



Northampton UDA Planning Committee Minutes

9th November 2010

Committee Members present:

Ann Tate (AT) – Chair

Councillor Chris Millar (CM)

John Weir (JW)

David Dickinson (DD)

Councillor Penny Flavell (PF)

Councillor Dennis Meredith
(DM)

Councillor Brian Markham
(BM)

In attendance:

Adrian Arnold (AA) – Director
of Planning Services

Stephen Webb (SW) – Legal
Adviser

John Hill (JH) – Head of
Development Management

Chris Preston (CP) – Principal
Development Manager

Amy Sales (AS) - Committee
Secretary

This Public meeting was held on

9th November 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	
Item 2	<u>Item 2: Declaration of interests</u> BM declared a personal interest for Item 6, and would not attend that Item. CM declared a personal, non-prejudicial interest for Item 4. JW declared a personal, non-prejudicial interest for Item 4. DD declared a personal, non-prejudicial interest for Item 5.	
Item 3	<u>Item 3: Minutes of the meeting held on 5th October 2010</u> 3.1 IT WAS AGREED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 5 th October 2010, were a true and accurate record, once grammatical and spelling errors had been corrected.	
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 AA apologised to the Committee and to the public for returning the application to Committee, this was due to an administrative error in failing to notify the ward member for the area of the application. This had now been done	Chris Preston

and his comments had been received on the application. AA then stated that WNDC had received a number of emails regarding the threat of a potential judicial review of a positive determination of the application and that the members needed to be aware of that. However, AA stated that he had taken legal advice and at this stage had not seen any grounds on which a judicial review was likely to be successful.

4.2 CP presented the update report and ran through the various points contained in it, in particular the need to give special attention to the impact on the St. Crispins Conservation Area, which officers had concluded was not adversely affected by the proposal. (Update report attached as Appendix A).

4.3 Brian Convery spoke against the application as a member of the public. The points he made are summarised as follows:

4.3.1 Mr Convery informed the Committee that he had received a letter from Northampton County Council (NCC) which stated that there were issues of congestion at particular locations within and around the application site, and the situation was being looked into by the Highways Authority.

4.3.2 At the 5th October 2010 Committee, the Chair (AT) questioned the traffic issues within the area, Mr Convery therefore felt that the Chair did not understand the area, and in his opinion, felt that it was unfair to make such comments.

4.3.3 St Luke's School currently causes major congestion and is not yet fully occupied. Therefore, should the houses be built, it would exacerbate the situation

further.

4.3.4 Berrywood Hospital has exceeded its parking capacity. This is proven by the overspill of cars from the car park parking on the Berrywood Drive, causing congestion.

4.3.5 The access road for the proposed development will cross land which is protected by the existing S106 agreement providing a Green for public open space. Northampton Borough Council's (NBC) planning department are in dispute with Taylor Wimpey over the issue of the entrance.

4.3.6 In Mr Convery's opinion, if the 80 houses were approved and built, the development will link with the Norwood Farm and Upton Lodge proposed developments, creating a "rat run" from the A4500 through to Duston.

4.4 CM asked to see the letter which Mr Convery received from NCC. He circulated this around the Committee members.

4.5 JW asked Mr Convery to elaborate on how the proposed development, if linked with Norwood Farm and Upton Lodge developments, would create a "rat run", as he did not believe, from viewing the plans, that a possible link road could be created.

4.6 Mr Convery advised that there is a cut through between houses on the site, which could create the link.

4.7 Roger Kingston spoke against the application as a member of the public. The points he made are summarised as follows:

4.7.1 Mr Kingston spoke on behalf of the Northants Residents Alliance.

4.7.2 He informed the Committee that he had the support of NBC Planning Committee, SNC Planning Committee, Andrea Leadsom MP, Cllr David Hugheston-Roberts, Cllr Paul Varnsberry, Cllr Richard Matthews, Upton Parish Council and the written submission from over 130 local residents.

4.7.3 He felt that WNDC officers continued to dismiss significant information given to them by the local authorities.

4.7.4 In his opinion, WNDC feared that the applicant may appeal if the application was rejected.

4.7.5 He stated that should the Committee vote to approve the application the Northamptonshire Residents Alliance will start a campaign against the members which would run until the local elections.

