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Regulatory Committee 28/02/2007

Report of the Executive Director

APPLICATION REF: WP/2006/0706/F

PROPOSAL: Extension to new building (92.9 m. sq.) - workshop unit and related parking.

LOCATION: 4 Titley Bawk Avenue, Earls Barton, Wellingborough.

APPLICANT: Mr D Mallard.

This application is recommended for committee and site viewing due to the nature of local planning policy for this locality, planning history of the site, the current ombudsman complaint regarding the previously approved planning application and neighbour concern.

PROPOSAL AND DESCRIPTION OF SITE:
The site is positioned within the village confines of Earls Barton and the special policy area of Titley Bawk Avenue. Small scale industrial users predominantly occupy this policy area with residential properties fronting Wellingborough Road abutting the western boundary. There are however at least two residential dwellings located within Titley Bawk Avenue. Open countryside surrounds this policy area on three sides. The road itself is private (not publicly maintained highway) and is of a substandard nature. It is not served by public surface water sewers and flooding occurs at the junction with Wellingborough Road. This area has been reserved, by the local plan, for small scale industrial users who do not require large premises.

This application seeks permission for an extension to the north eastern side of two previously approved semi-detached workshop units. Building works had originally commenced but have ceased whilst this planning application is considered by the local planning authority.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:
WP/2003/0707/F Construction of 2 semi-detached workshop units and related car parking – approved with conditions.

The above application was approved with conditions on 7th January 2004. Subsequently a minor amendment was approved by officers to allow the same footprint to be divided into three units as opposed to the two approved as part of the application. In the context of local plan Policy EB1, it was considered that the minor amendment could be permitted in light of the same footprint and floorspace being retained.
Prior to the above development the site was used for the storage of old cars, was in an untidy state and had a significant rodent problem.

**NATIONAL AND LOCAL PLANNING POLICY:**
Policies EB1 and G1 of the Borough of Wellingborough Local Plan.

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

1. Highways Authority – the following comments have been made.
   - Policy EB1 relating to the use of Titley Bawk Avenue is noted it is considered that the present application should be determined having regard to its requirements. On inspection at a time of moderate rainfall the roadway did not demonstrate significant flooding problems and the point of entry to this private road from Wellingborough Road was in satisfactory condition.
   - Except for a small proportion of residential use the land giving frontage to Titley Bawk Avenue is used for small scale industrial use and, in principle, the proposed development is considered to be an acceptable continuation of this use.
   - In view of Policy EB1 it is suggested that the applicant should provide an appropriate assessment to demonstrate whether or not the proposed development will result in a material increase in traffic generation. By extending the site into four individual units it would seem that increased traffic will be generated to the site (increased floor space).
   - You should satisfy yourself as to the adequacy of parking accommodation, for both cars and goods vehicles, provided to serve the development. In this respect I am concerned that inadequate space appears to be available to permit the four units to be conveniently serviced simultaneously within the curtilage of the site.
   - It is noted that the development is well advanced and that the building framework is already in place.

2. Earls Barton Parish Council – advised the local planning authority that they have no comment to make on this application.

3. Environment Agency – advised the local planning authority that they have no comment to make on this application.

4. Third Parties – two letters of objection have been received. Grounds of objection are as follows:
   - Increasing the number of units from 2 to 4 will substantially increase traffic flow.
   - There is not enough space for the lorries and vehicles using Titley Bawk Avenue.
• The road is unable to take anymore traffic.
• Proposed extension will be detrimental to the environment.
• The proposal, and previously approved building, is not in accordance with Policy EB1 of the local plan.
• The drainage and road should be brought up to standard before any further development takes place.

ASSESSMENT:
Previously Approved Application
It was considered that the proposal submitted under planning reference WP/2003/0707/F would not result in any material increase in traffic due to the previous use of the site and that this could have generated commercial traffic. To this end policy EB1 of the Borough of Wellingborough Local Plan was taken into account and the application was considered to be in accordance with this. It was also considered that the development would improve the environmental condition of the site and would be an overall benefit to this specific locality.

Local Planning Policy
The site lies within the village confines of Earls Barton and within the Titley Bawk Avenue special policy area. Due to the site location local plan policy EB1 must be considered in the determination of this planning application. The proposed extension will increase the floorspace of the building by 92.9 square metres. The existing approved floorspace is 278.7 square metres.

Policy EB1 states:

PLANNING PERMISSION WILL BE GRANTED FOR SMALL SCALE INDUSTRIAL USES AT TITLEY BAWK AVENUE, EARLS BARTON AS SHOWN ON THE PROPOSALS MAP, PROVIDED THE UNSATISFACTORY CONDITION OF THE HIGHWAY HAS BEEN SATISFACTORILY RECTIFIED.

EXCEPTIONS MAY BE MADE WHERE PROPOSALS WILL NOT RESULT IN A MATERIAL INCREASE IN TRAFFIC GENERATION.

The agent for the application has confirmed that the proposed extension will be used as overflow storage space to the approved building. It is considered that this can be adequately controlled through the imposition of conditions so that the extension is used for storage purposes only and that it remains ancillary to the main building. In this context and having considered the history of the site and the size of the extension relative to the approved floorspace it is considered that the proposal will not result in a material increase in traffic generation. The proposal is therefore considered to be in accordance with Policy EB1 in this case.

