



**Committee Members present:**

Cllr Sandra Barnes (SB) –  
Chair

John Weir (JW)

Deirdre Newham (DN)

Cllr Wendy Amos (WA)

Cllr Deanna Eddon (DE)

Cllr Alan Hills (AH)

**In attendance:**

Eric Owens (EO) –  
Development Team Manager

Andrew Smith (AS) –  
Development Management  
Officer

Richard Murdock (RM) -  
Principal Project Development  
Manager

Chris Hills(CH) – Daventry  
District Council

Amy Sales (ALS) - Committee  
Secretary

Marzena Guzda (MG) –  
Assistant Secretary

---

# Daventry UDA Planning Committee Minutes

26<sup>th</sup> July 2011

This Public meeting was held on

26<sup>th</sup> July 2011

At

Council Chambers  
Daventry District Council  
Daventry

Reference	Minutes	Action
	The Chair opened the meeting at 6.05pm.	
Item 1	<p><b><u>Item 1: Apologies</u></b></p> <p>Apologies were received from Cllr Tony Woods and Cllr Richard Church</p> <p>Deirdre Newham was appointed as a substitute</p>	
Item 2	<p><b><u>Item 2: Declaration of interests</u></b></p> <p>DE declared a personal non-prejudicial interest for Item 6, AH declared a personal non-prejudicial interest for Item 4.</p>	
Item 3	<p><b><u>Item 3: Minutes of the meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> April 2011</u></b></p> <p><b>3.1 IT WAS AGREED:</b> That the minutes of the meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> April 2011 were a true and accurate record.</p>	
Item 4	<p><b><u>Item 4: The Knoll</u></b></p> <p><b>Applicant:</b> Daventry District Council</p> <p><b>Application No:</b> 06/0180/OUTWND</p> <p><b>Description:</b> Outline planning application for high tech industrial development involving the formation of development plateau and new access to South March. All matters reserved except for access and landscaping (to include earth plateau works and structural planting only).</p> <p><b>Address:</b> The Knoll, South March, Daventry, NN11 4PH</p> <p><b>Ward:</b> Daventry Hill</p> <p>4.1 AS introduced the application and presented the update report. (attached as Appendix A)</p> <p>4.2 JW asked AS for clarification if Condition 15 should have read Condition 22 in the update report.</p> <p>4.3 AS confirmed that Condition 15 should have read Condition 22.</p> <p>4.4 SB asked CH why it would be difficult to achieve a BREEM</p>	Andrew Smith

