



**West
Northamptonshire
Council**

Northampton Local Area Planning Committee

Minutes of a meeting of the Northampton Local Area Planning Committee held at Jeffrey Room, The Guildhall st Giles Street, Northampton, NN1 1DE on Tuesday 2 November 2021 at 5.00 pm.

Present Councillor Jamie Lane (Chair)

Councillor Muna Cali
Councillor Raymond Connolly
Councillor Paul Dyball
Councillor Dennis Meredith
Councillor Cathrine Russell
Councillor Zoe Smith

Apologies Councillor Anna King
for Councillor Imran Ahmed Chowdhury BEM
Absence:

Officers Nicky Scaife (Interim Development Manager)
 Hannah Weston (Principal Planning Officer)
 Theresa Boyd (Planning Solicitor)
 Ed Bostock (Democratic Services Officer)

51. Apologies for Absence and Appointment of Substitute Members

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors I Chowdhury and King. Councillor Cali would be arriving late.

52. Declarations of Interest

None.

53. Minutes

The minutes of the meetings held on 5th October and 27th April were not ready for sign-off and would be brought to the next meeting.

54. Chair's Announcements

None.

55. Deputations/Public Addresses

RESOLVED:

That under the following items, the members of the public and Ward Councillors listed below were granted leave to address the Committee:

N/2020/1439 & N/2020/1364

Mark Kelly

WNN/2021/0562 & WNN/2021/0563

Giles Greenhalgh

Maureen Minami

WNN/2021/0704

Alan Stanley

David Richardson

Pat Dooley

56. Proposed Pre-Committee Site Visits

Site visits were not taking place at present due to the pandemic.

57. List of Current Appeals/Inquiries

The Interim Development Manager submitted a List of Current Appeals and Inquiries and explained that 2 appeal decisions had been received which related to refusals made under delegated powers. An appeal relating to 74 Barley Lane was dismissed; the Planning Inspector agreed with the Council that the proposed development would result in harm to the area due to the impact of the design and impact on neighbouring amenity. An appeal relating to 5 St Georges Place was also dismissed; the Planning Inspector agreed with the Council's decision that UVPC frames would have a harmful impact on the conservation area.

Members discussed the report.

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

58. N/2020/1439 & N/2020/1364

Partial demolition of redundant Retail Unit (Use Class E) and change of use into 14no Apartments (Use Class C3) and beauty salon (Sui Generis) including shopfront alteration and associated works

&

Listed Building Consent Application for partial demolition of Retail Unit and conversion into 14no Apartments and 1no Beauty Salon/Nail Bar (Sui Generis) and alterations to shop front

6 - 7 Drapery

The Principal Planning Officer submitted a report to the Committee which sought approval for the part demolition of a retail unit and change of use to 14 apartments

and a beauty salon (including shopfront alteration and associated works) and Listed Building consent for the same works. Members' attention was drawn to the addendum which contained a revision to Condition 17 and updated comments from Historic England and the Police. The applications followed previous approvals granted in December 2019 for a similar development; the layout had been amended to provide a larger courtyard, flat layouts slightly amended, and a shop altered to a beauty salon. It was noted that works had begun. The use of the retail unit as a beauty salon was considered appropriate for the location and the amended layout and courtyard was considered acceptable. Conditions were included to secure noise and air ventilation measures. Whilst no parking was provided as part of the development, the application site sat in a sustainable location and cycle storage would be provided. Highways had not objected to the application but requested details of a construction management plan, which was secured by way of a condition.

Mr Mark Kelly, the architect on behalf of the applicant, addressed the Committee and stated that he was happy to answer any questions that Members may have.

In response to questions, the Committee heard from Mr Kelly that the proposed fire escapes all complied with Building Regulations and that there were separate waste storage areas for the apartments and for the beauty salon. There would be no Section 106 contributions as the development was not of a scale to require these, but the development was CIL liable.

Members discussed the report.

RESOLVED:

That the applications be APPROVED subject to the conditions and reasons as set out in the report and **REVISED CONDITION 17 OF APPLICATION N/2020/1439** contained in the addendum.

59.

WNN/2021/0273

**Installation of sprinkler system inside existing unit, necessitating erection of sprinkler tank and pump house on concrete base supported by retaining wall at entrance to site
Unit 2 Nectar Way**

The Principal Planning Officer submitted a report to the Committee which sought approval for the installation of a sprinkler system including the erection of a sprinkler tank and pump house and subsequent altered parking. It was confirmed that Highways agreed with the alteration of the parking spaces and that none would be lost as a result of the development. The development was not considered to be out of character for the area and would not harm any nearby residential properties.

Members discussed the report.

RESOLVED:

That the application be **APPROVED** subject to the conditions and reasons as set out in the report.

