



**West  
Northamptonshire  
Council**

### **Northampton Local Area Planning Committee**

Minutes of a meeting of the Northampton Local Area Planning Committee held at The Jeffrey Room - The Guildhall, Northampton, NN1 1DE on Tuesday 2 August 2022 at 5.00 pm.

Present           Councillor Jamie Lane (Chair)  
                      Councillor Anna King (Vice-Chair)  
                      Councillor Muna Cali  
                      Councillor Paul Clark  
                      Councillor Raymond Connolly  
                      Councillor Sally Beardsworth  
                      Councillor Penelope Flavell

Officers:           Nicky Scaife (Development Management Team Leader)  
                      Adam Walker (Principal Planning Officer)  
                      Theresa Boyd (Planning Solicitor)  
                      Ed Bostock (Democratic Services Officer)

#### **14. Apologies for Absence and Appointment of Substitute Members**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Choudary, Dyball, Russell, and Z Smith.

#### **15. Declarations of Interest**

None advised.

#### **16. Minutes**

The minutes of the meetings held on 7<sup>th</sup> June 2022 and 5<sup>th</sup> July 2022 were agreed and signed by the Chair.

#### **17. Chair's Announcements**

There were no Chair's announcements on this occasion.

#### **18. Deputations/Public Addresses**

##### **RESOLVED:**

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

**WNN/2021/0159**  
Councillor Hallam  
Irene Painter

Helen Reay  
Jennie Harris

**WNN/2022/0104**  
Councillor Purser  
Sally Stroman

19. **List of Current Appeals/Inquiries**

The Development Management Team Leader submitted a List of Current Appeals and Inquiries and explained that at the time of writing the report, 4 decisions had been made by the Inspector. An application in respect of 21 Market Square was refused under delegated powers, with officers concluding that the proposal would look incongruous given its prominent position within the Conservation Area and proximity to listed buildings. The Inspector agreed with the officer's decision and stated that the application would have an unacceptable impact on heritage assets. An application in respect of a residential development for 8 flats on an existing car park on Hazelwood Road was not determined within the 8-week timescale; this was a resubmission that was similar to a previous application which was refused under delegated powers for reasons of design and scale, the impact on existing and proposed residential amenity and parking layout. The appeal was against non-determination of the application. The Inspector agreed with the officer's original reasons for refusal with the exception of impact on parking/highways and dismissed the appeal, finding that the proposal would fail to enhance and preserve the conservation area and would adversely impact on existing/proposed residential amenity. An appeal relating to 34 Abington Street was allowed by the Inspector; the retrospective application for an electric solid shutter and new shopfront was refused under delegated powers due to the impact on the character of the area and nearby Conservation Area and listed buildings on Fish Street. However the Inspector disagreed and concluded that the shop had a closer relationship with the retail character of properties on Abington Street, and considering the value of items stored in the shop window, despite not being perforated as required by the Council's shopfront guidance, on balance the shutters were appropriate for security reasons. The Inspector added that this permission should not be seen as precedence for approval of similar applications for solid shutters in the area.

Members discussed the report.

**RESOLVED:**

That the report be noted.

20. **WNN/2021/0159 - Demolition of existing dwelling at no 351 Kettering Road and replacement with part single, part two and part three storey extension to Rathgar Care Home together with parking and access alterations and associated works including alterations to boundary treatments. Rathgar Care Home, 349 Kettering Road**

The Development Management Team Leader presented the report which sought approval for the demolition of an existing dwelling and replacement with part single,

