

# NORTHAMPTON BOROUGH COUNCIL

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 29 July 2014

**PRESENT:** Councillor Oldham (Chair); Councillor Lynch (Deputy Chair);  
Councillors Aziz, I. Choudary, N Choudary, Ford, Golby, Lane, Mason  
and Palethorpe

### 1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Meredith.

### 2. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 17<sup>th</sup> July 2014 were agreed and signed by the Chair.

### 3. DEPUTATIONS / PUBLIC ADDRESSES

**RESOLVED:** That under the following items the members of the public listed be granted leave to address the Committee.

- N/2013/0912 - Land for redevelopment Nunn Mills Road  
Neil Rowley (Savills)
- N/2014/0475 - University of Northampton, Park Campus Boughton Green  
Road  
Pasquale Renda (Resident)  
Cllr Beardsworth  
Neil Rowley (Savills)
- N/2014/0600 - Land at Former Honda Car dealership between Compton  
Street and Grafton Street  
Cllr Stone (Ward member)  
Clive Ireson (Neighborhood Forum)  
Andy Ward (Agent)
- N/2014/0607 - 1 Spyglass Hill  
Cllr Larratt (Ward Member)  
Gary Turner (Resident)  
John Davis (Resident)  
Lisa Davey (Applicant)  
Kevin Hodnett (Resident)
- N/2014/0617 - Pig And Whistle PH, Blackthorn Bridge Court  
Tony Potts (Resident)  
Kathryn White (Blackthorn Good Neighbours)
- N/2014/0621 & N/2014/0622 - 87 St Giles Street

Cllr Stone (Ward member)  
Rod Kilsby (Agent)  
Gary Bees (Applicant)

#### **4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST/PREDETERMINATION**

Councillor Mason declared a personal, non-prejudicial interest in item 10e. She could however approach the matter with an open mind and without any predetermination.

The Director of Regeneration and Planning declared a pecuniary and prejudicial interest in items 10e. He advised the Committee that he would leave the meeting during the presentation and deliberation of this item.

#### **5. MATTERS OF URGENCY WHICH BY REASON OF SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES THE CHAIR IS OF THE OPINION SHOULD BE CONSIDERED**

None

#### **6. LIST OF CURRENT APPEALS AND INQUIRIES**

The Head of Planning submitted a List of Current Appeals and Inquiries.

The Development Manager introduced the written report and elaborated thereon.

**RESOLVED:** That the report be noted

#### **7. OTHER REPORTS**

None

#### **8. NORTHAMPTONSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL APPLICATIONS**

None

#### **9. NORTHAMPTON BOROUGH COUNCIL APPLICATIONS**

##### **(A) N/2014/0695 - SIXFIELDS STADIUM, WALTER TULL WAY: NON-ILLUMINATED FREE STANDING HOARDING**

The Planning Development Manager outlined the report of the Head of Planning, as set out in the agenda. The recommendation was for approval subject to standard advert conditions.

The Committee discussed the application.

**RESOLVED:** That the application be **APPROVED** subject to the conditions set out in the report.

#### **10. ITEMS FOR DETERMINATION**

The Chair advised the Committee that item 10e would be taken first, followed by the remaining items in agenda order.

**(E) N/2014/0617 - PIG AND WHISTLE PUBLIC HOUSE, BLACKTHORN BRIDGE COURT: CHANGE OF USE FROM PUBLIC HOUSE (A4 ) INTO CHILDCARE COMMUNITY NURSERY (D1) TO INCLUDE THE INSTALLATION OF ENTRANCE DOORS, NEW NORTH FACING WINDOW OPENINGS AND THE ADDITION OF SOLAR PANELS TO THE EAST FACING ROOF SLOPE**

The Director of Regeneration and Planning left the meeting for the duration of the item.

The Planning Development Manager outlined the report of the Head of Planning, as set out in the agenda and addendum. The recommendation was for approval of the application subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

The Chair invited Tony Potts, local resident, to address the Committee. Mr Potts outlined the history of the development of public houses on the eastern estates of Northampton since 1972. He believed that the pubs served as a focus for local trade, were a community amenity and helped reduce criminality in the local area.

The Chair invited Katheryn White, Manager of Blackthorn Good Neighbours (BGN), to address the Committee. Ms White explained that the need for nursery places was established and BGN would supply new provision, develop a community amenity and encourage volunteering. Closing the pub was not the aim, but the premises had been marketed for sale by the current owners for several years.

