



Committee Members present:

Ann Tate (AT)- Chair

Councillor Chris Millar (CM)
– Vice Chair

Nick Thompson (NT)

David Dickinson (DD)

Cllr Penny Flavell (PF)

In attendance:

Adrian Arnold (AA) - Director
of Planning Services

John Hill (JH) - Development
Control Manager

Stephen Webb (SW) - Denton
Wilde Sapte

Andrew Ryley (AR) – Senior
Development Management
Officer

Richard Murdock (RM)- Senior
Development Management
Officer

Amy Sales (AS)– Committee
Assistant

Northampton UDA Planning Committee Minutes

9th March 2010

This Public meeting was held on

9th March 2010

At

Heroes Lounge,
Northampton Saints RFC,
Franklins Gardens,
Weedon Road
Northampton
NN5 5BG

Reference	Minutes	Action
	<p>The Chair opened the meeting at 6pm and welcomed members of the public. The Chair reminded members of the public of Corporations' Standing Orders.</p> <p>Approximately 60 members of the public were present.</p>	
Item 1	<p><u>Item 1: Apologies</u></p> <p>John Weir and Cllr Dennis Meredith sent their apologies.</p>	
Item 2	<p><u>Item 2: Declaration of interests</u></p> <p>Cllr Millar declared a non prejudicial interest in Item 6, Thomas Becket Rc Upper School as he is the County Councillor.</p>	
Item 3	<p><u>Item 3: Minutes of the meeting held on 17th November 2009</u></p> <p>3.1 IT WAS AGREED: That the minutes of the meeting held in public on 17th November 2009 were a true and accurate record.</p>	
Item 4	<p><u>Item 4: Land At Booth Rise And Lumbertubs Way</u></p> <p>Applicant: Paddington Churches Housing Association Application No: 08/0214/FULWNN</p> <p>Description: Development of 111 affordable residential properties with alterations to access, associated parking and infrastructure works</p> <p>Address: Land At Booth Rise And Lumbertubs Way Northampton Ward: Headlands</p> <p>4.1 AR introduced the application and presented the update report. (Update report attached as Appendix A)</p> <p>4.2 Vincent Owen the Chairman of the Thorpeville Residents Association spoke against the application. The points he made are summarised as follows:</p>	

