Planning Committee
Wednesday 17th September 2008 at 7.00 pm

Council Chamber, Swanspool House, Doddington Road,
Wellingborough, Northamptonshire NN8 1BP

1. Apologies for absence (if any).
2. Declarations of Interest (if any).
3. Confirmation of the minutes of the meetings held on 20 and 28/8/2008.
4. Applications for planning permission, listed building consent and building regulation approval.
5. Any other items that the Chairman decides are urgent.

Enclosed
Site Viewing Group for Tuesday 16th September 2008 will be Councillors Griffiths, Morrall, Ward and Waters.

Lyn Martin-Bennison,
Chief Executive

Date issued: 9th September 2008

| Membership: | Councillor Morrall (Chairman), Councillor Ward (Vice Chairman), Councillors Bass, Beirne, P Bell, Dean, Griffiths, Maguire, Patel, Payne and Waters. |

For further information contact Democratic Services on 01933 231511.
dnewbold@wellingborough.gov.uk
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BOROUGH COUNCIL OF WELLINGBOROUGH

AGENDA ITEM

SITE VIEWING (Date of visit 16th September 2008 at 10.45 a.m.)

Planning Committee 17/09/2008

Report of the Deputy Chief Executive

APPLICATION REF: WP/2008/0040/FM

PROPOSAL: Erection of 25 no. affordable and shared ownership 2 storey houses and 3 storey flats with access, parking and re-located play area.

LOCATION: The Cottage Public House, London Road, Little Irchester, Wellingborough. NN8 2EA

APPLICANT: Orbit Housing Group Limited.

The proposal requires Committee consideration owing to the number of representations. A site visit is also recommended due to the complexity of the proposal, especially in relation to land ownership issues. A Legal Agreement under Section 106 of the 1990 Act will also need to be completed prior to the decision being issued.

PROPOSAL AND DESCRIPTION OF SITE:
The application site lies on the eastern side of London Road at the junction of Daniels Road in Little Irchester. It comprises a public house (now demolished), its open curtilage, including the car park and the children’s playground that is adjacent to Daniels Road. The site abuts the rear gardens of properties fronting Milton Road and Newton Road, to the south and east respectively.

Consent is sought to erect Nineteen (19) 2-storey houses and a 3-storey block of 6 self contained flats. The existing access to the public house car park from London Road would be made redundant and a new access created off Daniels Road and leading to 25 car parking spaces within the site. It is also proposed to relocate the play area to a new location. The proposal is the subject of extensive consultation with the Parish Council.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:
Purpose built public house with a lengthy history of consent for various alterations, extensions and signage. The public house is now demolished and the site cleared.

NATIONAL AND LOCAL PLANNING POLICY:
Planning Policy Statement 1; Delivering Sustainable Development.
Planning Policy Statement 3; Housing
Planning Policy Statement 7; Sustainable Development in Rural Areas
Planning Policy Guidance Note 13: Transport
Regional Spatial Strategy 8
Sub-Regional Strategy for Milton Keynes and South Midlands
Northamptonshire Structure Plan:
  Policy GS5 – Design
North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy:
  Policy 7 – Infrastructure Delivery and Developer Contributions
  Policy 8 – Delivering Housing
  Policy 11 – Distribution of Housing
  Policy 14 – General Sustainable Development Principles
  Policy 15 – Energy Efficiency and Sustainable Construction
  Policy 16 – Sustainable Housing Provision
Wellingborough Local Plan:
  Policy G4 – Villages
  H8 – Affordable Housing

SUMMARY OF REPLIES TO CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED:
1. Irchester Parish Council – no objection to the proposal, but expresses concerns regarding wheelie bins being left on the A509 as there have been bin fires in the past.
2. Environment Agency – no objection subject to the imposition of a condition requiring details of the phasing of the development.
3. NCC Highways – no objections raised but requires financial contribution towards mitigation of the effect of the development on the strategic road network. Also requires some changes to the layout of the development, which could be dealt with through the imposition of appropriate conditions.
4. NCC Education – financial contribution required towards education provision.
5. Northamptonshire Police – no formal objection as the details of the proposal have been discussed with the architect before hand.
6. Environmental Health Officer – impose condition to deal with potential contamination.
7. Design and Conservation Officer – entirely happy with the design and layout of the scheme.
8. Housing Strategy Team – supports the application – which will provide much needed affordable housing for local people in a sustainable, mixed tenure environment.
9. Growth and Development Manager – requires financial contribution towards greenway from the Embankment to Summer Leys.
10. Bee Bee Development – raised no objection in principle to the redevelopment of the site. However, would ask the Council to consider the cumulative effect of increased pressures on highways and drainage infrastructure. Developers should also be required to make a pro-rata contribution towards infrastructure provision.

11. The Civic Society have asked that the plans be examined by the Design Officer as they are not satisfied with the standard of architecture.

12. Stagecoach East – consideration ought to be given to the resiting of the bus stop adjacent to the site during demolition and construction phases of the development. Clarification is also sought as to whether or not the bus stop will resume its existing position once the development is completed.

The Applicant’s Response: Our proposed current residential layout will have no adverse affect upon the location of the bus stop. The proposals do in fact include stopping up the existing vehicular access into the existing pub car park which will improve the area around the bus stop. Also, during the course of the future construction work, the site will be securely fenced off so that continued use of the bus stop is maintained. As also discussed, to safeguard your concerns there can be planning conditions associated with the consent to enforce these measures. Following this discussion you appeared to have your concerns lessened. I would be grateful if you transmit this back to Mr Duyile at your earliest convenience.

13. E-on Central Networks – no objection.

14. The occupier of no. 6 Milton Road – the style of houses is not in keeping with the others in the village; the villagers do not want the play area to be moved; parking provision insufficient; and damage to the boundary wall that separates the site from the neighbouring dwellings.

15. The occupier of no. 3 Milton Road – concerns regarding the tree that separates his garden from the development site.

16. The occupier of no. 50 London Road – concern about the 3-storey flats and the potential fire hazard in view of recent wheelie bin fires. Has sought clarification in relation to the type of occupiers, road safety etc.

17. 12a Daniels Road – concerned that the plans do not show the siting of the static caravan next to the playground. Would like to know the kinds of boundary walls that would be erected. Concerns about parking and the plans also do not show if there would be any windows overlooking their property.

ASSESSMENT:
Principle of Development
The principle of residential development on this site is acceptable. National guidance in PPS 1 and 3 and the policies of both the Structure Plan; the recently adopted Core Spatial Strategy and the provisions in the Regional Spatial Strategy all encourage and support the reuse of previously developed sites in built up areas for residential
purposes. The application site is a previously developed site as defined in the annex to PPS 3. Residential development is acceptable in principle, because it will increase housing stock in the area. Furthermore, it will broaden the dwelling and tenure mix of the area, consistent with the advice in PPS 3.

Policy G4 of the Local Plan supports developments within the Restricted Infill Villages such as Little Irchester, provided that they are sited within the Village policy lines, and they would have no adverse effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The site falls within the village policy boundary and in the circumstances, the main issues would be to consider the impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area; impact on the living conditions/amenities of neighbouring occupiers and parking/traffic matters.

**Design, Layout, Character and Appearance**
The design and layout of the development are satisfactory. The surrounding area is characterised by 2-storey terraced housing. Within the development, the London Road frontage seeks to continue the form and pattern of the adjoining terrace on London Road, by proposing a terrace of five 2-storey dwellings, which respects the building line that is already established. The 3-storey block of flats is sited away from the neighbouring dwellings. The proposed buildings are primarily presented with red facing bricks (similar to those used on the existing buildings) with some rendering and timber boarding. The incorporation of juliette balconies would add interest to the facades of the 3-storey block. The fenestration is also similar in terms of the emphasis of the openings. In the circumstances, the proposed development is in keeping with the character and appearance of the area.

In respect of the relocated playground, there are concerns that this would be nearer the busy London Road than the existing location. However, appropriate boundary treatments (to be reserved by condition) would ensure the safety of the end users. There are inherent advantages in the new location in that the existing playground is poorly overlooked, whereas with the proposed location is better suited and would benefit from natural surveillance from the proposed dwellings.

**Amenity Impact**
The site is to be developed by the careful positioning and laying out of the new buildings so that any impact upon surrounding properties in respect of residential amenity is negligible. There is sufficient separation distance in accordance with the recommendations of Supplementary Planning Guidance and the need for floor levels survey can be stipulated by condition to cover the concern regarding the height of the units on the site. There are not considered to be any crime and disorder issues arising in respect of this application, notwithstanding the fears that have arisen about future possibilities in this regard. The proposed 3-storey block of flats is sited away from the neighbouring dwellings and would therefore have a negligible impact in terms of overlooking/overshadowing.

**Parking Provision, Traffic and Highways issues**
There are 25 car parking spaces proposed for 25 dwellings. In accordance with national guidance and the need to promote sustainable patterns of travel, this ought to be considered acceptable. There have been no adverse comments from the Highway Authority, however, certain conditions have to be fulfilled and certain works have to be
carried out under the Highways Act to create safe conditions in and around this development. The proximity of a bus stop and the affordable nature of the proposed dwellings ought to be taken into account. The issue of the impact on the adjacent bus stop has been dealt with in the previous section.

**Planning Obligations considerations.**
The applicant is a Registered Social Landlord, tasked with the provision of affordable housing. In the circumstances, an obligation as part of the Section 106 Agreement to provide a requisite affordable housing is not required. Rather, the imposition of a condition would suffice and in the event of the land being transferred to a private developer, there would be a requirement for part of the development being dedicated to social/affordable housing.

The Growth and Development Manager has requested financial contribution towards Greenway from the Embankment to Summer Leys. As this development is unrelated and at a significant distance from this initiative, such obligation is considered unreasonable and would fail the tests in the Circular 05/2005 – The Use of Planning Obligations.

In the circumstances, it is recommended that consent be granted for the development following the completion of a Section 106 Agreement covering the following heads of terms:

- Financial contribution towards strategic road improvements;
- Financial contribution towards education provision;
- Grant of public access to the relocated playground;
- Affordable housing.

**RECOMMENDATION:**
Grant permission subject to the following conditions.

1. This permission is personal to Orbit Housing Group. In the event of the site being transferred to another developer other than a Registered Social Landlord, the successors in title shall be obliged to submit details of the number of affordable/social units and dwelling mix to the local planning authority for approval prior to the commencement of the development in accordance with Policy H8 of the Wellingborough Local Plan. The requisite units shall be managed by a Registered Social Landlord to be approved by the local planning authority. Following this, the development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning.

2. Notwithstanding any materials specified in the application form and/or the drawings, particulars and samples of the materials to be used on all external surfaces of the buildings, including fenestration, windows, doors, eaves and verges shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before the commencement of the development. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

3. Details of those parts of the site not covered by buildings including any parking, roads, footpath, hard and soft landscaping, surface and boundary treatments shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
before the commencement of the development. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

4. A Landscape Management Plan including long term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules of all landscaped areas, other than small, privately owned domestic gardens, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the occupation of the development. The Management Plan shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

5. Before development is commenced an Environmental Risk Assessment (ERA) to assess the potential for contamination of the site shall be submitted to the local planning authority. Should the ERA reveal that the site is subject to contamination a scheme for its remediation shall be submitted to the local planning authority and approved in writing. The approved remediation scheme shall be implemented and completed to the satisfaction of the local planning authority before the dwellings are first occupied.

6. Before development is commenced the finished floor levels of the approved dwellings in relation to the adjacent properties shall be submitted to the local planning authority and approved in writing.

7. Before the development commences a scheme for refuse collection shall be submitted in writing and approved by the local planning authority.

8. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any other Order revoking or re-enacting this Order), no buildings, extensions or alterations permitted by Classes A, B, C, D and E of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Order shall be carried out within the curtilage of the approved 19 dwellinghouses without the prior written consent of the local planning authority.

9. No windows or other openings shall be formed on the flank elevation of the proposed unit 12 facing the rear gardens of properties facing Milton Road without the prior written consent of the local planning authority.

10. The car parking spaces shown on the approved drawings shall be laid out and provided before the occupation of the dwellings and shall thereafter be kept free from obstruction and shall be retained for purposes incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellings.

11. Full details of the design of the access of the junction with Daniels Road to include radii on both sides and accommodating fairground access shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the commencement of the development and the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

12. Forward visibility of 2.5m x 33m shall be provided in both directions at ninety degree bend and highway dedication to extend to splays.

Reasons:
1. To ensure that affordable housing is provided in accordance with the development plan objectives and government guidance.
2. Required to be imposed pursuant to S51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
3. To ensure that the site is satisfactorily landscaped and in order to maintain and enhance the visual amenity of the area.
4. To ensure that the site is satisfactorily landscaped and in order to maintain and enhance the visual amenity of the area.
5. In the interest of health and safety of the occupiers of the development.
6. In the interest of the amenities of the adjoining residential occupiers.
7. To ensure a satisfactory refuse storage accommodation in the interest of the amenities of the future and existing occupiers.
8. To allow the local planning authority the opportunity to control future developments on the site, having regard to nature of the site and in the interest of safeguarding the amenities of neighbouring occupiers.
9. In the interest of the amenities of the adjoining occupiers.
10. To ensure adequate off-street parking provision and in order to prevent additional parking in the surrounding streets, which could be detrimental to amenity and prejudicial to safety.
11. In the interest of highway safety.
12. In the interest of highway safety.

INFORMATIVE/S
1. Pursuant to Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the proposed development complies with the Regional Guidance and the applicable development plan policies and there are no other material considerations that would constitute sustainable grounds for refusal. These include specifically the following policies:
   Northamptonshire Structure Plan:
   Policy GS5 - Design
   North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy:
   Policy 7 - Infrastructure Delivery and Developer Contributions
   Policy 8 - Delivering Housing
   Policy 11 - Distribution of Housing
   Policy 14 - General Sustainable Development Principles
   Policy 15 - Energy Efficiency and Sustainable Construction
   Policy 16 - Sustainable Housing Provision
   Wellingborough Local Plan:
   Policy G4 - Villages
   H8 - Affordable Housing.
2. The applicant is advised that this decision relates to the following drawing numbers received on the dates shown:
   Drawing Numbers: Date Received:
   A5373/2.1/05G 31 July 2008
   2 coloured and unnumbered illustrative drawings 26 February 2008
3. The applicant should ensure that refuse collection arrangements of the proposal are discussed with the appropriate officer of the Borough Council. The Borough Council’s Amenities Performance Manager has indicated that the size and location of the ‘bin areas’ shown on the submitted drawing is unacceptable. The need is for 16 no. 1100L bins and these should be located as close to the highway as possible.
APPLICATION REF: WP/2008/0337/FM

PROPOSAL: The erection of 13 no. 2 bedrooomed apartments with associated parking on land that is a domestic garden.

LOCATION: 25 The Square, Earls Barton. NN6 0NA

APPLICANT: Hewes Developments.

This application comes before the Planning Committee for a decision due to the level of third party objectors and because of an objection by Earls Barton Parish Council. The concerns are with respect the site density and highway concerns. In addition the number of units proposed would trigger contributions.

PROPOSAL AND DESCRIPTION OF SITE:
The site is located within the village confines and Conservation Area of Earls Barton and comprises of the rear garden land of 25 The Square. The proposal is as above and ranges from 2 to 3 storeys and involves the demolition of a fairly dilapidated single storey building that fronts the highway to allow access on to the High Street.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:
None.

NATIONAL AND LOCAL PLANNING POLICY:
North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy Policies: 1, 10, 13, 14 & 15
Borough Council of Wellingborough Local Plan: G4
County Structure Plan Policy: GS5
National Guidance: PPS 1, 3, 7, 13 and 15
Supplementary Planning Guidance: IV, V and VIII.

SUMMARY OF REPLIES TO CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED:
1. Northamptonshire County Council (NCC) as the Highways Authority -

"It is appropriate for the means of access serving this development to be laid out as a shared private drive having a width of 4.5m for a distance of 10m from the highway boundary."
Vehicle to vehicle visibility of 2m x 43m and pedestrian to vehicle visibility of 2m x 2m must be provided and maintained on each side of the point of access. Because of the location of an adjacent building it is unlikely that the requirement in vehicle visibility in the southerly direction can be met and the application cannot be supported on highway safety grounds.

