



**URGENT BUSINESS AND SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**

**Strategic Planning Committee**

**Tuesday 12 September 2023**

<b>Page</b>	<b>Title</b>
(Pages 3 - 12)	Minutes of 15.08.2023 Strategic Planning Committee to be confirmed Late Representations 12.09.2023 Speakers List 12.09.2023

If you require any further information about this agenda please contact Diana Davies, Democratic Services via the following:

Tel: 01327 322195

Email: [democraticservices@westnorthants.gov.uk](mailto:democraticservices@westnorthants.gov.uk)

Or by writing to:

West Northamptonshire Council  
One Angel Square  
Angel Street  
Northampton  
NN1 1ED

This page is intentionally left blank



## Strategic Planning Committee

Minutes of a meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee held at The Forum, Moat Lane, Towcester, NN12 6AD on Tuesday 15 August 2023 at 2.00 pm.

### Present:

Councillor Kevin Parker (Vice-Chair)  
 Councillor Ann Addison  
 Councillor Alan Chantler  
 Councillor Rosie Herring  
 Councillor Rosie Humphreys  
 Councillor Charles Manners  
 Councillor Ken Pritchard  
 Councillor Danielle Stone

### Substitute Members:

Councillor Stephen Clarke

### Apologies for Absence:

Councillor Maggie Clubley  
 Councillor André González De Savage  
 Councillor David James  
 Councillor Bob Purser  
 Councillor Cathrine Russell

### Also in Attendance:

Councillor Jonathan Harris  
 Shaun Robson, Development Management Manager - Northampton Area  
 Nicky Scaife, Development Management Team Leader  
 Chris Burton, Principal Planning Policy Officer  
 Katherine Hall, Head of Legal (Place)  
 Jeverly Findlay, Committee Officer  
 Ed Bostock, Democratic Services Officer

#### 134. **Declarations of Interest**

None advised.

#### 135. **Minutes**

##### **RESOLVED:**

That the Minutes of the Strategic Planning Committee of 18 July 2023 be approved and signed as a correct record.

136. **Chair's Announcements**

None advised.

137. **WNS/2022/2402/EIA Land South of East Lodge Farm, Quinton Road, Courteenhall**

The Planning Officer presented the report to the Committee. The application sought approval for the construction and operation of an Anaerobic Digestion facility and associated infrastructure and landscape planting. The application was supported by an Environmental Statement. Members' attention was drawn to the addendum which contained several corrections to the report. A further condition would be added, with consent from the applicant, regarding a 30-year remedial strategy, where the land would be restored after 30 years, or a fresh application would be welcomed by the applicant.

In response to Members questions the Planning Officer advised:

- Regarding a query around fire safety, it was explained that the Environment Agency (EA) would consider any potential impacts, including safety, within their permitting scheme.
- A condition was included that required the submission of a primary routing plan to be submitted to the Council which would be provided to all of the applicant's contractors to show which routes they should use; they were proposed to be mainly through fields to the south of the M1 (Highways comments were contained in the report; the applicant originally asked for a Section 106 Agreement but were happy with Condition 14).
- Fire plans and risk assessments were a requirement of the EA for permits and they would only be granted when the EA were satisfied. Further works would need to be undertaken if a permit was not granted.
- A condition was proposed which related to odors; this was dealt with by the EA permitting scheme also.
- There were no approximate figures for current HGV movements, but it was noted that the Highways department has not raised an objection to the application.
- The site would offer 5 full-time equivalent jobs once operational, and 100 jobs during construction.

Alister Veitch, the applicant addressed the Committee in support of the application and commented that the application supported the Council's net zero target. The silos would be filled with mainly locally-sourced waste products. The use of biomethane compared to fossil fuel gas and the capture of carbon dioxide through the anaerobic digestion process would save 31,230 tons of carbon dioxide annually. Digestaid also improved soil and was less carbon-intensive than synthetic fertiliser. Mr Veitch added that no objections had been received from members of the public.

In response to members questions Mr Veitch added:

- There would be storage onsite for materials but this would be in sheds and odour-controlled.
- The site included a dirty water containment zone and sent to the digestors.

- Gas from the site would not be pumped directly into the national network as the local National Grid could not facilitate the amount of gas that would be produced at this site.
- All proposed routes were advertised during the consultation stage.
- The anaerobic digestion process was expensive; a large site was needed to capture as much carbon as the applicant intended to.
- The product would be transported to a capture hub in Banbury (other sites were also available). All rules would be followed, and all regulations complied with.

Members then debated the application and made the following comments:

- Green technology was welcomed but there were concerns around the sense of proportion regarding arable lands, and the need to be working smarter with Highways for better resolutions for vehicle movements.
- It was important that the traffic management plan was as robust as possible to allay the concerns of interested parties.

Councillor Chantler proposed that the application be approved. The proposition was seconded by Councillor Pritchard. The vote was declared carried with 8 voting in favour and 1 abstention.

**RESOLVED:**

That the Assistant Director for Planning and Development be given delegated powers to grant permission for the development subject to conditions including the additional condition regarding a 30-year remedial strategy, where the land would be restored after 30 years and the satisfactory resolution of drainage/flood and ecology.

138. **Urgent Business**

None advised.

