

# THRAPSTON TOWN COUNCIL

Mayor: Cllr Val Carter

77 High Street  
Thrapston  
Northamptonshire  
NN14 4JJ

Tel: (01832) 734 673

Email: [clerk@thrapstontowncouncil.gov.uk](mailto:clerk@thrapstontowncouncil.gov.uk)

Website: [www.thrapstontowncouncil.gov.uk](http://www.thrapstontowncouncil.gov.uk)



## Minutes of the Meeting of the Full Town Council held on Tuesday 8<sup>th</sup> March 2022 at 7.15pm at The Souster Youth Hub

**Present: Cllr Carter (Chairman), Cllr Cairns, Cllr Cribb, Cllr Hawkins [19:20],  
Cllr Twigger, Cllr Wheeler, Cllr Winter, Cllr Worley**

**In attendance: Geoff Shacklock (Unitary Councillor), David Brackenbury (Unitary  
Councillor), Emma Arklay (North Northamptonshire Council) and Linda Marshall (Clerk)**

No.	Item	Action	By Whom
<b>Part 1</b>			
1.	<b>To Receive Apologies for Absence</b> Cllrs Charles, Latimer, McGovern, McLuckie and Wilcox had tendered their apologies which were accepted. Unitary Cllr Wendy Brackenbury had also tendered her apologies.		
2.	<b>Declaration of Interest</b> Cllr Worley: agenda Item 21 – grant application.		
3.	<b>Public Open Time</b> None.		
4.	<b>To approve the Minutes of the Full Town Council meeting dated 8<sup>th</sup> February 2022</b> <b>Resolved</b> that the Minutes of the Full Town Council meeting dated 8 <sup>th</sup> February 2022 be confirmed as a true record.		
5.	<b>To approve the Minutes of the Full Town Council's Extra Ordinary meeting dated 21<sup>st</sup> February 2022</b> <b>Resolved</b> that the Minutes of the Full Town Council's Extra Ordinary meeting dated 21 <sup>st</sup> February 2022 be confirmed as a true record.		
6.	<b>To receive a presentation from Emma Arklay of North Northamptonshire Council on Neighbourhood Planning</b> Emma Arklay, Senior Development Officer, Planning Policy, North Northamptonshire Council (NNC), delivered a presentation to the Council on Neighbourhood Planning, followed by a Questions & Answers session. She gave an overview of what a Neighbourhood Plan is and the steps to go through to achieve a Neighbourhood Plan which gives it its statutory status. [Cllr J Hawkins arrived at the meeting 19:20.]  In summary the steps are:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identify the Qualifying Body: usually the Town or Parish Council.</li> <li>Designate a Neighbourhood Area: usually the whole town.</li> </ul>		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work with the local community/stakeholder engagement: it must be a community led plan and must have community engagement – evidence of which is needed – need to understand the wishes and needs of the community.</li> <li>• Define aims, objectives and vision for the Neighbourhood Plan.</li> <li>• Write the plan – provide evidence in support.</li> <li>• Keep consulting with the community.</li> <li>• Refine the plan ready for submission.</li> <li>• NNC will publicise for 6 weeks.</li> <li>• NNC will then start to move towards examination and will appoint an independent examiner.</li> <li>• Examiner will look through the Plan and will issue a report – modifications may then be required.</li> <li>• Referendum - at this point the Plan needs to go back into the community for support.</li> </ul> <p>Q&amp;A's following the presentation can be found at Appendix 1. Thanks were given to Emma Arklay.</p>		
7.	<p><b>To receive a report (if available) from the last JAG meeting; to discuss and agree any items requiring consideration; to identify any items to be raised at a future</b></p> <p>Report noted. There were no issues arising.</p>		
8.	<p><b>To receive a report (if available) from attendance at the Police &amp; Crime Commissioner's Surgery; to discuss and agree any items requiring consideration; to identify any items to be raised at a future meeting</b></p> <p>Report Noted. There were no issues arising.</p>		
9.	<p><b>To receive a report (if available) relating to the Thrapston Youth Forum, to discuss and agree any items requiring consideration</b></p> <p>Previous Minutes were circulated and discussed at the Events &amp; Community Engagement Committee meeting. Outstanding item: how to progress work experience opportunities in the town - could we publicise? After discussion it was agreed that we would put a call out on Facebook for any local businesses who can support work experience opportunities to get in touch, with a note that the students are available from June.</p>	Facebook Posting	Events & Community Engagement Co-ordinator
10.	<p><b>To receive a report (if available) from the Nene Valley Park Project's Management Team; to discuss and agree any items requiring consideration; to identify any items to be raised at a future meeting</b></p> <p>Report noted. There were no issues arising.</p>		
11.	<p><b>To receive a verbal update from the Chairman of the Planning &amp; Asset Management Committee</b></p> <p>Cllr Worley briefed the meeting on key points arising from the recent Planning &amp; Asset Management Committee meeting. To be noted that Minutes giving a detailed account of meetings are available on the Council's website.</p>		
12.	<p><b>To receive a verbal update from the Chairman of the Finance &amp; Devolution Committee</b></p> <p>Cllr Cribb briefed the meeting on key points arising from the recent Finance &amp; Devolution Committee meeting. To be noted that Minutes giving a detailed account of meetings are available on the Council's website.</p>		
13.	<p><b>To receive a verbal update from the Chairman of the Events &amp; Community Engagement Committee</b></p> <p>Cllr Wilcox was not at the meeting to provide an update and the Minutes have not as yet been circulated.</p>		

