



**Board members present:**

Cllr Sandra Barnes (SB) –  
Chair

Cllr Wendy Amos (WA)

Lee Baron (LB)

Cllr Catherine Boardman  
(CB)

Cllr Richard Church (RC)

Cllr Tony Woods (TW) (sub)

**In attendance:**

Stephen Kelly (SK) – Director  
of Planning and Development

Eric Owens (EO) – Special  
Projects Team Leader

Alex Marsden – Governance  
and Policy Assistant

Karen Mutton (KM) –  
Eversheds Solicitors

# Daventry UDA Planning Committee Minutes

## Agenda Item: 3

**Minutes from Daventry UDA Planning Committee Meeting held  
at The Cats suite, Barceló hotel, Daventry, in public on the 17<sup>th</sup>  
December 2008**

Approximately 8 members of the public were present.

The Chair opened the meeting at 6 pm.

### **Item 1: Apologies**

Apologies were received from John Weir and Councillor Alan Hills.

### **Item 2: Declarations of interest**

Councillor Tony Woods declared a personal, non-prejudicial interest in both agenda items as Chair of West Northamptonshire's Joint Strategic Planning Committee ("WNJSPC"), which had considered the proposals for growth of Daventry generally but had not considered individual applications.

Cllrs Wendy Amos, Sandra Barnes and Richard Church all declared personal, non-prejudicial interests in both agenda items as members of the WNJSPC for the same reason. Cllr Wendy Amos also declared a personal non-prejudicial interest, as Daventry district councillor and ward representative for Norton.

All members remained for the duration of the meeting.

### **Item 3: Minutes of the meeting held 2<sup>nd</sup> December 2008**

**IT WAS RESOLVED:** That the Minutes of the meeting were agreed as a true and accurate record of the meeting subject to the following amendments;

- a) 4.9b should read: the application should be refused due to the affect it has on the village of Norton and surrounding Borough Hill.

- b) 4.9d the word “small” to be deleted from the sentence: “*the revised scheme created 3 small villages that were isolated from the town*”
- c) 4.11. Should read subject to reference back to “this” committee and not “his” committee

**Agenda Item 4:**

**Applicant:** Croudace Homes Ltd

**Application No:** 07/0001/OUTWND

**Description:** Comprehensive mixed-use urban extension comprising residential development (up to 4,000 dwellings) (including provision of affordable housing) provision of employment land, diversion of B4036, access, roads, drainage, footpaths and cycleways, open space (including extension to Daventry Country Park), playing fields, landscaping, provision of social and community infrastructure, including; schools, district centre (including supermarket) and local centres.

**Address:** Land at Churchfields, Long Buckby Road, Daventry, Northamptonshire

- 4.1 Members confirmed receipt of the report at Agenda item 4 and the update report
- 4.2 Eric Owens set out in a presentation the proposal explaining the scheme changes and noting that the recommendations two remaining putative reasons for refusal were the Highways impact of the proposals and the absence of a Section 106 Agreement.
- 4.3 There were no speakers either for or against the application.
- 4.4 The Committee were taken through the update report
- 4.5 In discussion, the Committee raised the following points:
- 4.6 Cllr Sandra Barnes asked for clarification on the considerable reduction of floorspace in the proposed supermarket
- 4.7 In response, SK clarified that the new proposed store had a proposed floorspace of 1500 square metres and could be considered comparable to a typical Lidl store. It would be smaller than the existing Tesco store in Daventry.
- 4.8. Cllr Richard Church highlighted the reduction in available green space in the new proposal, noting that the 45 hectares of agricultural land would limit public access. He also highlighted the comments made by Sport England in the update report (1.12), and disliked the proposal of dual use arrangements with schools as a substitute for land loss.
- 4.9. In response, EO stated that the reduction in open space was to improve the overall quality of the development and it was the officer’s intention to secure appropriate provision of sports pitches through negotiation of the s106 agreements.

- 4.10. On this issue, SB pointed out the government's initiative to encourage exercise amongst children and agreed that the development needed adequate open space.
- 4.11. SK explained the difficulty in providing sports pitches within this particular development due to land levels. He confirmed that maximum efficiency would be sought in areas suitable for these facilities.
- 4.12. EO referred the committee to paragraph 9.170 within the report and noted the provision of 3.1 hectares within the school site which can accommodate additional sports pitch provision.
- 4.13. Cllr Wendy Amos raised the following points;
- a) Concerns with the size of the proposed development and that expansion should be for the benefit of the town.
  - b) Appreciated the changes to the scheme and its aspirations, particularly in terms of accommodating the proposed canal arm and the regeneration and integration of the Southbrook estate, but concerned with the practicality of delivering this as the applicants are not in ownership of all of the land involved for this project.
  - c) Concerns with the impact on Borough Hill
  - d) Issues with the proposed distance of 0.5 miles between the site and the village of Norton. Considering the long-term development of this site, she advised that mature planting before development commenced would be preferred.
  - e) Concern about the density of the development, although welcoming higher density in its heart. Good design would be required.
- 4.14 The issue identified at 6 (d) was addressed by EO who referred to 9.51 of the report, highlighting that specialist advice had also recommended mature planting
- 4.15 On this issue SB advised indigenous planting be used in favour of exotic planting
- 4.16. SK suggested that this issue be advanced at the forthcoming Inquiry but noted that the decision lies with the Secretary of State.
- 4.16 Cllr Catherine Boardman noted that the protection of green space and connectivity were the most important issues for her and urged consideration of the bigger picture in the long term. She raised a concern with the impact of the proposed canal link. SB also raised concerns with the practicality of the canal construction
- 4.17 In response SK pointed out that the canal is not a formal scheme at the moment and in any event, it is not considered an essential infrastructure requirement to the proposed development in planning terms although the scheme has been designed to accommodate it.

