



**Committee Members present:**

Councillor Chris Millar - Vice  
Chair

David Dickinson (DD)

Cllr Sandra Barnes (sub)

Cllr Penny Flavell

Cllr Jean Hawkins

Cllr Don Edwards (sub)

**In attendance:**

Adrian Arnold (AA) - Interim  
Director for Planning and  
Development

John Hill (JH) - Development  
Control Manager

Andrew Ryley – Senior  
Development Management  
Officer

Chris Preston – Senior Planner

Michelle Vas – Denton Wilde  
Sapte

Rhea Keehn – Governance and  
Policy Assistant

Amy Sales – PA to the Director  
for Planning and Development

---

# Northampton UDA Planning Committee Minutes

This Public meeting was held on

**29<sup>th</sup> September 2009**

At

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

Reference	Minutes	Action
	<p>The Chair opened the meeting at 6pm. He welcomed members of the public.</p> <p>Approximately 40 members of the public were present.</p>	
Item 1	<p><b><u>Item 1: Apologies</u></b></p> <p>John Weir, Nick Thompson, Cllr Sadik Chaudhury sent their apologies.</p>	
Item 2	<p><b><u>Item2: Declaration of interests</u></b></p> <p>Cllr. Sandra Barnes declared a personal non-prejudicial interest in Item 5 as her husband holds a season ticket for the Northampton County Cricket Club. Cllr Sandra Barnes stated that she has never attended a match there nor has any interest in cricket generally.</p> <p>Cllr Jean Hawkins declared a personal non-prejudicial interest in Item 5 as a Heritage Champion for Northampton Borough Council and a non-prejudicial interest in the item, as her political party rents a property at Clark Road.</p> <p>David Dickinson declared that he no longer holds an interest in Item 4. When Item 4 first came to committee on 26<sup>th</sup> May 2009, a letter of objection from Northamptonshire Enterprise Limited (NEL) was tabled at the meeting. David Dickinson was a Board member of NEL at this time. David Dickinson was not aware of NEL's letter nor its contents and on becoming aware, immediately stood down from the meeting and did not take part in the discussion. Since then, David Dickinson is no longer a member of the NEL Board. Legal advice has been sought and he confirmed that he has no prejudicial interest in this item.</p> <p>Cllr Chris Millar declared a personal non-prejudicial interest in item 6 as Chair of the Northamptonshire Waste Partnership Board.</p>	

Item 3	<p><b>Item 3: Minutes of the meeting held on 26<sup>th</sup> May 2009</b></p> <p><b>3.1 IT WAS AGREED:</b> That the minutes of the meeting held in public on 7<sup>th</sup> July 2009 were a true and accurate record.</p>	
Item 4	<p><b>Item 4: Criminal Justice Centre</b></p> <p><b>Applicants:</b> Northamptonshire Police Authority</p> <p><b>Application No:</b> 08/0283/FULWNN</p> <p><b>Description:</b> Criminal Justice Centre within Use Class C2A with associated parking, landscaping and access.</p> <p><b>Address:</b> Land At Pavillion Drive, Northampton, Northamptonshire, NN4 7YL</p> <p><b>Ward:</b> Nene Valley</p> <p>4.1 The Chair reminded the speakers of the speaking procedures.</p> <p>4.2 John Hill introduced the application and update report (Appendix 1 – Update report attached).</p> <p>4.3 Geoff Bolton from SSR Planning speaking against the application on behalf of a consortium of landlords from the Brackmills estate, made the following points.</p> <p>4.3.1 Legal requirement states that applications must be in accordance with the local development plan. If they are not, then the decision may be open to challenge.</p> <p>4.3.2 This application is a departure from the local development plan and has no overriding material planning considerations.</p> <p>4.3.3 Any departure from the proposed land use must be because of ‘significant benefit to the local community’ and that the proposal will create ‘substantial employment’.</p> <p>4.3.4 This application does not represent any benefit to the community and does not create substantial employment as the proposal results in the transfer of existing jobs to the new facility not new ones.</p> <p>4.3.5 The interpretation of policy B14 is incorrect.</p>	