	<p>'Excellent' rating.</p> <p>4.5 CH stated that it would be hard to achieve it due to the site characteristics which are outside of the applicant's control.</p> <p>4.6 SB asked if the footpath, which runs through the site, was used.</p> <p>4.7 CH advised that the footpath is only used by local workforce and is not a formally designated footpath.</p> <p>4.8 AH asked if there were any changes to be made to the indicative layout as approved originally.</p> <p>4.9 AS informed that there were no changes to the indicative layout.</p> <p>4.10 Cllr Chris Over (CO) spoke on behalf of the local residents in his capacity as an Abbey South Ward Councillor and raised the following points:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">4.10.1 CO supported the proposed development of the site in principal. He felt it was an attractive site and an important gateway to Daventry, therefore careful consideration should be given to the appropriate use and design of the proposal.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">4.10.2 The scheme should be an exemplar development that residents of Daventry would be proud of.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">4.10.3 Wherever possible the development should include the retention of established mature trees.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">4.10.4 He was concerned with the 'general industrial use' which had been proposed for the site.</p> <p>4.11 EO confirmed that the reserved matters application(s) would need to be submitted and details such as design and</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>use would need to be approved through either planning condition's or a new application. B2 uses can be designed to a high quality.</p> <p>4.12 CO emphasised that the site is of high value and should be used in the best possible way. He thought that the general industrial use would be more appropriate in other locations of Daventry.</p> <p>4.13 AH agreed with CO.</p> <p>4.14 JW agreed with CO that high quality design should be achieved on the site. However, due to surrounding industrial uses the proposed development appeared to be appropriate. He was concerned over the amount of earth works required to create the plateaus, he felt there would be a need for a Condition to secure the works.</p> <p>4.15 JW was in support of the S106 contribution towards the Daventry relief road.</p> <p>4.16 SB raised concerns over the ground levels and stressed that it will be DDC building control officers' responsibility to ensure that the buildings are built at the right levels.</p> <p>4.17 CH confirmed that engineers will be supervising the work to ensure that development is carried out at the right level. He also confirmed that large machinery will be used during the construction phase and that a cut and fill technique shall be utilised to minimise the amount of material to be removed from the site.</p> <p>4.18 EO clarified that in the interests of controlling noise and dust a Construction Management Plan Condition could be appropriate. He also stated that the Environmental Health Officer had no concerns with regard to dust.</p> <p>4.19 EO continued to say that Conditions 19 and 20 ask for an Ecological Management Plan and a Construction Ecological Management Plan respectively which deals with issues of noise and dust. However, if members felt that the</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>Construction Management Plan was appropriate, then the Condition could be added to the recommendation.</p> <p>4.20 WA emphasised that the site is a prominent site, which deserves prestigious design. Although this is not a reserved matters application, it is important to stress what is expected from the development; it should be a marker for Daventry. WA also raised her concerns about the security fencing especially during the construction phase. She also welcomed the contribution towards the relief road.</p> <p>4.21 JW asked for clarification on the design. The outline application shows 7 or 8 small buildings, he asked if it would be possible that a reserved matters application for one large building could be submitted instead.</p> <p>4.22 AA confirmed that a large building would require a new and separate application if the form of development was considered to be significantly different to what is shown on the submitted plans. However, it would not be ruled out as a possible design. The wider impacts of such proposals would need to be considered. AA added that a note about high quality design can be added as an informative for the applicant's attention. He also pointed out that there is no evidence that a building for B2 use cannot be designed to a high standard.</p> <p>4.23 SB asked if an archaeological survey had been carried out on the site and what would happen if developers were to find anything of significance? Is it possible that the development would cease?</p> <p>4.24 EO confirmed that an appropriately worded Condition could be added to control any archaeological eventuality.</p> <p>4.25 EO asked the members for their position on adding a Construction Management Plan Condition and an Archaeology Condition.</p> <p>4.26 All members agreed to the additional Conditions.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>4.27 SB expressed the need to plant native trees in the area and not just municipal planting. To be added as an informative.</p> <p>4.28 The Chair asked for the members to make their decisions.</p> <p>4.29 All committee members gave their support on the officer's recommendation for approval.</p> <p><b>IT WAS RESOLVED:</b></p> <p>That the application be <b>APPROVED</b> subject to the addition of an appropriately worded Construction Management Plan, Archaeology Conditions, Informatives on Design and Native Planting.</p>	
Item 5	<p><b><u>Item 5: Land To The North Of Ford Parts Distribution Centre</u></b></p> <p><b>Applicant:</b> Ford Motor Company Limited</p> <p><b>Application No:</b> 11/0038/OUTWND</p> <p><b>Description:</b> Outline planning application for development to provide up to 23,000 sq metres of B2 (General Industrial) and/or B8 (Storage and Distribution) with ancillary offices, and providing associated servicing and car parking. All matters reserved except for Access.</p> <p><b>Address:</b> Land To The North Of Ford Parts Distribution Centre Royal Oak Way South Royal Oak Daventry</p> <p><b>Ward:</b> Drayton</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>THE ITEM WAS DEFERRED</b></p>	
Item 6	<p><b><u>Item 6: Ford Training Centre Site</u></b></p> <p><b>Applicant:</b> Ford Motor Company Limited</p> <p><b>Application No:</b> 11/0032/OUTWND</p> <p><b>Description:</b> Outline planning application for development to provide up to 28,000 sq metres of B2 (General Industrial) and/or B8 (Storage and Distribution) with ancillary offices, and providing associated servicing and car parking. All matters reserved except for Access.</p> <p><b>Address:</b> Ford Training Centre Site and associated land, Royal Oak Industrial Estate, Royal Oak Way South, Daventry, Northants, NN11 8NT</p>	Andrew Smith

