



Committee Members present:

Ann Tate (AT) – Chair

Councillor Chris Millar (CM)

John Weir (JW)

Councillor Dennis Meredith

Councillor Brian Markham
(BM)

In attendance:

Adrian Arnold (AA) – Director
of Planning Services

John Hill (JH) - Development
Control Manager

Chris Preston (CP) – Senior
Planner

Amy Sales (AS) - Committee
Secretary

Northampton UDA Planning Committee Minutes

5th October 2010

This Public meeting was held on

5th October 2010

At

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

Reference	Minutes	Action
	The Chair opened the meeting at 6pm.	
Item 1	<u>Item 1: Apologies</u> Nick Thompson, David Dickinson and Councillor Penny Flavell	
Item 2	<u>Item 2: Declaration of interests</u> CM declared a personal, non-prejudicial interest for Item 4 and Item 6. DM declared a personal, non-prejudicial interest for Item 5 and 6. BM declared a personal, non-prejudicial interest Item 5. JW declared a personal, non-prejudicial interest for Item 4.	
Item 3	<u>Item 3: Minutes of the meeting held on 14th September 2010</u> 3.1 IT WAS AGREED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 14 th September 2010 were a true and accurate record.	
Item 4	<u>Item 4: Land Off South Meadow Road</u> Applicant: Taylor Wimpey East Midlands Limited Application No: 10/0039/FULWNN Description: Erection of 80 No. residential units with associated garages, roads and sewers. Address: Land Off South Meadow Road Northampton Northamptonshire NN5 4BQ Ward: East Hunsbury 4.1 CP introduced the application and presented the update report. (Update report attached as Appendix A) 4.2 Brian Convery spoke against the application as a member of the public. The points he made are summarised as follows: 4.2.1 Mr Convery informed the Committee that there are immense traffic issues on the roads surrounding the application, which would be	Chris Preston