14.	<b>To receive a verbal update from the Chairman of the Personnel Committee</b> Cllr Winter advised that there had not been a Personnel Meeting since the last meeting. Next meeting 15 <sup>th</sup> March 2022.		
15.	<b>To note Full Council training on Code of Conduct scheduled for Wednesday 30<sup>th</sup> March 2022</b> Noted. Cllr Worley had previously tendered his apologies for this training. Clerk to remind Councillors by WhatsApp.	Reminder on WhatsApp	Clerk
16.	<b>Following presentations on Neighbourhood Plans by both Cllr Worley and North Northamptonshire Council, to determine whether the Town Council wishes to proceed with initiating a Neighbourhood Plan for Thrapston and, if so, to designate the area the subject of the Neighbourhood Plan and discuss how to proceed with the forming of a steering group</b> Following discussions it was <b>resolved</b> that the Town Council does want to initiate a Neighbourhood Plan and that it wishes to designate the area as the parish boundary (red line).  With regards to proceeding with the forming of a steering group, it was agreed that Cllr Worley would give a 10-minute presentation at the Annual Town Meeting and gauge initial interest; following which it would be discussed at the May Planning & Asset Management Committee meeting.	Annual Town Meeting Presentation  May Agenda	Cllr Worley  Assistant Clerk
17.	<b>To review the report carried forward from 08.02.22 meeting relating to the issues arising with the public toilets and agree action</b> Cllr Wheeler advised that the Co-Op would like the Council to put forward in writing any proposals it has with regards to the public toilets/Co-Op toilet. It was <b>resolved</b> to write to the Co-Op saying that the Council would welcome a meeting, that they are considering closing the public toilets and that they may be willing to provide financial assistance to the Co-Op if the public can use the new toilet in their store. Cllr Wheeler to provide the correct contact details to the Clerk.	Write to the Co-Op	Clerk
18.	<b>To receive a report and discuss renewal of the Town App, included in the budget at £3,000 and agree action</b> The report was noted. Following discussion it was <b>resolved</b> not to proceed with the Town App, to put our efforts into Facebook and the Website and then to use the NNC Town App.	Do not renew Town App	Clerk
19.	<b>To receive nominations for the Town Awards and select winners. To agree to the purchase of the glass awards at a cost of approx. £20 each.</b> Members discussed the nominations received and have awarded 3 winners – the details of which will be made available at the Annual Town Meeting.	Proceed with purchasing awards	Clerk
20.	<b>To receive a nomination from the Council Staff for the new Dog Charity for the financial year 2022/23 (Guide Dogs for the Blind Association) and determine if to accept the nomination</b> It was <b>resolved</b> to accept the nomination that Guide Dogs for the Blind Association be the 2022/23 dog charity.		
21.	<b>To receive a Grant Application from Thrapston Nene Valley Park Project and determine if to award a grant</b> Following consideration of the grant application it was <b>resolved</b> to award a grant to the Thrapston Nene Valley Park Project in the sum of £1,000 – but given the opening of their bank account is	Advise successful application	Clerk

