



Committee Members present:

Ann Tate (Chair)

Councillor Chris Millar - Vice
Chair

Cllr Penny Flavell

Cllr Dennis Meredith (sub)

Cllr Don Edwards (sub)

John Weir (JW)

David Dickinson (DD)

Sandra Barnes

In attendance:

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

John Hill (JH) - Development
Control Manager

Matthew Collerson -

Rhea Keehn – Governance and
Policy Assistant

Northampton UDA Planning Committee Minutes

This Public meeting was held on

7th July 2009

At

Main Hall

Duston Community Centre

Northampton

Reference	Minutes	Action
	<p>The Chair opened the meeting at 6pm. She welcomed members of the public.</p> <p>Approximately 10 members of the public were present.</p>	
Item 1	<p><u>Item 1: Apologies</u></p> <p>Nick Thompson, Cllr Sadik Chaudhury and Cllr Jean Hawkins sent their apologies.</p>	
Item 2	<p><u>Item2: Declaration of interests</u></p> <p>Cllr Meredith declared an interest in Item 5 and agreed to leave after Item 4. Cllr Chris Millar declared a non-prejudicial personal interest in Item 4 as a County Councillor for Northamptonshire County Council.</p>	
Item 3	<p><u>Item 3: Minutes of the meeting held on 26th May 2009</u></p> <p>3.1 IT WAS AGREED: That the minutes of the meeting held in public on 26th May 2009 were a true and accurate record.</p>	
Item 4	<p><u>Item 4: St. Crispins Local Development</u></p> <p>Applicants: Lodge Park Developments Ltd</p> <p>Application No: 09/0045/FULWNN</p> <p>Description: New single storey convenience store with associated car parking and additional car parking for adjacent nursery unit, as part of St. Crispin's local centre development.</p> <p>Address: St. Crispin's Farm, Berrywood Road, Northampton, NN5 4XD</p> <p>4.1 The committee had received the report and were given an update (Appendix 1 attached) on the application by John Hill. The following speakers spoke against the application.</p> <p>4.2 Cllr Varnsberry speaking as the ward councillor requested that he speak after the members of Public had spoken. The Chair refused this request and stated that he was first on the list.</p>	

4.3 Cllr Varnserry made the following points

- a. the width of the road was not adequate and that during school hours there was not adequate parking. It has taken nearly 20 months to solve this current problem. This development would only increase traffic along the narrow roads.
- b. Residents have concerns over the movement of heavy goods vehicles and the potential damage to their cars on these narrow roads.
- c. Residents are also concerned over the delivery times for the retail unit.
- d. Existing permissions state that no more than 500 square metres of retail space would be provided to avoid competing with shops in Duston. This application takes 134 square metres of office space and replaces it with 342 square metres of retail space. He questioned whether the total figure of 500 square metres as stated in the original brief was being exceeded.
- e. Requested that delivery of goods only take place between Monday and Friday, with the exception of newspaper delivery.

4.3 Cllr Chris Millar asked Cllr Varnserry his view on emergency vehicle access.

4.4 Cllr Varnserry responded by stating that there have been problems in the past with access. He added the planning application does not come up under legal searches as the application actually sits on Kent Road and so residents were not expecting this development.

4.5 The committee asked Cllr Varnserry why residents do not use their own off road car parking spaces and whether traffic measures such as double yellow lines would provide a solution to

the problem.

4.6 Cllr Varnserry responded that it was human nature to park where it was most convenient and that some traffic restrictions would cause greater issues with residents. He added that any traffic measure would need good consultation with residents.

4.7 Danielle Race speaking as a member of the public against the proposal was invited to speak and made the following points:

- a. That many residents have 2 vehicles and so park in their designated space and also at the front of the house.
- b. The application did not come up on the legal search
- c. Increased traffic is a concern near the school as there is currently a high risk of traffic accidents for children.
- d. Increase noise and anti-social behaviour
- e. She questioned whether more retail outlets were really needed in the area as Duston has an adequate amount.
- f. View from her house overlooking the development
- g. suggested alternative delivery times, mainly after the school rush hour times and no deliveries on a Sunday.

4.8 The committee asked whether Ms. Race would object to the development in principle. Ms Race responded that residents object to the road access and the change of office space to retail space.

4.9 The committee asked whether people parking on the highway increases or decreases the risk to children. Ms. Race stated that it increases the risk and is part of a wider problem about bad planning.

4.10 The opinion was expressed that the number of parking spaces set out by government was inadequate.

4.11 There was discussion around the hours of delivery of goods.

4.12 Mr. K Charles speaking as a member of the public against the

proposal was invited to speak and made the following points:

- a. His property was opposite the facility and was concerned about the intrusion of light and noise into his property and how this affects his children sleeping. He noted that other developments uses hedges and fences to protect from light intrusion.
- b. His property and his family have already suffered from various crimes and anti-social behaviour and was concerned that anti-social activities would increase.

4.13 There were no questions for Mr. Charles. The officers received pictures from Mr. Charles of his property.

4.14 Oliver Bazely speaking for the proposal as the applicant, addressed the committee and made the following points:

- a. The design of the retail unit integrates with the area.
- b. They have had regular and thorough consultation with the Police, Highways Authority and WNDC and their comments have been integrated within the proposals.
- c. Main concerns related to traffic movement, noise and anti-social behaviour and the design has been developed to alleviate these issues. CCTV and adequate lighting will be in place to reduce the likelihood of anti-social behaviour.

4.15 There was discussion relating to the wall and the effect on anti-social behaviour and concealed areas. The committee expressed the view that the wall actually contributes to the increased likelihood of anti-social behaviour.