	<p>exacerbated by the proposed development, brings more residents to the area.</p> <p>4.2.2 St Lukes School, which is not yet fully occupied, creates parking issues outside the school causing traffic chaos on a daily basis.</p> <p>4.2.3 As a result of the proposed application going ahead, there would be a possible 1000 extra vehicles on the roads, adding to the traffic problems.</p> <p>4.2.4 In the past the local buses have needed to mount the roads in order to pass the masses of traffic.</p> <p>4.2.5 The traffic generated by the development of the 80 houses has not been included on the original design plan of the St Crispin development and the traffic flows were never included on the calculation on the design for the local road network.</p> <p>4.2.6 In Mr Convery's opinion the proposed access road is ill conceived, has restricted visibility and is too close to existing properties.</p> <p>4.3 CM asked Mr Convery if a possible access site might exist elsewhere.</p> <p>4.4 Mr Convery said that he did not believe one existed on the St Crispin site, as the houses were supposed to be part of the Norwood Farm development, therefore the access should be there.</p> <p>4.5 Roger Kingston spoke against the application as a member of the public. The points he made are summarised as follows:</p> <p>4.5.1 Mr Kingston stated that within the application Taylor Wimpey's consultants had written</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>concerns over the stability of the land on the site.</p> <p>4.5.2 Spoken to the Former St Crispin Hospital farm manager whose cottage, located inside the South East boundary of application, collapsed due to unstable ground conditions.</p> <p>4.5.3 A building control officer advised Mr Kingston that the advised level of Geotechnical testing of the particular area had not been carried out, due to the land being withdrawn from sale in 1980's because the recommended testing period of 12 months was not carried out as it was deemed too expensive, with an uncertain outcome for the developer.</p> <p>4.6 The Committee had no further questions for Mr Kingston.</p> <p>4.7 Councillor Paul Varnsvery spoke against the application as the Ward Councillor. The points he made are summarised as follows:</p> <p>4.7.1 Cllr Varnsvery informed the Committee that he would comment upon highways issues.</p> <p>4.7.2 The highways within the site are very narrow and winding, the infrastructure is for St Crispin alone, not including the proposed site which should be part of the Norwood Farm site, not to "piggy back" on the already inadequate infrastructure of St Crispin.</p> <p>4.7.3 Traffic jams form at school drop off and pick up times.</p> <p>4.7.4 WNDC did not mention in report that the Borough Council will add yellow lines to the roads in connection with the proposed shopping centre,</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>which will intensify the traffic jams.</p> <p>4.7.5 Cllr Varnserry asked the Committee to refuse the application and to potentially welcome it back when Norwood Farm has been developed, with its own infrastructure.</p> <p>4.8 DM asked Cllr Varnserry whether he thought that the supply of affordable homes to the area was a positive consideration.</p> <p>4.9 Cllr Varnserry agreed, however added that the infrastructure needed to come first.</p> <p>4.10 Colin Williams spoke for the application as the applicant. The points he made are summarised as follows:</p> <p>4.10.1 Taylor Wimpy have been working closely with the WNDK officers over the past few years to produce a scheme that meets a very high standard, and to support the officers at the Borough Council, who recently recommended the application for approval.</p> <p>4.10.2 Majority of objections were based around highways issues, however, the new development will provide a roundabout at Berrywood Road which they believed would improve the road network.</p> <p>4.10.3 The access arrangements have been improved by the County Highways department, as they thought that the road network is more than capable to accommodate the development.</p> <p>4.10.4 Taylor Wimpey will also be delivering 28 much needed affordable homes to the area.</p> <p>4.10.5 Mr Williams requested that the Committee approve the application.</p> <p>4.11 CM asked Mr Williams if the Geotechnical Testing had</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>occurred as it is a considerable health and safety risk.</p> <p>4.12 Mr Williams advised that on site risk assessment had taken place and were stated within reports by the Housing and Communities Agency (HCA), to say that there are no land stability issues that need to be taken into consideration, and should properties suffer as a result of the land, Taylor Wimpey would rectify any of the properties.</p> <p>4.13 DM asked Mr Williams how much consultation had Taylor Wimpey undertaken with the local residents.</p> <p>4.14 Mr Williams advised that the land was inherited by Taylor Wimpey in 2007, and since then they have consulted a number of residents in the area.</p> <p>4.15 CP advised the Committee that the County Highways requested further analysis of 3 junctions within the area, which projected further growth until 2021.</p> <p>4.16 CP continued to comment on the land stability issues and confirmed that WNDC followed guidance of developers who carried out tests and reports on the area, and the proposed site was not within an area that is deemed susceptible to land slips.</p> <p>4.17 CP explained to the Committee that the reason no residents were consulted originally, was because the planning application dated back to 2006, and at the time, there were no neighbouring houses.</p> <p>4.18 CP commented on the yellow lines, which are to be painted around the access area of the site, to keep the entrance clear, not to extend along Kent Road.</p> <p>4.19 CM asked if the Highways Authority (HA) have removed the TR10 holding directions.</p> <p>4.20 CP advised that the HA were concerned with the Strategic Road Network, however they were happy with discussions in relation to the S106, to improve the</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>Strategic Road Network, therefore they will not remove the TR10 until they have seen the finished wording.</p> <p>4.21 CM asked whether the application could wait until the Norwood Farm application commences, so that it could be part of Norwood Farm, and its infrastructure.</p> <p>4.22 CP advised that the Norwood Farm application had been approved in principal, and technical highway evidence revealed that there was not sufficient grounds to combine the sites.</p> <p>4.23 JW stated that there was little traffic with little restrictions, after visiting the site earlier, however, at peak times, around the school, not unlike most areas where there is a school, that there would be a probability of traffic issues for short periods of time.</p> <p>4.24 DM thought that there was already quite a lot of infrastructure in place on the site, and the need of affordable housing is great.</p> <p>4.25 BM told the Committee that he could appreciate the residents' frustration, he agreed that the access site should extend from the Norwood Farm application, therefore he abstained from the vote.</p> <p>4.26 A vote was taken by the remaining members of the Committee and collectively they voted for the application.</p> <p>IT WAS RESOLVED:</p> <p>That the application be APPROVED as per the officers recommendations.</p>	
--	---	--