	still progressing that the funds not be paid until the account is fully opened.		
22.	<p><b>To determine if the Council will fly a Ukrainian Flag at the mosaic, at a cost of £65 for the purchase of a flag</b></p> <p>Following discussion it was <b>carried by majority</b> to purchase a Ukrainian Flag at a cost of £65, to be spent from the s.137 fund.</p>	Purchase Flag	Clerk
23.	<p><b>Following the Extra-Ordinary meeting of the Town Council 21.02.2022 to consider the following planning application and determine the Council's response: NE/22/00151/FUL</b></p> <p><b>Resolved</b> to submit the following response: Thrapston Town Council objects to the principal of development, on that it does not at this stage meet Policy 24 of the Joint Core Strategy. In addition the information provided regarding Highways, Air Quality, Ecology, Landscape and Visual Impact, Water and Flooding and Heritage and Archaeology has not demonstrated that there would not be substantial harm resulting from the development and therefore there are also objections on these grounds.</p> <p>There is also substantial concern regarding the quality and extent of information submitted regarding Highways, Air Quality, Ecology, Landscape and Visual Impact, Water and Flooding and Heritage and Archaeology. Until this information is adequately provided and deemed satisfactory, for which in all regards it is not, there must be a presumption against development.</p> <p>The Town Council's full comments will also be submitted with the summary above, as attached at Appendix 2.</p> <p>Thanks were given to Cllr Worley for his work on this.</p>	Submit Comments	Clerk
24.	<p><b>Unitary Councillors' Reports (agenda item brought forward to after Item 6)</b></p> <p>Cllr Brackenbury reported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NNC passed the 2022/23 balanced budget a couple of weeks ago. In 2023/24 and 2025/26 the picture is not so rosy – there will be pressure from central government.</li> <li>• International matters are going to be a headache for everyone, businesses and individually – we need to be mindful what we're doing now with the energy price increases and cost of fuel. The cost of oil is now at \$129 a barrel, a 30% increase in the last couple of weeks.</li> <li>• Growth &amp; Regeneration welcomed a large packaging plant in Kettering which will employ 200 skilled people.</li> <li>• There is conflict in nursery education regarding Pen Green Nursery – to note Cllr Cairns works there. They are alarmed about what might happen. Equally 3 other nurseries which are not in such a good position. There is work to be done on that.</li> <li>• Unitary covers a multiple of areas – if there are any problems individually or as a council - reach out to the Unitary Councillors.</li> </ul> <p>There was a great deal of discussion about the proposed warehouse developments at Titchmarsh, including Q&amp;A's –see Appendix 3.</p> <p>Cllr Shacklock addressed the meeting. He apologised for not having attended previous meetings, for one reason or another, including a broken leg and ankle, but he is now fully back. He</p>		

