



Northampton UDA Planning Committee Minutes

20th April 2010

Committee Members present:

Ann Tate (AT)- Chair

Councillor Chris Millar (CM)
– Vice Chair

Cllr Penny Flavell (PF)

Cllr Brian Markham (BM)

In attendance:

Adrian Arnold (AA) - Director
of Planning Services

John Hill (JH) - Development
Control Manager

Richard Murdock (RM)- Senior
Development Management
Officer

Amy Sales (AS)- Committee
Assistant

This Public meeting was held on

20th April 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.</p> <p>Approximately 6 members of the public were present.</p>	
Item 1	<p><u>Item 1: Apologies</u></p> <p>John Weir, David Dickinson, Nick Thompson and Cllr Dennis Meredith sent their apologies.</p>	
Item 2	<p><u>Item 2: Declaration of interests</u></p> <p>None</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 9th March 2010 were a true and accurate record.</p> <p>Matters arising from 9th March 2010 Committee regarding Thomas Beckett School, Agenda Item 6, was approved subject to adding an additional condition, number 9. The Chair was satisfied that this had been achieved.</p>	
Item 4	<p><u>Item 4: 2 Gray Street</u></p> <p>Applicant: Clayson Country Homes Ltd</p> <p>Application No: 10/0022/FULWNN</p> <p>Description: Change of use from 5 No. apartments to 13 No. bedroom student accommodation (House in Multiple Occupancy – HIMO)</p> <p>Address: 2 Gray Street, Northampton, Northamptonshire, NN1 3QQ</p> <p>Ward: St. Crispin</p> <p>4.1 RM introduced the application and presented the update report. (Update report attached as Appendix A)</p> <p>4.2 Glenice Moss, a member of the Double H Residents</p>	

	<p>Association, spoke against the application. The points she made are summarised as follows:</p> <p>4.2.1 The report summary of the application is incorrect, it is not a change of use from 5 No. apartments to 13 No. bedroom student accommodation, as the building was not previously used as a house or apartments, it was commercial property.</p> <p>4.2.2 Many developers build private use accommodation in the area, which is in keeping with the surrounding location.</p> <p>4.2.3 Further multiple occupancy housing in the area will lead to additional congestion with parking on the road, as the area is already densely populated.</p> <p>4.2.4 The increase in population will exacerbate the slow internet broadband and also water and gas supplies.</p> <p>4.3 Gill St.John a member of the Double H Residents Association, spoke against the application. The points she made are summarised as follows:</p> <p>4.3.1 The student housing will bring a disproportionate effect to the local residents.</p> <p>4.3.2 The additional of up to 26 new residents will add to the parking concerns.</p> <p>4.3.3 There is currently no issue with noise in the area, however with the addition of students to the street, this could alter.</p> <p>4.4 CM questioned why Gill St.John referred to 26 residents.</p> <p>4.5 Gill St.John suggested that there could possibly be more than one resident in each room.</p> <p>4.6 Councillor Ifty Chaudry speaking for the Double H Residents Association, spoke against the application. The points he made are summarised as follows:</p> <p>4.6.1 The area is severely over congested.</p> <p>4.6.2 Ambulances and other emergency vehicles cannot get</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>through the roads.</p> <p>4.6.3 The value of the houses in the area have deteriorated due to the increase in population and crowding of cars.</p> <p>4.7 CM asked Councillor Chaudry if he thought people living in 5 residences could out number people living in 13 residences.</p> <p>4.8 Councillor Chaudry replied that there is a possibility of two or more people living in each of the 5 apartments, each having cars could greatly add to the congestion of the road.</p> <p>4.9 Colin Clayson speaking as the applicant spoke for the application. The points he made are summarised as follows:</p> <p>4.9.1 The building was last used for commercial purposes, the initial planning permission requested was for four flats 9 years ago, the additional flat was added in 2007.</p> <p>4.9.2 There is a need in the town for this type of accommodation, therefore it is ideally placed between the university campus and the town centre.</p> <p>4.9.3 The scheid proposed is for one flat with eight bedrooms and the second with five bedrooms.</p> <p>4.9.4 There are 8 secure parking spaces, one is disabled, as required.</p> <p>4.9.5 His company manage other student accommodation buildings within Northampton.</p> <p>4.10 PF stated that the quality of the existing developments by Colin Clayson are to a high standard, however the development in question has caused a lot of concern. She asked Mr Clayson where the other student properties, which his company managed, where situated.</p> <p>4.11 Colin Clayson confirmed that he managed 17 student houses altogether, 8 or 9 of them already being situated on the Mounts.</p> <p>4.12 Colin Clasyon clarified that he only lets to one student per room.</p> <p>4.13 PF highlighted the possibilities of dumping used items such</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>as mattresses within the streets of the area, as new students arrive to the accommodation. How will Mr Clayson propose to stop this from happening.</p> <p>4.14 Colin Clayson informed the committee that his company actively ensures that this does not happen by collecting waste and providing new mattresses for new tenants.</p> <p>4.15 PF asked Mr Clayson what type of security lighting there would be in the car park.</p> <p>4.16 Colin Clayson advised that it would possibly be 4 or 5 small lights, however he would alter this if necessary.</p> <p>4.17 PF asked which room would be developed for disabled accommodation.</p> <p>4.18 Colin Clayson informed the committee that bedroom 5 would be used for disabled accommodation. The size of the bathroom will be larger. However, as the property will be developed around an existing building, the disabled student would require assistance from other housemates to access the kitchen or lounge area, as the room cannot be on the ground floor.</p> <p>4.19 CM asked AA that a disabled person should not be left to operate their own, and rely on other residents to aid them, making the property inadequate for disabled access, therefore would this change the status of the application.</p> <p>4.20 AA agreed that there was an issue, however the policies around disabled accommodation for developing on an existing building is different than the policies on a new build development.</p> <p>4.21 CM stated that policy 5 in relation to disabled accommodation should be removed as it is not adequate to the development.</p> <p>4.22 A vote was taken and the members voted 2 for and 2 against the application.</p> <p>4.23 The Chair used her casting vote and voted to approve the</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>application, subject to conditions in the officers' report and the removal of condition 5.</p> <p>IT WAS RESOLVED:</p> <p>That the application be APPROVED subject to conditions in the officers' report and the removal of condition 5.</p>	
	<p>8. Future meeting dates were agreed to be</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18th May 2010 • 15th June 2010 • 13th July 2010 	
	<p>AOB</p> <p>There being no further business, the meeting closed at 18:50pm</p> <p>Amy Sales Committee Assistant</p> <p>Signed by the Chairman</p> <p>_____</p>	