	<p>4.3.6 Recognise the need to retain high quality sites, but there is no need to release land here. This development can be put elsewhere.</p> <p>4.3.7 Contrary to case law cited in the report, permission to build a hotel was refused.</p> <p>4.4 The committee had no questions for Mr. Bolton.</p> <p>4.5 Caroline Wilbaforce from Thredneedle, who own 900 Pavillion Drive, spoke against the application and made the following points:</p> <p>4.5.1 The application clearly fails to comply with the development plan, in particular policy B14 of the adopted local plan.</p> <p>4.5.2 The report artificially restricts the relevance of alternative sites.</p> <p>4.5.3 None of the quoted cases within the report set out the general principles to follow when considering meeting a recognised need elsewhere. There is danger of treating a judgement in a particular case as if it is an enactment of law .</p> <p>4.5.4 There are greater harmful effects and the applicant has to work hard to show that there are no realistic alternatives alternative.</p> <p>4.5.5 Site selection process: Search for site has been inconsistent with different criteria employed each time.</p> <p>4.5.6 There has been no effective comparative assessment feasibility study, sensitivity analysis or suitable procedures applied.</p> <p>4.5.7 Selection criteria have been restricted to undeveloped freehold land even when other options where available.</p> <p>4.5.8 The Police Authority speculatively purchased the land which has influenced the assessment of the site.</p> <p>4.5.9 In conclusion there are more appropriate sites.</p> <p>4.6 David Dickinson asked if it was her opinion that the Official</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>Journal of the European Union (OJEU) process was inadequate.</p> <p>4.7 Ms. Wilbaforce stated that the whole process was inadequate and there are more appropriate sites.</p> <p>4.8 Cllr. Kevin Barton speaking as Parish Councillor for Hardingstone Parish Council spoke against the application and made the following points:</p> <p>4.8.1 Residents stated that fear of crime was their main concerns.</p> <p>4.8.2 Residents had no faith in the detainee release policy.</p> <p>4.8.3 Report states that fear of crime must be justified by evidence; however, the courts have stated that genuine fear of crime can be a justified reason for refusal.</p> <p>4.8.4 There will be no additional police vehicles in the village and no significant benefit to the local community.</p> <p>4.8.5 There will be a negative impact on the village as detainees will have to travel through the village to get back to the town centre.</p> <p>4.9 The Chair asked if the fear of crime was due to the detainee release policy.</p> <p>4.10 Cllr. Barton stated that it was but also because the residents believed the Criminal Justice Centre was in the wrong place.</p> <p>4.11 Cllr. Sandra Barnes asked what the crime statistics were for the village. Cllr. Barton stated that he did not know the exact figures.</p> <p>4.12 Brian Binley MP spoke against the application.</p> <p>4.12.1 The Police Authority is in trouble financially and so can not provide significant employment benefits as the report states.</p> <p>4.12.2 The existing Police Authority sites are not guaranteed to be used for further employment, they may be used for housing.</p> <p>4.12.3 Fear of crime: Figures of re-offenders does not address those that do not get arrested.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>4.12.4 Undermines business confidence in planning procedures. Businesses bought their sites because it was a prestigious business site. Investment in Northampton is being put in jeopardy.</p> <p>4.13 The Chair asked for Mr. Binley's view of the proposals to mitigate the fear of crime.</p> <p>4.14 Mr. Binley stated that many people will refuse the offer and he is concerned about those people who will pick the detainees up.</p> <p>4.15 Jeremy Pyatt from Savills speaking as Planning Advisor for the Police Authority spoke for the application and made the following points:</p> <p>4.15.1 Application complies with policy B14 which provides flexibility for consideration of other applications.</p> <p>4.15.2 Site provides a benefit to the community. It provides a new centralised modern facility which will allow for more efficient policing.</p> <p>4.15.3 Contributes to infrastructure requirements for the wider area.</p> <p>4.15.4 Policy B14 does not state that we are required to look at alternative sites or provide new employment.</p> <p>4.15.5 There is no loss of employment land as this site has remained undeveloped despite an extant employment permission.</p> <p>4.15.6 Research shows that the proposals will not increase crime in the area.</p> <p>4.15.7 Despite not being required to seek alternative sites, they have looked for alternatives and found no suitable sites.</p> <p>4.16 Mr. Pyatt clarified for the committee that the jobs mentioned are existing jobs that will be transferred to the new sites and that there is no conflict with the B14 policy.</p> <p>4.17 The committee asked how many alternative sites were considered, and hypothetically, if this proposal was refused</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>would you seek alternative sites.</p> <p>4.18 Mr. Pyatt informed the committee that they had considered 3 other sites and had exhausted the possibilities. If the application was refused they would still stay with this site. The site needed to be within good proximity to the local highway network. The site needs to be accessible within 30 minutes drive time of the West Northamptonshire area.</p> <p>4.19 Derek Talbot, Deputy Chief Constable for West Northamptonshire Police Authority speaking as the applicant, spoke for the application and made the following points:</p> <p>4.19.1 He confirmed that the site was purchased in January 2008.</p> <p>4.19.2 Future growth: 50 cells are needed but an extra 10 cells are proposed in order to anticipate future growth.</p> <p>4.19.3 The number 52 bus service runs on the hour to Brackmills from the Town Centre.</p> <p>4.19.4 Access to the site needs to be within 30 minutes drive, most alternative sites do not meet this criterion.</p> <p>4.19.5 Comparative site analysis showed that existing sites found no fear of crime after the opening of these sites.</p> <p>4.19.6 Surveys show that there would be no increase in crime, however they are proposing to introduce a detainee release policy.</p> <p>4.19.7 Reasons for rejections of other sites are on public record.</p> <p>4.20 The Chair asked for further information about the statistics of re-offenders.</p> <p>4.21 Last year 10,000 people went through Campbell Square Police Station, of which 6 re-offended within 24 hours and within a quarter of a mile radius of Campbell Square.</p> <p>4.22 In regards to alternative sites, Deputy Chief Constable Talbot stated that the process of identifying this site had taken 2 and a half years, they had gone through the OJEU process. To repeat the process now would delay the process and cost more public money.</p>	
--	--	--