	confirmed that he has lived in this area all his life and so is passionate about it.  To conclude, the Unitary Councillors were asked to chase up on the pothole in the Sackville Street car park which has returned.		
25.	<b>Clerk's Report (for noting)</b> Annual Town Meeting: Tuesday 19 <sup>th</sup> April 2022 6.30pm for a 7.00pm start.		
26.	<b>Chairman's Comments</b> The Chairman thanked everyone for attending and especially to Cllr Worley and all Councillors for their contributions on the planning application.		
<b>Part 2</b>			
27.	<b>Under Section 1(2) of the Public Bodies (Admissions to Meetings) Act 1960 members of the public and press are to be excluded on the grounds that the following items to be discussed are of a confidential and sensitive nature</b> <b>Resolved</b> to close the meeting to the public and press on the grounds that the following items to be discussed are of a confidential and sensitive nature.		
28.	<b>To discuss personnel matters of a confidential nature</b> Matters agreed and of a confidential nature will be noted and held on the Personnel File by the Clerk.		
	<b>There being no further business the meeting closed at 21:29.</b>		

Signed .....

Dated .....

## **APPENDIX 1**

### **Neighbourhood Plan - Questions:**

Q: If below 50% vote in support of the plan, what happens?

A: Not faced that situation before as, if you engage with the local community enough then you shouldn't be in that position. But if the community rejects the plan, then it is rejected – you cannot then tweak, it would need to be done again.

Q: How often do you need to do these plans?

A: Guidance says the plans should be reviewed every 5 years to ensure they are still fit for purpose.

Q: Apart from the statutory minimum, what guidance and help do North Northants give?

A: In terms of writing the plan, they do not get involved, but will give advice and guidance (more towards the end of plan writing). They will direct to external bodies, e.g. Locality. We could also phone the lead officer at NNC if advice is needed. NNC will check our policies carefully – policy writing is not always that easy.

Regarding Consultants – there are two schools of thought. In a town this size there will often be a diverse skillset – often have someone who has written policy – if you don't have any of those skills consultants can be a real asset – but do manage them. Consultants are just doing their business, so manage them closely to ensure they are not just cut and pasting from other people's work – and that they are writing specifically for our town. Work together as partnership.

Q: Within the plan do we have the authority to put in what we want?

A: You would need to justify anything you put in. There are evidence-based documents which NNC need to adhere to. Example: you might want to designate an area for outdoor sports? The Sports Facility Strategy has done work to ensure evidence and need for a facility. So long as you can justify it, then you can suggest it. It is important that the Neighbourhood Plan is not just a wish list – it needs to be a community plan for what you are trying to do – and in conformity with the plans that sit above it – i.e. Local Plan, Strategic Plan. Every assertion that you make has got to be individually testable. It is important to make your plan as sound as possible before submitting it. A lot of the evidence is already there for you and you can use it. Ask NNC if trying to demonstrate a point to see what they have as evidence.

Q: What other areas have plans, and what has been their driving force and were they successful?

A: Neighbourhood Plans that EA has worked with have been in urban areas of deprivation. It all boils down to having planning influence. The driving force is really about saying that we're in charge of this town, this is how we want it to look. We want to make sure that the development that does come here is what we like. It also comes down to how much work you want to put in – you don't have to include all chapters that match the Local Plan. You could just pick open spaces, the design code, development sites. It is what you want to influence.

The Plan is about how to manage development.

Q: If we define something in the Neighbourhood Plan and then get an application in, are we bound to support that application or could we reject it?

A: If it is something that we have defined / allocated, then yes we would be expected to support it. Any developer will take account of the Neighbourhood Plan in their plan. Once a Neighbourhood Plan is adopted they do have weight with planning applications.

Q: Thrapston is on the cusp of Islip and Titchmarsh – when talk about neighbouring parishes are there benefits of working together?

A: There can be, you can join forces and work together on policies. It is always a good idea not to upset your neighbours. Plans can work together and follow a similar pattern – you can learn from each other and it helps build relationships.

Q: Will the Neighbourhood Plan effectively capture a description of the town as, despite feeling passionate about Thrapston am conscious that I don't know that much about it? Can the Plan give values of what makes Thrapston special?

A: Yes, absolutely. Together will create a vision of Thrapston for the future.

Cllr Shacklock: It is not all a bed of roses. He was involved in Barnwell's. There were important lessons learnt from their neighbours – it is good to work together.