It is considered that, by the inclusion of the adjoining premises to the south of the application site an opportunity could arise of not only achieving the visibility requirement but also providing an improvement in the width and alignment of the carriageway fronting the site and providing an improved footway facility. The applicant is urged to investigate this possibility further."

**NOTE:** The applicant following these comments performed a speed survey the comments by NCC with regard the results of this survey are as follows:

“The speed survey results indicate an 85%ile speed of traffic using the major road of 23mph which indicates that a ‘Y’ distance of 33m is appropriate to provide visibility in connection with the proposed development. I recall the conversation that took place when we met on 21 July 2008 but regret that, in spite of the survey indicating that a reduced visibility is appropriate, I am still not convinced, without some modification, that your drawing indicates an acceptable application of this requirement.

Visibility above a height of 0.6m must be achieved within a splay comprising a ‘Y’ distance of 33m and an ‘X’ distance, measured from the edge of the carriageway, of 2m. If it is intended that this requirement could be achieved by extending the stop line then suitably amended details must be submitted.

You will accept that this development is situated in close proximity to a pedestrian crossing and it is necessary to ensure that the highest standards are achieved at the point of access to avoid confusion and danger to more vulnerable road users.”

2. NCC (Education) -

“There are no requirement for a contribution towards school provision because local primary and secondary schools have sufficient places to accommodate the small number of school-aged children expected from this development.”

3. Borough Council of Wellingborough Housing Strategy -

“Whereas the proposal is below the trigger for Affordable Housing, which according to the Council’s Supplementary Planning Guidance X1 on Affordable Housing specifies that an affordable housing contribution is triggered in the rural areas on developments of 15 or more units, the recent Strategic Housing Market Assessment recommends:

‘Housing developments on rural housing sites of 3+ dwellings should provide 30% of affordable housing unless specific evidence indicates that a
lesser proportion is required to ensure viability. Of the affordable housing 25% should be social rented housing and 5% intermediate….’

In this instance, there would be a requirement for 3 units to be affordable.

The recommendations of the Strategic Market Assessment have been incorporated into the draft Core Spatial Strategy.”

4. The Environment Agency - had “no objection” but did suggest a flood prevention condition which will be reported below should approval be recommended.

5. Borough Council of Wellingborough - Amenities

“Whilst we are still considering the Section 106 requirement I would be obliged if you would draw the attention of the developer that we feel is the unsatisfactory nature of the facilities for waste collection.

With the road being unadopted, all the waste collection and recycling containers should be stored adjacent to the public highway boundary. Also because of the nature of the development we feel that communal facilities would be better. We suggest 6 no. 1100L containers.” And have requested a contribution for the containers provision plus a street litter bin.

6. Northamptonshire NHS -

“The PCT does not usually seek a contribution for any affordable housing being provided, but as none is indicated for this development, I have calculated a contribution for all 13 dwellings. The healthcare contribution is £1,266 per unit i.e. a contribution of £16,458.”

7. Conservation Officer -

“The scheme hangs together very well as footprint. Where it differs from the pre-application discussions held is in the third storey element, which should be deleted as alien to the prevailing vernacular form.

Please query to what extent the carbon/eco agenda is to be addressed in provision of the following possible features:

Solar panels, photo-voltaic cells, ground/air heat pumps, heat-exchange installations, grey-water storage for non-potable use, low-flow taps/showers, water-buttts, off-site prefabrication construction systems and high thermal performance walling systems.

I also require to add several conditions to any consent covering submission of details of materials recycling, and architectural features such as verges, porches and oriels.”
8. Earls Barton Police Station -  
Has requested a contribution towards the installation of CCTV.

9. Crime Prevention Design Advisor -  
“…as the development is in the town centre crime, disorder and anti-social behaviour issues need to be taken in to consideration. I have the following recommendations to make:

* All doors should comply to British Standard PAS 24-1:1999 doors for enhanced security.
* All windows should comply to BS7950.
* Communal Parking areas to be lit to BS548.
* Communal entry systems should only allow access to a maximum of 8 properties.
* Internal under croft should be gated.
* Parking bays individually numbered.

Due to the number of dwellings and the site layout the development could work towards achieving the Secured By Design Award (SBD). For more information on SBD please see the website for details:  http://www.securedbydesign.com”

10. Environmental Protection Department -  
Suggest 4 conditions and will be presented below should approval be recommended.

11. Third Party Objections - there have been 15 letters of objection received in total from various concerned residents and businesses of Earls Barton, the summary of those concerns are:

- Not in character of the area especially within the Conservation Area.
- Overdevelopment of the site.
- Insufficient parking provision.
- No demand for types of housing proposed.
- Highway safety concerns with respect to increased congestion and the access and its proximity to the shopping area and a pedestrian crossing.
- Also an individual concern with respect to overshadowing and access to a fire-route to the rear of the commercial premises.

A letter of support was also received from a nearby resident.

**ASSESSMENT:**  
**Principle of Development**
The principle of the development is considered with regard to Policy G4 of the Borough Council of Wellingborough Local plan policy. The policy states that so long as the development is within the village policy line (VPL) as defined in the proposal map and is not to the detriment of the size, form, character and setting of the village and its environs then the development is acceptable. The site is within VPL and is brownfield
in nature and therefore appropriate for development, the latter determining factor will be discussed below.

The types of properties required within Earls Barton has not been demonstrated by the authority, therefore no judgement can be made with regard the need for 2 bedroom maisonettes in the village.

**Highway Concerns**
The site is located in close proximity to the village retail centre with the intended access located close to a busy junction which attracts significant through-traffic. There is a small car park in The Square for users of the outlets; nevertheless this parking provision is insufficient for the number of vehicles resulting in on-street parking which contributes to the congestion and highway safety concerns in this vicinity. A survey conducted by the applicant on Wednesday 23 July 2008 found that 200 vehicles travelled northbound past the site between 09.45 and 11.40am. The proposed access is also within close proximity to a pedestrian crossing, within the approach chevrons of the cross-over and located between the villages main grocery shop and the other village conveniences and therefore receives a high volume of footfall. Essentially the site is located in a particularly congested area of the village and receives a relatively high volume of traffic given the nature of the roads resulting in pedestrian and vehicle movements being in close alignment. It is therefore important that the development does not increase the risk to highway safety either by way of additional on-street parking requirements or by the characteristics and positioning of the access.

The comments of the highway authority above indicates that visibility splays are not conducive in maintaining highway safety and convenience without the demolition of a structure external of the site and therefore represent a significant highway safety concern particularly given the location of the pedestrian crossing. Whilst the applicant has attempted to provide data to justify the access the highways authority remain unsatisfied and for this reason the application is recommended for refusal.

In addition the development comprises 13 dwellings and includes car parking for 14 cars, with many of the spaces falling short of the minimum sizes for tandem and dedicated parking spaces as indicated in pp. 22 of the parking SPG. Therefore some of the spaces are unfit for purpose and could put pressure on on-street parking in the area. Parking standards in PPS 13 and local standards indicate a maximum requirement of 1.5 spaces per dwelling. Whilst these standards are set at a maximum, in this instance, given the congested nature of the local road network and Earls Barton not having what could be classified as ‘good’ transport links it is considered that the maximum should be applied. This equates to 19.5 (20) parking spaces, therefore the proposed is 6 short. This represents overdevelopment of the site and adverse impact on the safety and convenience of the highway. The development also offers little space for cycle storage in lieu of the deficit parking provision.

**Impact on the Character and Appearance of the Area**
It is considered that the traditional two storey property fronting the street and the demolition of a dilapidated existing structure is of benefit to the character of the area providing the detailing and materials are suitable. Some of the detailing within the scheme is also to be applauded in providing a degree of character and interest. Much of the site will not form part of the principle street scene in the High Street, however, the
development should respect the character of the conservation area. Whilst the proposal for maisonettes may be appropriate on the site it is considered that the 3 storey element is uncharacteristic and the high density of the development unsuitable and not in-keeping with the density of other brown-field development within the area and therefore representing overdevelopment. This overdevelopment is further represented in the development with little regard being paid towards bin storage provision. Although a photomontage has not been included with the application it is likely the three storey element will be seen from the Square and there detracting from and being overbearing towards the traditional row terraces altering the streetscene to the detriment.

The development is therefore considered to have an adverse impact on the size, form and character and setting of the village and in conflict with policy G4.2 of the Borough Council of Wellingborough Local Plan, GS5 of the County Structure Plan and Policy 13 (h, I and o) of the CSS.

Amenity Space
The development comprises of 13 maisonettes, although it is not considered imperative to provide areas of amenity space in such schemes. SPG VIII does advocate the availability of a communal space at the very least. The space provided within the development is slight and is largely intended to be hard-paved. This goes further to demonstrate the overdevelopment of the site and significantly limits the opportunity to provide soft landscaping within the development and create a more aesthetic environment. The lack of communal space or dedicated amenity space also does not encourage community interaction.

Loss of Neighbours Amenities
There are few issues with regard the overlooking and overshadowing of neighbours due to the units fronting the site being non-habitable, being backed by a school and its orientation to no. 4 High Street.

Crime Prevention
Although the development would benefit from a gate to the under-croft this can be conditioned and therefore would not solely justify refusal.

Biodiversity
The site is both hard-paved and grassed with various unsubstantial trees and shrubs there is not considered to be any adverse impact of the biodiversity of the area.

Response to Representation
In respect to the third parties all concerns have been discussed above apart from the concern regarding the fire-exit; it appears that this access provision has been ensured in the layout. The comments from statutory consultees have been discussed above or would form part of the conditions of remuneration agreement should the application be approved.

Summary
It has been demonstrated that the site is considered appropriate for development and that it can be designed in such away so as not impact on the amenities of neighbours. There is however significant concerns with respect to the adverse impact on the local
road network because of the unsuitable access and the insufficient and sometimes unfit parking provision within the site. In addition the density and character of the area is considered to be adversely impacted with an unacceptable level of amenity space provided and concerns over bin storage all going to demonstrate the overdevelopment of the site and therefore its non-compliance with the policies indicated below in the reason for refusal. Therefore for the reasons given above the application is hereby recommended for refusal.

**RECOMMENDATION:**
Refuse.

1. Due to the proposed design, proximity and orientation of the access together with insufficient off-street parking provision the development would represent an unacceptable increase in the risk to the safety and convenience of the highway. Contrary to The North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy Policy: 13 and County Structure Plan Policy GS5. The proposal is also considered to be inconsistent with the advice in PPS 13.

2. Due to the proposed bulk, scale and density of the development it is considered to be to the detriment of the character and the setting of the conservation area and neighbouring buildings. Whilst also representing overdevelopment due to its density and lack of amenity space and bin storage provision. Contrary to The North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy Policy: 13 and County Structure Plan Policy GS5 and G4 of the Borough of Wellingborough Local Plan. The proposal is also considered to be inconsistent with the advice in PPS 3 and 15.

**POLICY G4**

**IN THE LIMITED DEVELOPMENT AND RESTRICTED INFILL VILLAGES DEVELOPMENT WILL BE GRANTED PLANNING PERMISSION, SUBJECT TO MORE SPECIFIC POLICIES REGARDING INDIVIDUAL SITES AREAS OR USES, IF IT:**

1. **IS WITHIN THE VILLAGE POLICY LINES, AS DEFINED ON THE PROPOSALS MAP;**

2. **WILL NOT, EITHER INDIVIDUALLY OR CUMULATIVELY WITH OTHER PROPOSALS, HAVE AN ADVERSE IMPACT ON THE SIZE, FORM, CHARACTER AND SETTING OF THE VILLAGE AND ITS ENVIRONS.**

**LIMITED DEVELOPMENT VILLAGES ARE:**

- EARLS BARTON;
- FINEDON AND WOLLASTON

**RESTRICTED INFILL VILLAGES ARE:**

- BOZEAT;
- ECTON;
- GREAT DODDINGTON;
- GREAT HARROWDEN;
- GRENDON;
HARDWICK;
IRCHESTER;
ISHAM;
LITTLE HARROWDEN;
LITTLE IRCHESTER;
MEARS ASHBY;
ORLINGBURY;
SYWELL EXCLUDING THE OLD VILLAGE; AND
WILBY

Limited development and restricted infill villages are mutually distinguished in other policies below, notably H2 and H3 (housing).

POLICY GS5

IN ORDER TO PROMOTE HIGH QUALITY DESIGN AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT, ALL PROPOSALS WILL HAVE REGARD TO THE FOLLOWING CONSIDERATIONS:


- THE NEED TO ENCOURAGE MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT AND THE RELATIONSHIPS OF DIFFERENT LAND-USE WITH EACH OTHER;

- THE NEED FOR MEASURES FOR PLANNING OUT CRIME; AND

- THE NEED FOR CONSERVATION OF ENERGY, RESOURCES AND THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT, AND FOR DEVELOPMENTS AND DESIGNS WHICH GIVE PRIORITY TO MEANS OF TRANSPORT OTHER THAN THE PRIVATE CAR.

Policy 13

Development should meet the needs of residents and businesses without compromising the ability of future generations to enjoy the same quality of life that the present generation aspires to. Development should:

Meet needs
a) Incorporate flexible designs for buildings and their settings, including access to amenity space, enabling them to be adapted to future needs and to take into account the needs of all users;

b) Seek to design out antisocial behaviour, crime and reduce the fear of crime by applying the principles of the 'Secured by Design scheme';

c) Maintain and improve the provision of accessible local services and community services, whilst focusing uses that attract a lot of visitors within the town centres;

d) Have a satisfactory means of access and provide for parking, servicing and manoeuvring in accordance with adopted standards;
e) Be designed to take full account of the transport user hierarchy of pedestrian-cyclist-public transport-private vehicle, and incorporate measures to contribute to an overall target of 20% modal shift in developments of over 200 dwellings and elsewhere 5% over the plan period;

f) Not lead to the loss of community facilities, unless it can be demonstrated that they are no longer needed by the community they serve and are not needed for any other community use to that the facility is being relocated and improved to meet the needs of the new and existing community;

g) Not lead to the loss of open space or recreation facilities, unless a site of equivalent quality and accessibility can be provided, services and made available to the community prior to use of the existing site ceasing.

Raise standards

h) Be of a high standard of design, architecture and landscaping, respects and enhances the character of its surroundings and is in accordance with the Environmental Character of the area;

i) Create a strong sense of place by strengthening the distinctive historic and cultural qualities and townscape of the towns and villages through its design, landscaping and use of public art;

j) Be designed to promote healthier lifestyles and for people to be active outside their home and places of work;

k) Allow for travel to home, shops, work and school on foot and by cycle and public transport.

Protect assets

l) Not result in an unacceptable impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties or the wider area, by reason of noise, vibration, smell, light or other pollution, loss of light or overlooking;

m) Be constructed and operated using a minimum amount of non-renewable resources including where possible the reuse of existing structures and materials;

n) No have an adverse impact on the highway network and will not prejudice highway safety;

o) Conserve and enhance the landscape character, historic landscape designated built environmental assets and their settings, and biodiversity of the environment making reference to the Environmental Character Assessment and Green Infrastructure Strategy;

p) Not sterilise known mineral reserves or degrade soil quality;

q) Not cause a risk to (and where possible enhance) the quality of the underlying groundwater or surface water, or increase the risk of flooding on the site or elsewhere, and where possible incorporate Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) and lead to a reduction in flood risk.

INFORMATIVE:
The applicant is advised that this decision relates to the following drawing numbers received on the date shown:

Drawing Number: Date Received:
No Drawing Numbers 23 June 2008
BOROUGH COUNCIL OF WELLINGBOROUGH

AGENDA ITEM

SITE VIEWING (Date of visit 16th September 2008 at 11.20 a.m.)

Planning Committee 17/09/2008

Report of the Deputy Chief Executive

APPLICATION REF: WP/2008/0398/F

PROPOSAL: Conversion of redundant water tower to form single dwelling.

LOCATION: Great Doddington Water Tower, Cut Throat Lane, Great Doddington, Wellingborough.

APPLICANT: AWG Property Limited

This application is referred to the Planning Committee for determination because the Parish Council has objected on the grounds that the development would be too far from the village envelope on what is essentially agricultural land would create an unwelcome precedent.