- 4.23 In regards to the detainee release scheme, the funding has been secured and the Police Authority has the capacity to screen the detainees before release. Transport will be available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week and transport availability will be modelled around peak times.
- 4.24 Deputy Chief Constable Talbot confirmed for the committee that the reason for seeking a new site is because the current sites are outdated.
- 4.25 He also confirmed that the types of detainees released will be low level offenders. No-one shall be released if they are a danger to the community.
- 4.26 The committee asked the Officers to clarify details about policy B14.
- 4.27 John Hill stated that the policy stated that the applications should provide 'substantial employment and benefit to the community'.
- 4.28 The site is currently vacant, therefore this proposal would bring employment to a vacant site.
- 4.29 It is for the Committee to make a judgement about what they class as 'substantial'. The reference to 'local community' is a matter for the committee to interpret as there is a wider community benefit, and the wider community includes the local community.
- 4.30 David Dickinson referred to the supplementary report by Savills, p28 section 5.2.1 and stated that this could be a situation where alternative sites should be sought.
- 4.31 The Chair invited the committee to express their views on the application.
- 4.32 The committee expressed concern over the search for alternative sites, the release of detainees into the area and how this would affect residents and also the interpretation of policy B14.
- 4.33 Adrian Arnold advised the committee that policy is open to

interpretation and is a matter of judgment. The Officer's report highlights how this proposal sits within a wider context; within the wider growth agenda and timescales for that growth. The weighting of each issue raised is a matter of judgement. The benefit to the wider community should be given great weight.

4.34 In regards to employment, this proposal complies with policy.

4.35 Fear of crime is an issue, but the weight given to it should be considered, as the evidence does not support a justified fear of crime. The signing of the s106 is a binding legal agreement and will secure the detainee release scheme will remain for the lifetime of the development.

4.36 If the committee is of the view that it complies with policy then alternative sites is not an issue. This issue should hold little weight.

4.37 Michele Vas advised the committee on the issue of the alternative sites and confirmed that the consideration/existence of alternative sites is capable of being a material planning consideration. The principles for this can be drawn from case law. If there are clear planning objections to a development then it may be appropriate to consider whether the development should be located elsewhere and whether or alternative sites should be considered.

4.38 Officer advice is that the application falls within the policy B14 and therefore there is no planning objection in this respect. One then needs to consider if 'fear of crime' is a material consideration capable of giving rise to a clear planning objection. Again, officers' advice in this instance is that limited weight can be attached to 'fear of crime' as a material consideration which is should be given such weight that planning permission be refused.

4.39 Accordingly there was no clear planning objections to the proposal and the issue of alternative sites was not something members should go on to consider.

4.40 The Chair invited the committee to vote on the application.

4.41 David Dickinson clarified that B14 reads 'benefit to the local community' not 'wider and local community'.

4.42 The committee voted 5-1 against the proposal on the grounds that it fails to comply with policy B14. It does not bring significant benefit to the local community or substantial employment benefits, the fear of crime is a concern and friends and families of the detainees will also be visiting the site.

