

NORTHAMPTON BOROUGH COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 5 April 2011

PRESENT: Councillor Collins (Chair); Councillors J. Conroy, Davies, Golby, Malpas and Matthews

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Church, Hawkins, Hill, Lane, Meredith and Woods.

2. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 8 March 2010 were agreed and signed by the Chair.

3. DEPUTATIONS / PUBLIC ADDRESSES

- RESOLVED:**
- (1) That Richard Lee and Councillor B. Hoare be granted leave to address the Committee in respect of Application no. N/2011/0117.
 - (2) That Pearl Soper-Dyer and Philip Robbins be granted leave to address the Committee in respect of Application no. N/2011/0111.
 - (3) That Councillor B. Markham be granted leave to address the Committee in respect of Application no. N/2011/0134.

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Davies declared a Personal interest in item 10C, N/2011/0134 as a member of groups that met at the premises.

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

The Chair was of the opinion that the following item be discussed as a Matter of Urgency due to the undue delay if consideration were deferred:

TRANSFER OF POWERS FROM WNDC

The Head of Planning stated that further to the report made at the last meeting a smooth transfer had taken place on 1 April 2011 including data concerning ongoing

issues. There were only six outstanding planning applications requiring determination.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

12. APPLICATIONS FOR CONSULTATION

(A) N/2010/0653- EXTENSION TO EXISTING FOOD STORE, RELOCATION OF TWO SHOP UNITS, ERECTION OF A COMMUNITY BUILDING, NEW BUS WAITING FACILITY, PROVISION OF NEW PEDESTRIAN FOOTPATHS, LANDSCAPE WORKS, LIGHTING WORKS AND REVISIONS TO CAR PARK LAYOUT- TESCO SUPERSTORE HUNSBURY CENTRE, CLANNELL ROAD

The Head of Planning referred to the Addendum that noted that the Applicant, had during the day, submitted an amendment to their application to remove the provision of a Community Centre. This brought the gross additional floorspace to below the 2,500m² threshold for WNDP to determine the application so it would now be decided by the Borough Council. The effect of the proposed changes needed to be considered and therefore the report was withdrawn from the meeting. The application would come back to the Committee at a future date.

RESOLVED: That the item be withdrawn from the agenda.

6. LIST OF CURRENT APPEALS AND INQUIRIES

The Head of Planning submitted a List of Current Appeals and Inquiries, elaborated thereon and commented that over the course of the year the Council had lost four out of sixteen appeals (25%), which was well within the target of 33%.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

7. OTHER REPORTS

(A) DEED OF VARIATION TO S106 AGREEMENT 166-169 ST ANDREWS ROAD

The Head of Planning submitted a report and elaborated thereon.

The Committee discussed the report.

RESOLVED: That the variation to the Section 106 agreement as detailed in the report be agreed.

8. NORTHAMPTONSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL APPLICATIONS

None.

9. NORTHAMPTON BOROUGH COUNCIL APPLICATIONS

None.

10. ITEMS FOR DETERMINATION

(A) N/2011/0117- CHANGE OF USE FROM RETAIL (A1) TO HOUSE IN MULTIPLE OCCUPATION (C4)- 48 ADAMS AVENUE

The Head of Planning submitted a report in respect of application no N/2011/0117

Councillor B. Hoare, as Ward Councillor, commented that the photographs, part of the presentation of the report adequately told the story of the parking issues in the site area. He believed that the planning system was letting down residents and referred to the site opposite that was to be developed into flats, an application which had originally been refused and then granted on appeal. He commented that there must be a stage at which the planning system recognised that issues arose from more and more cars: at what stage was residential amenity affected in respect of them being able to park their own vehicles.

Richard Lee, the Applicant, stated that his application was to bring former commercial premises back into residential use as a HIMO. There was a shortage of private rented accommodation in the area. He had sought pre application advice from the Planners. His proposal would provide accommodation for young professionals, key workers and students to a high standard. He believed that the car parking situation would be no worse that when the premises had been in commercial use and that some extent the displayed photographs were misleading. He noted that the premises were close to the Wellingborough Road and public transport. In answer to a question from Councillor Malpas, Mr Lee commented that he had visited the site at evenings and weekends and was aware of the parking issues however there were times such as when the site visit had taken place when there were few cars parked.