	<p>4.2.1 The residents of Boothville feel that utilisation of the Green space and the buffer space should be avoided.</p> <p>4.2.2 The designs of the proposed housing do not match the existing properties aesthetically.</p> <p>4.2.3 Car parking will be reduced significantly, resulting in residents and visitor parking on verges, road parking and parking by the exits of the site.</p> <p>4.2.4 The facilities for the site are inadequate, therefore available land for the facilities will have to be created elsewhere.</p> <p>4.2.5 Traffic and Infrastructure are the two main issues. Round Spinney roundabout is always congested and dangerous. There will only be two x 1 bed flats on the development and the rest will be family units. Therefore, traffic movements will increase further during the school run, by approximately 70 cars, during a period of three quarters of an hour. This has not been reflected in any documentation.</p> <p>4.2.6 There is a lack of infrastructure, including inadequate roads, schools, doctors and bus services. He questioned why the site was being proposed at Booth Rise. Sites elsewhere would be more adequate, with existing facilities, or space to create the facilities.</p> <p>4.2.7 Mr Owen concluded by stating: If social housing needs to be provided, then why was an alternative/easier site not chosen.</p> <p>4.2.8 He asked the committee to refuse the application.</p> <p>4.3 CM asked Mr Owen which area of lack of infrastructure concerned him the most.</p> <p>4.3.1 Mr Owen described that the local college and schools are already oversubscribed, and dentists and doctors are not widely available.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>4.4 Councillor David Garlick, speaking as the Northampton Borough Council (NBC) Councillor for the Headlands Ward, spoke against the application. The points he made are summarised as follows:</p> <p>4.4.1 Northampton County Council (NCC) has adopted a unanimous decision that there will be no further housing developments unless the necessary infrastructure is in place.</p> <p>4.4.2 Primary schools in the area are over subscribed and the new estate will further add to that problem. There will be more cars, therefore adding to carbon footprint, and children who walk or cycle to school will be at risk with the additional traffic.</p> <p>4.4.3 The land is identified as Green Space in the Local Plan, and it is not a planning role to determine the utilisation of the green land, when brown land is available.</p> <p>4.4.4 The area in question acts as a buffer zone and should be maintained for that reason. It cuts down noise and allows pollution to disperse. The homes to be built will be amidst the noise and pollution.</p> <p>4.4.5 Developers were reviewing many other sites, the land in question is just one of those additional sites, however, an adjacent site was refused permission.</p> <p>4.4.6 The dual carriageway between this area and Riverside acts as a green corridor for pollution, therefore, if the estate is built, wildlife and plants will deplete.</p> <p>4.4.7 Councillor Garlick concluded by informing the Committee that the average speed limit, in the already heavily congested area, is 38mph in a 30mph zone, and so does not justify the NCC support of the application.</p> <p>4.5 CM asked Councillor Garlick about the NCC Highways</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>objection. As stated in section 9.5 of the planning report, NCC originally had concerns in relation to the proposed access and layout of the roads, but then withdrew their objection. CM asked whether Councillor Garlick had contacted the Highway Authority to establish why the change of heart has taken place.</p> <p>4.6 Councillor Garlick replied that he had not been in contact with the Highway Authority regarding this application, but had been in connection to the duelling of the A43, where he raised his concerns in that regard. The roundabout, which will also be used by the residents of the proposed new development, continuously causes chaos, therefore it will not make sense to add to that chaos.</p> <p>4.7 Councillor Mike Hallam, speaking as NCC Councillor for the Parklands ward spoke against the application. The points he made are summarised as follows:</p> <p>4.7.1 The Speed and Volume Traffic assessment illustrates that traffic has worsened since the last planning application was rejected. Councillor Hallam handed the Committee a copy of the Speed and Volume Traffic assessment. (Please see appendix 2). Previous applications for the land have been rejected due to the large amount of traffic..</p> <p>4.7.2 A survey conducted by the Casualty Reduction team (concluded on 5th March 2010) showed that the average speed is way above the speed limit and that hundreds of cars use the small road every day.</p> <p>4.7.3 The road has proved to be dangerous with the highest speed recorded at 71mph. Action is needed on the volumes and speeds of traffic in the area, regardless of the possible increased numbers of residents adding to it.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>4.7.4 On this basis, he urged the Committee to reject the application.</p> <p>4.8 CM asked Councillor Hallam the same question in relation to the Highway Authority as directed to Councillor Garlick in paragraph 4.5.</p> <p>4.8.1 Councillor Hallam replied that he wished to obtain his own information first, and will follow up with the Highways Authority in due course.</p> <p>4.9 Catherine Russell, speaking on behalf of Sally Keeble MP, spoke against the application. Reading a statement on behalf of Sally Keeble MP, the points made are summarised as follows:</p> <p>4.9.1 the proposed density of housing will be out of keeping to the area.</p> <p>4.9.2 Whilst the housing will be affordable housing, the proposed houses will be hemmed in by the busy roads and the biggest and busiest roundabout in Northampton.</p> <p>4.9.3 The road access will be problematic, leading to substantial congestion at peak times. The access to open countryside will be dramatically reduced.</p> <p>4.9.4 Sally Keeble MP strongly opposed the proposals of the site.</p> <p>4.10 CM quoted from a recent newspaper article where Sally Keeble MP had been quoted to say, “There is lack of infrastructure to support the housing”. CM asked Catherine Russell what aspect of local infrastructure was lacking.</p> <p>4.10.1 Catherine Russell replied that she believed it was within education, due to the primary and secondary schools being oversubscribed, and lack of recreational facilities.