4.43

4.44 As set out in the Planning Committee Standing Orders, where the committee is minded to disagree with the Officer's recommendation, the application shall be deferred until a future meeting of the Committee and no decision shall be taken on that matter until that meeting.

4.45 The reasons for the members disagreeing with the Officer's report shall be recorded in the minutes.

4.46 The Director of Planning and Development shall be requested to prepare a report specifically addressing the reasons provided by members for consideration by members at a future meeting.

4.47 It was clarified that the reasons for refusal were because of B14, there was no local benefit to the community and secondly, the fear of crime.

4.48 Brian Binley MP stated that this deferral drags out the process and is not seen as democratic.

4.49 Adrian Arnold stated that the first deferral was due to the committee seeking clarification on certain issues related to the development. This second deferral is a requirement of

AA

	<p>the standing orders and allows the Officers an opportunity to deliver a report giving sound reasons for refusal. Without this, the Committee is running the risk of appeal and the appeal costs.</p> <p><b>IT WAS RESOLVED:</b></p> <p>That the application be <b>DEFERRED</b> as required I by the standing orders as members were not minded to approve the officer recommendation for the following reasons:</p> <p>(i) The Development did not comply with Policy B14 by not being of significant benefit to the local community.</p> <p>(ii) That 'fear of crime' in this instance was a material consideration capable of warranting refusal of the application.</p> <p>A report would be brought back to a future committee addressing these issues.</p> <p>There was a short comfort break.</p>	
	<p><b>Item 5 Flood Lights</b></p> <p><b>Applicants:</b> Northamptonshire County Cricket Club</p> <p><b>Application No:</b> 09/0061/FULWNN</p> <p><b>Description:</b> Erection of two commentary boxes, camera gantry, extension to pavilion and installation of six floodlights (48m in height) columns.</p> <p><b>Address:</b> County Cricket Ground, Abington Avenue, Northampton, Northamptonshire, NN1 4PR</p> <p><b>Ward:</b> Abington</p> <p>5.1 Chris Preston introduced the application and update report (Appendix 1 – Update report attached)</p> <p>5.2 David Levanthal, speaking as a local resident spoke against the</p>	

