the Conservation area and as such, its development is to be encouraged; and (ii) I have no objection to this proposal and am generally in support of this proposed development subject to the following conditions: Physical samples of the external materials, brick and stone and slates. Sample panel of stone complete with mortar pointing. Joinery details of windows and doors. Design matter is fully considered below.

### **Design, Layout and the Effect on the Character and Appearance of the Surrounding Area**

- 7.9 The JCS at policy 8 describes the principles that proposed development must take into account with regards to its effect on the character and appearance of an area.
- 7.10 The government at chapter 12 of the NPPF says it attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. It goes on to advise: that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning and should contribute positively to making places better for people.
- 7.11 Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that 'In the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, of any functions under or by virtue of any of the provisions mentioned in subsection (2), special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.
- 7.12 It is one of the core principles of the NPPF that heritage assets should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance. Chapter 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework sets out that the local planning authority should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset. They should take this assessment into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.
- 7.13 Paragraphs 189 - 192 set out the framework for decision making in planning applications relating to heritage assets and this application takes account of the relevant considerations in these paragraphs. In this instance the key heritage asset is the Cottingham and Middleton Conservation Area and in the setting of several grade 2 listed buildings as noted above.
- 7.14 In line with paragraph 195 of the NPPF (2019) local planning authorities should refuse permission unless a substantial public benefit is identified. In this instance, public benefits would be (i) the creation of new market housing, which by itself and given the minimal contribution this makes to meeting the housing need in the area cannot be deemed a substantial public benefit; (ii) enhancement of the character/appearance of this part of the Conservation Area identified in the Conservation Area Appraisal which is deemed a substantial public benefit. Therefore, having due regard to the provisions of Policy 2 of the North Northamptonshire JCS and Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, planning permission should be granted.
- 7.15 In terms of the design and layout of the proposed development, the Conservation Officer noted *"The return along School Lane results in a narrow and therefore less imposing gable end complete with chimney being clearly visible on entry to the village. Thereby reinforcing the traditional street scene and reducing the visual impact of the new dwelling, retaining the narrow pinch point upon entry to School Lane. The low boundary wall is to be retained, encircling the car park and the dwelling. The proposed dwelling reflects the size and proportions of the simple functional cottage design of the centre of a 18th and 19th century village, set under natural slate. The public house,*



*to which the existing car park is associated is an integral part of the village and it is to retained as far as is practical, as such additional development, above and beyond the current application, within the car park would not meet with positivity as overdevelopment would soon outweigh any perceived harm by the retention of the remaining car park.”* Officers consider the proposal a sympathetic redevelopment of the site; in terms of being in keeping with the character and appearance of this part of the Conservation Area.

- 7.16 Policy 30 (Housing Mix and Tenure) of NNJCS refers to Nationally Described Spaced Standards for assessing housing development(s). The proposed development has adequate internal space provision; and is Nationally Described Space Standards compliant. The proposal is consistent with Policy 8 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (2011–2031) and the NPPF (2018).

### **Neighbouring Amenity**

7.17 The JCS at policy 8(e)(i) details policy relating to the protection of amenity of neighbouring occupiers. At chapter 12 of the NPPF, the government requires new development to provide 'a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.' Regarding the matters loss of privacy, loss of light or loss of outlook, it is considered that there is considerable separation distances between the proposed and neighbouring dwellings; in which case no concern is raised in these regard. In terms of neighbouring amenity the proposal is therefore compliant with Policy 8 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy.

### **Standard of accommodation**

- 7.18 Policy 30 (Housing Mix and Tenure) of NNJCS refers to Nationally Described Spaced Standards for assessing housing development. The proposed development is compliant (see Accommodation Schedule above) with the NNJCS; and no issue is raised in this regard.

### **Car Parking and Amenity space**

- 7.19 The Highways Officer has suggested conditions in case of approval. Amenity space provision is modest but usable; and is comparable to nearby neighbouring curtilages in this locality. No issue is raised on car parking and amenity space grounds.