In response to questions from the Committee Ms White supplied the following information:

- £100,000 funding for Phase I of the project was secured.
- Capacity at the nursery was 64, taking 32 children in the morning and the same in the afternoon.

In response to questions from the Committee the Planning Development Manager supplied the following information:

- The car park spaces are not currently marked, but the nursery would make use of a short term drop off point. They also expected most parents and children to walk to the nursery.

The Committee discussed the report.

**RESOLVED:** That the application be **APPROVED** subject to the conditions set out in the report.

**(A) N/2013/0912 - LAND FOR REDEVELOPMENT AT NUNN MILLS ROAD: OUTLINE PLANNING PERMISSION FOR REDEVELOPMENT OF THE SITE AS A NEW CAMPUS FOR THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTHAMPTON, INCLUDING SITE CLEARANCE AND ENABLING WORKS COMPRISING REMEDIATION AND RE-LEVELING OF THE SITE, DEMOLITION OF ALL BUILDINGS ON THE SITE (EXCEPT THE GRADE II LISTED STRUCTURES). THE PROPOSAL INCLUDES UP TO 40,000M2**

**UNIVERSITY FLOORSPACE (ALL FLOORSPACE IS GEA); UP TO 15,000M2 UNIVERSITY EXPANSION FLOORSPACE; UP TO 35,000M2 COMMERCIAL (B1) FLOORSPACE; UP TO 3,550M2 OF RETAIL FLOORSPACE (UP TO 1800M2 OF A1, UP TO 150M2 OF A2, AND UP TO 1600M2 A3/A4); UP TO 1,500 BEDS OF STUDENT ACCOMMODATION; UP TO 760 CAR PARKING SPACES FOR UNIVERSITY USE; UP TO 1,100 CAR PARKING SPACES FOR COMMERCIAL / LEISURE USE; A HOTEL OF UP TO 7,000M2 (UP TO 150 BEDROOMS); FLOODLIT SPORTS FACILITIES; REUSE OF LISTED LOCOMOTIVE SHED (520M2) AND CURTILAGE LISTED OFFICE BUILDING; AN ENERGY CENTRE OF UP TO 600M2; A NEW ROAD BRIDGE AND JUNCTION ON TO BEDFOR**

The Senior Planning Officer outlined the report of the Head of Planning, as set out in the agenda and addendum. The recommendation was for approval in principle, subject to the prior completion of a S106 agreement and subject to the conditions set out in the report.

The Chair invited Neil Rowley, agent for the applicant, to address the Committee. Mr Rowley explained that the scheme was basically as previously approved, with improvements as suggested by the Highways Authority.

In response to questions from the Committee Mr Rowley supplied the following information:

- The applicant was still open to discussions with the Sea Cadets with regard to access to their facilities.
- The hotel will be a commercial venture and will only come forward if the market demands.

In response to questions from the Committee the Senior Planning Officer supplied the following information:

- The sports provision will be concentrated in the south-east corner of the site.
- Sport England was now happy with the provision at the site.

The Committee discussed the report.

**RESOLVED:** That the application be **APPROVED IN PRINCIPLE** subject to the conditions set out in the report and the addendum.

**(B) N/2014/0475 - UNIVERSITY OF NORTHAMPTON PARK CAMPUS, BOUGHTON GREEN ROAD: OUTLINE APPLICATION (WITH ALL MATTERS RESERVED EXCEPT ACCESS) FOR THE DEMOLITION OF EXISTING UNIVERSITY FACILITIES AND ERECTION OF NEW BUILDINGS COMPRISING RESIDENTIAL ACCOMMODATION (C3) UP TO 800 UNITS AND ASSOCIATED DEVELOPMENT**

The Senior Planning Officer outlined the report of the Head of Planning, as set out in the agenda and addendum. He advised that after the publication of the addendum the Environment Agency confirmed that they now no longer had any objection

regarding any potential flood risk. The recommendation was for approval in principle, subject to the prior completion of a S106 agreement and the conditions set out in the report.

The Chair invited Pasquale Renda, local resident, to address the Committee. Mr Renda advised that his was not a full blooded opposition, but he wished to raise the issues of potential increased traffic, dust and noise pollution during the build and his wish that the University of Northampton (UoN) not dominate the decision making processes of the town.