Q: Could we have a joint Neighbourhood Plan with Islip and Titchmarsh?

A: Yes, you could.

It was suggested for Councillors to have a look at other Neighbourhood Plans and to use the Unitary Councillors as a means of resource.

## **APPENDIX 2**

### **Planning Application NE/22/00151/FUL - Comments**

#### **Principal of development**

There is agreement with the submitted Planning Statement 6.6 that 'Development of this scale is envisaged to come forward on allocated sites or within identified SUE under the adopted plan'. The proposed site is not an allocated site within the Joint Core Strategy, nor does it form part of an SUE. As such the principal of the proposed development rests on Policy 24 of the aforementioned plan, for which it is required to meet *all* criteria. There is substantial concern that the proposals do not meet all of these 7 criteria.

With regard to criteria a) *Subject to market demand and viability, strategic distribution developments (involving individual units of 9,300sqm or more floorspace) should also include the provision of a proportion of floorspace in the form of smaller employment units*, no provision has been made for smaller employment uses. It is accepted that as a hybrid application the principal is regarding maximum footprint and scale, however it has not been demonstrated that within this maximum it would be possible to provide smaller employment uses. Therefore at this juncture it is not considered that the applicant has met this criteria.

In terms of criteria c) *Have good access to local labour supply and be accessible to the local workforce through public transport, walking and cycling*; there is a serious question regarding the existing capacity of the local labour market. The existing companies on Halden's Parkway, which are representative of the potential occupiers of the site, have as existing an acute shortage of staff with many bussed in from around the country.

The information provided by the applicant indicates that this development would in itself reduce unemployment in the district by a third. This is not credible and is exacerbated by the small labour pool available within Thrapston, which it should be noted has already fulfilled its projected residential developments for the next decade with regard the Local Plan. Consequently over ninety-five percent of the workforce would not be considered local and therefore does not meet the required criteria.

Criteria e) requires development to be *in locations which allow 24-hour operations with acceptable environmental, community and landscape impact* and Criteria f) *Provide sufficient infrastructure to mitigate highways impacts*; as discussed later, it is not considered that sufficient information has been submitted to meet the required burden of evidence for either of these points.

In light of the above Thrapston Town Council (TTC) does not consider that the principal of the development has been demonstrated. As such there is an in principal objection to the development.

Although there is an in principal objection to the development, TTC has a series of comments on the various specific aspects of the proposals. These should in no way be seen as an acceptance of the principal of development.

#### **Highways**

##### *Comments of the submitted information*

There are concerns regarding the highway analysis that has been submitted. The most substantial concern is regarding the timing of the assessment only being AM and PM at general commuter periods. However as the transport assessment indicates, these will not be the peak times for the site, nor are they the peak times for the existing Halden's Parkway. The backing up of traffic occurs as much just before and after 1400h as it does during the assessed morning and evening.

This omission is considered to fundamentally undermine the highways assessment to a point which it cannot be considered fit for purpose. The assessment must demonstrate that the roads can adequately handle all traffic at all peak periods and failing to consider one of the peak periods which will be most impacted by the proposed development it has demonstrably failed in this regard.

Clarity is also required regarding the number of lanes from J13 northbound to the A605. Depending on the plan this varies from one to two. Considering that this forms part of the proposed mitigation measures there is concern that the assessment has not been conducted correctly.

As existing there is an issue regarding flooding on the roundabout. This does not appear to have been addressed within the scheme.

There is a junction to the Lazy Acre estate from the A605, this has not been included within the models. It therefore must be included within the models or sufficient justifications as to why it has not. There is already evidence that when the traffic passes the Oundle Road/A605 roundabout vehicles instead traverse through the town, exiting either at this junction or via Huntingdon Road.

There is a question regarding the accuracy of the accident figures. For instance from an inspection of the A605/Oundle Road roundabout you can see the evidence of more incidents that quoted within the Highways Assessment. Clarification and expansion of this is required.