PROPOSAL AND DESCRIPTION OF SITE:
The defunct water tower sits deep in the Open Countryside, outside the village of Great Doddington. Apart from the Wellingborough Rugby Football Ground which is located south of the application site, the surrounding area is predominantly agricultural. The proposal site is located east of Cut Throat Lane from which it gains vehicular access. It is currently fenced off by timber post and rail fence and contains a number of self seeded trees. Permission is sought to convert the tower into a residential dwelling. This would be achieved by carrying out external alterations involving window openings and creating an additional floor. The application is accompanied by a Structural Report and an Ecological Appraisal.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:
PRE/2008/0021 Pre-application inquiry in respect of the proposal.

NATIONAL AND LOCAL PLANNING POLICY:
National
Planning Policy Statement 1 (PPS 1) - Delivering Sustainable Development.
Planning Policy Statement 3 (PPS 3) - Housing.
Planning Policy Statement 7 (PPS 7) - Sustainable Development in Rural Areas.
Northamptonshire County Structure Plan
GS5 - Design
North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy
Policies:
1 - Strengthening the network of settlements.
13 - General Sustainable Development Principles.

Northamptonshire Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) - Minor Applications that have an effect on the highway.
Supplementary Planning Guidance: Trees on Development Sites and Parking

**SUMMARY OF REPLIES TO CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED:**

1. Neighbours – no responses received.

2. Parish Council – objects to the proposal on the grounds that it would constitute the erection of a dwelling too far outside the existing village envelope in what is essentially agricultural land and could set an unwelcome precedent for further housing development.

3. Highways – the means of access should be suitably refurbished in accordance with the specification of Northamptonshire County Council and the first 5m of the driveway in the rear of the highway driveway should be hard paved to prevent loose material being carried onto the highway.

4. Conservation Officer – the scheme looks fine. A condition covering approval of all exterior surfaces/materials should be attached to the decision.

5. Environmental Development and Protection – the application should have had an Environmental Risk Assessment (ERA). If minded to approve, the decision should be subject to a standard contamination condition.

6. Landscape Officer – the plan appears to indicate that the tree/hedge line would be continued along the site frontage, although there is no indication whether this would be provided by the existing self set ash trees or new planting. I assume that there is a vision splay to be considered. It is apparent when on site and from the aerial photograph that there are more trees adjacent to the site boundary with the rugby ground than are indicated on the plan, which is an advantage. The self set ash trees around the base of the water tower are likely to cause damage if they are not removed. Not all the trees are ash. There is a mature willow behind the tower. This water tower is considerably smaller than the nearby one at Earls Barton and it is screened to some extent at present. There is no indication of the proposed boundary treatment on the open field side. A native hedge would be appropriate although an open view would probably be preferred by the applicant. There should be a landscape condition attached to the conditions if the application is approved. Some garden features might appear somewhat incongruous in this rural setting. The site does not appear to be sensitive in wildlife terms, but clearance of trees should not take place within the nesting season.

7. Wellingborough Rugby Football Club – there is no objection per-se but the Club wishes to educate any future occupiers of the property about the various activities that happen at the ground which may have traffic and/or noise implications to avoid any comebacks once the proposal has been implemented. The Club runs various activities some of which heavily rely on the floodlit training areas adjacent the site boundary. The training takes place on Tuesdays,
Wednesdays and Thursday evenings. The Rugby Club wishes to alert any future occupiers of the potential nuisance that may arise from these lights, and future prospect of enhanced floodlighting within 200m of the water tower and occasional stray balls. The proposed design which shows windows facing the ground may need further consideration.

8. Strategic Policy – no response received.

**ASSESSMENT:**
The development plan consists of the saved policies of Northamptonshire County Structure Plan adopted in 2001 and Borough of Wellingborough Local Plan 1999 (Including Local Plan Alteration adopted in 2004); and North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy adopted in 2008.

Structure Plan Policy GS5 seeks to promote high standards of design in the County, having regard to, amongst other matters, the visual appearance of the development in the context of the defining characteristics of the local area. This is reiterated by Policy 13 of North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy which seeks developments that meet needs, raise standards and protect assets.

Members should note that the proposal is considered as a conversion of an institutional building and not a ‘new build’ for which Local Plan Policy G6 (*Development in Open Countryside*) would have been applicable. The now superseded Local Plan Policy G10 (*The Re-use and Adaptation of Buildings*) would have been relevant to the application. As such, there are no relevant policies in respect of the proposed development in the Local Plan, therefore the proposal is considered on its contextual merits and in the light of relevant issues and other material considerations. The main issues would be:

(i) principle of development;
(ii) impact of the proposal on the character of the area, and
(iii) amenities of neighbours and living conditions of future occupiers;
(iv) highway and traffic implications;
(v) landscaping; and
(vi) biodiversity considerations.

**Principle of Development**
PPS 1 and PPS 3 are in favour of the efficient and effective use of land, with particular emphasis on re-use of brown field land, conversion of existing and redundant buildings, good design and supply of housing in rural areas.

PPS 7 seeks to protect the open countryside for the sake of its intrinsic character and beauty, the diversity of its landscapes, heritage and wildlife and the wealth of its natural resources. Accordingly, new building developments located away from existing settlements or outside areas allocated for development in development plans should be strictly controlled.

However, it states in paragraph 17 that ‘the Government’s policy is to support the re-use of appropriately located and suitably constructed existing buildings in the countryside where this would meet sustainable development objectives. Reuse for economic development purposes will usually be preferable, but residential conversions may be...
more appropriate in some locations and for some types of building’. It goes on to say that the local planning authorities should set out in Local Development Documents their policy criteria for permitting the conversion and re-use of buildings in the countryside for economic, residential and any other purposes, including mixed uses. The criteria should take account of, among other things, the potential impact on the countryside and landscapes and wildlife, the suitability of different types of buildings for re-use, and the specific local economic and social needs and opportunities. The local authority has not yet developed the full range of these documents, except the North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy which states in Policy 1 that developments outside village boundaries will only be justified where they involve the re-use of buildings, among other things.

Having regard to the above, it would appear that there is policy justification for the proposal, subject to other considerations below.

Character of the Area
The water tower is a prominent, intrusive and somewhat hideous feature of the surrounding landscape, especially when viewed from Cut Throat Lane and other adjoining areas. The proposed conversion works would enhance its aesthetics without causing significant harm to the visual amenity or rural character of the area. The proposed third floor, though adding bulk, would enhance the visual appeal of the structure which would outweigh the perceived harm associated with the increased height. Also, the use of less intrusive material on the elevations and the third floor would mitigate any such harm. A condition covering the material shall be attached to the decision. Regard is had to the fact that there would be no increase to the existing footprint and that the conversion would be incorporated into the existing structure. The Structural Report accompanying the application concludes that the water tower is suitable for conversion without major reconstruction.

In terms of use, a two bedroom dwelling house would not result in a significant increase in activity, parking, car movements and domestic paraphernalia as to harm the rural character of the area. + Any other developments normally associated with the domestic dwellings which might have an impact on the rural character of the area would be controlled by removing the permitted development rights.

The Parish Council has raised an objection on the basis that the dwelling house would be far from the village built lines, that it would be on agricultural land and that it would set an undesirable precedent. While issues of sustainability are considered elsewhere in the report, it can be said that there is a finite number of defunct water towers in the village (which obviates the precedent claim) and that the site is brown field and the property capable of conversion to residential use. There are a few signs of human activity around the site and it is a real possibility that the site may offer opportunities for unsavoury activities if left in its current state.

Neighbours’ amenities and living conditions of future occupiers.
The proposal site would be big enough to provide reasonable amenity space for the enjoyment of the future occupiers. Having regard to its location, there would be no issues of overlooking, overshadowing and/or loss of outlook.
The neighbouring Rugby Club raises issues regarding its own activities that may affect the future occupiers in terms of noise and light pollution from the flood lit areas of the training ground. To the extent that the light will be facing way from the property and that the trees on the boundary would screen light spillage, it is considered that light pollution to the ground and first floor would be minimal. The applicants are willing to reorient the third floor element to overcome the impact of light. In terms of noise, it is considered that the activities would be limited to selected periods. It would appear that much of the activity would be concentrated behind the club house, leaving the grounds adjoining the application site for training on stipulated days. It is accepted that there may be occasional disturbances arising from the activities associated with the Rugby Club but these would not be considered determinative in this instance. The issue of noise and other environmental considerations would also be controlled under the licences regulating the use of the facility.

Highways and Traffic Implications
The remoteness of the site from village services means residents would be car dependent, contrary to PPG 13. However, PPG 13 acknowledges that the potential for using public transport would be more limited in rural areas than urban. It is considered that national advice concerning re-use of previously developed land and the conversion of redundant building should take priority. In addition, regard is had to the fact that the property would be two bedrooms thereby unlikely to generate additional traffic which would affect the existing highway or cause a significant detraction from the activities associated with the rural area.

The proposed site would have sufficient on-site parking to accommodate appropriate amount of parking.

Landscaping
There are lots of self seeded trees within the vicinity of the site. It would be preferable to have some of them retained in the interest of preserving the rural character of the area. Accordingly, a landscaping condition shall be attached to the decision notice.

Biodiversity Considerations
The Ecological Survey accompanying the application concludes that the site has little or no wildlife value and it is unlikely that any wildlife species would be harmed by the application.

Conclusion
To the extent that the proposal would be compliant with national policy in terms of re-use of redundant buildings in the open countryside and the fact that the proposal would significantly improve the visual appeal of the area, it is considered that it would be acceptable. There may be issues regarding the site’s remoteness from the main village and occasional issues of noise and general disturbance resulting from the adjoining rugby ground but these are considered secondary and unlikely to be of sufficient weight to warrant a refusal of the scheme. On balance, the need to provide rural housing, use of brown field land, suitability of the building for conversion and the positive impact on the visual character of the area would take precedent over the perceived harm mentioned above. As such, the proposal is recommended for approval.
RECOMMENDATION:
Approve with conditions.

1. The development shall be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

2. Representative samples of all external facing and roofing materials including windows, sheeting panels and glazing shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before the development is commenced.

3. Notwithstanding the submitted plans, details of the hard and soft landscaping, boundary treatments and other means of enclosure shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before the commencement of the development. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

4. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995, as amended, or any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order, no alterations to or structures permissible under Classes A, B, C, D, E of the Order shall be erected within the curtilage of the dwelling house hereby approved without the written consent of the local planning authority.

5. Before the development hereby permitted is commenced, an investigation and risk assessment, in addition to any assessment provided with the planning application, must be completed in accordance with a scheme to assess the nature and extent of any contamination on the site, whether or not it originates on the site. The contents of the scheme are subject to the approval in writing of the local planning authority. The investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken by competent persons and a written report of the findings must be produced. The written report is subject to the approval in writing of the local planning authority. The report of the findings must include:
   (i) a survey of the extent, scale and nature of contamination;
   (ii) an assessment of the potential risks to:
      • human health,
      • property (existing or proposed) including buildings, crops, livestock, pets, woodland and service lines and pipes,
      • adjoining land,
      • groundwaters and surface waters,
      • ecological systems,
      • archaeological sites and ancient monuments;
   (iii) an appraisal of remedial options, and proposal of the preferred option(s).
   This must be conducted in accordance with DEFRA and the Environment Agency’s ‘Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, CLR 11. The development shall then proceed in strict accordance with the measures approved.

6. Notwithstanding the approved plans, full details of vehicular visibility splays to be provided in accordance with specifications of Northamptonshire County Council shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority before the development permitted is commenced. The details thereby approved shall be installed prior to occupation of the building.

7. Prior to first use or occupation of the development hereby permitted the means of vehicular access hereby permitted shall be paved with a hard bound surface for a minimum of 5m from the highway boundary and retained as such.
Reasons:
1. Required to be imposed pursuant to S51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
2. In the interests of visual amenity and to preserve the rural character of the countryside.
3. To ensure that the site is satisfactorily landscaped and to control the type of boundary treatments in the interests of the visual amenities of the surrounding area and the rural character of the open countryside.
4. To allow the local planning authority the opportunity to control future development, having regard to the rural nature of the site.
5. To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors [in accordance with policy 13 of North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy].
6. In the interests of highway safety.
7. To prevent loose material being carried onto the highway in the interests of highway safety.

INFORMATIVE/S:
1. Pursuant to Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the proposed development complies with the applicable development plan policies and there are no other material considerations that would constitute sustainable grounds for refusal. These include specifically the following policies: GS5 of the Northamptonshire County Structure Plan and 1 of North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy and Planning Policy Statements 1, 3 and 7.

2. Although the Ecological Survey accompanying the application concludes that the site is of low wildlife value, the applicant is advised to seek professional ecological opinion should notable animals move onto the site in the interim. The applicant shall have regard to Section 1(1) of the Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981) which states that it is an offence:

"to intentionally take, damage or destroy the nest of any wild bird while that nest is in use or being built; or take or destroy an egg of any wild bird".

As such, no works shall be undertaken during the nesting season, unless works to make the habitats unsuitable are first undertaken, or a detailed examination before clearance starts declares the area free.

3. The applicant is advised that this decision relates to the following drawing number received on the date shown:

Drawing Number: 112-2.05A
Date Received: 5th September 2008
BOROUGH COUNCIL OF WELLINGBOROUGH

AGENDA ITEM

Planning Committee 15/09/2008

Report of the Deputy Chief Executive

APPLICATION REF: WP/2004/0600/O

PROPOSAL: Mixed use development including 87ha of residential development; B1, B2 and B8 development, new public transport links (buses), new and enhanced walking and cycling routes and facilities, Country Park, Neighbourhood Centre, 2 Secondary local centres, construction of access roads, bridges and highway structures, footways, footpaths, bridleways; and associated works and facilities.

LOCATION: Land between Finedon Road and The Railway, Neilson's Sidings and Land north of Finedon Road (Bovis), Finedon Road, Wellingborough.

APPLICANT: Bovis Homes Limited.

NOTE: The purpose of this report is to present the first Stanton Cross Urban Design Code document to Members for their consideration and approval.

A technical document known as a Design Code has been in process of preparation for some three years, in connection with the first phase of the Stanton Cross Urban Extension. This has involved Council officers and design consultants and, importantly, a full and exhaustive consultation process with all interested parties.

The purpose of the Design Code is to lay down standards and criteria by which the development will be carried out, in the interests of creating high quality functional and aesthetic built form and spatial inter-relationships. The code uses a mix of written and illustrative material, including photographs, plans, elevations, perspective sketches, and 3D computer models, to prescribe design responses which can be evaluated by officers and judged accordingly.

With the code in place, developers will normally be assured of a maximum 13 week determination period for individual planning applications.

Copies of the code document have been placed in the Members’ Room at Swanspool House for perusal in advance of the meeting.
Black line denotes boundary of neighbourhood centre
PROPOSAL AND DESCRIPTION OF SITE:
The Stanton Cross Neighbourhood Centre Urban Design Code is submitted by Bovis Homes pursuant to the requirements of condition 3 attached to the outline planning permission for Stanton Cross, reference WP/2004/0600/O. The condition states:

“Unless otherwise agreed by the local planning authority, no reserved matters application shall be submitted for development on any subarea until and unless a design code and/or design brief for that sub-area has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.”

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:
Members will be familiar with the technical work that has been carried out by your officers over the past 4 years in connection with the drawing up of the Wellingborough East Masterplan and consideration of the related outline planning application submitted in August 2004 on behalf of the landowners involved. Now known as Stanton Cross, this area of land to the east of the town was identified as a strategic development area, being one of a range of sites able to provide the 6500 new homes and 160 hectares of employment land needed in Wellingborough between 1996 and 2016.

The preparation of design codes is an outcome of the design proposals put forward in the Masterplan. The Stanton Cross Neighbourhood Centre Design Code (SCNCDC) is the first document in what is envisaged will be a suite of inter-related documents. Each design code will be specifically related to one of the nine character areas described in the Masterplan.

The Condition attached to the outline planning permission as mentioned above has the effect of requiring subsequent applications for Approval of Reserved Matters to adhere to the details set out in each individual design code.

NATIONAL AND LOCAL PLANNING POLICY:
N/a.

SUMMARY OF REPLIES TO CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED:
This is attached as Appendix 1.

ASSESSMENT:
The purpose of the SCNCDC is two-fold: Firstly, it will ensure that the character of the Neighbourhood Centre is as described in the Masterplan and the related Simplified Planning Guidance documents, (comprising the Wellingborough East Development Framework, the Wellingborough East Neighbourhood Centre Development Brief and the Wellingborough East Station Island Development Brief), and that it meets the design principles in these documents. The code will also ensure that development is of a high level of design quality. Secondly, it will ensure that if proposed development is in accordance with the code, the target for achieving planning consent for subsequent planning applications should be 13 weeks.