Item 5	<p><u>Item 5: Northampton County Cricket Club</u></p> <p>Applicant: Musco Sports Lighting</p> <p>Application No: 10/0097/FULWNN</p> <p>Description: Retention of six floodlight (48m in height) columns and a GRP Switch Cabinet</p> <p>Address: Northampton County Cricket Club County Ground Abington Avenue Northampton Northamptonshire NN1 4PR</p> <p>Ward: Abington</p> <p>5.1 CP introduced the application and presented the update report. (Update report attached as Appendix A)</p> <p>5.2 Duncan Chadwick spoke against the application as a member of the public. The points he made are summarised as follows:</p> <p>5.2.1 Mr Chadwick informed the Committee that he was speaking on behalf of the Residents of Wellingborough Road.</p> <p>5.2.2 He advised the Committee that the flood lights are four times the height of surrounding houses, and was unsure how the Borough Council's Conservation Officer thought the lights would have a neutral effect on the area.</p> <p>5.2.3 The lights are close to residential properties and are close together, and are close to the conservation area and listed buildings.</p> <p>5.2.4 They have a significant impact on the area emitting 2000 Lux of light before 10:15pm, after that time the lights are reduced, but are still intrusive to the</p>	Chris Preston

	<p>surrounding residents' homes.</p> <p>5.2.5 They have been kept on late at night, past the agreed time when they are meant to be switched off.</p> <p>5.2.6 The generator causes noise which disturbs local residents.</p> <p>5.2.7 No one from the Local Authorities has viewed the lights from inside residents' homes to see the impact on the immediate houses.</p> <p>5.2.8 He asked the Committee to refuse the application.</p> <p>5.3 The Committee had no questions for Mr Chadwick.</p> <p>5.4 David Leventhal spoke against the application as a member of the public. The points he made are summarised as follows:</p> <p>5.4.1 Mr Leventhal informed the Committee that he represented the Abington Conservation Area.</p> <p>5.4.2 The Northampton County Cricket Club (NCCC) have complete disregard to the arranged agreements, they continue to leave lights and music on past 10:15pm.</p> <p>5.4.3 The lights and music are a nuisance to the local residents, however, complaints to NCCC do not stop this.</p> <p>5.4.4 As the generators for the lights are not mains connected, they can emit smoke and fumes which disturb the local residents, Mr Leventhal Suggested that the generators become mains connected.</p> <p>5.4.5 Mr Leventhal concluded by advising the Committee that himself and the residents would like the lights to be moved 10 meters closer to the stands and the pitch, closer to where they were originally intended.</p> <p>5.5 AT asked Mr Leventhal how the Borough Council dealt</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>with the complaints.</p> <p>5.6 Mr Levethal advised the Chair that they had made the complaints, then the Borough would contact the NCCC and reinforce the agreements, however the NCCC would not cooperate and continued to break the agreement.</p> <p>5.7 There were no further questions for David Leventhal.</p> <p>5.8 Councillor Brain Hoare spoke against the application as a County Councillor. The points he made are summarised as follows:</p> <p>5.8.1 Cllr Hoare felt that the visual impact of the lights was inappropriate for the conservation area.</p> <p>5.8.2 He was of the opinion that the NCCC erected the lights where they are, so that they would not be asked to take them down.</p> <p>5.8.3 The Club has not proven to be a good neighbour to the residents.</p> <p>5.8.4 The conditions need to be written and enforceable if WNDC wants to protect the amenity of the residents.</p> <p>5.8.5 He asked the Committee several questions; Have there been any further plans put forward since the application was last at Committee in September last year? And, do they understand what the light intensity is?</p> <p>5.8.6 Continuing from his above questions, he asked the committee to consider a site visit whilst the Stadium lights are lit after dark to appreciate the full intensity of the lights.</p> <p>5.8.7 Similarly, in terms of noise he asked the Committee to not agree to the application until they have experienced it themselves.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>5.9 CM asked Cllr Hoare, as the Leader of the Northampton Borough Council (NBC), when a complaint goes to NBC with regards to the noise and light pollution, why does the Borough not enforce it to discontinue, as agreed in the conditions.</p> <p>5.10 Cllr Hoare advised that the situation is not enforceable when it is at this particular level. The Borough does not have officers who are available to ensure that the lights are switched off after each cricket match.</p> <p>5.11 Jerry Brown spoke for the application as a member of the public. The points he made are summarised as follows:</p> <p>5.11.1 He advised the Committee that he was representing Musco Sports Lighting.</p> <p>5.11.2 He informed the members that the error was unknown at the time the lights were erected.</p> <p>5.11.3 The impact of the error had not caused great adverse effect on the surrounding and residential areas.</p> <p>5.12 Sally Tagg spoke for the application as the application's planning advisor. The points he made are summarised as follows:</p> <p>5.14.1 She advised that the club were unaware of the positioning of the lights error until they were erected.</p> <p>5.14.2 She informed the Committee that a survey was taken on the light spill, which concluded that the light was further reduced, with the exception of one area, than the original predicted light spill levels.</p> <p>5.14.3 During the current season, it has been necessary for the club to use temporary generators to light the stadium, which will be rectified for the new</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>season.</p> <p>5.14.4 She stated that lighting and music has been present at the Cricket Ground for many years, and the new planning conditions control this more so than before.</p> <p>5.14.5 Individual officers at NBC deemed the lighting and music acceptable.</p> <p>5.14.6 The only element for material consideration is the sighting.</p> <p>5.14.7 The facilities are required for benefit of the spectators and users of the club.</p>	
5.13	JW asked Sally Tagg if she thought that the six lights of their size and height, if sighting was quite an important consideration, in a residential area.	
5.14	Sally Tagg told JW that she felt it was important, however the scheme was controversial when it was first proposed, and analysis of the positioning error proved to not be vastly different from the original plans.	
5.15	JW suggested that 10 meters was a considerable difference.	
5.16	CP advised that the conditions set out could be enforceable and monitored by NBC officers.	
5.17	JW asked CP about different views of lighting and areas on original plans, which supported the maintenance of surrounding vistas. He asked if the vistas had now been affected.	
5.18	CP informed JW that the conservation areas and vistas had been thoroughly examined and taken into consideration for the original application, and was considered to not have a great adverse affect on the conservation area.	
5.19	The Committee discussed the issue of the adverse affects that the lights had on the surrounding and	