4.8 The Committee informed Mr Kingston that the application would be considered on the basis of the information contained in the Officers report and the update report.

4.9 Councillor Richard Matthews spoke against the application as the Ward Councillor. The points he made are summarised as follows:

4.9.1 There are already congestion problems within the St. Crispin estate.

4.9.2 The hospital and the school produce large amounts of traffic.

4.9.3 The addition of the Tesco Express store has generated more traffic including a large number of

	<p>deliveries. The plans originally showed that only small shops would be present on site, not a medium sized super market.</p> <p>4.9.4 The Highway Authority have stated that they hope to reduce the problem, but not eliminate it.</p> <p>4.10 Cllr David Hugheston-Roberts spoke against the application as the County Councillor. The points he made are summarised as follows:</p> <p>4.10.1 The current surrounding incomplete development should be completed before the proposed 80 houses are built.</p> <p>4.10.2 Access to the site from the St. Crispin development rather than Sandy Lane will cause significant traffic generation on already poorly designed and over crowded roads.</p> <p>4.10.3 Cllr Hugheston-Roberts asked the Committee to consider the lives of the residents of St. Crispin.</p> <p>4.11 Colin Williams spoke for the application as the applicant. The points he made are summarised as follows:</p> <p>4.11.1 Taylor Wimpey have been working closely with WNDC officers and have the support of officers at the Borough Council, who recently recommended the application for approval.</p> <p>4.11.2 Majority of objections were based around highways issues.</p> <p>4.11.3 The new development will provide a roundabout at Berrywood Road which will improve the road network.</p> <p>4.11.4 The access arrangements have been approved by the County Highways department, as the road</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>network is capable to accommodate the development.</p> <p>4.11.5 An additional overflow car park for the school is under construction.</p> <p>4.11.6 Taylor Wimpey will be delivering 28 affordable family homes to the area, in support of the 6215 applicants on the NBC housing register.</p> <p>4.11.7 Mr Williams requested the Committee to approve the application.</p> <p>4.12 DD asked Mr Williams about the ground stability of the site and if he thought there was an issue?</p> <p>4.13 Mr Williams advised that on site risk assessments had taken place and confirmed that there are no land stability issues that need to be taken into consideration. However, if properties should suffer as a result of any land stability issues, Taylor Wimpey would rectify any of the properties.</p> <p>4.14 DM asked Mr Williams what type of infrastructure would be put in place?</p> <p>4.15 Mr Williams advised that they have provided football pitches, Berrywood Park and the Memorial Gardens have been tidied up, the drainage system has be made safe, school and highway contributions have been made and six million pounds has been spent on the main retained buildings including the Clocktower.</p> <p>4.16 CM asked if Taylor Wimpey would be contributing to the local transport service?</p> <p>4.17 Mr Williams advised that they have contributed £100,000</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>for a bus service.</p> <p>4.18 In relation to Roger Kingston's comments, AA advised the Committee that any appeal by the applicant would not be transferred to NBC, as WNDC would be responsible for defending the decision. Also, WNDC's planning function has not been "abandoned"- some planning powers will be transferred to NBC in April 2011, the other wider powers for larger applications will stay with WNDC..</p> <p>4.19 The Committee discussed the proposal, including traffic issues, where the site access should be situated, the issue of land stability and the amount of local objection to the proposal. There was extensive debate regarding the County's views in relation to traffic congestion and the consultation response.</p> <p>4.20 AA advised that the Committee could make a decision as they had adequate information from NCC regarding highway issues.</p> <p>4.21 PF felt deeply concerned in relation to the congestion issues within St Crispin, and felt that the additional houses would exacerbate the situation and create more frustration for the residents.</p> <p>4.22 The Committee felt the additional affordable housing for the area would be a great benefit.</p> <p>4.23 DD asked if an Informative could be put in place relating to the land stability issue.</p> <p>4.24 CP agreed to an Informative being added.</p> <p>4.25 A vote was taken and two members of the Committee</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>voted against the application and five members voted for.</p> <p>IT WAS RESOLVED:</p> <p>That the application be APPROVED as set out in the report and the update report together with an appropriate S106 agreement and conditions, and with the addition of an Informative note to the applicants, drawing their attention to potential land stability issues on the site.</p>	
Item 5	<p>Item 5: Lings Way Meadow Hindu Temple</p> <p>Applicant: Indian Hindu Welfare Organization (IHWO)</p> <p>Application No: 09/0086/FULWNN</p> <p>Description: Erection of cultural and recreation centre to include Hindu Temple, multi-purpose hall, sports facilities, visitor centre and exhibition space, teaching spaces including library, creche, priest's house and six sheltered flats for over 55's. Externally, construction of access, parking, all weather sports pitch and landscaping including perimeter security fencing.</p> <p>Address: Lings Way Meadow Lings Way Northampton Northamptonshire NN3 8BE</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 Tony Tombling spoke against the application as a member of the public. The points he made are summarised as follows:</p> <p>5.2.1 Lings Wood meadow is an integral part of Lings Wood and Northampton.</p> <p>5.2.2 The wood is recognised as a haven for wildlife,</p>	Chris Preston