**Ward:** Drayton

- 6.1 AS introduced the application and presented the update report. (attached as Appendix A)
- 6.2 Cllr Colin Poole (CP) spoke on behalf of the local residents in his capacity as a Drayton Ward Councillor and raised the following points:
  - 6.2.1 CP referred to the Daventry ring road. He felt that the proposed entrance to the site on Leamington Way would not be sustainable due to the existing levels of traffic on the road.
  - 6.2.2 Braunston Road, which links to Leamington Way, had become a “rat run” via the A361 to the M40 South.
  - 6.2.3 He felt that keeping the entrance to the site on Royal Oak Way South would be sensible, as there is less traffic.
- 6.3 Cllr Ann Dunn (AD) spoke on behalf of the local residents in his capacity as a Drayton Ward Councillor and raised the following points:
  - 6.3.1 AD expressed her concern over drains flooding when Fords grounds have flooded in the past.
  - 6.3.2 She suggested that planting in the north part of the site should be used to prevent future flooding.
  - 6.3.3 She informed the Committee that a large traffic incident involving air ambulances had occurred in the area recently, as people speed along the adjacent roads. She stated that the proposed cycleway would be a positive addition. In addition, the visual impact of the development on a key gateway to Daventry should be carefully considered.

	<p>6.4 EO advised that the Highways Agency had no issues with safety on the surrounding roads and flooding has been covered in Officer's report.</p> <p>6.5 CP said that the need for camouflage was important. He felt that the hedges should be replaced with evergreen trees. He also raised concerns over the potential for light pollution.</p> <p>6.5 EO advised that the hedgerows were deemed an acceptable screen from the building. Lighting will be controlled by a condition attached to future reserved matters application(s). Highways Agency have taken into consideration that Daventry's population will grow over the coming years, therefore a Travel Plan has been added as a Condition. A Flooding Condition has also been added and the proposal includes swales/attenuation ponds that will help with the issue. More detailed proposals will be submitted with reserved matters application(s).</p> <p>6.6 Matthew Brewer spoke For the application on behalf of the developer and raised the following points:</p> <p>6.7.1 He advised that Ford has assessed the usage of the land to best contribute to new development and employment in Daventry. Soft marketing has been undertaken and the indicative scheme is designed to meet market requirements.</p> <p>6.7.2 Ford have identified the potential of relocating the existing Training Centre within the Parts Distribution Centre</p> <p>6.7.3 Ford are looking to ensure the best design to meet current market requirements.</p> <p>6.7.4 Negotiations have been held with surrounding occupiers with regards to the landscaping of the site.</p> <p>6.7.5 Proposed new access routes for cycles and</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>pedestrians.</p> <p>6.7.6 Acceleration and deceleration lanes and an island will be added to prevent motorists turning right into the site.</p> <p>6.8 AH asked what the buildings operating hours would be.</p> <p>6.9 MB advised that it would be a 24hr operation baseline due to the current market demands. Thus the Noise Assessment has been based on the 24hr operation. This would be obviously the worst case scenario; it doesn't mean that the future occupiers couldn't operate in a different capacity.</p> <p>6.10 SB asked if the buildings would be sold.</p> <p>6.11 MB confirmed that they would be sold. Therefore the reserved matters applications will come forward from the future occupiers.</p> <p>6.12 JW felt the site needed to create a visual impact. The elevations facing the Leamington Way have to be very prestigious. A standardised approval is not good enough for this site. He proposed the addition of a grand feature to show the entrance of the site at the south east corner of the eastern unit.</p> <p>6.13 SB felt that the elevation designs could do better. There is an opportunity to make a statement.</p> <p>6.14 WA stated that a market for design quality must be put down prior to the site being handed from Ford.</p> <p>6.15 DE questioned if the accelerator lane onto Leamington Way is of sufficient length.</p> <p>6.16 MB advised that the acceleration/deceleration lanes will fulfil their purpose, incorporate visibility splays and comply with LHA requirements.</p> <p>6.17 EO asked the members if they would be happy to add a Condition requiring the submission of a Design Study to ensure best practice.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>6.18 All members agreed.</p> <p>6.19 The Chair asked for the members to make their decisions</p> <p>6.20 All committee members gave their support on the officer's recommendation for approval.</p> <p><b>IT WAS RESOLVED:</b></p> <p>That the application be <b>APPROVED</b> subject to the addition of a Design Study Condition.</p>	
Item 7	<p>7. Future meeting dates were agreed to be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>13<sup>th</sup> September 2011</i></li> <li>• <i>1<sup>th</sup> October 2011</i></li> <li>• <i>8<sup>th</sup> November 2011</i></li> <li>• <i>15<sup>th</sup> December 2011</i></li> </ul>	
Item 6	<p><b>AOB</b></p> <p>The Committee thanked the Chair (SB) for her support to the Development Control and Planning Committee process, as the evening's Committee was her last committee with WNDC.</p> <p>There being no further business, the meeting closed at 7:40pm</p> <p>Amy Sales Committee Assistant</p> <p><b>Signed by the Chairman</b></p> <hr style="width: 20%; margin-left: 0;"/>	