## **8. Conclusion**

- 8.1 The proposed development is considered to be of an acceptable design, size and siting in relation to the site and this part of Cottingham and Middleton Conservation Area; resulting in no loss of amenity to any adjoining properties or highways safety; and complies with Policy 1 (Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development), Policy 2 (Historic Environment), Policy 6 (Development of Brownfield Land and Land affected by Contamination), Policy 7 (Community Services and Facilities), Policy 8 (Place Shaping Principles), Policy 11 (The Network of Urban and Rural and Areas), Policy 15 (Well-connected Towns, Villages and Neighbourhoods), Policy 22 (Delivering Economic Prosperity), Policy 29 (Distribution of new Homes), Policy 26 (Renewables and Low Carbon Energy), Policy 30 (Housing Mix and Tenure); and the relevant aims of the National Planning Policy Framework. It is recommended that the proposal be approved subject to conditions.
- 8.2 Neighbour’s representations have highlighted the issue of the appeal decision at Spread Eagle PH. The appeal Inspector noted the following:

*Appeal Decision (extracts) – 16/00512/COU:*

### *Paragraph 3*

*“Policy 7 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy 2011-2031 (2016) (CS) states development should support and enhance community services and facilities, where appropriate by among other things, safeguarding existing facilities unless it can be demonstrated that they are no longer viable; no longer needed by the community they serve and are not needed for any other community use or that the facility is being relocated and*

*improved to meet the needs of the new and existing community. This is consistent with the aims of Paragraph 70 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework)”.*

Paragraph 7

*“However, the level of competition also shows that a number of similar enterprises are viably operating in the area and the viability of a tenancy is not directly comparable to the viability associated with owning an enterprise. Whilst I accept the broad figures provided and the previous owners had been operating at a loss there are no detailed business accounts before me. Without which, I am not therefore satisfied the public house is not a viable business”.*

Paragraph 10

*“Even though the Council have decided not to register the appeal premises as an ACV, the desire of the community to do so and the significant number of letters of objection show the facility is valued by the local community. In any event the Council’s decision regarding the ACV does not negate the need for the proposal to accord with the development plan”.*

Paragraph 11

*“Overall for the reasons given, I am not satisfied that the appeal premises have been appropriately marketed for sale as a community facility and overall through a lack of substantive evidence I am not satisfied the appeal premises cannot be viably used as a community facility. Thus the proposal is not justified and is in conflict with Policy 7 of the CS and paragraph 70 of the Framework which seek to avoid the unjustified loss of community facilities and guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities”.*

It is Officers view that the appeal decision does not bear a direct correlation with the current proposal; albeit it is of relevance.

**9. Recommendation**

Officers recommend that Members should grant planning permission subject to the following condition(s):

**Conditions**

**1. Implementation timescale**

The development hereby permitted shall begin before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

**Reason:** As required by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

**2. Approved plans / documents**

The development shall conform in all aspects with the plans and details shown in the application as listed below, unless variations are agreed by the Local Planning Authority in order to discharge other conditions attached to this decision:

Drawing no. 1883-30G Proposed Layout Plan Location Plan; dated 12/11/2019

Drawing no. 1883-31B Proposed Ground Floor Plan; dated 12/11/2019

Drawing no. 1883-32B Proposed First Floor Plan; dated 24/06/2019

Drawing no. 1883-33A Elevations (Sheet 2); dated 21/09/2019

Drawing no. 1883-34A Elevations (Sheet 2); dated 21/09/2019

Drawing no. 1883-35 Existing Layout; dated 29/06/2018

Drawing no. 1883-36 Location Plan and Block Plan; dated 29/08/2018

Drawing no. 1883-37 Disabled Space and Cycle Parking Proposed Layout; dated 01/10/2019

Drawing no. BTP-2019-007\_10; dated September 2019

Planning, Design and Access Statement by Caldecotte Group; received 12.09.2018

**Reason:** For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure a suitable form of development in accordance with Policy 8 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy.

### **3. Archaeology**

No development shall take place within the site until the applicant, or their agents or successors in title, has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted by the applicant and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The agreed details shall be implemented as approved.