In response to questions from the Committee Mr Renda supplied the following information:

- He has lived in the area since childhood and currently lived a ½ mile from the site.
- He accepted UoN was an asset, but should not dominate the town.
- He did not have direct knowledge of any previous planning objections from local schools.

The Chair invited Councillor Beardsworth, the County Councillor for the application area, to address the Committee. Councillor Beardsworth expressed her concern that infrastructure, such as medical provision, should precede any construction. She asked that the Committee consider the bigger picture and see the application as part of a cumulative impact on the Kingsthorpe corridor.

In response to questions from the Committee Councillor Beardsworth supplied the following information:

- She believed there would be a reduced bus service with the relocation of the UoN.
- There was a potential for four vehicles to a household and increased traffic movements
- The direction of traffic flow with the change from UoN to residential was unknown.
- Parking on Boughton Green Road was an issue, but who this was generated by was unknown.

The Chair invited Neil Rowley, agent for the applicant, to address the Committee. Mr Rowley explained that the scheme was fundamental to the UoN developing in the coming years. The site would close in 2018, with approximately 100 residential units expected to be constructed in each subsequent year. He accepted the need for infrastructure, but the S106 would help with the required provision. With 15000 students no longer on site there should be additional GP capacity created. The loss of sports facilities would be offset by the creation of new provision at the Waterside Campus.

In response to questions from the Committee Mr Rowley supplied the following information:

- The budget for the £300m waterside project was tight and the potential receipt from this development was a key element.
- It was hoped the pathway to the Benham Sports Centre would be maintained.
- The final traffic assessment was still being considered by the Highway Authority, but it demonstrates that there will be less traffic movements than currently experienced.

In response to questions from the Committee the Senior Planning Officer supplied the following information:

- Management of dust and noise during construction should be mitigated by condition 13.
- The S106 applied to this development and further provision regarding other developments should be considered with each application.
- Sports provision would be supplied at the new campus.
- The Environment Agency have evaluated the flood risk and agreed conditions.

The Committee discussed the report.

**RESOLVED:** That the application be **APPROVED IN PRINCIPLE** subject to the prior completion of a S106 agreement and the conditions set out in the report and addendum.

**(C) N/2014/0600 - LAND AT FORMER HONDA CAR DEALERSHIP BETWEEN COMPTON STREET AND GRAFTON STREET: ERECTION OF 36 DWELLINGS COMPRISING 12 THREE BED HOUSES, 12 TWO BED HOUSES AND 12 TWO BED FLATS WITH VEHICULAR ACCESS FROM COMPTON STREET**

The Senior Planning Officer outlined the report of the Head of Planning, as set out in the agenda and addendum. The recommendation was for refusal for the reasons set out in the report.

The Chair invited Councillor Stone, the Ward Member, to address the Committee. Councillor Stone highlighted her work in and knowledge of the area. She believed the business development would not take off and that the need for family housing in the area was well proven. She asked the Committee to note the residents support for the development.

In response to questions from the Committee Councillor Stone supplied the following information:

- She believed the Housing Association involved was well aware of the local housing costs.

- This could be a regeneration project to help alleviate the overcrowding in the Spring Boroughs area.

The Chair invited Clive Ireson, Chair of the Neighbourhood Planning Group, to address the Committee. Mr Ireson explained that while the neighbourhood plan was not yet finalised, this site had been identified by local residents as being suitable for housing development. He noted the high levels of overcrowding locally and this unused land could help alleviate that problem. He added that development of the Enterprise Zone would leave this site vacant for the foreseeable future. There were some design issues regarding the site, but he believed these could be rectified.

In response to questions from the Committee Mr Ireson supplied the following information:

- The applicant had not consulted local residents directly regarding the design.
- Local need would fill these larger properties.
- Local residents had a preference for properties with gardens/outside space and areas for children to play.

The Chair invited Andy Ward, agent for the applicant, to address the Committee. Mr Ward explained that the applicant was working on changes to address the issues raised by the residents and planning officers. The applicant was happy to agree an extension of time to discuss these matters further. He highlighted that there were no environmental or highways objections and asked the Committee to give weight to the community support for the development. He believed the NPPF encouraged flexibility and pointed out that once agreed work would commence on site within 6 months.