To facilitate this, the SCNCDC sets out a series of qualities and criteria by which reserved matters planning applications can be evaluated by the Council. If the design proposals submitted with the planning applications are in accordance with the criteria set out in the code, then the Council will endeavour to adhere to the 13 week target,
without prejudice, of course, to any other material planning considerations.

**Consultation** on the preparation of the Neighbourhood Centre Urban Design Code began in April 2005. Initially this involved all parties gaining an understanding of what a design code is, how it would work and its relationship to the previously prepared design guidance and the Masterplan. Several design workshops took place involving officers from BCW, NCC and their advisors. Comments and discussions on the first draft code took place following a further workshop held in October 2005.

On receipt of comments on the first draft document, a further period of revision and consultation began in early 2006. Studies were undertaken to deal with specific issues such as the arrangement of land uses, car parking, vehicular, cycle and pedestrian movement (including calming vehicular traffic), environmental standards, affordable housing, detailed road junction design and local character – an expansion of the original study contained in the Masterplan. The code for the residential aspect of the Neighbourhood Centre was endorsed by the working group in August 2006.

The design and layout of the central area of the Neighbourhood Centre was the subject of design workshops and detailed design exercises between August and October 2006. These workshops explored the location of larger retail units such as a supermarket, vehicular service access, car parking and pedestrian movement. Agreement on a preferred layout was reached in October 2006.

Discussions in 2006 resulted in the requirement for a further draft of the code. This was agreed and duly issued for “informal” consultation in April 2007. The process was similar to that of a formal consultation, with the document being issued to statutory consultees and landowners who were given four weeks to respond with comments where they felt it was necessary to do so.

Comments were collated in July 2007 and these formed the basis for a workshop at the end of August at which the outcome of a “Code Testing Exercise” conducted on behalf of the Council was also discussed. Additionally, a meeting took place with the owners of Irthlingborough Grange to discuss the code. Following this, amendments to the code were agreed in November 2007.

A final consultation exercise was then undertaken with the consultees in May 2008, the results of which have been collated, with Council responses to comments, and attached to this report as Appendix 1.

The Council was asked to provide a screening opinion with regard to the potential environmental impact that the design guidance contained in the code will have. It was confirmed that no further environmental assessment work was required and that the studies completed and mitigation measures proposed in respect of the outline planning permission are sufficient in this regard. The guidance contained in the code document will have no additional or adverse environmental impact.

**Design Code Structure.** The SCNCDC covers a diverse and important part of the overall Stanton Cross development area. This includes the mixed-use core, key public open spaces, areas for sports and recreation and residential development that ranges from high-density apartments to conventional housing. In order to deal with the nature
of the development, ensure a high level of design quality and to control what is built, the design code is structured around the concept of “typologies”. There are four main typologies contained in the code, which deal with:

- **Streets** – route hierarchy, permeability, pedestrian and vehicular circulation;
- **Blocks** – layout of buildings forming the overall development structure;
- **Edges** – groups of individual buildings addressing routes and open spaces; and
- **Open Spaces** – landscape treatment, use and role in the overall structure.

Typologies are effectively specifications. For example in the case of street types, in order for a route to be defined as an “avenue”, it should be a certain width, have trees planted along it at prescribed intervals, buildings lining it of a certain height, and the surfaces of footpaths and carriageways comprised of particular materials, etc.

As it is fundamental for users of the code to appreciate the aims and aspirations for the entire Neighbourhood Centre, the “typologies” sections of the document are preceded by a **character and identity** chapter. This seeks to differentiate the character intended for the Neighbourhood Centre from that of other areas outlined in the Masterplan, providing an overview of the intended density, dwelling/building types, land use, landmark and open space/landscape treatment. The chapter also describes the existing character of Wellingborough town and surrounding villages, with photographs of particular features/elements cross-referenced to the succeeding typology chapters, as an aid to designers.

Additional chapters of the code document cover the **public realm**, where palettes of materials and street furniture are identified and cross-referenced to the open spaces, streets and mixed-use core chapters; the **mixed use core** with its area-specific characteristics; the way in which the development will meet national and local guidance on **affordable housing**; how the development addresses **sustainability** issues; and finally under **implementation**, what information will need to be provided by applicants in order to satisfy the requirements of the code and obtain planning permission.

**Using the Code.** Development within the Neighbourhood Centre will be controlled by a **regulating plan**. This is illustrated graphically in the document and has a layout that generally follows the WEAST Development Framework, 2003 and Neighbourhood Centre Development Brief of 2004, but more closely follows that shown in the Masterplan of August 2004. The role of the Regulating Plan is to show the location of all the various typologies within the proposed layout. In so doing, it can be used both by the Council and developers to quickly ascertain the nature of development permissible at any particular location within the Neighbourhood Centre. The Regulating Plan is split into two categories, those elements of development that are mandatory and those that are to some degree discretionary. **Mandatory elements** are those parts of Stanton Cross Neighbourhood Centre that are fundamental to achieving the overall aims of the Masterplan. They are highly visible to all users - those who will pass through the development and those who will live and work there - and are associated with main routes through the development and key public spaces. **Discretionary elements** on the other hand are associated with movement corridors not considered to be “through routes” and localised public spaces generally surrounded by residential development, and as such will be experienced mainly by local people. Flexibility is permitted here in the exact alignment of movement corridors and block dimensions, as...
well as that allowed within the criteria and specification of the individual typologies. Proposed development in these locations must follow the “spirit” of the Regulating Plan and the specification on the typology information sheets.

**Conclusion**
A comprehensive and lengthy consultation process has been carried out to ensure that the views of all interested parties were taken fully into account in the generation of the code document. As demonstrated above its form and content was duly modified to take account of the views of consultees.

Although a relatively recent Government initiative, design coding is now effectively standard practice for all large development schemes. The present SCNCDC is considered to be an excellent example of its type. Officers are confident that its formal acceptance by Members, and utilisation by officers as individual planning applications come on stream, will speed up the determination process and facilitate the creation of an accessible, high quality, characterful urban extension, thereby helping to realise the original vision contained in the Stanton Cross Masterplan.

**RECOMMENDATION:**
That Committee approves the Stanton Cross Neighbourhood Centre Urban Design Code as the primary development control tool to be used in the regulating of the development of that part of the urban extension.
**Stanton Cross Design Code Consultation responses May 2008**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultee</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sheena Rogers - English Heritage</td>
<td>Our specialist staff have considered the information received and we do not wish to offer any comments on this occasion.</td>
<td>None required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways Agency</td>
<td>The Highways Agency has no comment to make on the Design Code.</td>
<td>None required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Steve Bolton - Policy Advisor</td>
<td>In general terms, our view is that the Code will make a contribution to achieving the criteria for promoting better design in new development contained in Policy 3 of the Draft Regional Plan, September 2006. In particular we have noted the reference to EcoHomes as standard. It would however be helpful to see renewable energy identified to show the way towards delivering the Code for Sustainable Homes.</td>
<td>None required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Bullen - Senior Project Officer</td>
<td>Transport - The County Council as Highways Authority may respond separately to this application and therefore comments in their response relate to other areas of concern for the County Council. Mixed Use Core - The general Layout of the mixed core appears adequate. The County Council are pleased to see that the applicant has considered the needs of the ageing populations in proposing an area in the mixed use core adjacent to the health centre for residential care or sheltered accommodation. The County Council would prefer these to be extra care houses (houses that fall in between sheltered accommodation and residential care). Further discussions on this matter would be welcome. The location proposed for the main frontage on to the mixed use area appear acceptable. The location of the main car park could also be beneficial as it could be dual function in providing a place for parents to park to drop and pick up children.</td>
<td>None required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Stanton Cross Design Code Consultation responses May 2008

#### Consultee

**Comments**

Housing - The affordable housing section states that 10% of all houses are to be affordable as has already been agreed. It then goes on to state that a minimum of 10% of all the dwellings will be built to Lifetime Homes standards, It is not clear whether this is 10% of all houses on site or 10% of the affordable offer.

The document states that 90% of all houses will be built to Ecohomes very good and 105 will be excellent. This is to be encouraged. However, although the document states the reasons why it does not, given that all houses when built (rather than at the point of planning permission) are to be assessed against the Code for Sustainable Homes, the document should also examine how the houses will fair against this rating.

As the Code is mandatory at Level 3 for all affordable houses, Level 3 should be the minimum that applies across the whole development. The fact that Level 3 is mandatory for the affordable houses also has repercussions for Lifetime Homes. From 2013, Lifetime Homes will be mandatory at Level 3 of the Code. Therefore any affordable houses built after that date will be Lifetime Homes. To ensure that there is no disparity between those built pre 2013 and post 2013, the developer should be encouraged to provide a higher level of Lifetime Homes across the whole site and to provide all affordable units as Lifetime Homes.

**Environmental Standards** - Whilst it is encouraging to note that energy and water efficiency has been examined across the site, there are some significant areas of weakness within the proposal. There is no mention of energy production on site or where materials used in the development are to be sourced. Again use of the Code for Sustainable Homes here would help.

#### Response

Residential development adhering to the BRE ECO Homes standards is a requirement of the section 106 agreement.

Onsite energy production is not precluded but nor is it a requirement under the Eco Homes Standard. This is also the case with the Code for Sustainable Homes.
### Comments

The document includes reference to a centrally locate ‘bring’ waste facility which is pleasing. This should be looked at in reference to Policy 6 of the Adopted Waste Local Plan. There is a requirement in this policy to address recycling and re-use within the neighbourhoods. The requirements of Policy 6 are further expanded upon in the Development and Implementation Supplementary Planning Document (Adopted March 2007). The mixed use core, as is suggested in the document, would appear the most appropriate location for this facility.

The County Council is pleased to see that not only will space be allowed for storage of waste within properties, but also space will be provided to put the waste receptacle for collection will not interfere with public footpaths. The location of these facilities needs to be carefully considered so they are not situated too close to dwellings or non domestic properties, in order to prevent the opportunity for arson.

The design codes do not appear to have taken into account use of the roads for essential vehicles when designing the development. Vehicles which require more space to turn do not appear to have been addressed within this document. A prime example of this is the vehicles that are used to collect waste and recycling need to be able to access the locations where the bins are to be collected from.

Fire and Rescue - Access for fire appliances also need to be considered. Relevant regulations make reference to specific dimensions and weights of fire appliances. However, the County Council Fire & Rescue service operates vehicles that are outside the ranges stated.

### Response

Text stating that highways will be designed to the relevant standards - e.g. Manual for Streets and NCC guidance, has been added to the document to cover this.
**Comments**
Where roadside parking is permitted, particularly on residential developments, it can prove difficult for fire appliances to manoeuvre in between parked cars when attending incidents, especially if the road is not particularly wide. Where this occurs, it can affect the service meeting operational response times. On residential developments a large proportion of incidents could be "life risk".

The Fire and Rescue Service will also require hydrants to be installed within the site. For approximately every 50 properties built, one hydrant is required in areas of residential risk.

**Response**
Text stating that highways will be designed to the relevant standards - e.g. Manual for Streets and NCC guidance, has been added to the document to cover this.

Discussions re the provision of hydrants will take place with the Fire and Rescue service during the detailed design stages

**Crime Prevention - Northamptonshire Police**
We are very pleased to have confirmed that we were involved in S106 discussion on the Stanton Cross application and this resulted in CCTV provision in the S106 and the multifunctional community centre in the neighbourhood centre including a Police Office (see para 2.2 Schedule 2 of the S106). We will ensure Mike Franklin, HQ Community Safety/Insp Alistair Reynolds, Wellingborough Community Inspector works with you on the CCTV and Richard Bucknall on the Community Centre Safer Community Team needs.

I can find no specific mention of 'Planning out Crime' or 'Designing out Crime' in the code and whilst security is mentioned in several places there is no mention of specific guidance relating to planning or designing out crime other than references to PPS1 and PPS3, which I consider to be a serious omission.

We recognise that this is an important issue. The code is underpinned by basic urban design theory which has the definition of public and private space as one of its core principles.

None required
### Stanton Cross Design Code Consultation responses May 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultee</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The following guidance should be included as a minimum to demonstrate how safer and more sustainable communities will be delivered.</td>
<td>This principle covers ‘designing out crime’ and numerous stipulations are included in the code with regard to ensuring adequate surveillance and supervision (increasing security) of both public and private space for residents and visitors alike. However, we understand that explicit references to the policies and documents stated here were not included in earlier versions of the code. Therefore we have addressed this by including an additional section in the environmental standards chapter covering this issue. Future detailed designs will be subject to these criteria.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Safer Places published by DCLG in 2004
SPG for Planning Out Crime in Northamptonshire (2004) with supporting protocol

Code for Sustainable Homes (Feb 2008)
Secured by Design New Homes 2007
Designing out Crime and Community Safety in their wider sense should be included with some indication of how these issues will be addressed through making contact with Police CPDA in relation to crime elements of the Design and Access Statement and for Designing out Crime issues, with other partners including the police to be consulted for wider community safety concerns.
**Stanton Cross Design Code Consultation responses May 2008**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultee</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There were a few references to crime prevention and the Code lacked some clarity in identifying how crime or anti-social behaviour issues would be dealt with from a Design code perspective although there were several good references to surveillance and the issue of parking provision was dealt with quite thoroughly, despite the lack of any requirement to gate and electronically/remotely control access gates to the larger rear courtyard parking areas; which is of concern as is the lack of definitive standards for doors and windows.</td>
<td>The provision of gates to the larger courtyards has not been identified as a requirement previously and experience of other developments has shown that this in fact can be a cause of anti-social behaviour with children riding on motorised gates and causing damage to the motors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The reliance upon BREEAM and ECO Homes standards deliver sustainable communities for the future is of concern unless equal consideration is given to adopting the Security elements of the Code for Sustainable Homes and Secured by Design as exemplary in practice and although the Code for Sustainable Homes is referred to in relation to the ECO Home Standard, it is not described in any detail, which is, an omission.</td>
<td>The security of doors and windows in all dwellings will meet current building regulations and include multi-locking devices and hooded letter boxes. They will continue to improve in line with updates to the building regulations. Where dwellings are subject to the standards set out in Eco Homes 'excellent' and Code for Sustainable Homes level 3, security will be enhanced above building regulations and meet Secured by Design standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We do not have any comments to make regarding the Urban Design Code.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The purpose of this letter is to set out comments on behalf of Mr and Mrs Gardiner the owners of Irthlingborough Grange and related land.

There appears to have been no formal publicity, notification, or consultation process for the latest version of the code. The documentation sent to us suggests that this is the Final Version' and has been dated February 2008. This appears to be an attempt on the part of the developer to push through an important piece of work that really does need to be subject to full and proper consultation.

Further as we have indicated previously, the Code should take account of current Government guidelines on good design, sustainable planning and design coding generally. As it stands the Code continues to contain a number of weaknesses. In this letter I will focus on matters of particular relevance to Irthlingborough Grange although it seems to us that the concerns we have identified have a wider significance and we suggest a need for the entire Code to be more carefully scrutinised.

The requirement for the Stanton Cross Neighbourhood Centre - Revised Urban Design Code is a condition on the Stanton Cross outline application (Ref: WP/2004/0600/O). As such the normal procedure would be for the applicant to submit the documentation, officers to review this and approve it. It was felt, however, that the document provided sufficient level of detail to require further consultation. Appropriate Statutory Consultants and affected landowners were duly consulted. The Council feels, therefore, that the consultation undertaken has been robust, particularly as it is not a statutorily requirement. In relation to the route alignment over Irthlingborough Grange Avenue, as this is not something Bovis can deliver, we agreed at the last meeting that the Design Codes would identify a potential route, which the document has done.
Consultee

In 2007 we wrote to you on a number of occasions on matters of permeability, ransoms and the need for comprehensive planning of the development. Most recently, these concerns were set out in my letter of 13th September 2007. Also in 2007 we raised a number of concerns about the draft Design Code and these were discussed in our meeting with representatives from Bovis on 14th September 2007. Victoria kindly issued full minutes of this meeting on 1st November last year. It seems to us that the minutes need to be reconsidered as actions agreed at that time have not been carried through to the revised Design Close documentation. In January of this year Mr and Mrs Gardiner were supplied with a copy of the Irthlingborough Grange Avenue Tree Survey undertaken by RPS Consultants.

