



**Committee Members present:**

John Weir (JW) – Chair

David Dickinson (DD)

Councillor Tony Woods  
(TW)

Councillor Richard Church  
(RC)

Councillor Alan Hills (AH)

**In attendance:**

Adrian Arnold (AA) – Director  
of Planning Services

John Hill (JH) - Development  
Control Manager

Richard Murdock (RM) – Senior  
Planner

Ben Ellis – Daventry District  
Council Senior Environmental  
Health Practitioner

Amy Sales (AS) - Committee  
Secretary

---

# Daventry UDA Planning Committee Minutes

21<sup>st</sup> December 2010

This Public meeting was held on

21<sup>st</sup> December 2010

At

Council Chambers  
Daventry District Council  
Daventry

Reference	Minutes	Action
	The Chair opened the meeting at 6pm.	
Item 1	<b><u>Item 1: Apologies</u></b> Councillor Sandra Barnes, Councillor Wendy Amos, Councillor Catherine Boardman.	
Item 2	<b><u>Item 2: Declaration of interests</u></b> Councillor Richard Church declared a personal non-prejudicial interest for agenda item 4.	
Item 3	<b><u>Item 3: Minutes of the meeting held on 5<sup>th</sup> August 2009</u></b> <b>3.1 IT WAS AGREED:</b> That the minutes of the meeting held on 5 <sup>th</sup> August 2009 were a true and accurate record.	
Item 4	<b><u>Item 4: Waste Transfer Station</u></b> <b>Applicant:</b> SITA UK <b>Application No:</b> 10/0083/FULWND <b>Description:</b> Change of use of an existing industrial unit (Class Use B2/B8) to a Waste Transfer Station (WTS) /Material Recycling Facility (MRF) <b>Address:</b> Unit 6, Sopwith Way, Drayton Fields, Daventry, Northamptonshire, NN11 8PB <b>Ward:</b> Abbey North  4.1 RM introduced the application and presented the update report. (Update report attached as Appendix A) 4.2 Gary Bateson spoke against the application as a member of the public. The points he made are summarised as follows:  4.2.1 Location of the facility would have a negative impact on the local amenity and commercial viability. 4.2.2 Noise pollution will have a large detrimental effect to the surrounding community, which was not accurately documented within SITA's reports.	Richard Murdock

	<p>4.2.3 The smell from the proposed waste facility would travel and affect the air quality of the surrounding business and residential sites.</p> <p>4.2.4 Local residents visited the Buxton waste facility site and experienced overpowering smells.</p> <p>4.2.5 Mr Bateson asked the Committee to reject the application</p> <p>4.3 Roger Monk spoke against the application as a member of the public. The points he made are summarised as follows:</p> <p>4.3.1 As the Managing Director of a business which provides adhesive labels to many food and beverage products, he is required to ensure that his factory is hygienic, which includes reducing dust levels.</p> <p>4.3.2 The surrounding businesses of the existing High March and Buxton waste facility sites have complained of large amounts of dust, emitted by the waste facilities, entering their properties.</p> <p>4.3.3 Dust from the proposed waste facility site would jeopardise Mr Monk's and surrounding businesses.</p> <p>4.3.4 His company provides many jobs within the area, and relocation, as a result of the proposed facility, could put the jobs at risk.</p> <p>4.4 Councillor Chris Long spoke against the application as the Ward Councillor. The points he made are summarised as follows:</p> <p>4.4.1 Environmental problems resulting from the waste facility relocating to Sopwith Way would be severe; noise pollution, air pollution and pest</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>issues.</p> <p>4.4.2 SITA requested extended working hours for the waste facility, which would create increased noise levels early morning and late evening for the surrounding residents.</p> <p>4.4.3 Surrounding businesses deal with food products, the waste facility would create an unhygienic environment for those businesses.</p> <p>4.4.4 Urged the Committee to reject the application.</p> <p>4.5 Michelle Spruth spoke for the application as the Applicant. The points she made are summarised as follows:</p> <p>4.5.1 SITA UK has been searching for an appropriate site to manage Daventry's waste and recycling for 2 years.</p> <p>4.5.2 Northamptonshire County Council deemed the Sopwith Way site to be an appropriate site for the waste facility.</p> <p>4.5.3 SITA engaged with local residents for their views on the proposed site.</p> <p>4.5.4 SITA has undertaken assessments to determine the levels of sound pollution, odour and pest control. SITA found no major concerns with the issues, as the waste and the facilities would be enclosed inside the factory.</p> <p>4.6 DD asked Michelle Spruth about the environmental health impacts.</p> <p>4.7 Michelle Spruth proposed that any concerns can be addressed and solved.</p> <p>4.8 DD countered Michelle Spruth's response, he informed her that the Daventry District Council's Environmental</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>Health Officer had informed the Committee of errors in SITA's assessments.</p> <p>4.9 Michelle Spruth advised that a condition could be made and any errors in calculations could be recalculated.</p> <p>4.10 RC asked Michelle Spruth if the Committee could have confidence that the errors which were made could be corrected efficiently.</p> <p>4.11 Michelle Spruth advised that the existing facility had received no complaints about odour pre-submission of the application, the benefit of the Sopwith Way site is that it is enclosed, and therefore there would be less odour omitted.</p> <p>4.12 RC queried the errors at the existing site, which would be escalated at the larger Sopwith Way site.</p> <p>4.13 Michelle Spruth advised that SITA did not foresee the average waste within Daventry exceeding 35,000 tonnes per year, which would be enclosed, reducing the concerns the public residents have about the existing issues at the current High March site.</p> <p>4.14 AH stated that the calculations of the applicant should be accurate at the stage of Committee.</p> <p>4.15 TW asked Michelle Spruth for the recorded noise levels on average and during glass tipping.</p> <p>4.16 Michelle Spruth advised that the average was around 42 decibels and several times a day the noise levels would spike to around 100 decibels due to glass tipping.</p> <p>4.17 TW asked Michelle Spruth how the waste facility would maintain low dust levels.</p> <p>4.18 Michelle Spruth advised that the facility would be indoors, which would reduce the levels of dust.</p> <p>4.19 Ben Ellis clarified for the Committee and members of the public the possible issues around noise levels and odour to surrounding businesses and local residents</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>4.20 The Committee discussed the issues surrounding the application. Collectively they felt that the errors should not have been made by SITA during their assessments. The noise, dust, odour and possible pest problems would be a large issue, which possibly could not be successfully resolved. The site was not a suitable location for a waste facility.</p> <p>A vote was taken, the members unanimously voted to refuse the application.</p> <p><b>IT WAS RESOLVED:</b> That the application be <b>REFUSED</b> as per the officer's recommendations.</p>	
Item 5	<p>5. Future meeting dates were agreed to be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>8<sup>th</sup> February 2011</i></li> <li>• <i>10<sup>th</sup> March 2011</i></li> <li>• <i>5<sup>th</sup> April 2011</i></li> <li>• <i>3<sup>d</sup> May 2011</i></li> </ul>	
Item 6	<p><b>AOB</b></p> <p>There being no further business, the meeting closed at 18:55pm</p> <p>Amy Sales Committee Assistant</p> <p><b>Signed by the Chairman</b></p> <hr style="width: 20%; margin-left: 0;"/>	