	<p>residential areas.</p> <p>5.20 The Committee agreed that the application would be deferred to enable the members to witness the impact of the floodlights to the residents after dark, and would return to the next Committee in order to make a decision.</p> <p>A vote was taken and the members collectively voted for the application to be deferred to enable a site visit.</p> <p>IT WAS RESOLVED:</p> <p>That the application be DEFERRED for a site visit to be undertaken to enable the Committee members to witness the impact of the floodlights to the residents after dark.</p>	
Item 6	<p><u>Item 6: Land off Lancaster Way</u></p> <p>Applicant: Bovis Homes / Barry Howard Homes</p> <p>Application No: 07/0348/FULWNN</p> <p>Description: Residential development comprising 206no. dwellings</p> <p>Address: Land Off Lancaster Way Towcester Road Northampton Northamptonshire</p> <p>Ward: Delapre</p> <p>6.1 JH introduced the application and presented the update report. (Update report attached as Appendix A)</p> <p>6.2 Jamie Seamark spoke against the application as a member of the public. The points he made are summarised as follows:</p> <p>6.2.1 Mr Seamark informed the Committee that the Committee report for the application stated that</p>	Bernadette Owens

	<p>the application is compliant with local planning policy H6, however the policy states that the number of houses per hectare should be 30-35, but the number of houses per hectare for the application will be 41, which exceeds the number of houses per hectare within the surrounding residential areas.</p> <p>6.2.2 All residents for the proposed application will be using one access road.</p> <p>6.2.3 Mr Seamark informed the Committee that he had also discovered that the need for larger homes with 3 or more bedrooms is great in Northampton, however the application provides affordable homes with 1 or 2 bedrooms, not meeting demand.</p> <p>6.2.4 No separate access had been created for the application, which would be greatly needed. In Mr Seamark's opinion he felt that WNDC had lied in relation to the separate access road, and believed that such road will not be built.</p> <p>6.3 The Chair corrected Mr Seamark's comment that the WNDC officers lied about the application, she informed him that the officers would not lie in any circumstance.</p> <p>6.4 Mrs H Percival spoke on behalf of Jon Marsh who requested to speak against the application. The points she made are summarised as follows:</p> <p>6.4.1 Mrs Percival read from notes by Mr Marsh, he informed the Committee that the application would not fit within the surrounding area.</p> <p>6.4.2 The infrastructure would not support the new development, unless new access roads were created, which he felt was highly unlikely.</p> <p>6.4.3 Existing houses will be overlooked.</p> <p>6.4.4 He stated that there would be loss of security</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>for the area.</p> <p>6.4.5 Residents should have been consulted on a new access point to the site.</p> <p>6.4.6 Environmental impact assessment is needed.</p> <p>6.4.7 Density of housing is too high, not adequate access points.</p> <p>6.4.8 He stated that the application had too many problems, and asked the Committee to defer the application until the problems were addressed.</p> <p>6.5 Councillor Brendan Glynane spoke against the application as the Ward Councillor. The points he made are summarised as follows:</p> <p>6.5.1 The application is not compliant with Policy H6 in relation to density.