In response to questions from the Committee Mr Ward supplied the following information:

- The applicant had not been aware until the report was prepared that there was a potential for refusal. He believed that the proposed changes would mitigate the reasons for refusal.
- He not been aware of the Urban Design Officer's views until the report was written.
- Consultation with residents would take place moving forwards.
- He believed it was not unusual to see former commercial sites developed to meet housing need.
- The site had one entrance with a turning circle.
- The applicant had not considered withdrawal, but would be happy for the application to be deferred.

In response to the issues raised by the speakers the Senior Planning Officer supplied the following information:

- He did believe that there was a realistic chance of amendments overcoming the reasons for refusal.
- Planning Officers would be happy to continue a dialogue with the applicant.

In response to the questions from the Committee the Senior Planning Officer supplied the following information:

- The site had been empty for 4 years.
- Any Neighbourhood Plan should conform to the CAAP strategic objectives. The debate would be if this site was part of any strategic objectives.

The Committee discussed the report.

Upon a proposal from Councillor Golby, seconded by Councillor I Choudary the committee **RESOLVED**:

That the application be **REFUSED** on the grounds that:

1. The proposed development by reason of its design and layout would fail to create a safe and distinctive high quality environment. The proposal would therefore fail to secure a satisfactory level of residential amenity for the future occupiers of the development, which fails to comply with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policies 1 and 24 of the Northampton Central Area Action Plan.
2. The proposal would prevent the site from being developed for employment uses, which would preclude the sustainable redevelopment of the wider area. The development therefore fails to comply with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy 24 of the Northampton Central Area Action Plan.
3. By reason of its design, the proposed development fails to secure a safe road layout. The proposal therefore would adversely affect highway safety, contrary to the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

The vote on the resolution being - For: 5 Against: 4 Abstained: 1

**(D) N/2014/0607 - 1 SPYGLASS HILL: CHANGE OF USE FROM DWELLING (C3) TO MIX RESIDENTIAL AND NURSERY USE**

The Planning Development Manager outlined the report of the Head of Planning, as set out in the agenda and addendum. The recommendation was for refusal for the reasons as set out in the report.

The Chair invited Councillor Larratt, the Ward Member, to address the Committee. Councillor Larratt accepted there was need for nursery provision, but believed this was the wrong location. He highlighted the Highways Authority observations regarding the site proximity to the road junction.



The Chair invited Gary Turner, local resident, to address the Committee. Mr Turner believed there would be a detrimental impact on a quiet residential area. Parking in the area was already an issue at times and he suggested the Committee heed the expert advice of the Highways Authority.

In response to a question from the Committee Mr Turner supplied the following information:

- The photographs shown earlier highlighted the parking problems on every school day, twice a day.

The Chair invited John Davis, local resident, to address the Committee. Mr Davis has been a resident for 17 years and overtime seen the traffic movements in the area increase year on year. He did believe that the property could not hold 10 vehicles on the drive. The volume of traffic movements both current and proposed made an incident inevitable.

The Chair invited Lisa Davey, the applicant, to address the Committee. Ms Davey highlighted the need for nursery provision. She added that her business operated in a flexible way and that the specific timing of traffic movements suggested would not occur. The nursery would operate with 55 children present. She pointed out that the Environmental Health Officer had suggested the business be granted a temporary permission for 12 months to ensure the operation was correct.

In response to questions from the Committee Ms Davey supplied the following information:

- She expected 23 traffic movements to be generated over two periods, 08:00-08:30 and 09:15-09:30. Many children were picked up of site by mini-bus.
- No structural changes would be made to the property.
- She had taken advice on the process from a Borough Councillor and an independent highways expert.
- Local ward councillors had not visited the site when invited at the pre-application stage.

The Chair invited Kevin Hodnett, local resident, to address the Committee. Mr Hodnett was a neighbour of Ms Davey's current nursery and explained he had not experienced any problems with its operation. He suggested that the current issues with parking be taken up with the school and GP surgery, not laid at Ms Davey's door.

The Committee discussed the report.

Upon a proposal from Councillor I Choudary, seconded by Councillor Golby the committee **RESOLVED**:

That the application be **REFUSED** on the grounds that:

1. The proposal would have an adverse impact upon the amenity of residents in the area, in particular those immediately adjoining the site, by virtue of the introduction of an incompatible use in a residential area leading to undue disturbance to adjoining occupiers. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy H35 of the Northampton Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. The proposed development would increase the concentration of traffic in the vicinity of the site causing additional danger to users of the highway and adversely impacting the amenity enjoyed by neighbouring residents contrary to National Planning Policy Framework and Policy T11 of the Northampton Local Plan.