4.18 Cllr Tony Woods noted that the density of proposed housing at 53 units per hectare was high and asked for clarification on the number of houses to be provided.

4.19 EO clarified that up to 4,000 housing units were proposed across the whole site, with potentially 600 houses being within the Daventry District Council's (DDC) area. With regards to the issue of housing density, EO clarified the density range of 37-44 dwellings per hectare (dph).

4.20 In response, TW acknowledged the government's minimum density requirement of 30 dph.

4.21 TW raised the following points;

- a) Endorsed RC's comments relating to sports pitch provisions and the problems associated with dual use of school facilities.
- b) Referred to the police's response outlined in the update report (1.17), noting the difference between formal and informal spaces, with the latter being most important for youths in the area.
- c) Questioned the new development's employment opportunities, in line with comments made by Welton Parish council in the update report (1.21)

4.23 In response, EO advised the committee that the proposed development offered 8,300 sqm of office and light industry employment floorspace to reflect the future of Daventry skill base.

**IT WAS RESOLVED:** That the committee agree to the recommendation as set out in the report with the following amendment to paragraph 2.5 of the Committee Report to reflect the amendments to the scheme of delegation approved by the Board on 9<sup>th</sup> December 2008:

*That the Planning and Development Director, or Special Projects Manager, shall progress the Corporation's case to Inquiry based upon the resolution made in respect of paragraph 2.1 including the negotiation of Statements of Common Ground and a Section 106 Legal Agreement to resolve any outstanding issues, subject to reference back to this Committee as appropriate.*

**Agenda Item 5:**

**Applicant:** Capel House Property Trust Ltd

**Application No:** 07/0161/OUTWND

**Description:** Outline Planning Application for Comprehensive Development of Land to Provide a Sustainable Urban Extension Comprising 1,000 Dwellings with associated infrastructure including New Vehicular Access onto Welton Lane; Alterations to Welton Lane; New on-site Access and Distribution Road Networks; Cycleway and Footpath Network; Primary School; Public Open Space Facilities; Community Buildings including Community Hall and Local Medical

Centre; Retail Accommodation and Local BI Employment Accommodation, together with other supporting facilities

**.Address:** Land at Monksmoor Farm, Monksmoor Farm, Welton Lane, Daventry, Northamptonshire.

- 5.1. Members confirmed receipt of the report at Agenda item 5 and the update report
- 5.2 Eric Owens set out in a presentation the proposal explaining the scheme changes and noting the recommendation's two remaining putative reasons for refusal, the Highway's impact of the proposals and the absence of a section 106 agreement..
- 5.4. There were no speakers either for or against the application
- 5.5. In discussion, the following points were made:
  - a) Referring to 7.2 on the update report and supporting Cllr Alan Hills views, CB raised her concerns as to the effect the development would have upon Welton Lane and in particular the increased volume of traffic and lack of provision of cycleways. She also queried why there is no access to the site from the existing roundabout at its south west corner.
  - b) TW endorsed CB's comments and highlighted that the cycling provisions on the proposal were recreational but, due to the close proximity to the town centre, they should be utilitarian to enhance Daventry as a cycling town. He also disliked the shared footpath and cycling lanes. He confirmed that he would have been concerned at a proposal to access the site from the existing roundabout due to high speed traffic.
- 5.6. EO responded to these queries by highlighting the four additional footpath and cycle access points which are well connected to Daventry's existing infrastructure. He also noted that traffic calming measures are being discussed by the appellant with the County Council.

**IT WAS RESOLVED** That the committee agree to the recommendations as set out in the report with the deletion of recommendation 2.2 as Daventry District Council is not a determining authority for this application. Additionally paragraph 2.5 of the Committee Report should be altered as follows to reflect the amendments to the scheme of delegation approved by the Board on 9<sup>th</sup> December 2008:

*That the Planning and Development Director, or Special Projects Manager, shall progress the Corporation's case to Inquiry based upon the resolution made in respect of paragraph 2.1 above including the negotiation of Statements of Common Ground and a Section 106 Legal Agreement to resolve any outstanding issues, subject to reference back to this Committee as appropriate.*

**5. Future meeting dates**

- 13<sup>th</sup> January 2009
- 10<sup>th</sup> February 2009
- 10<sup>th</sup> March

**6. AOB**

There being no further business the meeting closed at 7.55pm.

Alex Marsden

Policy and Governance assistant

**Signed by the Chairman**

.....

**Dated** .....

DRAFT