part 2, and part 3 storey extensions to Rathgar Care Home together with parking and access alterations and associated works, including alterations to the boundary treatments. The Committee heard that following deferral from 4th May 2022 Planning Committee, discussions had taken place with local residents in respect of parking, trees and refuse storage in particular and the applicant had advised that the scale of development and the number of bedrooms could not be further reduced, or the development would no longer be commercially viable. It was also explained that the design of the development was necessary to ensure that there was level access throughout the building. The existing access to the property would be widened to 6m; this was secured by a condition. 10 parking spaces would be provided, including 1 disabled space and 1 EV charging point; these provisions were also secured by a condition. It was noted that Highways had raised parking concerns, however the application had been assessed against the current parking provision of which there was an existing shortfall, and the parking provision would be doubled along with the number of rooms in the care home. This was taken into account by officers, along with the site's sustainable urban location. Refuse storage for 2 Euro bins was proposed to the rear of the property and 1, which would be used for clinical waste, was proposed to be kept at the front of the property. The trees bordering the application site and neighbouring property would be retained and certain windows on the upper floors of the side elevations would be obscure glazed to ensure no overlooking to the neighbouring property. The side extension would be set further back than the existing property and an additional storey added; due to the distance of any clear glazed windows from the neighbouring boundaries any overlooking was not considered sufficiently severe to warrant refusal. The principle of development was considered acceptable, the development would provide specialist accommodation and add to the Council's 5 year housing supply and contribute to an identified housing need. In respect of concerns around noise, it was noted that Environmental Health had raised no objections to the application subject to the submission of a construction management plan.

Councillor Hallam, in his capacity as a Ward Member for Boothville & Parklands, spoke against the application and thanked those that took part in talks following the application's deferment in May but noted that the only change was to retain the trees bordering the properties. He stated that the residents of the neighbouring property did not want commercial waste stored by their garden and said that the developer was "shoehorning" housing into a footprint that was too small.

Irene Painter, the owner of the neighbouring property, spoke against the application and highlighted comments that she made at the previous Planning Committee in relation to the trees and existing highways issues. She also stated that the planning officer agreed that the ambient atmosphere in the garden of her property would be damaged with bins at the rear of the care home and noted that a smaller care home nearby had more bins than were proposed for this development.

In response to a question, Mrs Painter confirmed that the proposed 2 storey extension would be 2-3m from her side patio door.

Helen Reay, a local resident, spoke against the application and voiced concerns around the scale of the proposal, the building extending beyond the existing building line, refuse storage, the lack of amenities and highways and parking issues. She

stated that too few changes had been made to the proposal following further consultation, that the neighbouring property would be severely overlooked by the development and noted that the Police had recommended that the bins be kept at the front of the property.

Jennie Harris, the agent on behalf of the applicant, spoke in favour of the application and commented that the development was an important contribution towards the current under-provision of care homes. She noted that the applicant had fulfilled its obligation to carry out further consultations, having done so on 10th May and 22nd June 2022. She advised that the scale of the proposal was needed to ensure that the development remained viable and noted that officers had found the proposal acceptable. She further noted that the proposal would contribute to the Council's 5-year housing supply and provide a number of employment opportunities.

In response to questions, Ms Harris confirmed that the portacabin that was onsite was not part of the application and would be removed in due course. The bin proposed to be kept at the front of the property would be used for clinical waste; there were 3 bins on the property currently, however 1 was not in use. Regarding parking, Ms Harris explained that the shortfall would be the same as it currently was. The parking spaces had been designed to allow for maximum manoeuvrability and cycle storage was also proposed; there was none on the site currently. A travel plan was also proposed as part of the application. Ms Harris confirmed that the waste would be collected by a private waste collector and not the Council's contractors. She explained that the application had been amended to provide 17 rooms; this was a reduction from 20 and could not go any lower due to viability constraints. All other options had been considered. A flat level was required throughout the development due to access to fire escapes.

Members discussed the application and made the following observations and comments:

- Highways and Police concerns had not been sufficiently addressed
- The application seemed like an overdevelopment and was not sympathetic to the neighbouring property
- The bins proposed to be kept at the rear of the property were in the wrong place, they should all be kept at the front.

There was no proposer to accept the officer recommendation.

Councillor King proposed and Councillor Beardsworth seconded that the application be refused against the officer recommendation for reasons of parking/highways impact, design, overdevelopment, impact on amenity and refuse storage. This was put to a vote and was unanimously declared carried.

**RESOLVED:**

That the application be **REFUSED** contrary to the officer recommendation on the grounds of parking/highways, impact, design, overdevelopment, impact on amenity, and refuse storage with delegated authority to the Chair and Assistant Director of Place and Economy to agree the detailed refusal reasons.