</p> <p>4.11 Keith Colley, speaking as the applicant, spoke for the</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>application, and made the following points:</p> <p>4.11.1 Genesis Housing Group, is a charitable organisation providing affordable housing to residents of Northamptonshire.</p> <p>4.11.2 234 affordable houses are currently being provided in Northampton.</p> <p>4.11.3 Increasing affordable housing will lower the average age of the first time buyer, which is currently 34 and increasing.</p> <p>4.11.4 The development will provide 111 homes, the construction will provide jobs.</p> <p>4.12 CM asked Mr Colley whether he has considered the infrastructure needs for the new community including appropriate facilities.</p> <p>4.12.1 Mr Colley replied that the Genesis Housing Group has a division called Genesis Community which ensures appropriate facilities are established by means of the S106 agreement.</p> <p>4.13 PF asked Mr Colley what he personally considered “Socially Inclusive” to mean.</p> <p>4.13.1 Mr Colley clarified that the site is mixed tenure; 50% aimed for intermediate housing and the other 50% aimed for first time buyer housing. The definition is a quite extensive.</p> <p>4.13.2 PF added that the report stated there are no open market units.</p> <p>4.13.3 Mr Colley responded that there will be no open market housing but 50% will be aimed at first time buyers, in the form of shared ownership.</p> <p>4.14 Shelley Dix, the Highways Advisor to the applicant, spoke for the application, and made the following points:</p> <p>4.14.1 NCC’s Highways considered the scheme acceptable . The site will not exacerbate the current traffic</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>problems for the area. It will provide a bus service, bus shelters, onsite parking and footpaths to encourage public transport use.</p> <p>4.15 DD asked, in relation to the school run figure between 8:00am and 9:00am that 70 trips will take place to and from the schools, whether she had taken the figure into account.</p> <p>4.15.1 Ms Dix informed DD that NCC had taken surveys on similar sites in relation to the magnitude of trips taken to and from the schools, and therefore had added the results to their consideration.</p> <p>4.15.2 DD expressed that the site in question is a particularly individual site with a large number of family houses with young children, therefore taking surveys on alternative sites may have resulted in NCC underestimating the trip generation.</p> <p>4.15.3 Ms Dix stated that NCC provided information from a private development site, which shared many similarities, including number of children.</p> <p>4.16 CM referred to Councillor Hallam's Speed and Volume Traffic assessment (appendix 2), he asked Ms Dix whether similar information had been taken into consideration for highways risk.</p> <p>4.16.1 Ms Dix clarified that similar and significant assessments were taken into consideration.</p> <p>4.17 The Chair asked the Committee members for their opinions on the application, and if they had any questions for the Director of Planning Services .</p> <p>4.18 PF and DD stated that they had concerns with the application, which were: infrastructure and traffic. She asked if the Officers could help to clarify those two aspects further.</p> <p>4.19 The Committee felt that social housing is needed in this</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>area, Concerns were expressed in relation to the infrastructure and highway and traffic management issues, Further clarification was sort on this.</p> <p>4.20 The Chair asked if there has been correspondence with the Primary Care Trust in relation to doctors and dentists, and the local education authority in relation to further primary and secondary schools.</p> <p>4.21 The Director of Planning Services informed the Committee that the PCT were contacted but had not responded. In response to DD’s question in relation to the similar site assessment, the Council’s practice is to offer a similar site assessment based on size or the type of housing in the area..</p> <p>4.22 AA added that NCC and the local Highways Authority are responsible for managing and maintaining the local highway network, therefore it is in their best interest to ensure that the increased amount of traffic on the network does not cause major traffic issues. AA explained that the process for making an assessment on a planning application works on the basis of the County Council providing figures to the applicant so that a Transport Assessment can be created.</p> <p>4.23 AR clarified that private developments generally have a higher trip generation figure than social developments, therefore the NCC’s assessment of the application was sufficient in this context. The NCC have made a detailed evaluation of the transport assessment and the transport implication for the development, and they have concluded that it would not adversely affect the local road network.</p> <p>4.24 AA stated that education is high up on the infrastructure growth agenda for the area. He has held several meetings with Sally Keeble in relation to community facilities.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>4.25 A vote was taken and the Committee approved the application 4-1.</p> <p>IT WAS RESOLVED:</p> <p>That the application be APPROVED but that the issuing of the planning permission be delegated to the Director of Planning Services or Appointed Officer subject to securing the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submission of a further amended layout drawing to incorporate changes agreed between the applicant and the Crime Prevention Design Advisor • Resolution of Section 106 discussions with applicant and submission of Section 106 Legal Agreement 	
	<p>Item 5 – Upton Way Hotel</p> <p>Applicants: Willow Inns Limited</p> <p>Application No: 09/0079/OUTWNN</p> <p>Description: Outline planning application for the construction of a 112 bedroom hotel complex, spa and leisure facility, access road, car-park and associated development. All matters reserved except for means of access, layout and scale of hotel complex and layout, scale and appearance of spa and leisure facility building and car-parking.</p> <p>Address: Upton Way, Duston Mill Lane, Northampton</p> <p>Ward: St James</p> <p>5.1 AA introduced the application and presented the update report (Appendix A)</p> <p>5.2 David Alderson speaking as the applicant, spoke for the application, and made the following points:</p> <p>5.2.1 The external appearance of the proposed hotel will be its most prominent feature. The Spa and leisure facilities will be operated by the applicant, and a separate hotel operator will be introduced. The site</p>	