	<p>available to the wider public.</p> <p>5.2.3 Schools use the meadow and wood to teach the local children how to respect nature and wildlife.</p> <p>5.2.4 He has lived in the area for 30 years and his children grew up playing in the woods and meadow.</p> <p>5.2.5 He appreciated that the IHWO respects nature, however they will destroy the meadow to build the Temple.</p> <p>5.2.6 The meadow was maintained and mowed regularly.</p> <p>5.2.7 In 2009 the meadow was declared a local wildlife site by the Biodiversity Partnership.</p> <p>5.2.8 Consideration for bats has been addressed, but no provision has been made for invertebrates which the bats feed on.</p> <p>5.2.9 The application would destroy the wildlife within the area.</p> <p>5.3 Danny Parmar spoke in support of the application as a member of the public. The points he made are summarised as follows:</p> <p>5.3.1 He informed the Committee that he is a Committee member of the IHWO.</p> <p>5.3.2 The building was designed to enable use by the whole Northampton community.</p> <p>5.3.3 It will provide facilities and activities which will be used by the young and the old.</p> <p>5.3.4 The building will be an enterprise hub for inward investment from Countries such as India.</p> <p>5.3.5 Educational classes will be provided for all communities.</p> <p>5.3.6 It will have conference, wedding and banquet facilities.</p> <p>5.3.7 The building is eco-friendly, including solar panels</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>and ground source heat pumps. A wildlife garden will be included, as well as a grass roof, which will encourage insects, comparable to the meadow.</p> <p>5.3.8 The centre will provide youth facilities to deter anti-social behaviour to the surrounding areas.</p> <p>5.4 CM asked Mr Parmar if the wildlife garden would be available to the public?</p> <p>5.5 Mr Parmar advised that the police recommended that the garden should be enclosed, however, they had decided against that and the garden would be open to the public, with small hedgerows with gaps.</p> <p>5.6 Neelam Aggarwal spoke in support of the application as the applicant. The points she made are summarised as follows:</p> <p>5.6.1 Ms Aggarwal informed the Committee that the IHWO are passionate about helping the Northampton communities.</p> <p>5.6.2 The Temple includes community facilities which will inject life into the town.</p> <p>5.6.3 The facilities will be complimentary to the existing local facilities.</p> <p>5.6.4 There is a shortage of sports facilities in Northampton, the IHWO are trying to help to meet that demand.</p> <p>5.6.5 The building will be a landmark building for Northampton.</p> <p>5.7 DD stated that the building, its facilities and the gardens will require a vast amount of managing, he asked Ms Aggarwal if she felt the whole scheme could be efficiently managed.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>5.8 Ms Aggarwal informed DD that she thought it could be.</p> <p>5.9 The Committee discussed the benefits the proposed facilities would bring to the community, but stressed the importance of safeguarding the local wildlife as far as possible</p> <p>5.10 AA noted that the planning application did not include any individual business units and that while uses such as exhibitions and conferences could take place to support the inward investment function, any individual business use on the site would require a separate planning application.</p> <p>A vote was taken and all members voted for the application.</p> <p>IT WAS RESOLVED: That the application be APPROVED as set out in the report</p>	
Item 6	<p>Item 6: Northampton County Cricket Club</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>6.1 CP presented the update report. (Update report attached as Appendix A)</p>	Chris Preston