### *General Comments*

There is acceptance that the existing arrangement is not ideal and improvements are required. In an isolated sense the improvements are welcomed however there is concern that the proposed mitigations do not sufficiently provide capacity for the proposed increased demand. As existing there is already substantial use of J12 and the Titchmarsh turning from the A14 and the A45/B663 roundabout north exit for traffic to avoid junction 13. There is a strong concern that the use of these alternative access to Thrapston will increase causing a substantive impact on traffic flows within the town itself.

There is a failure to demonstrate the proposed alterations to the existing arrangement would not be of clear detriment to traffic movements, specifically the lack of assessment during all peak times. Until this has been demonstrated not only does this mean that there is no robust evidence that the substantive increase in traffic would not be materially harmful, it fails to ensure that point f) of Policy 24 of the Strategic Plan is complied with.

In terms of pedestrian and cycle access from the west of the A605, Thrapston town, to the east Haldens Parkway there is a question how both an increase in traffic flow of all forms of access can be accommodated. The proposal is for an increase in both, yet the increase in traffic will make pedestrian and cycle crossing both more difficult and dangerous. Considering part of the planning balance is the improvement this has not been demonstrated and there is concern that the proposal is actually to the detriment of non-vehicular access. Increase in provision does not equate to greater ability to use. There is agreement therefore with LHA that a crossing must be signalled for safety and use reasons.

It is noticeable that the highway assessment relies upon the existing bus and rail services which are every 90-120 minutes and not in line with proposed shift patterns. As such this provision must be discounted in calculations of public transport use. As demonstrated elsewhere the vast majority of employees will have to commute by car as there is no alternative. This is evidently not sustainable for various reasons including on a traffic level and is contrary to Policy 24 of the Joint Core Strategy

### *Required Improvements*

An adequate means public transport must be provided and guaranteed on a long term basis

Signalled pedestrian crossing from Huntingdon Road

Improved drainage to reduce the existing flooding of the Junction 13 roundabout

### **Air Quality**

#### *Comments of the submitted information*

There is a concern that impacts from pollution have only been considered from 350m from site or 500m and then 50m off highway. Impact on pollution by the Islington Cottages and Thorpe Waterville would be quite high. The proposals would increase the volume of traffic and despite the distance can not be

dissipated except past these dwellings. As such it is not reasonable to only consider such a limited radius regarding pollution.

### *General Comments*

It is noted that substantive parts of the assessment is based on a representative example and does not take in to consideration the actual use of any particular unit. Since specific use apart from use class there is a concern that the end pollution impact could exceed this assessment.

### *Required Improvements*

In order for the impact upon the air quality of the measures to be acceptable, stringent conditions must be applied regarding accreditation schemes and on the emissions from the use of the units

## **Lighting**

### *General Comments*

There is a general concern that any development does not replicate the large warehouse just to the east of A14 Junction 12. This is a blight in the night and wholly unnecessary. It is noted that the Campaign for Darker skies is generally supportive of the proposed mitigation measures

### *Required Improvements*

Stringent conditions regarding maximum levels of lighting permitted must be attached to any permissions

## **Ecology**

### *Comments of the submitted information*

There is agreement with Natural England that a complete Habitat Regulations Assessment and a second winter bird survey is required. The Upper Nene Valley Gravel Pits are a Ramsar site and a Special Protection Area, one of the most important types of habitat in the area. The proposals sit atop of the valley and therefore have the potential to have a substantive impact upon this important site. Although the applicant has demonstrated it intends to meet the net biodiversity gain of 10%, this is predicated on site impact and does not include potential impacts off-site which have not been adequately assessed.

### *General Comments*

There is concern regarding the assertion that there will be no detrimental ecological impact. As existing the space is a natural habitat and although mitigation measures have been proposed these will only displace the existing positive habitat and not fully compensate for the loss of green space.