## Appendix A

### COMMITTEE UPDATE

Daventry UDA Planning Committee

26<sup>th</sup> July 2011

#### **General Update:**

The Draft National Planning Policy Framework has been published for consultation. It will, once adopted, replace all existing PPG's and PPS's. The key theme running through the document is that there will be a presumption in favour of sustainable development and that this will form the basis for every plan and decision. This takes forward the thrust of some recent Ministerial announcements regarding planning and growth. There is nothing within the draft document that would alter the content and recommendations set out in the report.

#### **Agenda Item 4:**

Application Number: 06/0180/OUTWND

The Knoll, South March, Daventry, NN11 4PH

Applicant: Daventry District Council

#### **Comments received from the applicant 19/07/2011, summarised as follows:**

Condition 15 makes reference to the attainment of a BREEAM 'Excellent' rating. Should this not read as a 'Very Good' rating? Achieving 'Excellent' would be extremely difficult on this site.

#### **Officer Response:**

The applicant has been made aware that the Corporation's Sustainability Manual makes reference to the benchmarking of BREEAM 'Excellent' for non-residential schemes totalling 2,500 sq m and above of gross floor space. The applicant's attention has been drawn to the flexible wording of the condition,

which allows for an alternative rating to potentially be negotiated post-decision. For this to occur the applicant would be required to submit thorough written justification explaining the reasons why an 'Excellent' rating cannot be achieved. This could potentially include a review of the site's constraints or involve viability assessment if the costs of achieving an 'Excellent' rating is prohibitively expensive in the context of the financial model of the scheme. The wording of Condition 15 as worded within the report is considered to be robust and acceptable.

**Further Officer update:**

On another issue, in light of the Local Highway Authority requesting measures to be implemented to prevent on street parking within the development it is recommended that a further condition be applied to require a Car Parking Strategy to be submitted. This is considered prudent in light of the 98m of access road that would be permitted as a consequence of the recommendation. Condition 27 is proposed as follows:

*Prior to the commencement of development a Car Parking Strategy shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Strategy shall be implemented prior to first occupation and retained thereafter.*

*Reason: In the interests of highway safety.*

**Agenda Item 5: DEFERRED**

Application Number: 10/0038/OUTWND

Land to the North of Ford Parts Distribution Centre, Royal Oak Way South, Daventry, NN11 8NT

Applicant: Ford Motor Company Limited

This item has now been deferred from tonight's committee meeting on the request of the applicant. This deferral offers the opportunity for further discussions to be held between officers, the applicants and statutory consultees in respect to potential amendments and further information to allow for the application to be brought back to Committee with a positive recommendation for approval.

**Agenda Item 6:**

Application Number: 10/0032/OUTWND

Ford Training Centre and associated land, Royal Oak Way South, Daventry, NN11 8NT

Applicant: Ford Motor Company Limited

**Comments received from the applicant 21/07/2011, summarised as follows:**

The recommendation for approval is welcomed. However, it should be noted that this application is not being made by a specific operator or developer. The wording of some of the recommended conditions place constraints upon the potential form and detailed design of the development to come forward at reserved matters stage. The indicative scheme put forward provides one of the potential approaches for accommodating the set out area of B2/B8 floor space. There are however a range of options that may be feasible depending on the specific requirements of the occupier(s) coming forward. For example, a range of smaller industrial units or a different configuration to meet specific needs may be accommodated within the site. Flexibility is sought to ensure that the site can be appropriately marketed to attract potential operators and to ensure that the detailed scheme can meet their specific needs.

Condition 6 restricts the proposals to 2no. units and to general conformity with the indicative site layout plan. It is considered that specific reference to these requirements should be omitted. Flexibility should also be incorporated within the wording of Condition 6 in respect to distance specifications so as to offer the opportunity for the consideration of an alternative scheme at reserved matters stage. For example, this may propose buildings of a lower height and less visual impact.

Condition 9 ensures an appropriate visual appearance of Unit B at the eastern boundary of the site. The wording of the condition should be amended so as to allow for a reconfigured scheme with potentially more units. It should refer to the eastern end of the most easterly located building within the site.