21. **WNN/2022/0104 - Change of use of single dwelling to 4 no. apartments (part retrospective), including top floor rear extension, single storey ground floor rear extension and expansion of basement, with new light well to rear and low level windows to front, additional internal alterations and rear external door. 46 Abington Avenue**

The Principal Planning Officer presented the report which sought approval for a change of use from single dwelling to 4 apartments including top floor rear extension to provide a bedroom, single storey ground floor rear extension to provide a bedroom and bathroom, expansion of the basement with new lightwell to the rear and low-level windows to the front, internal alterations and a rear external door. The application was part in retrospect as the property was already in use as 4 apartments, understood to have been in such use for a number of years. The existing application sought to regularise the use and provide improved internal accommodation for occupants. All of the apartments would have access to the rear garden where waste and cycle storage was proposed, and waste would be taken through communal access to the front of the property. All rooms exceeded national minimum space standards. Parking requirements remained the same as existing and the property sat within a sustainable location, close to public transport links and shopping facilities. The Principal Planning Officer confirmed that there was an update to Condition 2 of the report in respect of the correct approved plans.

Councillor Purser, in his capacity as a Ward Member for Abington & Phippsville, spoke against the application and commented that the basement apartment would be very dark, and that the sloping roof in the top floor apartment meant that comfortable living space would be smaller than the plans indicated. He had concerns with waste being brought through the house and highlighted existing issues with parking in the area. Councillor Purser believed the application to be an overdevelopment, despite some desirable qualities.

Sally Stroman, the agent on behalf of the applicant, spoke in favour of the application and commented that the property had been used as apartments for a number of years; the extensions were proposed to bring the apartments up to the required standard and the change of use to ensure that the apartments complied with planning requirements. Ms Stroman noted that there were no objections from local residents to the application.

In response to questions, Ms Stroman advised that the basement apartment was also partly on the ground floor and that the proposed waste arrangements were the same as they were currently.

The Principal Planning Officer confirmed that the 2nd storey apartment was in accordance with national space standards, even when taking the sloping roof into account.

Members discussed the report.

Councillor Clark proposed and Councillor King seconded that the officer recommendation be approved. The recommendation contained within the report was put to a vote and was carried with 6 votes for and 1 against.

**RESOLVED:**

That the application be **APPROVED** subject to the conditions and reasons as set out in the report **and amendment to condition 2 (plans condition)**

Amended Condition 2:

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: N457-101C, N457-102, N457-001.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to accord with the terms of the planning application.

22. **WNN/2022/0152 - Conversion of First and Second Floors to 31no Apartments. 34 - 34A Gold Street**

The Principal Planning Officer presented the report which sought approval for the conversion of 1st and 2nd floor town centre units in the All Saints Conservation Area to 31 apartments. Limited external alterations were proposed with the ground floor retail unit would be retained, and new front access to the apartments provided, with the addition of 3 windows to the front at 2nd floor level and the insertion of new windows in the side elevations to provide light and outlook to the apartments. All the units met or exceeded national space standards and waste and cycle storage would be provided as part of the development. Following a noise assessment, glazed windows were proposed and secured by a condition. The application was supported by a Viability Assessment which had been independently assessed on behalf of the Council. The conclusions were that the development, whilst not being able to secure fully policy compliant developer contributions and affordable housing, could achieve a viable scheme with a contribution towards off-site affordable housing provision and contributions towards healthcare, off-site open space, construction training and the Council's monitoring fee to be secured by way of a Section 106 Legal Agreement.

Members discussed the report and commented that town centres were changing so should look to be used in a variety of ways.

Councillor Clark proposed and Councillor Connolly seconded that the officer recommendation be approved. The recommendation contained within the report was put to the vote and was carried with 6 votes for and 1 against.

**RESOLVED:**

That the application be **APPROVED IN PRINCIPLE** subject to the conditions and reasons as set out in the report and subject to the completion of a S106 Legal Agreement to secure the obligations as set out in the officer's report.

23. **Urgent Business**

There was no urgent business on this occasion.

The meeting closed at 6.38 pm

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

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