### *Required Improvements*

The proposed 10% net biodiversity gain is the minimum required. As such this should not be taken as positive for this development. In order to provide a net benefit the biodiversity and in recognition of the importance of the surrounding ecological sites the biodiversity net gain must be 20% with the additional 10% credits to be used on identified sites within Thrapston.

## **Landscape and Visual Impact**

### *Comments of the submitted information*

The Landscape Assessment does not consider any views north of the river Nene, despite the potential visibility plan identifying the area as having views of the proposed site. The proposal is on the valley ridge and there are clear views across the valley for which the proposal has the potential to significantly impact. It is noted that this is in clear contrast to the forthcoming development to the north-east.

Although it is possible that the forthcoming development may screen this proposed development, this is not a reasonable justification for not conducting a proper assessment of the landscape impact. As such this lack of proper assessment must be rectified.

#### *General Comments*

The proposed development will have a clear landscape impact, especially when viewed from Titchmarsh

#### *Required Improvements*

It should be a requirement that no signage of any kind is placed on any north or west elevation

The proposed heights should be no higher than the adjacent buildings on Halden's Parkway

### **Water and Flooding**

#### *General Comments*

There is scepticism regarding the conclusions of the submitted flood risk assessment. Thrapston is vulnerable to flooding and does flood on a regular basis. Although SUDS will slow down the rate of water from the site to the town, it will not eliminate it.

#### *Required Improvements*

There must be a management plan which demonstrates how adequate monitoring of any potential contamination of the site will be undertaken, demonstrates how chemical spill off's will be managed, and assigns clear ongoing responsibility for any potential impacts.

### **Socio-Economic**

#### *General Comments*

The developer is in effect claiming that this development will solve local unemployment and reduce district unemployment by a 1/3. Considering that there is already an acute shortage of jobs on various units at Halden's parkway, an equivalent development, there is strong scepticism regarding the ability of the proposal to assuage any unsatisfied employment needs. This would therefore result in further widespread labour shortages in the area, resulting in substantially increased importation of labour from long distances. This therefore contrary to point c) of Policy 24.

### **Heritage and Archaeology**

#### *Comments of the submitted information*

It has been established for a considerable period of time that the impact of development on the significance of the heritage assets is from the impact upon the relationship between the proposed development site and the site of the heritage asset. As such the submitted Heritage Appraisal and Setting Assessment is fundamentally flawed in its methodology for the assessment of the impact of the development upon significance of the heritage assets due to its use of visibility as primary criteria for impact.

In addition to the flawed methodology there is a concern regarding various other aspects of the assessment. For instance the significance of the moated site is assessed as only evidential value. How the presumably the original manor of Titchmarsh does not have historical value has not been explained. Furthermore this assessment is contradicted in various places including where the Scheduled Monument is considered to contribute towards the significance of the Conservation Area. In addition the site is called 'Castle Manor Farm' and there is scheduled former Castle less than a kilometre away with no intermediate buildings. Surely there is a presumption of a relationship that would be lost by the development of the site which must be assessed.

There is further concern regarding the justifications for the conclusions. For instance *'the distance of the development from the village, set within what is a modern agricultural landscape with significant modern infrastructure nearby, is one which precludes the proposed development causing impacts to the Conservation Area which could be considered to cause a negative effect on it or the listed buildings within it'* There are fundamental errors in this assessment, including failure to understand cumulative harm, an assumption that an existing setting can preclude harm and an assumption that distance is *the* determinant of impact.

Although two fundamental errors in assessment have been identified above, the heritage assessment is so full of inaccurate assessments, that it is not worth listing them all here. Instead the applicant must reassess the heritage impact and submit an assessment that abides by conservation principals.

#### *General Comments*

The proposals will undoubtedly have an impact upon the rural setting of the village of Titchmarsh to the detriment of the heritage assets.

### **Health**

#### *General Comments*

If the proposals have a detrimental impact upon the existing Thrapston hum or the peak time congestion, there is a concern that the proposals will have a long term impact upon the mental health of the town.