At the meeting in September it had been agreed that this was not necessary and could have a bearing on footpath, cycling or road positioning and alignment and planting considerations generally. It is of some concern to us that this was an initial Assessment only and there is still no clear information available on root protection zones. Without this information it is difficult to see how route alignment can be properly considered. The assessment carried out by RPS is contradictory in its conclusions and needs to be subject to review by appropriately qualified officers.

Response

The Council feels that the Design Code adequately covers the issues of character area, public realm strategy and movement network including route hierarchy. Regarding the detailed concerns made on the Code, the workshop to which you refer in August 2007 was a workshop for officers and consultants to meet with Bovis and consider the comments received and it was not a wider consultation event. As you identify in your letter the Council then met with you and your clients to address the concerns raised.

As you identify, there was an agreement to provide an illustrative plan of the boundary treatment around the Irthlingborough Grange, which we will raise with Bovis/Lovejoys as this does not seem to be included. A road has been identified up to the boundary of Irthlingborough Grange. However, as Bovis cannot deliver a road beyond the ownership boundary, this road cannot be delivered, so it is therefore not identified in this Design Code. The further information on the type of development close to Irthlingborough Grange has been provided on Page 19 of the Design Code which identifies the changes discussed.
Consultee Comments

1. Page 5, para 1.5.5: the Design Code testing exercise referred to was not robust.

Our clients are landowners whose property is affected by the Design Code but they were not invited to attend the workshop that took place in August 2007. Further, the amendments that were to be made following our meeting on 14th September 2007 (as minuted) have not been incorporated, Please note that the minutes clearly state that:

James Wilson raised concerns about the boundary treatment. The Design Code needs to be clear about development proposals on the boundary. It was agreed an illustrative sketch to show the boundary treatment would be included in the Code. Paul Boatman suggested the Design Code show the road joining up to Irthlingborough Grange.

It was agreed that further context information would be included, development to stop turning its back on Irthlingborough Grange, for this to be two storey and a road to Irthlingborough Grange to be included with a spur road due south to the front garden of Irthlingborough Grange. It was also recorded as an action that:

Lovejoys changes to include further context information, amended development block and road to Irthlingborough Grange.

Response

Letter from Damian Williams (Associate Capita Lovejoy) as follows:

We have undertaken numerous, well-publicised design workshops and consultation exercises with council officers and key stakeholders (including the owners of Irthlingborough Grange and their agent) during the production of the code over a 3 year period. An extensive informal consultation exercise was undertaken in 2007 and revisions were made to the code to take account of respondents' comments. The latest consultation exercise is a formal repeat of this and goes beyond what is actually required for the approval of a document such as this.

The production of the code has followed relevant government guidance as it has developed over time. The code has been subjected to extensive scrutiny and endorsed by both BCW officers and external urban design consultants charged with overseeing its compliance with relevant policy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultee</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The revised Code does not include the agreed 'road joining up to Irthlingborough Grange' as suggested by Paul Boatman and agreed at the meeting. Similarly, the spur road to the front garden of Irthlingborough Grange is not shown although the spur road to north linking with Grange Farm is shown. 2. Page 19: Access between Neighbourhood Centre and Irthlingborough Grange - The Code suggests this access should not be precluded and is encouraged. In our view this does not comply with relevant Government Guidance. The connection should be mandatory. The Wellingborough East/ Neighbourhood Centre Design Briefs demand permeability and connectivity. To have a connection with a route which may or may not exist and which may or may not therefore allow connectivity to key destinations is inappropriate. This matter needs to be subject to further review in a context of the points raised in the first section of this letter. Lastly we note in Para 7.3.1 that the sketch above the text shows the hedge on the eastern boundary of our clients paddock being retained. This is inconsistent with the Environmental Impact Statement and the masterplan that show the hedge as removed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BOROUGH COUNCIL OF WELLINGBOROUGH

AGENDA ITEM

Planning Committee 17/09/2008

Report of the Deputy Chief Executive

APPLICATION REF: WP/2008/0095/F

PROPOSAL: Insertion of 465 sq m mezzanine within unit 1 of consented retail warehouse scheme (WP/2005/0815/F).

LOCATION: Knapp Toolmaking Limited, 45-51 London Road, Wellingborough. NN8 2DP

APPLICANT: Castlemore Securities Limited.

PROPOSAL AND DESCRIPTION OF SITE:
Installation of 465 sq m (5000 sq ft) mezzanine into previously approved unit 1 DIY store. This increases gross floor space to 2469 sq m.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:
WP/2005/0815/F Demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment for bulky goods retail warehouse (Class A1) with access, parking and servicing - revised site layout and flood risk assessment addendum - (call in).

NATIONAL AND LOCAL PLANNING POLICY:
PPS1, saved Borough of Wellingborough Local Plan Policies, County Structure Plan Policies and North Northants Core Spatial Strategy.

SUMMARY OF REPLIES TO CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED:
1. NCC Highways -

“The proposal represents a significant increase in the retail floor space of the development of which it forms part. It is not considered that the supporting Transport Statement provides adequate evidence that the proposal would have minimal impact on the local road network in spite of the fact that the parent development provides funding to carry out highway improvements. Unless nil detriment in highway capacity can be demonstrated the application cannot be supported on highway grounds.

2. East Northants District Council – no objection.
ASSESSMENT:
Much discussion has taken place around the matter of highway contribution relating to the extra space (in addition to the contribution already agreed in association with main application). A sum has now been agreed.

RECOMMENDATION:
That issue of consent subject to conditions is delegated to Proper Officer on signing of S106 Planning Agreement relating to highway contributions.

1. The development shall be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason:
1. Required to be imposed pursuant to S51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

INFORMATIVE/S
Pursuant to Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the proposed development complies with the applicable development plan policies and there are no other material considerations that would constitute sustainable grounds for refusal. These include policies of the Northamptonshire County Structure Plan, the Borough of Wellingborough Local Plan and PPS 1.
BOROUGH COUNCIL OF WELLINGBOROUGH

AGENDA ITEM

Planning Committee 17/09/2008

Report of the Deputy Chief Executive

APPLICATION REF: WP/2008/0224/F

PROPOSAL: Erection of 5 no. new dwellings and associated access road - amended plans.

LOCATION: Land to rear of 30a Harrowden Road, Wellingborough.

APPLICANT: Blenheim Realty Limited.

NOTE:
Councillors will recall that at its meeting on 23rd July 2008 the Planning Committee resolved to delegate the grant of planning permission to the Corporate Director subject to the satisfactory outcome of consultations in respect of the handing of plot five, in accord with the conditions set out in the report.

Revised plans indicating the handing of plot no. 5 and moving plot three 1.0m away from the south west boundary were received and consulted upon. A summary of the neighbour comments received in response to the additional publicity procedure is given below.

The occupier of 31A Harrowden Road confirms that the same objections that were lodged to the previous plan still stand.

The occupier of 4 Whytewell Road raises the following issues:

- belief that the refuse collection point will not allow a refuse collection vehicle to access the properties directly and will also render the site inaccessible for emergency vehicles
- there is no footpath on the access road and query posed regarding whether a blind deaf person would have no choice but to walk on the access road in order to gain pedestrian access
- noted that provision has been made for ten vehicles and question raised as to what provision will be made during the winter months to prevent vehicles sliding out onto Harrowden Road due to the access gradient
- query also raised with regards the possible need to pump effluent out from the site.

It is considered that the amended plans accord with the request of the Committee and are recommended for approval.

RECOMMENDATION:
Approve subject to conditions set out in the previous report together with the inclusion of an additional condition relating to the revised plans.
APPLICATION REF: WP/2008/0224/F

PROPOSAL: Erection of 5 no. new dwellings and associated access road - amended plans

LOCATION: Land to rear of 30a Harrowden Road, Wellingborough.

APPLICANT: Blenheim Realty Limited.

NOTE:
This application was deferred at Planning Committee on 25th June 2008 to enable the Site Viewing Group to visit the site.
APPLICATION REF: WP/2008/0224/F

PROPOSAL: Erection of 5 no. new dwellings and associated access road.

LOCATION: Land to rear of 30a Harrowden Road, Wellingborough.

APPLICANT: Blenheim Realty Limited.

This application is referred to the Planning Committee for determination due to the number of objections that have been received.

PROPOSAL AND DESCRIPTION OF SITE:
As described above.

The site is irregular in shape and is used as two separate garden areas by the residents of 29 and 30a Harrowden Road. The gardens are unusual because they run at an angle to the main part of the properties. The site has the benefit of a variety of landscaping and there is also considerable mature planning on the site boundaries.

At the point of proposed access to the site is an ironstone wall which returns along the site boundary with no. 390 Harro wden Road and rises to a substantial height towards the rear of the dwellinghouse. Growing in the highway at the access location is a mature pollarded lime tree that forms part of an avenue of such trees along this part of Harrowden Road.

The land form generally slopes down from a northerly direction which results in no. 30 Harrowden Road being set at a noticeably higher ground level than no. 30a.

An amended plan has been received on 6 June that corrects the position of the trees and illustrates a refuse and recycling bin area located at the entrance to the site.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:
No relevant history

NATIONAL AND DEVELOPMENT PLAN PLANNING POLICY:
Regional Spatial Strategy 8
SUMMARY OF REPLIES TO CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED:

1. Northants County Council Highways – does not object to the application but offers the following comments:
   - Laments the intended loss of the highway tree but considers it unreasonable to oppose the development. The removal of the tree to be carried out with due diligence and at the expense of the applicant.
   - Gives technical requirements for the width of the private driveway and advises that the visibility splays be maintained
   - Advises that the development meets with the approval of the emergency services
   - Advises that the applicant discuss refuse collection arrangements with the Borough Council of Wellingborough

2. Council’s Landscape Officer – reports that a number of trees that were not subject to a Tree Preservation Order were felled before the application was submitted. The Council’s Landscape Officer goes on to make comments on the report of the consultant ecologist regarding the possible presence of protected species on the site but concedes that the two ponds on the site are not likely to contain Great Crested Newts due to their vertical sides. The Landscape Officer comments that the trees on the site are far enough away from not to pose any problems but the propinquity of an overhanging tree in the adjacent factory site is noted. A landscape management plan is suggested for an area of landscaping along the eastern boundary of the site. The accuracy of the plans with regards the location of the tress is questioned.

3. Natural England – expresses no objection. Natural England states that its accepts that some changes may effect biodiversity but concludes that given the scope and detail put forward in the ecological report it is satisfied that the proposals will not be detrimental, but in all likelihood will promote increased opportunities for some of the fauna which utilize the area.

4. Northamptonshire Wildlife Trust – no comment received

5. Northamptonshire Fire and Rescue Service – no comment received

6. Wellingborough Council Amenities Performance Manager – confirms that the Council would not want to enter into the site but would require the householders to present their wheeled bins adjacent the highway in Harrowden Road. The Manager presumes that the bins would be lined up at the front of the drive for
emptying and goes on to comment that the road access is very narrow which could cause access/visibility problems.

7. Neighbours – objections have been received from the occupiers of 21 Gold Street; 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 30b, 31a Harrowden Road and 2 and 4 Whytewell Road. The writers cite the following reasons for opposing the application:

**Highway safety and access**
- Proposed access road is in a dangerous position and reference to number of fatalities and other road traffic accidents.
- Concern stated regarding residual on-street parking situation in the area.
- Access road is cramped and there is insufficient room for refuse vehicles and emergency vehicles.
- There are frequent queues of traffic waiting for the Broad Green traffic lights and during quieter periods Harrowden Road is used by ‘boy racers’.
- Harrowden Road is now classified as a ‘Red Route’.
- Problems with visibility for emerging vehicles from the site due to the lime tree and highway furniture. Reference to both legally and illegally parked vehicles obstructing driver visibility locally.

**Highway tree**
The lime tree that is to be removed is part of an avenue of trees which is a feature in this part of Harrowden Road.

**Planning policy**
Belief that the application site is not brownfield.

**Other issues**
- Query posed regarding what is the purpose of the development.
- Application is intended to purely profit the applicants and does not benefit anybody else.
- Inaccuracies of third party boundaries in relation to the application site.
- Site provides a habitat for various species of birds.
- Trees felled on the application site before the ecology survey was conducted.
- Reference to demolition of an ironstone wall at the entrance to the site.
- Five houses will not significantly impact on the Government’s demands for new homes.
- Request for visit from the Site Viewing Group.
- Loss of property value.
- Expectation of rate reduction.
- Reference to statements made by an Estate Agent before purchase of an adjacent dwellinghouse.

**ASSESSMENT:**
The material planning considerations are:
- Compliance with policy
- Effect on neighbours amenities
• Effect on visual amenity
• Highway safety and parking
• Highway tree
• Crime and disorder
• Biodiversity

Compliance with policy
It is considered that the principle of a residential development on brownfield land within the urban area is sound and in accord with both development plan policy and Government guidance. With respect to classification of the site as brownfield land, PPS 3 in Anne B provides a definition ‘previously-developed land is that which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land and any associated fixed surface infrastructure’. Other aspects of the scheme will be examined below.

Effect on neighbours’ amenities
It is accepted that the proposed development will have an effect on the standard of amenity of the neighbouring residential occupiers. It is considered however that the effect on their amenities will not be sufficiently harmful to warrant refusing the application because there is an adequate intervening distance between the proposed dwellings and the adjacent presidential properties.

Effect on visual amenity
Notwithstanding the loss of the highway tree and the demolition of the ironstone wall at the entrance to the site, the influence of the development on the street scene will be minimal due to its location behind dwellings that front onto Harrowden Road. A condition that requires the submission of a landscaping scheme prior to development commencing is recommended so that planting can be carried out near to the entrance to the development which will be publicly visible.

Highway safety and parking
The comments of the nearby residents concerning aspects of highway safety are noted, but of prime significance is the stance of the Highway Authority which is not opposed to the development. The visibility splays of the proposed access road are to the satisfaction of the Highway Authority and they can be retained by way of a condition. The comments regarding the current on street parking difficulties are also noted but there are remedies available to residents by way of informing the body that enforces the parking regulations should vehicles be parked illegally.

Highway tree
The loss of a mature highway tree which is an integral part of the avenue of trees that runs along Harrowden Road is regrettable because it has a degree of public visual amenity value. It is considered however, that the weight that should be accorded to the retention of the tree is not sufficient to warrant withholding planning permission for the scheme.

Crime and disorder
It is considered that there are no pertinent crime and disorder issues that need to be taken into consideration in the determination of this application.
Biodiversity
The Council’s Landscape Officer has made comments regarding the biodiversity aspect of the proposal but the expertise of English Nature has been brought to bear on the subject and it is content with both the submitted report and application details. Mention has also been made of the trees that were felled before the survey was undertaken. The serving of an emergency Tree Preservation Order when the trees were felled was not considered to be appropriate by the Council because they were judged not have a significant public amenity value. English Nature opines that the development could provide the opportunity for fauna and the scheme in relation to biodiversity issues is considered to be acceptable.

None material considerations
• Loss of property value
• Expectation of rate reduction
• Statements made by an Estate Agent

RECOMMENDATION:
Approve with conditions.

1. The development shall be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.
2. Representative samples of all external facing and roofing materials shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before the development is commenced and the development shall be carried out using the approved materials.
3. Before development is commenced a landscape scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented concurrently with the development and shall be completed not later than the first planting season following the substantial completion of the development. Any trees and shrubs removed, dying, being severely damaged or becoming seriously diseased within five years of planting shall be replaced by trees and shrubs of similar size and species to those originally required to be planted or other species as may be agreed.
4. Before development commences details of the existing and proposed ground levels of the site together with the finished floor levels of the dwellinghouses shall be submitted to the local planning authority and approved in writing. The development shall be carried out in accord with the approved details.
5. Before development commences a scheme for screen fencing/walling shall be submitted to the local planning authority and approved in writing. The approved scheme shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the local planning authority before the houses are first occupied.
6. The shared private driveway shall have a width of 4.5m and shall be hard surfaced to the satisfaction of the local planning authority.
7. The highway visibility splays shall be maintained to the satisfaction of the local planning authority.
Reasons:
1. Required to be imposed pursuant to S51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
2. In the interests of visual amenity.
3. In the interests of visual amenity.
4. In the interests of privacy and adequately controlling the development on the site.
5. In the interests of amenity and privacy.
6. In the interests of highway safety.
7. In the interests of highway safety.