	<p>application and made the following points:</p> <p>5.2.1 The assessment made does not take into account the 365 day visual impact.</p> <p>5.2.2 There is no financial benefit to having permanent lights as their 20-20 matches already receive full capacity.</p> <p>5.2.3 This application does not provide any benefit to Northampton.</p> <p>5.2.4 It has a negative impact to the conservation area.</p> <p>5.2.5 Alternative lights should be sought.</p> <p>5.2.6 A decibel level should be attached to this proposal as the late night matches will increase noise.</p> <p>5.2.7 A condition should be placed stating that if there are less than 6 20-20 cricket matches in the year then the lights should be removed.</p> <p>5.3 The committee asked what the height of the temporary lights was.</p> <p>5.4 Mr. Levanthal informed the committee that the temporary lights are 40 metres. The new lights are 48 metres high and significantly wider. Currently they have 4 lights and are seeking to have 6 permanent lights.</p> <p>5.5 Nick Summers, speaking on behalf of a local residents group spoke against the application and made the following points:</p> <p>5.5.1 It is a Conservation Area and Abington Park is used as an overspill car park.</p> <p>5.5.2 Parking is severely limited in the area. The proposal will increase the parking problems. Resident will have nowhere to park on Friday evenings.</p> <p>5.5.3 His children will be sleeping 12m away from the lights.</p> <p>5.5.4 Residents are concerned with the future use of these lights for concerts and shows.</p> <p>5.5.5 Residents are concerned with the noise raised from 20 -20 cricket as it is for TV, has a carnival atmosphere, and plays loud music. There is disturbance already in the area from</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>people coming home from town.</p> <p>5.6 Cllr. Flavell sought confirmation that 20-20 cricket is taking place currently and whether the lower height lights and noise from 20-20 cricket were affecting him.</p> <p>5.7 Mr. Summers confirmed that one 20-20 match had taken place so far and he and his family were not at home for this match. He was concerned over the increase number of matches.</p> <p>5.8 Mr. Summers stated that in regards to parking, an increase in matches will increase parking.</p> <p>5.9 David Dickinson highlighted the condition that these flood lights will only be used for cricket and not for any other shows.</p> <p>5.10 Cllr. Edwards asked Mr. Summers if he was aware of the cricket ground when he bought his house.</p> <p>5.11 Mr. Summers stated that he was but he was aware night matches only happened once a year and that it was a conservation area.</p> <p>5.12 Cllr. Brian Hoare declared a personal non-prejudicial interest in this item as the political party that he is a member of rents a property in Clark Road within the vicinity of the cricket ground. Cllr. Jean Hawkins also declared this same interest.</p> <p>5.13 Cllr. Brian Hoare, speaking as Cllr for Abington Ward, spoke against the application and made the following points:</p> <p>5.13.1 Dialogue between NBC, WNDC and residents has resulted in some improvement.</p> <p>5.13.2 Conditions are not adequate.</p> <p>5.13.3 No visual impact assessment has been made.</p> <p>5.13.4 Lighting has improved.</p> <p>5.13.5 In regards to monitoring, would like the conditions to be amended to say that the NCCC annual report be copied to councillors.</p> <p>5.13.6 Condition 5 is actually saying that any noise up to 22.15pm</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>is acceptable.</p> <p>5.14 Cllr. Hoare clarified for the committee that 20-20 is a compacted version of a cricket match. The climax of the match takes place towards the end of the match with the use of music and animations on the score board.</p> <p>5.15 Sally Tagg, representing NCCC spoke for the application and made the following points:</p> <p>5.15.1 There has been significant investment in time and commitment on behalf of the club.</p> <p>5.15.2 Careful consideration has been given to local residents and members.</p> <p>5.15.3 Scheme has evolved to reduce light spill.</p> <p>5.15.4 This application gives committee members the opportunity to control the use of the lights</p> <p>5.15.5 An annual survey allows for the monitoring of the use of the lights.</p> <p>5.15.6 NCCC is a sporting asset for the County and growth of the Club benefits Northampton.</p> <p>5.15.7 Impact on conservation area is addressed in Officer's report.</p> <p>5.16 In regards to the exhibition, Ms. Tagg stated that over 100 letters were hand delivered and approximately 25% responded to the survey and approximately 40-50 people attending the exhibition.</p> <p>5.17 NCCC have proposed a travel plan which Northampton County Council has given conditional release.</p> <p>5.18 The committee sought clarification over the increase in lights needed.</p> <p>5.19 Ms. Tagg informed the committee that the proposed taller lights give a better opportunity to direct the light.</p> <p>5.20 Mark Tagg, speaking as the applicant spoke for the application and made the following points:</p> <p>5.20.1 This proposal seeks to strengthen the NCC's position in</p>	
--	---	--

the region.

5.20.2 They aim to continue investment into the ground.

5.20.3 There is a risk that professional players will leave to play for clubs with greater profile.

5.21 Mr. Tagg clarified that the new proposals reduce light spill and provide high quality light compared to the current temporary lights.

5.22 Mr. Tagg clarified that retractable lights are not an alternative as they cost £2.5 million compared to £650,000 for permanent lighting. He added that permanent lights look more elegant.

5.23 It was clarified that 20-20 cricket is one type of cricket and the lights would not be used simply for this purpose.

5.24 Mr. Tagg added that floodlit cricket has been around for 15 years and 20-20 cricket has been around for 5 years. They have received no letters of complaint about amplified noise so far.

5.25 Chris Preston informed the committee that NBC's Environmental Health recommended not introducing a decibel limit in the conditions.

5.26 He added that the application is for flood lights, night matches currently already take place. Traffic is a separate issue that already exists regardless of whether these lights are in place or not. It would be difficult to refuse the application on ground of traffic issues.

5.27 In response to comments made about the visual assessment, Chris Preston confirmed that officers had gone to great lengths to gauge the impact.

5.28 A vote was taken and the Committee approved the application.

**IT WAS RESOLVED:**

That the application be **APPROVED** as per the officers'

	<p>recommendation.</p>	
	<p><b>Item 6:</b> Great Billing Waste Water Treatment works  <b>Applicants:</b> Anglian Water Services  <b>Application No:</b> 09/0041/FULWNC  <b>Description:</b> Change of use of existing concrete bays / structures to use as Green Waste and Biosolids Composting facility.   <b>Address:</b> Great Billing Wastewater Treatment Works, Lower Ecton Lane, Northampton, Northamptonshire, NN3 4DQ   <b>Ward:</b> Billing</p> <p>6.1 Andrew Ryley introduced the application and update report (Appendix 1 – Update report attached). He added that oversight of the environmental impact would be carried out by the Environment Agency, not Northampton Borough Council in their role as monitoring Statutory Nuisances under the Environmental Protection legislation</p> <p>6.2 Andrew Ryley outlined that in terms of the proposed application the applicant, should they be granted planning permission, will require an Environmental Permit from the EA under the Environmental Permitting Regulations 2007. Amongst other things it requires people working on site to be subject to strict accreditation and the EA will monitor the site more closely.</p> <p>6.3 Andrew Ryley set out that there was one outstanding matter, that of the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) for the application. This had been submitted by the applicant and was currently being reviewed by the EA; Officers advised that they considered it was likely that the EA would withdraw their objection on this matter very shortly.</p> <p>6.4 The Chair noted that there were several letters of objections</p>	