The Head of Planning commented that planning permission had been granted for eight flats on the site opposite the application site. The scale of the two developments was different and the Highways Authority, in this case, had not asked for a contribution towards transport improvements. The applicant had provided indicative details of refuse bin storage. Although this application made no car parking provision there was provision for six bicycles and the site was within a sustainable transport area. The Inspector in considering the site opposite had given clear guidance about car parking. A holistic approach to car parking in the wider area was needed and it may be possible to discuss with the Highways Authority potential solutions.

The Committee discussed the application.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report as the proposal would not have an undue detrimental impact on the character of the locality or on residential amenity of the area and would not give rise to highway safety problems. The proposal was therefore compliant with Policies E20 and H30 of the Northampton Local Plan and advice contained in PPS1, PPS3, PPG13 and PPG24.

(B) N/2011/0111- ERECTION OF NEW END TERRACE HOUSE- LAND ADJACENT TO 18 WALLACE ROAD

The Head of Planning submitted a report in respect of application number N/2011/0111 and referred to the Addendum that set out an amendment to paragraph 7.4 of the report. He noted that a second application to build flats on the site also existed but was not so far advanced as this proposal. In answer to a question he noted that the moving of the entrance to 18 Wallace Road would not require planning permission.

Philip Robbins, a nearby resident, commented that he had not been notified of the application and had not seen any onsite notices. He also had not seen any notice of a second application. He elaborated on what he viewed as inconsistencies with the planning application and commented that he believed that the site was biologically diverse and was aware that newts were present. He believed that there would be issues concerning foul sewerage and noted that the proposal would affect neighbours, there would only be on-street parking and that anti social behaviour already existed by the electricity sub- station. In answer to a question Mr Robbins stated that he did not know which species of newts were present, only that they were.

Pearl Soper- Dyer, a neighbour, commented that her main concern was in respect of foul sewerage. There was a foul sewer manhole cover at the front of her property and this had flooded several times with sewerage left all over the front gardens of this terrace of properties. An extra house would make this worse. In answer to a question Mrs Soper-Dyer commented that Anglian Water had stated that the problem was caused by a nearby block of flats.

The Head of Planning reported that Anglian Water had not responded to the consultation and that neighbours had been notified of the application. A site notice had also been displayed. No information had come to light about protected species in what was a domestic garden. In answer to questions he commented that car parking issues were covered by the report and that although foul water sewerage could be a material planning consideration, in this instance the proposal was for a modest addition to the existing provision and as such the issues would be dealt with by Building Control.

The Committee discussed the application.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as the principle of using existing predominantly residential land for a new residential use was acceptable. The siting and design of the dwelling would compliment the existing terrace of houses and the wider locality and would not be detrimental to visual or residential amenity or highway safety in accordance with Policies H6 and E20 of the Northampton Local Plan and the guidelines contained within PPS3 and PPG13.

(C) N/2011/0134- ERECTION OF 12.5M TELECOMMUNICATIONS MAST AND ERECTION OF 2NO RADIO EQUIPMENT ENCLOSURES AT THE HEADLANDS PUBLIC HOUSE, LONGLAND ROAD

The Head of Planning submitted a report in respect of application number N/2011/0134 and elaborated thereon.

Councillor B. Markham, as Ward Councillor, commented that he was against the application and supported the recommendation in the report for refusal. The siting of the mast was of particular concern to the two immediate neighbours in The Headlands and Longland Road. The mast would be some 15 feet from the back door of the property in The Headlands. He also observed that the equipment boxes were likely to provide another way of getting into the beer store of the Public House.

The Committee discussed the application.

RESOLVED: That the application be refused as the proposed monopole, by reason of its height and positioning would have an intrusive and overbearing affect on the surrounding residential properties, specifically 18 Longland Road and 135 The Headlands and therefore the proposal fails to comply with the requirements of PPG8 – Telecommunications.

11. ENFORCEMENT MATTERS

None.

The Chair noted that this was the last meeting that Councillors Church and Davies would be attending as Councillors as they were not standing in the forthcoming elections and wished them well for the future on behalf of the Committee.

The meeting concluded at 19.24 hours.