INFORMATIVE/S
1. Pursuant to Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the proposed development complies with the applicable development plan policies and there are no other material considerations that would constitute sustainable grounds for refusal. These include specifically the following policies:
   Regional Spatial Strategy 8
   North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy: 14 and 15
   Northamptonshire County Structure Plan: GS5
   Planning Policy Statement 1; Delivering Sustainable Development
   Planning Policy Statement 3; Housing
   Planning Policy Guidance 13; Transport.
2. The applicant is advised that this decision relates to the following drawing numbers received on the dates shown:
   Drawing Numbers:             Date Received:
   BLE1838PA100, BLE1838PA200, 17 April 2008
   BLE1838PA300 and BLE1838PA400
   BLE1838PA001 Rev A           6 June 2008
3. The applicant is advised that planning permission does not automatically allow the construction of the vehicle crossing, details of which require the approval of the Highway Authority. In this regard you should contact the Team Leader Regulations, Sustainable Transport, Riverside House, Riverside Way, Northampton NN1 5NX prior to any construction/excavation works within the public highway.
BOROUGH COUNCIL OF WELLINGBOROUGH

Planning Committee  17/09/2008

Report of the Deputy Chief Executive

APPLICATION REF:  WP/2008/0321/F

PROPOSAL:  Convert and extend existing double garage into 2 bed detached bungalow - re-submission following withdrawn application WP/2008/0259/F.

LOCATION:  27 Fairfield Road, Isham. NN14 1HF

APPLICANT:  Mr David Bradshaw.

NOTE:
This application was deferred at Planning Committee on 20th August 2008 to allow the applicant/agent to revise the scheme to reduce the impact of the development on the rear garden of no. 21 Fairfield Road. An amended scheme has been received which shows the garage extension adjoining no. 21 set in from the adjoining neighbour and its roof subordinated in accordance with Committee advice. The neighbouring properties have been invited to make comments and their responses shall be reported at Committee.
BOROUGH COUNCIL OF WELLINGBOROUGH

Planning Committee

Report of the Deputy Chief Executive

APPLICATION REF: WP/2008/0321/F

PROPOSAL: Convert and extend existing double garage into 2 bed detached bungalow - re-submission following withdrawn application WP/2008/0259/F.

LOCATION: 27 Fairfield Road, Isham.

APPLICANT: Mr David Bradshaw.

This application is referred to the Planning Committee for determination because a site viewing has been requested by the Parish Council on the grounds of overdevelopment.

PROPOSAL AND DESCRIPTION OF SITE:
The application site comprises a detached dwelling house with a large garage located at the north-eastern end of the side garden. The proposal seeks to subdivide the plot to create a 2 bed bungalow incorporating the garage. The two properties would be separated by a 2m high close boarded fence. Parking for the existing dwelling house would be relocated to the front garden after widening the existing crossover.

The new scheme is different from a previous scheme which was dismissed on appeal (ref T/APP/H2835/A/96/270531/P7) in that:

- it would be 2 bedrooms as opposed to 3;
- there would be no principal windows facing the rear garden of no. 19;
- its front elevation would be set further back from the eastern elevation of the existing property; and
- additional parking would be provided for the existing dwelling house after demolition of the front boundary wall and widening of the crossover.

There would also be changes to the design, involving internal reconfigurations, a lower but uneven roof line, and staggered footprint.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:
WR/52/61 Layout of housing - approved with conditions.
WR/54/17 House, bungalows and garages - approved with conditions.
WR/54/99 House and garage - approved.
WP/1996/0119 New bungalow - refused and dismissed at appeal.
WB/1999/0315 Detached garage.
WP/2004/0190 Proposed single storey extension to kitchen and utility room (amended) - approved with conditions.
PRE/2007/0025 1 dwelling.
WP/2008/0259 Convert and extend existing double garage into 2 bed detached bungalow - withdrawn.

NATIONAL AND LOCAL PLANNING POLICY:
National
Planning Policy Statement 1 (PPS 1) - Delivering Sustainable Development
Planning Policy Statement 3 (PPS 3) - Housing.
Northamptonshire County Structure Plan
GS5 - Design
Northamptonshire Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) - Minor Applications that have an effect on the highway.
Borough Council of Wellingborough Local Plan
G4 - Development within Limited Development and Restricted Infill Villages.
Supplementary Planning Guidance: Building Better Places; Trees on Development Sites, Parking
North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy
Policy 13 - General Sustainable Development Principles.

SUMMARY OF REPLIES TO CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED:
1. Neighbours – 1 letter from no. 21, citing:
   - Isham is a restricted infill village, a factor which must have contributed to the rejection of a previous application on appeal.
   - The boundaries would be close to the boundary fence leading to increased noise and overshadowing on the rear garden.
   - Loss of privacy from the rear window.
   - Adverse highway implications due to increased demand for parking.
2. Parish Council – overdevelopment of the site. A site viewing is requested.
3. Highways – regard to be had to the highway guidance document stated above.
4. Environmental protection – no response received.

ASSESSMENT:
The development plan consists of the saved policies of Northamptonshire County Structure Plan adopted in 2001 and Borough of Wellingborough Local Plan 1999 (Including Local Plan Alteration adopted in 2004); and North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy adopted in 2008. Structure Plan Policy GS5 seeks to promote high standards of design in the County, having regard to, amongst other matters, the visual appearance of the development in the context of the defining characteristics of the local area. Policy 13 of North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy sets out acceptability criteria for development proposals and indicates that developments should (a) meet needs (b) raise standards and (c) protect assets, whilst Policy G4 has a presumption in
favour of developments in villages which do not adversely affect the character and setting of the villages.

There are no plot-subdivision policies in the Local Plan, therefore the proposal is considered on its contextual merits and in the light of relevant issues discussed below and other material considerations. PPS 3 is in favour of the efficient and effective use of land, as long as they satisfy other considerations discussed below.

(i) Character of the area;
(ii) Design;
(iii) amenities of neighbours and living conditions of future occupiers; and
(iv) highway implications.

The Inspector’s report on the previous application is a material consideration in this case and the discussion of the items above will evaluate the scheme in relation to the concerns expressed therein.

Character of the Area.
The Parish Council has concerns about overdevelopment of the site and its impact on the character of the area. The Inspector’s comments are cited below, verbatim, to explain why this would not be the case:

“…my impression of the immediate area is that it has the character of a suburban housing estate within which there are various designs of houses and bungalows. The appeal site is not readily visible from public vintage points and is well screened by trees from the land to the south. I do not consider that the proposed bungalow would harm the character and appearance of the area, particularly as it would be faced and roofed in materials to match the existing dwelling.”

Therefore, these allegations would not be sustainable because the situation has remained the same since.

Design and Appearance
The proposed extension to the garage would follow the existing roof line while the new extension to the south would be set in from the rear and front elevations, with a subservient roof. The result would be a dwelling house with a subdued profile in relation to the existing property which would not cause offence to the visual amenities of the surrounding area. The proposed material would match that of the existing garage.

Neighbours’ Amenities and living conditions of future occupiers.
The rear elevation of the proposed bungalow would be set in from the adjoining boundary to the rear garden of no. 19 by between 1m and 1.5m and would not have principal windows. This is considered to overcome the previous concern regarding overlooking and loss of privacy to both the neighbouring property and the future occupiers of the property. The windows at the rear would be obscure glazed. The principal windows on the front elevation would be partly obscured by the proposed 2m high close boarded fence separating the properties. The fence would prevent any overlooking from adjoining gardens. The dwelling house would respect the separation distances stipulated in the local plan and would be set further back from the side elevation of the existing dwelling house. As such, it would overcome the concern raised
by the Inspector in respect of general disturbances and increased noises resulting from concentrated residential activity. Noise from a 2 bed bungalow would not, in the opinion of the local authority, unacceptably add to the existing noise levels of the neighbourhood. In terms of loss of outlook and visual intrusion, it is considered that the proposed dwelling house’s silhouette would be unassuming, therefore not adversely harmful to neighbouring properties.

**Highway Implications**
The appeal predated the construction of the existing garage which later received permission in spite of the Inspector's disquiet about the then proposed access in relation to the garage near the entrance belonging to no. 25. The existing garage would be incorporated into the design while new parking would be created at the front after demolition of the front wall and access widening. Regard is had to the fact that this section of the road is a cul-de-sac and that the garages located at the end appear to be disused. As such, the proposed access arrangements would appear acceptable. By virtue of the subsequent construction of the garage and its associated access and the proposed parking spaces at the front, the Inspector's comments in this respect have become obsolete.

**Conclusion**
The proposed development would not detract from the exiting character of the area and it would have a comparable garden size. The bungalow has been carefully designed to respect the relationships between the properties and the proposed parking at the front would alleviate the resultant parking problems. The separation distances of the properties, the modest scale of the properties and the proposed layout would mitigate any harm in terms of noise and general disturbance within the neighbourhood. The proposal is considered to overcome the objections which led to the previous refusal. As such, it is recommended for approval.

**RECOMMENDATION:**
Approve with conditions:

1. The development shall be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.
2. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any other Order revoking or re-enacting this Order) no buildings, extensions, or alterations permitted by Classes A, B, C and E of Part 1 of schedule 2 in the 1995 Order shall be carried out without the prior written consent of the local planning authority.

**Reasons:**
1. Required to be imposed pursuant to S51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
2. To allow the local planning authority to control future development having regard to the nature of the site.
INFORMATIVE/S:
1. Pursuant to Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the proposed development complies with the applicable development plan policies and there are no other material considerations that would constitute sustainable grounds for refusal. These include specifically the following policies: GS5 of the Northamptonshire County Structure Plan, G4 of the Borough of Wellingborough Local Plan and 13 of North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy.
2. The applicant is advised that this decision relates to the following drawing number received on the date shown:
   Drawing Number:      Date Received:
   08-152                1st September 2008
APPLICATION REF: WP/2008/0363/FM

PROPOSAL: New build development of 11 no. flats in a traditionally designed single 2 and 3 storey block with associated parking, landscaping, bin and cycle stores.

LOCATION: Land adjacent 183 Midland Road, Wellingborough. NN8 1NG

APPLICANT: Elsden Park Properties Limited.

This application requires Committee consideration owing to the number of objections and because a Unilateral Undertaking under Section 106 of the Town and Country Act 1990 has been submitted. This covers the following heads of terms:

- Financial contribution towards sustainable transport initiatives/strategic road improvements;
- Financial contribution towards the enhancement of nearby play facilities; and
- Financial contribution towards health provision.

BACKGROUND
In March this year, the Committee considered a similar proposal (2007/0765/FM) for this site for the erection of 11 flats and resolved to refuse permission for the following reasons:

The proposal is an inappropriate and incongruous form of development, not in keeping with the character and appearance of the area, by reasons of its design, contrary to development plan policies.

The current proposal is similar to the previous, but differs in terms of external facing materials. Whereas the previous scheme involves the use of render, the current proposal has a brick exterior with detailing of soldier courses, base, heads and sills in contrasting colours to create a traditional façade. The layout, building footprint and configuration are identical.
PROPOSAL AND DESCRIPTION OF SITE:
The application site lies on the northern side of Midland Road. It is rectangular in shape, measures about 0.15 hectare and has extensive tree coverage. It forms part of the open curtilage of no. 183-185 Midland Road, also known as Chester House (also known as Elsden Lodge). There is no common architectural theme in this part of Midland Road. However, the prevailing pattern of development in the immediate area, particularly on this frontage is one characterised by buildings set within large plots.

Consent is sought to erect a part 3 and part 2-storey building comprising 11 self contained flats. Provision is made within the front curtilage of the site for 13 car parking spaces (including 1 disabled bay) and bicycle store for 11 spaces. These are accessed via the existing vehicular cross-over, which would be slightly modified to achieve the desired visibility splay. The proposal involves the removal of some existing trees and shrubs, but a significant proportion of the trees, including the very large ones with amenity value, would be retained. There are provisions within the development for communal amenity space and private gardens for some of the units. The proposed development equates to a density of about 73 dwellings per hectare.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:
In March this year, the Committee considered a similar proposal (WP/2007/0765/FM) for this site for the erection of 11 flats and resolved to refuse permission for the reasons set out above.

This site was listed in the June 2007 Committee Agenda. This was for a proposal to construct two 3-storey blocks containing 11 self contained flats (Ref: WP/2007/0223). The proposal was recommended for refusal, but prior to it being considered by the Committee, it was withdrawn. The differences between that proposal and the proposal under consideration are explained later in this report.

Prior to the above:

BW/76/772  Permission refused for a change of use from residential to community centre.
WU/58/26  Permission granted for conversion of house into 3.

NATIONAL AND LOCAL PLANNING POLICY:
Planning Policy Statement 1 - Delivering Sustainable Development.
Planning Policy Statement 3 - Housing
Planning Policy Guidance 13 - Transport
Regional Spatial Strategy 8
Northamptonshire County Structure Plan:
  GS5:  Design
North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy:
  Policies 1 - Strengthening the Network of Settlements
  5 - Green Infrastructure
  7 - Infrastructure Delivery and Developer Contributions
  8 - Delivering Housing
  10 - Distribution and Location of Development
  11- Distribution of Housing
SUMMARY OF REPLIES TO CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED:

1. County Highway Authority – have not highlighted any adverse highway implications in relation to the proposed development. However, observations have been made in relation to a range of matters which would normally be dealt with by conditions if permission is granted. These include matters such as visibility splay, shared access requirements, adequacy of parking provision and refuse collection. Furthermore, they have requested a financial contribution towards strategic road improvements.

2. The Environment Agency – no objection subject to the imposition of condition concerning phasing of the development and the provision of mains foul water drainage.

3. Northamptonshire Police – no formal objection, but with some minor alterations, the scheme would qualify for the Secured BY Design Award.

4. County Education Officer – no requirement for financial contribution.

5. Borough Environmental Protection Manager – a suitable condition should be imposed requesting the submission for approval, of a phase 2 Environmental Risk Assessment report.

6. Borough Housing Strategy Manager – the application is for 11 units, which is below the threshold to trigger affordable housing contribution in accordance with Policy H8 of the Local Plan.

7. Borough Culture Development Manager – the proposal does not warrant the provision of on-site amenity space. Nevertheless, a contribution towards the enhancement of existing nearby play facilities is sought, based on a percentage of the NPFA Six Acre standards.


9. Borough Landscape Officer – recommend the imposition of conditions concerning protection to trees during construction works and in relation to the relocation of the ‘monkey puzzle’ tree.

10. Letters of objection were received from 5 neighbouring residents. The grounds of objection can be summarised as follows:

- Proposal not in keeping with the character and appearance of the area;
- Inappropriate choice of facing materials;
- Over-development/excessive scale;
• Overlooking/loss of privacy and loss of light;
• Proposal will increase run-off water and restrict the availability of green space;
• Noise disturbance; and
• Loss of trees and destruction of beautiful garden/green area.

ASSESSMENT:
National guidance in PPS 1 and 3 and the policies of both the Structure Plan; the recently adopted Core Spatial Strategy and the provisions in the Regional Spatial Strategy all encourage and support the reuse of previously developed sites in built up areas for residential purposes. The application site constitutes a previously developed site as defined in the annex to PPS 3. The redevelopment of the site for flats is acceptable in principle, because it will increase housing stock in the area. Furthermore, it will broaden the dwelling and tenure mix of the area, consistent with the advice in PPS 3.

Design, layout, density and the effect on the character and appearance of the area:
The surrounding buildings exhibit no common architectural scheme. Indeed the surrounding area comprises traditional and modern buildings of varying scale, with some 2-storeys and some 3-storeys in height. Unlike the previous scheme, a brick exterior is now proposed, to give the building a traditional appearance, which in the context of the surrounding area would not be a visual variation.

The layout is also satisfactory, with the building footprint respecting the building line on this frontage, particularly in relation to the building to the west of the site. Although the proposed building would project forward of the building line of Chester House, the difference is marginal. In any case, the extensive tree coverage at the front of the proposed and existing building would not make this difference readily apparent when viewed from the street.

In view of the foregoing, the proposal represents a satisfactory development in design and layout terms. It would not appear incongruous relative to the surrounding developments and by reasons of its scale, it would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the surrounding area, in compliance with the relevant development plan policies and consistent with various national guidance in PPS 1 and PPS 3.

Loss of trees
The application is accompanied by a topographical survey, which shows the approximate location of the trees on the site. Although some trees would be lost, these are mainly those with limited amenity value. The large mature trees would mainly be retained thereby maintaining the ambience and pleasant appearance of this part of Midland Road.