	<p>and yet no speakers. He invited the officers to comment.</p> <p>6.5 Officers responded by stating that there has been ongoing engagement with the local community and Anglia Water have helped to satisfy the objections raised.</p> <p>6.6 Also, the site will be subject to a separate set of legislation called the Integrated Pollution Prevention and Control (IPPC) regime which is more proactive than reactive. and would be monitored by the Environment Agency. They can impose conditions to control and measure.</p> <p>6.7 David Dickinson was pleased to see that the Environment Agency will be issuing a licence and reviewing the process.</p> <p>6.8 The committee raised concern over increased traffic.</p> <p>6.9 The officers highlighted that the Highways Agency and Northamptonshire County Council Highways department stated that traffic levels were acceptable.</p> <p>6.10 The committee unanimously approved the application.</p> <p><b>IT WAS RESOLVED:</b></p> <p>That the application be <b>APPROVED</b> as per the officers' recommendation .</p>	
	<p><b>7. Future meeting dates were agreed to be</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 27<sup>th</sup> October 2009</li> <li>• 24<sup>th</sup> November 2009</li> <li>• 15<sup>th</sup> December 2009</li> </ul>	
	<p>AOB</p> <p>There being no further business the meeting closed at 8:50pm</p> <p>Rhea Keehn</p> <p>Governance and Policy Assistant</p>	

	Signed by the Chairman  <hr/>	
--	-------------------------------------	--

## Appendix 1 – Update Report

### COMMITTEE UPDATE

Northampton UDA Planning Committee

29<sup>th</sup> September 2009

#### Agenda Item 4:

**Application number:** 08/0283/FULWNN

**Applicant:** Northamptonshire Police Authority

**Address:** Land at Pavillion Drive, Northampton, NN4 7YL

**Description:** Criminal Justice Centre (Use Class C2a) with associated parking, landscaping and access (Full Application).

Northampton Borough Council has confirmed that they have no objection to the proposed development.

#### Agenda Item 5:

**Application number:** 09/0061/FULWNN

**Applicant:** Northamptonshire County Cricket Club

**Address:** County Ground, Abington Avenue, Northampton, NN1 4PR

**Description:** Erection of two commentary boxes, camera gantry, extension to pavilion and installation of six floodlights (48m in height).

Following further consultation with residents regarding an amended lighting scheme, four further letters and two e-mails have been received.

The comments are summarised below:

- The lights would have a negative effect on the skyline
- The use of the lights will make the traffic situation in surrounding streets worse than it is at present
- The impact upon adjacent listed buildings will be unacceptable
- The views of residents should be paramount when taking a decision on the application
- Concerned that the area will slip into decline because of the proposals
- The scale and height of these structures will dwarf the surrounding area and be visible for 365 days per year
- Artificial light into bedrooms until 11.00pm will affect sleeping patterns, particularly those of children
- Noise from an alcohol fuelled crowd, whipped up by loud pop music will be unacceptable
- Other grounds need only 4 floodlights to light the pitch, why does Northampton need six?

### **Officer Response**

The issues raised in response to the additional consultation are covered within the body of the main report and no new issues have arisen. Therefore, the recommendation remains as set out within the original report.

### **Agenda Item 6:**

**Application number:** 09/0041/FULWNN

**Applicant:** Anglian Water Services

**Address:** Great Billing Wastewater Treatment Works, Lower Ecton Lane, Northampton, Northamptonshire, NN3 4DQ

**Description:** Change of use of existing concrete bays / structures to use as Green Waste and Biosolids Composting facility

Northampton Borough Council has no objection to the application subject to suitably addressing the issues of odour and bio aerosols to the satisfaction of the Environmental Health Officer.

## Officer response

The comments of the Environmental Health Officer have been recounted in the Committee Report in paragraph 9.2. An evaluation of their concerns is set out in paragraphs 11.19 to 11.28.