The meeting closed at 3.11 pm

Chair: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

This page is intentionally left blank

## **Strategic Planning Committee**

### **COMMITTEE UPDATE**

for the planning application to be discussed at the

## **Strategic Planning Committee**

**12 September 2023**

## Committee Updates

The schedule below details those letters, etc. that have been received since the Committee report was drafted

Application Details	Item No.
<p>Case Officer: Michael Osman</p> <p>Ward: Bugbrooke</p> <p>Application No: WNS/2023/0007/MAF</p> <p>Location: Northampton West Allocation N4: Comprising of New Roundabout Access from Roman Road and Northern Side Footpath Along Roman Road to Junction with New Sandy Lane</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>5</b></p>

### Case Officer clarification

#### **Corrections to report:**

- Submitted plan omitted from list of drawings: New Roundabout Access from Roman Road and Northern Side Footpath Along - 332210790\_700\_001 A - Pavement and Paved Areas Sheet 1 of 2.pdf
- Condition 5 CEMP – Remove reference to Section 5 of the submitted Environmental Statement
- The applicants have advised that where Paragraph 7.3 suggests land in their control could deliver 500-600 dwellings that this is higher than is likely. That the forthcoming application will likely be for up to 450 dwellings.

### **Update to Committee Report**



This is an update to the report following additional comments received from:

A resident of Harpole has raised the following concerns:

- Village is experiencing increased traffic flow due to the Sandy Lane relief road works;
- Road Hill could become feeder road into Harpole as part of a short cut to the A4500;
- Can traffic from and to the proposed development be directed towards New Sandy Lane?

#### **Officer response to this additional consultation response:**

A response on this comment was sought from the WNC Highways Development Management Team. Their response is that the current proposal, which is changing the design of a traffic junction only, will not generate any traffic and is unlikely to affect traffic distribution. Traffic using Road Hill would neither be encouraged or discouraged to use that route as a result of the roundabout (or cycleway and toucan crossing) as the intersection of the 2 roads already exists in that location. The applicants have submitted a technical note which WNC Highways officers have assessed and accept the findings that the forecast trips from the development onto Upper High Street and vice versa total 12 in the AM peak hour and 14 in the PM peak hour which would be seen as a negligible impact.

This should be seen as a robust approach to ensure that the infrastructure being designed and installed in advance is suitable and operates within capacity once the adjacent development is built out. Clearly whilst road works and temporary road closures are in place, vehicles finding alternative routes is an issue. However on completion of major road infrastructure in this area, particularly Sandy Lane Relief Road, much faster journey times from Roman Road to the A4500 will be available.

When an Outline application for the Davidsons site comes forward, that will be supported by a full Transport Assessment where the full impact of the site traffic will be considered and any necessary mitigation be identified and secured.

#### **Additional Applicant Correspondence**

After publication of the Committee report the applicant has submitted a detailed written request for an amendment to the recommendation to the Strategic Planning Committee to omit reference to a s.106 legal agreement. They argue that a S106 agreement is not necessary in this instance, only a S278 highways Agreement.

#### **Response to consultation:**

The intention behind the s106 agreement is linked to the key planning policies covering the wider SUE.

WNJCS at paragraph 12.36 states:

*"... A **masterplan** will be required to be submitted alongside any proposal to demonstrate how the land use elements positively respond to context, design issues, **connectivity** and sustainable planning requirements"*

Policy N4 states (extract from the policy):

*"..... THE DEVELOPMENT WILL MAKE PROVISION FOR... e) **AN INTEGRATED TRANSPORT NETWORK FOCUSED ON SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT MODES,***

***INCLUDING PUBLIC TRANSPORT, WALKING AND CYCLING WITH STRONG LINKS TO ADJOINING NEIGHBOURHOODS, EMPLOYMENT AREAS AND THE TOWN CENTRE”***

The policies should be read as a whole. Officers think that Davidson’s are taking a narrow approach to their development. That this development cannot be looked at in isolation to the development of the wider SUE (included their part) as a whole. Given that the SUE is a large development a s.106 may be necessary to address connectivity issues between the two developments (albeit being provided by different owners/developers) and there may be a need to provide the SUE in phases.

It will always be the case that the highway aspect of the intended development will need to be considered as a whole, not be looked at in isolation, timing and phasing will need to be considered. Given the infancy of Davidson’s proposed larger intention to develop out their option, the contents of a s.278 are as yet not fully known and ‘may’ not be capable of addressing all the planning needs of the development as whole (especially if connectivity issues arise given involvement of more than developer in the construction of highway works for the wider SUE); for this reason officers are reluctant at this point in time to remove reference to a Section 106 agreement without a greater understanding of the likely S278 agreement.

It is suggested that at this stage the recommendation is simply ‘delegated to officers to ensure an appropriate legal agreement is in place for the delivery of the highway works before a planning approval is issued’ but that the final content of the legal agreement be delegated to officers.

**Applicants Comments on proposed Planning Conditions**

The applicant has commented on some of the proposed planning conditions as set out below.

*‘Condition 8 and 9 Landscape – please can this be removed as there will not be any landscaping within the application area other than perhaps grass verges which would be secured via S.278.*

*Condition 10 Phasing – why is a condition needed requiring a phasing plan? This work would be completed in a single phase. Please remove.*

*Condition 11 Lighting – not relevant because any lighting would fall under the S.278 / S.38 agreement within highway land. Please remove.’*

**Officer Response:**

It is considered that the same issue arises as the request to vary the Section 106 agreement, that an assumption is being made that everything can be covered by a S278 agreement, when this may not be the case. Should it be the case that a S278 agreement does fully cover any of the matters referred to in these planning conditions then the applicant could simply submit a request for the condition in question to be discharged on this basis. As such it is not recommended that any conditions be deleted.

**West Northamptonshire Council**

**Strategic Planning Committee**

**12 September 2023**

**List of Public Speakers**

<b>Page No.</b>	<b>Application</b>	<b>Name</b>	
5 - 22	<b>Agenda Item 5</b> WNS/2023/0007/MAF  Northampton West Allocation N4: Comprising of New Roundabout Access from Roman Road and Northern Side Footpath Along Roman Road to Junction with New Sandy Lane  Bugbrooke	Paul Waterfield, Applicant	

This page is intentionally left blank