## **APPENDIX 3**

### **Unitary Councillors Report – Proposed Warehouse Developments at Titchmarsh**

Cllr Brackenbury advised the meeting: the developers claim they will employ 1000's. It is important to know that the Unitary Councillors have serious concerns about the developments in terms of highways, but the employment figures the developers are quoting are nonsense – the existing logistics around us already bus people in. If the Town Council are going to argue against these development proposals, evidence will need to be provided to support any arguments. If the Town Council are going to make assertions, evidence is needed to back it. Advice is to take advice and work together with other parishes and engage with stakeholders. The Unitary Councillors cannot say they oppose this development as they cannot pre-determine – if this happened they could not then sit on or vote on any committee that makes the decision. To clarify, neither of them at the moment sit on the committee, but as they first application won't be heard for 9 months – who knows which committees they'll be on by then.

#### **A Q&A session then took place:-**

Q: Is it right that both applications will be heard together?

A: No, they will be heard individually on their own merit. Some of the evidence is being combined. The Newlands application is already in. The IM Developments application is expected sometime next month.

Q: Referring to the first application not being heard for 9 months; this implies consultation period + 2 months? Is this the assumption of why 9 months?

A: Complex applications take time – 9 months is a guestimate. Although the current application stops on 12<sup>th</sup> March, Paul Bland (Planning Officer) has advised that any submissions made after that date will still be taken into consideration.

Cllr Brackenbury confirmed that at the moment the Unitary Councillors are not sitting on the committee – he is also Portfolio Holder for Growth & Regeneration. They can act as Ward Councillors in this matter. They do welcome development, but not under all circumstances. There are lots of logistics around. The highways impact is going to be crucial. Despite the mitigation on the roundabouts, it won't make the traffic go away. If anything, Highways might stop these developments going ahead.

Q: Are you suggesting on the highway issue that Thrapston should be commissioning its own reports? Can we just challenge, or should we have counter-arguments?

A: They will come up with useful information and statistics which will support their case. It will be difficult to challenge, but not impossible. The statistics used might be slanted in such a way to support their application. If anyone has evidence to show that statistics could be open to different interpretation that would be valid. Anything we have to present a different case with some evidence would be valuable.

Suggestion that you could have people sit on side of road with clickers – 2 x north and 2 x south – one click for a lorry and one click for a car – all for say a 2+ hour period. It would be a lot of work but would give good evidence.

Cllr Brackenbury confirmed that the developers are developing 15 other sites elsewhere; this isn't a done deal. It is a decision that will be taken by the Strategic Planning Committee at NNC. If it is to be turned down, it needs to be done on solid planning grounds.

Q: On traffic issue, STAUNCH have done some work on counting vehicles. What authority can help support knowing that the roundabout was designed to support so many cars? We know 50% of employees will be driving a car – over three shift patterns. We can calculate the extra number of car movements through that network, but how do we find out whether the road network was built for that level?

A: We can already evidence that the A605 is under pressure – that is easy to evidence. You can make a reasonable assumption that a good percentage of the employees of these two developments will be using vehicles to get to these two sites – there is no junction 13A – they will all be coming off onto the A605. It is easy to evidence that the A605 will struggle.

Q: Can evidence be pictures of the A14 – the queues of traffic on the A605.

A: Jurisdiction is important. The A605 and the roundabout at J13 and slip roads are County Highways. The bridge over the top and the A14 is Highways England. They are different operations. Highways

England haven't got a lot to say about this unless what they are doing affects the actual A14. It may come to a point where the effect of the various logistics around the area, which includes Cambridge, Kettering, Corby etc., there will be some form of cumulative impact. Logistics is something we need, there is a global supply chain, it has been affected by the pandemic, by Brexit etc. and of course people want more stuff and are buying online. Geographically we are in a good position – 2½ hours from the Channel, 2½ hours' drive from 80% of the population.