Condition 15 refers to the submission of a Sustainability Strategy detailing a method of achievement of BREEAM 'Excellent'. Having considered the guidance contained within the Corporation's Sustainability Manual it is considered that the wording of the condition should provide flexibility to allow for justification to be provided if the desired level is not achievable.

**Officer Response:**

Officers accept that the scheme is in outline form with all matters reserved apart from Access. It is noted that there shall exist at reserved matters stage the opportunity for the local planning authority to control the layout, scale, appearance and landscaping of the scheme. Notwithstanding this, the present wording of Condition 6 reflects the negotiations and amendments that have occurred since the scheme was first submitted. The initial scheme put forward was considered by officers to constitute an overdevelopment of the site with amenity issues raised by way of the close placement of buildings in respect to certain boundaries of the site.

The latest Site Layout plan being put forward for approval details the scale of proposals to be acceptably accommodated within the site without being overbearing or overshadowing in respect to its surrounding landforms and built environment .i.e. this establishes maximum parameters. The Site Layout plan also details how servicing areas, car parking areas and sustainable urban drainage systems can be accommodated in association with the main built form. Officers consider that the scheme represents the optimum level and form of development for the site in terms of allowing for the maximum level and positions of built floor space without being visually/ environmentally detrimental or harmful to the amenities of neighbouring occupiers.

Nevertheless, it is reasonable to recommend a slight revision to the present condition, as drafted, to allow for flexibility to respond to market demand. It is proposed to amend the condition to allow for changes to the parameters set, through agreement with the local planning authority. This flexibility will not detract from the rigorous assessment undertaken nor allow for any future submission to move away from the scale/ position of development tested without significant justification nor approval by the Planning Authority.

It is proposed that the wording of Condition 6 is revised as follows:

*The detailed proposals to come forward at reserved matters stage shall take the form of 2no. freestanding Units located on either side of the new vehicular access hereby approved on to Leamington Way in general conformity with the indicative Site Layout plan (ref: 2294-26 Rev E) unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No part of the built extent of Unit A (excluding surface treatment) shall be positioned within 25m of the western boundary of the site (bounding the rear of properties fronting Browns Lane) unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No part of the built extent of either Unit A or Unit B (excluding surface treatment) shall be positioned within 50m of the northern edge of Leamington Way unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No part of the built extent of Unit B (excluding surface*

*treatment) shall be positioned within 50m of the western edge of Royal Oak Way South unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.*

**Reason:** *In the interests of protecting both visual and residential amenity in compliance with Policies GN1, GN2, and EN12 & EN42.*

In respect to Condition 9, the issue raised by the applicant is acknowledged. It is recommended that this condition be amended to refer to the eastern end of the most easterly located building as requested by the applicant. This would allow for a design feature to be secured to the Royal Oak Way / Leamington Way roundabout whilst not compromising any potential reconfiguration of the scheme. It is proposed that the wording of Condition 9 is revised as follows:

*The eastern end of the most easterly located building shall incorporate (a) design feature(s) such as feature glazing, pillaring or towering that enable that area of the building to be differentiated from the remainder of the building in question. Full details of which shall be submitted at reserved matters stage (relating to appearance).*

**Reason:** *In the interests of providing high quality design at a readily visible area of the site in compliance with Policies GN2 & EN42 of the Daventry Local Plan (1997).*

The present wording of Condition 15 already allows flexibility for an alternative rating to BREEAM 'Excellent' to be achieved. The applicant would be required to submit thorough written justification explaining the reasons why an 'Excellent' rating cannot be achieved. This is consistent with the situation explained for Agenda Item 4 above. The present wording of Condition 15 should be maintained.

#### **Further Officer update:**

Paragraph 8.1 of the Committee report refers to the receipt of 7no. neighbour responses. There were in fact 8no. responses. The summary of the responses contained within the Committee report remains accurate.

In respect to S106, paragraph 8.45 refers to the County Council's request for a contribution to cover the installation of 4no. fire hydrants. Officers have noted within the report that fire suppression measures are not normally secured by way of a planning obligation. However, further discussions with colleagues at the County Council have highlighted that there may be a justification for such a contribution given that the County Council may be liable to cover the costs of such installations. This issue shall be considered in full during the future negotiation of the associated S106 agreement.

DRAFT