4.16 John Hill informed the committee that when the St. Crispin development was approved it was intended that a local centre would be in place here. He added that the proposals do not exceed the 1000 square metre limit. This was confirmed.

4.17 He reminded the committee that the question is how much impact this development will have on residents and whether this was acceptable or not. Limited weight should be given to cars

parking on the road as they should not be parking there to a certain extent. The condition regarding delivery times can be amended, taking into account store viability.

Condition 5 specifically addresses the boundary treatment and could include North of the store being reviewed to mitigate the impact on anti-social behaviour.

4.18 The committee summarised their views and stated that parking or traffic calming measures would require enforcement. They stated that delivery hours should be addressed and the wall concerns should be addressed, whilst taking into account light intrusion for residents.

4.19 John Hill added that low-level lighting could be used to address this.

4.20 The committee was of the view that a piazza style exterior may be a more appropriate and pleasant feature for this development. John Hill responded by saying that the hard treatment of the surface could be reconfigured to address this and would likely require the officers to re-consult, should the committee be minded to delegate condition 5 to the officers.

4.21 There was discussion as to whether the application should be deferred and it was noted that deferring the application would not resolve the parking or road situation. Members also discussed whether trying to change the application substantially meant it was a bad application.

4.22 Adrian Arnold reminded the committee that they can only refuse an application on reasonable grounds and with evidence. He noted that there was no evidence that the highways were inadequate.

4.23 It was proposed that Condition 5 be delegated to officers and expanded to include a review of the hard landscaping with a full consultation with the community. It was also added that the delivery times as stated in Condition 8 be amended after consultation with the community.

	<p>4.24 A vote was taken on the above and 7 members voted for and 1 voted against.</p> <p>4.25 The officers were asked whether or not the total retail floor space allowance was for 1000 square metres or for 500 square metres as stated by Cllr Varnserry. John Hill replied by stating that the total retail floor space is restricted to 1000 square metres. The existing scheme and this scheme would total 583 square metres.</p> <p>4.26 The committee asked for this in writing.</p> <p>4.27 A vote was taken on the application. 6 voted to approve, 1 member abstained, 1 voted against the application.</p> <p>IT WAS RESOLVED: That the application be APPROVED subject to condition 5 being delegated to Officers and being amended to include reference to hard landscaping to enable a review of the hard surfaced area to the building to be undertaken and Condition 8, which relates to the control of delivery time to the store, being amended following consultation with local residents, to reflect times that have greater regard to the concern of local residents.</p> <p>Sandra Barnes stated that national planning policy relating to parking allocations and transport modes needs to be reviewed as current plans are making it difficult for residents and developments to grow.</p>	AA
	<p>5. Item 5: Former St Edmunds Hospital</p> <p>Application number: 09/0002/FULWNN</p> <p>Applicant: Rochmills Ltd</p> <p>Address: Former St. Edmunds Hospital, Wellingborough Road, Northampton.</p> <p>Description: Mixed use development comprising the</p>	

development of a retirement village and ancillary facilities following the demolition of former infirmary building; Development of mixed use building comprising A1 (Retail), A2 (Financial and Professional Services) and A3 (Restaurant and Cafe) at ground floor, with 6 apartments on upper floors; Conversion of the former St Edmunds hospital buildings to comprise B1 (Office) use, specialist care facility, visitor accommodation and security building.

5.1 The committee received the report and Matthew Collerson presented the update sheet to the committee.

5.2 The Chair invited the committee for comments.

5.3 The committee expressed the view that this proposal was welcomed as the site has been in need of development for a long time. However, as one of the main gateways through the town they felt that the design actually downgraded Northampton and was not attractive or adventurous enough.

They also added that the security measures seemed excessive and was actually contributing to the likelihood of anti-social behaviour and crime as the design was not open and active enough. Furthermore, the restrictions on windows recommended by Environmental Health seemed excessive.

5.4 David Dickinson asked for clarification over the demolition of the Infirmary building. The officers replied that the decision to demolish the Infirmary lay with Northampton Borough Council. They have agreed the demolition as part of the accompanying listed building application, subject to the WNDP securing the phasing of the works through section 106 agreement, thereby securing the future of the listed buildings before they demolish the listed Infirmary buildings and begin construction of the retirement village.

5.5 Matthew Collerson replied and stated that a lot of design work had gone into the application. The design adds

	<p>contemporary detailing and looks to not replicate the past, but reflect the character of the existing buildings. The retirement village has restrictions as it is adjacent to a listed building and so restricts the freedom of design.</p> <p>5.6 In regards to fixed windows, officers would like to negotiate further with environmental health. A mix of mechanical ventilation and open windows is needed.</p> <p>5.7 The apartments are for nurses working on the site. Habitable room windows could not be placed on the back of the apartments as they overlook existing properties, so they have had to be placed on the front elevation.</p> <p>5.8. In response to the sub-division of the site, officers have tried to reach a balance with the Police. He reminded the committee that a lot of vulnerable people will be living on the site</p> <p>5.9 There was discussion over the aesthetics of the façade of the site and the committee would like the officers to look at this further to improve the façade.</p> <p>5.10 Discussion was had over the brickwork and that any artwork/alterations require listed building consent.</p> <p>It was resolved:</p> <p>That the application be APPROVED as per the officers' recommendation and the imposition of an additional condition requiring the submission and approval of a revised façade for the mixed use/retail building, prior to the commencement of development.</p>	
	<p>6. Future meeting dates were agreed to be</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 28th July 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 29th September• 20th October	
	<p>AOB</p> <p>There being no further business the meeting closed at 7:45pm</p> <p>Rhea Keehn</p> <p>Governance and Policy Assistant</p> <p>Signed by the Chairman</p> <p>.....</p>	

DRAFT