Access and traffic
The Highway Authority have not made adverse observations in respect of highway implications of the proposal. The parking provision is satisfactory in the context of the location of the site, within walking distance of the Wellingborough Town Centre which is served by many bus routes and also within walking distance of the train station.
Effect on living conditions of neighbours

Having regard to the siting of the buildings, particularly in relation to the separating distance from the adjacent buildings to the side and rear, it is not considered that the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the amenities of the neighbouring occupiers in relation to overlooking/loss of privacy or loss of light. The rear of the proposed building from the rear St Mary’s Paddock is about 19 metres. Furthermore, the separating boundary treatments comprise a 2.5m high brick wall and 3m high hedge, both of which would be retained and would offer necessary safeguards.

RECOMMENDATION:
Grant planning permission subject to the following conditions.

1. The development shall be begun no later than 3 years beginning with the date of this permission.
2. Notwithstanding any materials specified in the application form and/or the drawings, particulars and samples of the materials to be used on all external surfaces of the access and parking surfaces; buildings, including fenestration, windows, doors, eaves and verges shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before the commencement of the development. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
3. Details of the hard and soft landscaping and the boundary treatments shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before the commencement of the development. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
4. Details of the tree protection measures in accordance with BS5837 and the details of the proposed transplanting/replanting (including the new location of the trees) on the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before the commencement of the development and the transplanting works carried out during the next planting season after the completion of the building operations on site or within any such longer period as may be agreed in writing with the local planning authority. Such planting shall be maintained, including the replacement of dead, dying or defective trees, shrubs or ground cover plants for a period of 5 years. The tree protection measures shall be implemented throughout the construction phase of the implementation of the development.
5. Details of the proposed slab levels of the approved building and the existing site levels shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the commencement of the development and the development shall be completed in accordance with the approved slab levels.
6. Notwithstanding the provisions of sections 94, 98 and 106 of the Water Industry Act 1991, no development shall commence until details of a scheme, including phasing, for the provision of mains foul water drainage on and off the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. No dwellings shall be occupied until the works have been carried out in accordance with the approved scheme.
7. The car parking spaces shown on the approved drawings shall be laid out and provided before the occupation of the dwellings and shall thereafter be kept free from obstruction and shall be retained for parking purposes for the occupiers of...
the development and their visitors.
8. Vehicle to visibility of 2m by 70m and pedestrian to vehicle visibility of 2m x 2m shall be provided and maintained on both sides of the point of access.
9. Any gates at the point of access shall be hung so as to open inwards only and be set back by at least 5.5m from the highway boundary.
10. The vehicular crossing shall be constructed in accordance with the specification of the Northamptonshire County Council.
11. At least the first 5m of the driveway shall be hard paved.
12. Before the development commences, a validation report (to include test certificates to confirm the suitability of imported soil, confirmation of capping thickness and all tipping receipts) in respect of remediation proposals to remove contaminants from the site shall be submitted to the local planning authority for approval and the development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved measures, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reasons:
1. Required to be imposed pursuant to S51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
2. To ensure a satisfactory appearance for the development in the interest of visual amenity.
3. In the interest of neighbouring amenities.
4. To ensure that the site is satisfactorily landscaped and the existing trees protected in order to maintain and enhance the visual amenity of the area.
5. In the interests of the amenities of the neighbouring residential occupiers.
6. To prevent flooding, pollution and detriment to public amenity through provision of suitable water infrastructure.
7. To ensure adequate off-street parking provision and in order to prevent additional parking in surrounding streets which, could be detrimental to amenity and prejudicial to safety.
8. In the interests of highway and pedestrian safety.
9. In the interests of highway and pedestrian safety.
10. In the interests of highway and pedestrian safety.
11. In the interests of highway and pedestrian safety.
12. In the interests of the health and amenities of the future occupiers of the development.

INFORMATIVE/S
1. Pursuant to Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the proposed development complies with the applicable development plan policies and there are no other material considerations that would constitute sustainable grounds for refusal. These include specifically the following: Planning Policy Statement 1 - Delivering Sustainable Development.
Planning Policy Statement 3 - Housing
Planning Policy Guidance 13 - Transport
Regional Spatial Strategy 8
Northamptonshire County Structure Plan:
GS5: Design
North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy Policies:
1 - Strengthening the Network of Settlements  
5 - Green Infrastructure  
7 - Infrastructure Delivery and Developer Contributions  
8 - Delivering Housing  
10 - Distribution and Location of Development  
11 - Distribution of Housing  
14 - General Sustainable Development Principles  
15 - Energy Efficiency and Sustainable Construction  
16 - Sustainable Housing Provision  

Supplementary Planning Guidance Notes - Building Better Places; Parking; Trees on Development Sites and Planning Out Crime.

2. The applicant is advised that this decision relates to the following drawings received on the date shown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drawing numbers</th>
<th>Date Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site location plan (6172 010G), 6172 040D, 6172 047, 6172 048, 6172 049 and 6172 050</td>
<td>11/07/2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BOROUGH COUNCIL OF WELLINGBOROUGH

Planning Committee 17/09/2008

Report of the Deputy Chief Executive

APPLICATION REF: WP/2008/0388/F

PROPOSAL: Loft conversion with dormers.

LOCATION: 19 Scott Road, Wellingborough. NN8 3DJ

APPLICANT: Mr Huggett.

This development comes before the Planning Committee for consideration due to the level of third party objections. The objections are concerned with overlooking, highway implications and the impact on the appearance of the street.

PROPOSAL AND DESCRIPTION OF SITE:
The property is located in a small cul-de-sac off the main Scott Road thoroughfare; there is a drop in the height of the land towards the west. The proposal is as indicated above and involves a rear flat-roofed dormer the full width of the rear elevation and a smaller flat-roofed extension to the front elevation.

NOTE: The rear dormer development in its entirety could be built under the dwellings existing permitted development rights, nevertheless the application is determined as submitted. The development is to accommodate a carer for the current occupant.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:
BW/1989/0123 Single storey extension - approved with conditions.

NATIONAL AND LOCAL PLANNING POLICY:
County Structure Plan: GS5.
Supplementary Planning Guidance: II, IV, V and VIII.
National Guidance: PPS 1 and 3.

SUMMARY OF REPLIES TO CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED:
1. 6 objections received from third parties; summary:
   • “Invasion of privacy”.
   • Congestion concerns in cul-de-sac and problems with refuse collection.
   • Precedent established.
• In-keeping with street character and appearance.

2. In addition 2 separate concerns were also raised:
   • Property devaluation.
   • Encroachment onto land during construction.

ASSESSMENT:
Impact on neighbour’s amenities
Due to the obtuse orientation of the front dormer to fronting dwellings together with the separation distances there are considered to be no loss of privacy to neighbours fronting the site. The dwellings to the rear aligning Stanwell Way are on a lower plot, therefore the current situation allows for a degree of mutual overlooking, this is not expected to increase with the development. The development property and therefore the rear dormer are set an angle to the dwellings in Stanwell Way and maintain a minimum separation gap of 21m. 21m is the minimum distance stipulated in SPG VIII to afford privacy levels for 2 storey dwellings that are back-to-back. Therefore the loss of privacy is not considered to be of sufficient detriment to either the fronting dwellings in Scott Road or those to the rear to justify refusal.

Impact on Appearance and Character of the Property and the Street
The development property is semi-detached it is therefore important to consider the symmetry that exists with the adjoining dwelling; no. 17 Scott Road. Scott Roads general appearance comprises of semi-detached dormer bungalows that line the road. The development property, however is located in a small 6 property cul-de-sac back from the main linear street, within the development the properties are of a generally smaller-scale that those lining Scott Road to the east and do not have any dormer type extensions to the roof. It is accepted that no. 11, within the cul-de-sac has undergone a roof alteration to incorporate a first floor; although this involved an increase to the ridge of the roof it did not include a dormer extension. The immediate vicinity therefore comprises of small detached and semi-detached bungalows, characterised by their single storey appearance. The proposed dormer therefore is not congruous with this appearance and although it is not especially large in nature it does have an adverse impact on the street appearance and the symmetry with no. 17.

In addition the rear dormer is not considered to be in accordance with Supplementary Planning Guidance II (3.6). Where is stipulates that top-heavy roof extensions, especially flat-roofed, are to be resisted and should provide light to make better use of a roof space rather than create a roof-space in its own right and retain much of the existing roof pitch. The proposed dormer is almost the full width of the rear roof elevation with little of the existing roof plain remaining and is therefore contrary to the SPG. It is however accepted that the extension is to the rear and does not therefore comprise part of the principle street scene; nevertheless a dormer of this bulk should be resisted wherever possible. It is also accepted that the dormer to the rear could be constructed under the dwellings permitted development rights and can therefore be constructed regardless of the recommended decision. In any event to maintain continuity in decision making and the congruity of the street frontage the application is recommended for refusal in accordance with Policy 13 (h) of the North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy.
Highway Implications
The dwelling maintains 2 off-road parking spaces, which is an appropriate provision for a 3 bed-roomed dwelling of this size. There is no increased loss of safety convenience on the local highway network.

Other Considerations
The amenity space associated with the dwelling remains unaffected, with the biodiversity remaining as currently exists and not increased likelihood of crime.

Response to Representations
The comments received with regard overlooking issues, impact on the street appearance and highway concerns and discussed above. The concern with respect to the setting of a precedent is appreciated, although every application must be considered on its own merits with regard to the street character and appearance. The concerns with regard to property devaluation and possible land encroachment during construction are not considered to be of material planning consideration.

Conclusion
It is accepted that much of the development can be built under permitted development, although this is included in the reason for refusal together with the incongruity of the appearance of the front dormer in respect to the symmetry of the semi-detached bungalows and the overall street scene. The development is recommended for refusal.

RECOMMENDATION:
Refuse.

1. Due to the proposed orientation and bulk of the dormer extensions the development is not considered to enhance or preserve the character and appearance of the area, the symmetry with no. 17 and makes the bungalow appear top-heavy and therefore contrary to The North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy Policy: 13 and County Structure Plan Policy GS5. The proposal is also considered to be inconsistent with the advice in PPS 3.

POLICY GS5

IN ORDER TO PROMOTE HIGH QUALITY DESIGN AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT, ALL PROPOSALS WILL HAVE REGARD TO THE FOLLOWING CONSIDERATIONS:


- THE NEED TO ENCOURAGE MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT AND THE RELATIONSHIPS OF DIFFERENT LAND-USE WITH EACH OTHER;

- THE NEED FOR MEASURES FOR PLANNING OUT CRIME; AND
- THE NEED FOR CONSERVATION OF ENERGY, RESOURCES AND
THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT, AND FOR DEVELOPMENTS AND
DESIGNS WHICH GIVE PRIORITY TO MEANS OF TRANSPORT
OTHER THAN THE PRIVATE CAR.

Policy 13

Development should meet the needs of residents and businesses without compromising the ability of future generations to enjoy the same quality of life that the present generation aspires to. Development should:

Meet needs
a) Incorporate flexible designs for buildings and their settings, including access to amenity space, enabling them to be adapted to future needs and to take into account the needs of all users;
b) Seek to design out antisocial behaviour, crime and reduce the fear of crime by applying the principles of the 'Secured by Design scheme';
c) Maintain and improve the provision of accessible local services and community services, whilst focusing uses that attract a lot of visitors within the town centres;
d) Have a satisfactory means of access and provide for parking, servicing and manoeuvring in accordance with adopted standards;
e) Be designed to take full account of the transport user hierarchy of pedestrian-cyclist-public transport-private vehicle, and incorporate measures to contribute to an overall target of 20% modal shift in developments of over 200 dwellings and elsewhere 5% over the plan period;
f) Not lead to the loss of community facilities, unless it can be demonstrated that they are no longer needed by the community they serve and are not needed for any other community use to that the facility is being relocated and improved to meet the needs of the new and existing community;
g) Not lead to the loss of open space or recreation facilities, unless a site of equivalent quality and accessibility can be provided, services and made available to the community prior to use of the existing site ceasing.

Raise standards
h) Be of a high standard of design, architecture and landscaping, respects and enhances the character of its surroundings and is in accordance with the Environmental Character of the area;
i) Create a strong sense of place by strengthening the distinctive historic and cultural qualities and townscape of the towns and villages through its design, landscaping and use of public art;
j) Be designed to promote healthier lifestyles and for people to be active outside their home and places of work;
k) Allow for travel to home, shops, work and school on foot and by cycle and public transport.
Protect assets

l) Not result in an unacceptable impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties or the wider area, by reason of noise, vibration, smell, light or other pollution, loss of light or overlooking;

m) Be constructed and operated using a minimum amount of non-renewable resources including where possible the reuse of existing structures and materials;

n) No have an adverse impact on the highway network and will not prejudice highway safety;

o) Conserve and enhance the landscape character, historic landscape designated built environmental assets and their settings, and biodiversity of the environment making reference to the Environmental Character Assessment and Green Infrastructure Strategy;

p) Not sterilise known mineral reserves or degrade soil quality;

q) Not cause a risk to (and where possible enhance) the quality of the underlying groundwater or surface water, or increase the risk of flooding on the site or elsewhere, and where possible incorporate Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) and lead to a reduction in flood risk.

INFORMATIVE:
The applicant is advised that this decision relates to the following drawing numbers received on the date shown:

Drawing Number: 08/048/01
Date Received: 30 July 2008
APPLICATION REF: WP/2008/0405/C

PROPOSAL: Variation of condition 12 of planning permission WP/2006/0359/C to extend the date by which the development should be completed by 12 months to 15 August 2009.

LOCATION: Earls Barton Quarry, Grendon Road, Earls Barton, NN6 0PE

APPLICANT: Mr Mark Page, Hanson UK.

PROPOSAL AND DESCRIPTION OF SITE:
This is an application being dealt with by the County Council to extend the life of the previously permitted importation of inert waste materials to infill some former mineral workings at Earls Barton quarry. The Borough Council is one of the consultees.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:
There is a long history of sand and gravel working at Earls Barton quarry dating from 1935. Throughout this time, there have been various operations associated with mineral extraction and infilling of void spaces with inert waste at this location. This application is to vary Condition 12 of Planning Permission WP/2006/0359/C which is solely to extend the time period to complete the importation of inert waste from 15 August 2008 to 15 August 2009. The details and nature of this development remain unchanged (except for the date by when operations will cease) to the previously permitted application WP/2006/0359/C.

Planning application WP/2006/0359/C was previously reported to the Regulatory Committee on the 19 July 2006 and was recommended for refusal, to which the Committee agreed. The County Council subsequently approved application WP/2006/0359/C.

NATIONAL AND LOCAL PLANNING POLICY:
The main Policy document that is relevant in relation to this matter is the Northamptonshire Waste Local Plan 2003 to 2016 Adopted March 2006.

SUMMARY OF REPLIES TO CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED:
As this is a ‘County Matter’ application, the Borough Council has not carried out any consultation on this proposal. At the time of writing this report, no details of views from any of the County Council’s consultees on this application had been received.
ASSESSMENT:
This is an application to extend the life of the existing planning permission, reference WP/2006/0359/C

Planning application WP/2006/0359/C is to allow for the importation of 80,000 cubic metres of inert waste to infill an area covering some 4.1 hectares that was formerly used for mineral extraction.

The application area encompasses a number of small inter-linking water areas that have formed in abandoned mineral workings at the quarry. These water areas and margins have regenerated naturally. The remainder of the application site is comprised of rough grass and open water. The aim is to restore the land to a revised landform in order to create an area of wet woodland, grassland small pools and reed bed/swamp.

It is proposed that the material would be transported to the site from the A45 and then via Grendon Road to Earls Barton quarry over an approximate period of one year.

In general terms, the Adopted Northamptonshire Waste Local Plan encourages a hierarchy involving the reuse and recycling of waste materials ahead of disposal. This application is therefore contrary to this broad aim.

In addition, Policy 22 of the same document only allows new landfill operations in the following circumstances:

a. Where landfill or land raise is shown to be the Best Practicable Environmental Option for the waste stream(s) concerned; and
b. Where use of the proposed site for disposal of the waste concerned is consistent with the proximity principle; and
c. Where use of the proposed site for disposal of the waste concerned is consistent with regional self-sufficiency; and
d. Where no existing landfill or land raise site is available for the disposal of the waste concerned.