</p> <p>6.5.2 He has been a resident of the area for many years and he believed, including the other residents, that the application was not fit to be passed, he asked the Committee to reject it.</p> <p>6.5.3 Access to the site has not been addressed correctly. Cllr Glynane had calculated that, should the application be passed, the total number of vehicles using the access road would be 3648.</p> <p>6.5.4 The roads will become unsafe. A safety barrier has been erected recently.</p> <p>6.6. CM asked Cllr Glynane what reasons he would give to reject the application.</p> <p>6.7. Cllr Glynane informed CM that he would reject the application on the basis of density, also the type of housing being built, he felt that there was too many houses with 1 or 2 bedrooms, and not enough houses with 3 or 4 bedrooms.</p> <p>6.8. JW asked Cllr Glynane how many 1-2 bedroom apartment/houses were on site.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>6.9. Cllr Glynane informed the Committee that around 50% of the housing was 1-2 bedroom apartment/houses.</p> <p>6.10. Barry Herrod spoke for the application as the applicant. The points he made are summarised as follows:</p> <p>6.10.1 A number of caveats have been resolved, however the Highways Agency still have an objection, which will be resolved as soon as possible.</p> <p>6.10.2 High density is caused by a high number of apartments. However, reduction to the density had originally been made.</p> <p>6.11. CM asked Mr Herrod what the original density was.</p> <p>6.12. Mr Herrod explained to CM that he couldn't give an "off the cuff" number for the original density.</p> <p>6.13. JH advised the Committee that Policy H6 does not specify a maximum amount of 30-35 houses.</p> <p>6.14. JH also advised the Committee that in total there would be 134 houses/apartments on site: 4 would be 1 bedroom, 45 would be 2 bed, 78 would be 3 bed, and 7 would be 4 bed.</p> <p>6.15. The Committee discussed the application, stating that affordable housing was very important, however, parking and access points would be an issue and would need to be resolved.</p> <p>6.16. DM stated that he felt the development was not suitable for the area, and the parking for the area was not adequate, therefore he abstained from the vote.</p> <p>6.17. A vote was taken by the remaining members of the Committee and collectively they voted for the application.</p> <p>IT WAS RESOLVED:</p> <p>That the application be APPROVED as per the officers' recommendations.</p>	
--	---	--

Item 7	<p><u>Item 7: River Nene Country Park</u></p> <p>Applicant: Homes and Communities Agency</p> <p>Application No: 10/0059/FULWNN</p> <p>Description: Change of use from agricultural land to Country Park, construction of car park and access road for the proposed River Nene Country Park.</p> <p>Address: Land To The West And East Of Upton Valley Way Northampton Northamptonshire</p> <p>Ward: West Hunsbury</p> <p>7.1 There were no updates to be presented to the Committee, and there were no speakers registered for the application.</p> <p>7.2 Therefore, a vote was taken and the members collectively voted for the application to be approved.</p> <p>IT WAS RESOLVED:</p> <p>That the application be APPROVED as per the officers' recommendations.</p>	Bernadette Owens
Item 8	<p>8. Future meeting dates were agreed to be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 9th November 2010 ● 7th December 2010 	

Item 9	<p>AOB</p> <p>There being no further business, the meeting closed at 18:10pm</p> <p>Amy Sales Committee Assistant</p> <p>Signed by the Chairman</p> <hr/>	
--------	---	--