60. **WNN/2021/0562 & WNN/2021/0563**

Alterations to rear of 34-35 and 36-38 Billing Road to include demolition of 4no extensions, rear basement access stairs and the removal of upper floor escape ladders, replacement of ground floor access stairs and late 20thc windows and doors to include re-instatement of blocked up openings and associated works and the erection of single new build block on existing car park, comprising of 14no assisted living units (Use Class C2) facing Palmerston Road, with associated works including new landscaping, new parking provision and replacement of boundary walls

&

Listed Building Consent for alterations to rear of 34-35 and 36-38 Billing Road to include demolition of 4no extensions, rear basement access stairs and the removal of upper floor escape ladders, replacement of ground floor access stairs and late 20thc windows and doors to include re-instatement of blocked up openings and associated works and the erection of single new build block on existi

The Principal Planning Officer submitted a report to the Committee. It was explained that the recommendation was for approval of the listed building consent application but for refusal of the planning application. The listed building consent application sought approval for alterations to the rear of 34-35 and 36-38 Billing Road, including the demolition of extensions, rear basement access stairs and removal of upper floor escape ladders, replacement of ground floor access stairs and late 20th century windows and doors to include reinstatement of blocked up openings and associated works. The listed building consent only related to the works to the listed buildings themselves. The development also included the erection of a new build block on the existing car park, comprising of 14 assisted living flats facing Palmerston Road, with associated works. This new build block did not require listed building consent as it was not attached to the listed building, however it forms part of the planning application. It was explained that whilst the principle of assisted living was acceptable, the design of this block was not; it would appear out of character and cause unacceptable harm to the street scene and wider conservation area. Additionally, the new build aspect to the rear of the site would overlook rear gardens of residential properties on Palmerston Road. Highways had further objected to the proposal due to the loss of parking spaces, narrow proposed entrance and gate being situated too close to the road. As such the new build block could not be supported and the recommendation for the planning application was for refusal due to the unacceptable design and impact upon the conservation area, the unacceptable impact upon neighbouring amenity, and the unacceptable highway safety impact.

Mr Giles Greenhalgh, the architect on behalf of the applicant, spoke in favour of the application and commented that details from the existing building were reflected in the proposed development; it was a prominent site and that is why the height has been used, and that the gardens on Palmerston Road were already overlooked due to the nature of terraced houses. Mr Greenhalgh suggested that Highways' measurements of the entrance width and distance of the gate from the road were incorrect.

In response to questions Mr Greenhalgh advised that there was no lift and people with mobility issues would be located on the ground floor.

Maureen Minami, the proposed Care Home Manager, spoke in favour of the application and commented that the location was suitable for facilitating care for vulnerable young people.

In response to questions, the Committee heard that any service user with mobility issues would be housed on the ground floor and that provisions would be in place to evacuate those with mobility issues on the upper floors.

In response to questions the Principal Planning Officer confirmed that Planning and Highways officers had independently measured the proposed entrance to the site and parking spaces and were confident that their measurements were correct. The Officer advised that the pre-application advice service was available should the developer need advice on an amended scheme but that the site was highly constrained and it would be hard to provide the desired number of units in this location.

Councillors Cali and Dyball joined the meeting at this juncture but took no part in the discussion or the vote.

Members discussed the report.

RESOLVED:

That application WNN/2021/0562 be **REFUSED** as per the officer recommendation and that application WNN/2021/0563 be **APPROVED** subject to the conditions and reasons as set out in the report.

61. **WNN/2021/0704**
Change of Use from Dwellinghouse (Use Class C3) to Children's Home (Use Class C2) to accommodate a maximum of 3no children, aged 5 to 18 years old
474 Obelisk Rise

The Interim Development Manager submitted a report to the Committee which sought approval for a change of use from dwellinghouse to children's home for a maximum of 3 children aged 5-18 years old. No layout changes were proposed; the smallest bedroom would be used by staff, of which there would be 2 full-time and 1 visiting regularly. Environmental Health had not objected to the application and a condition was included to ensure the maximum occupancy did not exceed 3 service users. Highways had not objected to the application and the site was considered a sustainable location. It was explained that concern voiced around the suitability of the care company was not a material consideration.

Alan Stanley, a local resident, spoke against the application and commented that lots of elderly and disabled people lived in the area who were concerned about antisocial behaviour. He noted that when the estate was built, covenants were put in place which stipulated that only private dwelling houses be built.

At this juncture the Planning Solicitor advised that covenants and mortgage conditions were not matters for the Planning Committee to consider.

David Richardson, a local resident, spoke against the application and commented that the location was unsuitable for a children's home and voiced concern around the suitability of the company due to not having a proven track record.

Pat Dooley, the agent on behalf of the applicant, spoke in favour of the application and commented that the area was highly populated with families and noted that a family with several children could move into the property, having the same effect on neighbours as the children's home. The proposed development would provide structure and routine to vulnerable young people.

The Interim Development Manager explained that the application was not for an HMO; the staff and service users would be living in the property as a family and as such there were no requirements for additional washing facilities.

Members discussed the report.

RESOLVED:

That the application be **APPROVED** subject to the conditions and reasons as set out in the report.

62. **Urgent Business**

None.

The meeting closed at 6.30 pm

Chair: _____

Date: _____