**Reason:** In the interest of character and appearance; and to ensure compliance with Policy 8 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy.

### **4. Highways**

Notwithstanding details shown on the approved plans:

- (i) Cycle parking should be covered, secure, overlooked and easy to use, laid out with a minimum 1.2m clear access including gate widths. No lifting of cycles should be required.
- (ii) No doors or windows shall be able to open outwards over the public highway, nor shall any household goods such as water pipes enter the public highway nor eaves project over the public highway on the proposed dwelling.
- (iii) Subject to the elements above, the site should be laid out in accordance with site layout plan 1883-30G.

**Reason:** In the interest of highway safety and public amenity. To ensure compliance with Policy 8 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy.

### **5. Completion and Maintenance of Car/Vehicle Parking – Shown on approved plans**

No building or use hereby permitted shall be occupied or the use commenced until the car/vehicle parking area shown on the approved plans (site should be laid out in accordance with site layout plan 1883-30G) has been completed, and thereafter, the area shall be kept free of obstruction and available for the parking of vehicles associated with the development.

**Reason:** To ensure that there are adequate parking facilities to serve the development in accordance with Policies 8 and 15 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy.

### **6. Contamination**

In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development that was not previously identified it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority. An investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken and where remediation is necessary, a remediation scheme must be prepared which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority. Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme a verification report must be prepared, which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

**Reason:** To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors.

### **7. Carbon / Energy Strategy**

Prior to commencement of work on site, the applicant/developer shall agree in writing with the Local Planning Authority a carbon/energy strategy for the hereby approved development. The

agreed details shall be implemented as approved before first occupation of the Lodge and be retained thereafter.

**Reason:** In the interest of sustainability and to ensure compliance with Policy 26 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy.

### **8. Materials (Conservation Area)**

Notwithstanding the details submitted, no development shall commence on site until: (i) samples of all materials, and (ii) joinery details of windows and doors; to be used in the external construction of this development shall be provided on site and details (including photographs) shall be submitted for the approval in writing by the Local Planning Authority (in consultation with the Planning Committee Chair). Development shall only take place in accordance with the approved details.

**Reason:** To ensure a satisfactory appearance in the interests of visual amenity and to comply with Policy 8 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy.

### **9. Boundary Treatments – Commercial**

Prior to the commencement of development the details of the boundary treatments (including details of the fences, gates, bollards and turnstiles) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This should include a copy of the supplier's technical instructions, showing the type of fence panels and posts being proposed, and the style and locking mechanisms for the gates and turnstiles. The approved details shall be implemented and retained thereafter.

**Reason:** To ensure that the site is satisfactorily secured in accordance with Policy 8 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy.

## **INFORMATIVE**

### **List of Plans and Documents**

Drawing no. 1883-30G Proposed Layout Plan Location Plan; dated 12/11/2019

Drawing no. 1883-31B Proposed Ground Floor Plan; dated 12/11/2019

Drawing no. 1883-32B Proposed First Floor Plan; dated 24/06/2019

Drawing no. 1883-33A Elevations (Sheet 2); dated 21/09/2019

Drawing no. 1883-34A Elevations (Sheet 2); dated 21/09/2019

Drawing no. 1883-35 Existing Layout; dated 29/06/2018

Drawing no. 1883-36 Location Plan and Block Plan; dated 29/08/2018

Drawing no. 1883-37 Disabled Space and Cycle Parking Proposed Layout; dated 01/10/2019

Drawing no. BTP-2019-007\_10; dated September 2019

Planning, Design and Access Statement by Caldecotte Group; received 12.09.2018

### **Sustainability**

The applicant/developer interest is drawn to comments by CBC Sustainability Officer: Only an observation that the planning and design statement is missing information regarding low carbon, home energy efficiency, technologies as laid out in NNJPU JCS adopted 2016. From looking at the plans, there is an opportunity to include air source heat pumps to heat the property, and solar thermal and/or voltaic on the roof of the south east and the south west elevation.

Officer to Contact  
Kokoete Ekanem  
01536 464058  
Kokoete.Ekanem@corby.gov.uk