	<p>6.2 David Leventhal spoke against the application as a member of the public. The points he made are summarised as follows:</p> <p>6.2.1 The lights are not in keeping with the character of the area.</p> <p>6.2.2 They are intrusive when they are lit, and obtrusive when off.</p> <p>6.2.3 He requested the Committee to reject the application, or that the lights be re-erected in the correct positions as per the original plans.</p> <p>6.2.4 The lights should be mains powered before use, due to the level of noise the generators create.</p> <p>6.2.5 The grounds will become a “stadium” soon, as potential concerts are to be held there, creating further noise, light and traffic issues.</p> <p>6.2.6 He requested that the cricket grounds noise levels do not exceed 70 decibels.</p> <p>6.3 DD informed Mr Leventhal that the applicant had stated that the lights would be mains powered by January 2011, rather than generator powered.</p> <p>6.4 Mr Leventhal requested for the applicants statement to be put in writing by the Cricket Club.</p> <p>6.5 Councillor Brian Hoare spoke against the application as the Ward Councillor. The points he made are summarised as follows:</p> <p>6.5.1 He informed the Committee and Mr Leventhal that NCC had received, in writing, that the cricket ground would be connecting the lights to mains power by January 2011.</p> <p>6.5.2 Light pollution is a great concern to the residents.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>6.5.3 The ballast boxes should be moved away from eye level.</p> <p>6.5.4 The sky level view is unacceptable and has a large negative impact on the area.</p> <p>6.5.5 Relationships between the residents and NCCC need to improve.</p> <p>6.6 Mark Tagg spoke for the application as CEO of the NCCC. The points he made are summarised as follows:</p> <p>6.6.1 NCCC holds one eighteenth of cricket matches in England.</p> <p>6.6.2 The lights are essential at the ground, as the matches are aired on television.</p> <p>6.6.3 The lights are turned down to evacuation level once the matches and post match interviews are complete.</p> <p>6.6.4 The procedures are the same if the matches are aired on television or not.</p> <p>6.6.5 NCCC is now considered one of the leaders in County cricket.</p> <p>6.7 CM asked Mr Tagg how he thought communication between the residents and NCCC could improve to mitigate the current issues.</p> <p>6.8 Mr Tagg informed the Committee that he had agreed with Councillor Hoare to hold meetings with local residents to discuss issues.</p> <p>6.9 Alan Burgess spoke for the application as the applicant. The points he made are summarised as follows:</p> <p>6.9.1 He informed the Committee that he was the project manager for the instillation of the lights at</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>the cricket ground.</p> <p>6.9.2 The original locations for the lights were troubled with site restraints, therefore, he believed moving the lights a minimal distance would not cause a problem.</p> <p>6.9.3 They discovered that the original drawings were not accurate.</p> <p>6.9.4 Columns were moved in the best interest of the club.</p> <p>6.9.5 He ensured that the new locations of the lights did not increase the spill light out of the grounds.</p> <p>6.10 AT asked why the installation of the lights continued after he had realised the locations were incorrect.</p> <p>6.11 Mr Burgess informed the Chair that he had a very short amount of time to install them, and he did not believe the new locations would cause any problems.</p> <p>6.12 JW updated the Committee on the Committee site visit to the club and residents homes, before and after dark. He felt that there were no major adverse effects to the surrounding vistas, however he sympathised with the residents and stated that the club needed to work in partnership with the residents.</p> <p>6.13 The Committee agreed that NCCC needed to communicate and work more effectively with the local residents, and ensure that the light and sound levels are reduced as per the agreed conditions.</p> <p>6.14 PF felt the clubs actions in relation to the incorrect positioning of the lights and the treatment towards the</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>public was unacceptable, therefore she decided to abstain from the vote.</p> <p>A vote was taken by the remaining members of the Committee and they voted for the application.</p> <p>IT WAS RESOLVED: That the application be APPROVED as set out in the officer's report.</p>	
Item 7	<p>7. Future meeting dates were agreed to be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7th December 2010 • 25th January 2010 • 22nd February 2010 	
Item 8	<p>AOB</p> <p>There being no further business, the meeting closed at 20:30pm</p> <p>Amy Sales Committee Assistant</p> <p>Signed by the Chairman</p> <hr style="width: 20%; margin-left: 0;"/>	