The vote on the resolution being - For: 8 Against: 2

**(F) N/2014/0621 - 87 ST GILES STREET: CHANGE OF USE FROM OFFICES (B1) TO HIMO FOR 13 RESIDENTS (SUI GENERIS) AND INSTALLATION OF REAR CONSERVATION ROOFLIGHT AND N/2014/0622 - 87 ST GILES STREET: INTERNAL ALTERATIONS INCLUDING REMOVAL OF PARTITION WALLS AND TOILETS, BLOCK UP DOORWAYS AND INSTALLATION OF NEW DOORWAYS AND NEW PARTITIONS, ALTERATIONS TO THIRD FLOOR WINDOW TO FRONT ELEVATION AND INSTALLATION OF REAR CONSERVATION ROOFLIGHT**

The Principal Planning Officer outlined the report of the Head of Planning, as set out in the agenda and addendum, regarding applications N/2014/0621 and N/2014/0622. The recommendation was for approval of both applications, subject to the conditions set out.

The Chair invited Councillor Stone, the Ward member, to address the Committee. Councillor Stone believed that the town centre needed protection from future over development, particularly further HIMO proposals. She added that such development would lead to a transient population. She suggested that taken in conjunction with the property next door this constituted an overdevelopment.

The Chair invited Rod Kilsby, Agent for the applicant to address the Committee. Mr Kilsby explained that the application matched others previously approved and met the Private Sector Housing Policy and the Local Authority licensing requirement.

In response to questions from the Committee Mr Kilsby supplied the following information:

- The next door property was a similar size and had no allocated parking.

The Chair invited Gary Bee, the applicant to address the Committee. Mr Bees explained that he had been involved with letting properties since 2008. He aimed to produce high quality developments, for working residents. He added that planning policy did not require parking for the development. He further explained to the Committee his reasons for wanting to carry out such developments which related to his personal health.

In response to questions from the Committee Mr Bees supplied the following information:

- He did not own the next door property, but he did have an option to purchase it.

The Committee discussed the reports.

**RESOLVED:** That the application N/2014/0621 be **APPROVED** subject to the conditions set out in the report and addendum.

**RESOLVED:** That the application N/2014/0622 be **APPROVED** subject to the conditions set out in the report and addendum.

**(G) N/2014/0778 - DEVELOPMENT LAND, UPTON VALLEY WAY EAST:  
APPLICATION TO VARY SECTION 106 AGREEMENT IN RESPECT OF  
N/1997/128 IN RELATION TO THE PROVISION OF THE PARK & RIDE  
FACILITY**

The Planning Development Manager outlined the report of the Head of Planning, as set out in the agenda. Following legal advice the recommendation would need the words, “and the necessary Deed of Variation be entered into to vary the agreement.” The recommendation was for approval of the report, with the amendment as stated above.

The Committee discussed the report.

**RESOLVED:** The report be **APPROVED** with the additional wording to 1.1, “and the necessary Deed of Variation be entered into to vary the agreement.”

**11. ENFORCEMENT MATTERS**

None

**12. ITEMS FOR CONSULTATION**

**(A) N/2013/1195 - OVERSTONE LEYS: NORTHAMPTON NORTH  
SUSTAINABLE URBAN EXTENSION (SUE), OUTLINE APPLICATION OF  
UP TO 2000 DWELLINGS, WITH ACCESS, APPEARANCE, LAYOUT AND  
SCALE UNRESERVED FOR THE FIRST PHASE OF 200 DWELLINGS;  
ASSOCIATED DEVELOPMENT**

The Principal Planning Officer outlined the report of the Head of Planning, as set out in the agenda. He advised the Committee that the determination of the application would be made by Daventry District Council (DDC) and this report would form part of the formal consultation response.

In response to a question from the Committee the Principal Planning Officer supplied the following information:

- The final timescale for completion following any approval could be as much as 20 years based on an average of 100-150 units per year.

The Committee discussed the report. It was agreed to ask that DDC should have an ongoing dialogue with the Education Authority regarding secondary school provision.

**RESOLVED:** That Northampton Borough Council has no objections to the principle of development subject to the issues outlined in the report being addressed by Daventry District Council with the addition of a further item of 1.1 “Provision shall be made to ensure adequate secondary education facilities are provided in the area to accommodate the increase in pupil numbers”.

The meeting concluded at 9:52 pm