This proposal is considered to be contrary to this Policy in that landfill is not the Best Practicable Environmental Option for the waste stream concerned because inert waste such as this should ideally be reused or recycled. In addition, even if this is not possible, there is a nearby landfill site at Sidegate Lane which would benefit from the use of this type of material to cover more hazardous waste materials and aid restoration. Such a use is a better environmental option than purely disposing of the material as is proposed in this case. The view taken in relation to this current application remains unchanged from that expressed when consulted on WP/2006/0359/C.

However, as the County Council subsequently approved planning application WP/2006/0359/C and that the site is now operational then, it is considered that an objection to this latest planning application would jeopardise the final restoration scheme and could result in a less than desirable landscape feature. On this basis it is therefore considered that the Borough Council of Wellingborough raise no objection.

RECOMMENDATION:
That the County Council be advised that no objection is raised to this application.
The following applications dealt with under the terms of the Deputy Chief Executive’s delegated powers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application No.</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Applicant's Name</th>
<th>Location of Proposal</th>
<th>Description of Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WP/2008/0185/F</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Mr Paul King</td>
<td>Land rear of 30 High Street, Wellingborough.</td>
<td>6 no. retirement apartments, secure refuse and cycle store together with parking and associated works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/2008/0283/FM</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Mr Owen Sanders Watson and Cox Limited</td>
<td>Site W Huxley Close, Park Farm Industrial Estate, Wellingborough.</td>
<td>New three storey offices (Use Class B1) and associated car parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/2008/0288/F</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Mr F Russo C/o Vincent and Associates</td>
<td>Land at rear 41 Cambridge Street, Wellingborough.</td>
<td>Erection of a part 2 and part 3 storey building comprising 5 apartments with provisions for cycle storage and bin store.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/2008/0289/F</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Mr D S Mann Finedon Post Office</td>
<td>Finedon Post Office, 89 Wellingborough Road, Finedon.</td>
<td>Proposed single storey rear extension to the post office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/2008/0301/RM</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Supersun Limited</td>
<td>Club Diana, 109E Finedon Road, Wellingborough.</td>
<td>Extension to existing leisure club, internal alterations and provision of additional car parking (Reserved matters application pursuant to conditions 1 and 2 of planning permission Ref: 2007/0221/OM), relating to Clubhouse extension only and not the approved motel).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application No.</td>
<td>Applicant’s Name</td>
<td>Location of Proposal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/2008/0311/F</td>
<td>Mr and Mrs Harrison</td>
<td>12 Hawthorne Road, Finedon. Part single, part 2 storey extension to rear.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/2008/0315/F</td>
<td>Mr Huseyin Ozen</td>
<td>23 Sheep Street, Wellingborough. Change of use from waiting area to pizza takeaway outlet (A5) - retrospective application.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/2008/0325/F</td>
<td>Mrs Fowler</td>
<td>12 St Mary’s Paddock, Wellingborough. Erect a UPVc conservatory to the western elevation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/2008/0328/F</td>
<td>Mr and Mrs H James</td>
<td>Chalkhill House, Newlands Farm, 75 Harrold Road, Bozeat. Erection of double garage and loft conversion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/2008/0329/F</td>
<td>Mr O'Reilly</td>
<td>7 Cottesmore Way, Wellingborough. To change existing canopy to front of property to a pitched roof to carry over drive to side and porch.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/2008/0331/LB</td>
<td>Mr Edward Cookman</td>
<td>78 High Street, Ecton. Create 2 recesses in internal walls of existing kitchen extension to fit AGA cooker in one (with wood mantel around) and &quot;dresser&quot; in other. To remove internal partition wall between existing kitchen and utility creating larger kitchen space with breakfast area. To replace one window in utility area, becoming breakfast area, with &quot;French&quot; style patio doors leading to rear garden. Replace lino flooring with stone tiling (Application for Listed Building Consent).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application No.</td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Applicant’s Name</td>
<td>Location of Proposal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/2008/0333/F</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Mr Alfred Martin</td>
<td>Land adjacent 24 Roses Close, Wollaston. 3 bed detached house.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/2008/0334/F</td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
<td>Mr Stuart Becker</td>
<td>141 Wellingborough Road, Finedon. Erection of conservatory to rear elevation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/2008/0335/F</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Mr R Simons</td>
<td>25 Ladys Lane, Mears Ashby. Single storey flat roof extension at rear. Construction of internal passageway within existing property leading to re-opening of old doorway for pedestrian access onto Lady's Lane.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/2008/0336/LB</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Mr R Simons</td>
<td>25 Ladys Lane, Mears Ashby. Single storey flat roof extension at rear. Construction of internal passageway within existing property leading to re-opening of old doorway for pedestrian access onto Lady's Lane. Internal alterations to form ground floor WC and entrance lobby. Listed Building Consent Application.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/2008/0339/F</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Mr J Robinson</td>
<td>Part of garden 103 - Plot B Main Street, Little Harrowden. Detached dwelling including means of access.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/2008/0341/F</td>
<td>REFUSED</td>
<td>Mr and Mrs Lawrence</td>
<td>49 Oakley Drive, Wellingborough. 2-storey side extension.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/2008/0342/F</td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
<td>Mr Tom Mason</td>
<td>2nd Floor, 33-35 Sheep Street, Wellingborough. Conversion of 2nd floor of 33-35 Sheep Street to 3 no. residential flats, each providing 1 no. bedroom.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application No.</td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Applicant's Name</td>
<td>Location of Proposal</td>
<td>Description of Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/2008/0343/F</td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
<td>Silver Band Club</td>
<td>Silver Band Club, 4 Queen Street, Earls Barton.</td>
<td>Smoking shelter in existing car park, raising the existing brick wall to 2.75m, and enclosure of part of the car park - re-submission following the withdrawal of WP/2008/0093/F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/2008/0344/F</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Weatherbys Group Limited</td>
<td>Weatherbys Group Limited, 52 - 60 Sanders Road, Wellingborough.</td>
<td>Re-enveloping parts of the visible façades of existing building, providing a new main entrance, a ground level link walkway and new canopy to personnel entrance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/2008/0346/F</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Mr J Memoli</td>
<td>116 Knox Road, Wellingborough.</td>
<td>Conversion of existing dwelling - 116 Knox Road into two separate 1 bedroom flats with associated external alterations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/2008/0351/AV</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>United Co-op Pharmacy</td>
<td>Co-op Pharmacy, 48 High Street, Irchester.</td>
<td>Fascia sign - letters only to illuminate and projecting sign (internally illuminated).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/2008/0353/RM</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Mr Karl Hodgkinson</td>
<td>Part of garden 103 - Plot A Main Street, Little Harrowden.</td>
<td>Reserved matters application pursuant to conditions 1 and 2 of planning permission Ref: WP/2007/0056/O for 1 no. dwelling; Discharge of conditions 3 (Arboricultural Survey) and 5 (Archaeology).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application No.</td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Applicant’s Name</td>
<td>Location of Proposal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/2008/0354/F</td>
<td>REFUSED</td>
<td>Mr Wayne Hobbs</td>
<td>24 Ranelagh Road, Wellingborough. Change of use from nursery to residential. Conversion to 6 flats, consisting of 3 no. one-bedroom and 3 no. two-bedroom dwellings - re-submission following the refusal of WP/2007/0574/F.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W H Contracting Sign Services Limited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/2008/0355/F</td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
<td>Mr Paul Bagshaw</td>
<td>28 - 44 (evens), 60 - 64 and 66 - 80 Huxley Close, Wellingborough. Amendments to planning permission Ref: 2007/0491/OM involving the installation of external security shutters to the gable windows of units 1A and 2A. The shutters will be retracted during working hours.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rotherhill Developments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/2008/0356/F</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Mr Charlie Harris</td>
<td>48 Main Road, Grendon. Proposed two storey rear extension, single storey front extension, partial stone cladding to front elevation and internal alterations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/2008/0357/F</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Mr R Morris</td>
<td>131 Ecton Lane, Sywell. Retention of planning permission WP/2007/0448/F without compliance with condition 3 - no part of the hereby approved development shall be used for habitable accommodation without the express planning permission of the local planning authority.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/2008/0358/CA</td>
<td>REFUSED</td>
<td>Mr David Pierpoint</td>
<td>Left Bank, 17 North Street, Mears Ashby. Removal of 3'6” of the stone wall at the north east corner of the property to improve visibility.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application No.</td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Applicant's Name</td>
<td>Location of Proposal</td>
<td>Description of Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/2008/0359/F</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Mr Mike Hager</td>
<td>Wrenn School, London Road, Wellingborough.</td>
<td>Installation of 2 portakabin double classroom blocks to be hired for a period of up to 5 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/2008/0361/F</td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
<td>Mr Nick Shelton</td>
<td>Unit 12 Regent Park, Booth Drive, Wellingborough.</td>
<td>10 new windows to the rear elevation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/2008/0365/F</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Mr and Mrs W Britton</td>
<td>Brittons Nursery, Glebe Road, Mears Ashby.</td>
<td>Construction of single storey extension to form granny annexe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/2008/0372/F</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Mr David Cousins</td>
<td>13 Clare Close, Earls Barton.</td>
<td>Proposed single storey extension providing bedroom en-suite.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BACKGROUND PAPERS**

The background papers for the planning and building applications contained in this report form part of the relevant files appertaining to individual applications as referenced.

Borough Council of Wellingborough, Sustainable Communities, Croyland Abbey, Tithe Barn Road, Wellingborough.
PLANNING COMMITTEE - BUILDING REGULATION DECISIONS ISSUED
APPLICATIONS DEALT WITH

APPLICATION DECISIONS  BOROUGH OF WELLINGBOROUGH  Date: 01/092008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application No.</th>
<th>Name &amp; Address</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FP/2008/0351/</td>
<td>B Mark Prescott 153 Main Road Wilby Wellingborough</td>
<td>Erection of 2 dwellings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BN/2008/0529/</td>
<td>Mr R Mudd 26 Glenfield Drive Great Doddington Northants</td>
<td>Single storey extension and alterations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP/2008/0531/</td>
<td>A Willowbrook Building and Refurbishment Limited 93 Cromford Road Langley Mill Notts</td>
<td>Erection of seven flats and access to parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP/2008/0727/</td>
<td>L Moses 20 Denford Way Wellingborough Northants</td>
<td>Extension and associated alterations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP/2008/0728/</td>
<td>Lee Beaver 36 Hatton Park Wellingborough Northants</td>
<td>Change of use to reduced retail (soft office) and 2 no. flats with external staircase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP/2008/1033/</td>
<td>Mr C Armstrong 18 The Headlands Wellingborough Northants</td>
<td>Two storey extension to side and single storey extension to rear.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PLANNING COMMITTEE - BUILDING REGULATION DECISIONS ISSUED
APPLICATIONS DEALT WITH

APPLICATION DECISIONS                BOROUGH OF WELLINGBOROUGH                Date: 01/09/2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application No.</th>
<th>Name &amp; Address</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FP/2008/1050</td>
<td>Ms Y Wills</td>
<td>2 storey rear extension and garage conversion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 Somerford Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wellingborough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP/2008/1072</td>
<td>Mr I Lewis</td>
<td>Alteration to existing roof area into bedroom/study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whytewell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harrowden Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wellingborough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP/2008/1074</td>
<td>Ian Pateman</td>
<td>Two storey extension comprising of garage, dining room and en-suite bathroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Poplar Close</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Irchester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REJECTED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP/2008/1079</td>
<td>Mr D Inns</td>
<td>2 no. new semi detached houses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70 Broad Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Earls Barton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>APPROVED C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS/2008/1081</td>
<td>London Borough of Bromley</td>
<td>Erection of 5 terraced houses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Civic Centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stockwell Close</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bromley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>APPROVED C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP/2008/1082</td>
<td>Mr Mike Hager</td>
<td>Assembly and recreation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>London Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wellingborough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>APPROVED C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PLANNING COMMITTEE - BUILDING REGULATION DECISIONS ISSUED

APPLICATIONS DEALT WITH

APPLICATION DECISIONS  BOROUGH OF WELLINGBOROUGH  Date: 01/09/2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application No.</th>
<th>Name &amp; Address</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| FP/2008/1085/   | Mr V Takkou  
The Pyghtle  
Earls Barton       | Single storey rear extension forming lounge and bathroom.                    |
| FP/2008/1089/   | Mr Vinod Khakhar  
5 Wernside  
Wellingborough     | Conversion of ground floor flat to two shops.                                |
| FP/2008/1090/   | Citrus Training  
Bentley Court  
Wellingborough     | Change of use, install first floor Etc.                                      |
| BN/2008/1100/   | Mr Ben Winrow  
Wellingborough Road  
Earls Barton       | Removal and support of two internal walls, resizing of two windows and replacement. |
| DI/2008/1104/   | Mr D Wilkins  
Blenheim Road  
Wellingborough     | Bathroom conversion to a level access shower plus internal door modifications.|
| DI/2008/1105/   | Hazel Sturgess  
The Pyghtle  
Wellingborough     | Proposed rear extension to bungalow.                                        |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application No.</th>
<th>Name &amp; Address</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FP/2008/1107/</td>
<td>Northamptonshire County Council</td>
<td>External window and door replacement project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guildhall Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northampton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BN/2008/1108/</td>
<td>Mr Dylan Justice</td>
<td>Conversion of garage into habitable room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arkwright Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Irchester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wellingborough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ACCEPTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP/2008/1109/</td>
<td>Ms K Stanton</td>
<td>Part first floor extension above garage and part two storey rear extension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Western Way</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wellingborough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>APPROVED C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DI/2008/1110/</td>
<td>Mr D Felows</td>
<td>Disabled adaptions, widen doorways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Irthlingborough Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finedon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wellingborough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ACCEPTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP/2008/1113/</td>
<td>Wollaston Parish Council</td>
<td>Construction of single storey extension with flat roof to side elevation of existing village hall structure for storage purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C/o Parish Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46 Queens Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wollaston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>APPROVED C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BN/2008/1114/</td>
<td>Mining and Chemical Products Limited</td>
<td>New double doors between exempt air lock extension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-4 Nielson Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finedon Road Industrial Estate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wellingborough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ACCEPTED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PLANNING COMMITTEE - BUILDING REGULATION DECISIONS ISSUED

### APPLICATIONS DEALT WITH

**APPLICATION DECISIONS** | **BOROUGH OF WELLINGBOROUGH** | **Date: 01/092008**
--- | --- | ---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application No.</th>
<th>Name &amp; Address</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DI/2008/1115/</td>
<td>Mrs Chapman 14 Newtown Road Little Irchester Northants</td>
<td>Conversion of existing bathroom into a shower room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCEPTED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DI/2008/1116/</td>
<td>Mr P Elston 117 Burns Road Wellingborough Northants</td>
<td>Conversion of existing bathroom into a shower room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCEPTED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BN/2008/1118/</td>
<td>Miss Donna Akers 23 The Banks Wellingborough Northants</td>
<td>Partial garage conversion to join living room, front part of garage to stay as garage - dividing wall to separate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCEPTED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DI/2008/1139/</td>
<td>Mr S Pateman 80 Townsend Close Wellingborough Northants</td>
<td>L/A bathroom adaption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCEPTED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BN/2008/1204/</td>
<td>Lisa Cashin 29 Manor Road Earls Barton Northants</td>
<td>Knock one wall down between kitchen and dining room and add utility space at the back with a toilet at the side. New doors to dining room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCEPTED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP/2008/1205/</td>
<td>Mr D Bradley 28 High Street Bozeat Northants</td>
<td>Rear G.F extension and first floor bathroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPROVED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application No.</td>
<td>Name &amp; Address</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DI/2008/1288/</td>
<td>Mrs Henson</td>
<td>Disabled adaptation to shower room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Wood Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wellingborough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCEPTED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DI/2008/1292/</td>
<td>Mr Augustus</td>
<td>Installation of through floor vertical wheelchair lift (disable adaptation).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 Haddon Close</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wellingborough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCEPTED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BN/2008/1293/</td>
<td>Mrs Kamlaben Patel</td>
<td>Constructing new outer skin to external party wall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mill Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wellingborough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCEPTED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP/2008/1295/</td>
<td>Mr and Mrs Curtis</td>
<td>Single storey front extension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 Muirfield Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wellingborough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPROVED C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP/2008/1297/</td>
<td>Mr and Mrs Wright</td>
<td>Form new opening between kitchen and dining room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32 Cross Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wellingborough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPROVED C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>