	<p>location would add to the health and viability of the town centre. There are no other sites in Northampton which are as ideal. the site and location are attractive, the site is close to commercial and retail units, the site near two major sports clubs: Saints & Cobblers stadiums. The hotel is complimentary to everything in the area.</p> <p>5.3 In relation to the separate hotel operator, the Committee questioned how confident Mr Alderson was that the hotel site would not be left vacant.</p> <p>5.4 Mr Alderson ensured the probability of the spa going ahead without the hotel, or vice versa, would be minimal.</p> <p>5.5 The Committee asked how satisfied Mr Alderson was with the applicants ability to meet the requirements of the Environment Agency, so that floods do not become an issue?</p> <p>5.6 Mr Alderson responded that they have worked very closely with the Environment Agency over a long period of time, and their concerns have been satisfied.</p> <p>5.7 CM questioned Mr Alderson in relation to the Northampton Borough Council's saved policies: D7, E1, E2, E14 and E20, and asked Mr Alderson if any of the mentioned safe policies conflict with the application.</p> <p>5.8 Mr Alderson stated that he could not see how the policies would be in breach, as the application is complying with the Wildlife Trust, Natural England and the Environment Agency.</p> <p>5.9 David Coles, the architect for the application, spoke for the application, and made the following points:</p> <p>5.9.1 The hotel will enhance the surrounding quiet sanctuary. The 6 storey hotel will benefit Upton Way. He concluded by stating the hotel will be an appropriate application in function, form and scale.</p> <p>5.9.2 There were no questions for Mr Coles.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>5.10 A vote was taken. All committee members voted in favour of the application</p> <p>IT WAS RESOLVED:</p> <p>That the application be APPROVED but that the issuing of the outline planning permission be delegated to the Director of Planning Services or Appointed Officer subject to securing the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The withdrawal of the Highway Agency's objection to the application; • Resolution of any Section 106 Agreement negotiations. 	
	<p><u>Item 6 – Thomas Beckett School</u></p> <p>Applicant: Northamptonshire County Council</p> <p>Application No: 09/0156/FULWNN</p> <p>Description: Installation of all-weather pitch with perimeter fencing. Eight No. 15 metre floodlighting columns. Alterations and remodelling of existing building to facilitate relocation of athletics track and sports pitches</p> <p>Address: Thomas Beckett C Upper School, Becket Way, Northampton, Northamptonshire, NN3 6HT</p> <p>Ward: Parklands</p> <p>6.1 AA introduced the application and presented the update report. (Appendix A)</p> <p>6.2 CM commented that a large number of many letters of support were received but only 5 letters of objection, therefore the application appeared to be supported by the majority of the local community.</p>	

	<p>6.3 PF asked what times in the day would the all-weather pitch be used.</p> <p>6.4 AA clarified that the all-weather pitch will not be used between the hours of 21:00pm and 08:30am Monday to Friday, 18:00pm and 09:00am on Saturdays and 16:00pm and 10:00am on Sundays – as per page 14 of the Officer’s report.</p> <p>6.5 A vote was taken. All committee members voted in favour of the application</p> <p>IT WAS RESOLVED:</p> <p>That the application be APPROVED, subject to adding an additional condition, number 9, as set out in the update sheet relating to the submission of a Travel Plan and granting delegated powers to the Director of Planning Services, in consultation with the Chair of the Committee, to consult those properties affected and grant planning permission subject to no new issues arising that have not already been considered as part of the committee report.</p>	
	<p>8. Future meeting dates were agreed to be</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20th April 2010 	
	<p>AOB</p> <p>There being no further business, the meeting closed at 8pm</p> <p>Amy Sales</p> <p>Committee Assistant</p> <p>Signed by the Chairman</p> <hr style="width: 20%; margin-left: 0;"/>	