The agent has confirmed that a program of maintenance has been agreed between the owners of businesses that use Titley Bawk Avenue and that this is to include repairs and improvements to the existing road surface water gulley system. Although the
proposal as submitted, without any road improvements, is considered to comply with EB1 of the local plan, the works described by the agent represent potential future improvements in the current condition of this private road.

Residential Amenity
It is considered that the proposed extension will not have any greater impact on amenity than is currently the case. Although there are at least two residential dwellings located within Titley Bawk Avenue, this area is reserved for small scale industrial users. Current users within this area support this general aim. It is considered that no significant detrimental impact on residential amenity will be caused by the erection of this extension, which is relatively small scale in relation to existing uses currently operating within this special policy area.

Parking Availability on Site
Two parking spaces, in addition to the eight approved under WP/2003/0707/F, have been provided for the proposed extension. A total of ten spaces will therefore be accommodated on site. Although the Highways Authority originally expressed some concern regarding parking availability on site, having considered the information submitted by the agent that the use is to be storage only they have verbally confirmed that they do not wish to raise an objection on this basis. Furthermore according to the parking standards of Supplementary Planning Guidance V and the Highway Authority, a storage use (B8 use) requires 1 space to be provided per 120 square metres. In terms of floorspace 1 parking space would be required for the proposed development. In light of this and conditions to restrict the use of the extension to storage it is considered that parking accommodation on site is sufficient.

Proposal Design
The design of the proposed extension represents a continuation of the main building previously approved and is considered to be in-keeping with the general industrial character of this locality.

Summary
Overall it is considered that the proposal is in accordance with the relevant policies of the development plan, particularly in this case EB1 and G1 of the Borough of Wellingborough Local Plan, and there are no other material planning considerations which constitute sustainable grounds for refusal.

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. The external walls and roof of the extension shall be constructed with materials of the same type, texture and colour as the external walls and roof of the existing building.
3. The hereby approved extension shall be used for the purposes of storage only.
4. The hereby approved extension shall remain ancillary to the main building.
Reasons:
1. Required to be imposed pursuant to S51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
2. In the interests of amenity.
3. To maintain control over the use of the site.
4. To maintain control over the use of the site.

INFORMATIVE/S
1. Pursuant to Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the proposed development complies with 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 Regional Spatial Strategy 8 and the following policies: EB1 and G1 of the Borough of Wellingborough Local Plan.
2. The applicant is advised that this decision relates to the following drawing numbers received on the date shown:
   Drawing Number:     Date Received:
   Location Plan
   BP/DM/4/2/06        15/12/2006
BOROUGH COUNCIL OF WELLINGBOROUGH

AGENDA ITEM

SITE VIEWING (Date of visit 27th February 2007 at 2.30 p.m.)

Regulatory Committee 28/02/2007

Report of the Executive Director

APPLICATION REF: WP/2006/0737/F

PROPOSAL: Change of use from garden to car park.

LOCATION: Little Harrowden Village Hall, 83-85 Main Street, Little Harrowden, Wellingborough.

APPLICANT: Grace Abbott.

NOTE:
This application was deferred by the Regulatory Committee in order to view the site.
APPLICATION REF: WP/2006/0737/F

PROPOSAL: Change of use from garden to car park.

LOCATION: Little Harrowden Village Hall, 83-85 Main Street, Little Harrowden, Wellingborough.

APPLICANT: Grace Abbott.

PROPOSAL AND DESCRIPTION OF SITE:
The application site is an area of ill-maintained garden to the rear of Little Harrowden Village Hall on Main Street. The proposal is to construct hard-paving in order to increase the parking potential of the site by a further 20 vehicles.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:
No relevant planning history.

NATIONAL AND LOCAL PLANNING POLICY:
Borough Council of Wellingborough Local Plan Policies: G1, G6, H12 and T9.
Northamptonshire County Structure Plan: T9.

SUMMARY OF REPLIES TO CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED:
1. Highways (NCC) - recommends that the highway standards and planning conditions set out in the NCC document ‘Minor Planning Applications that have an effect on the highway’ be applied to this application.

2. Landscape Officer comments –

WP/2006/0737 Little Harrowden Village Hall
FW 03.01.07

It is proposed to extend the existing car park onto the neglected garden land to the rear. The design and access statement speaks of improving the site by removing conifers and scrub, but there are tree species present which should perhaps not be so readily dismissed plus an attractive Cotoneaster, Cherry laurel and Pittosporum. There is no specific reference to the hedge on the north east boundary. The neighbours evidently appreciate the well maintained screen
which this provides with the addition of young cedar, spruce and cherry. Unfortunately the existing trees and shrubs have not been plotted and it is difficult to tell if the shaded area along the boundary of the neighbouring residential curtilage is intended to represent the conifer hedge, and if so it appears to be too narrow. If the hedge is within the site boundary and is to be removed this could have an effect on the neighbouring property as the house is close to the boundary and the soil type is not known. If the hedge is within the neighbour’s curtilage and a retaining wall is required the hedge would be destabilised. The Eucalyptus which would have dominated the space has evidently been felled recently.

While the aspiration to provide the maximum number of car parking spaces is appreciated the information provided is not adequate and if as it appears all the existing vegetation is to be removed from the north east boundary and replaced by a six foot fence it could be to the detriment of the neighbouring property. There is no indication as to whether the existing buddleia and elder would be retained at the far end of the site or whether there would be any new planting.

There is a difference in level between the existing car park and the proposed site of approximately 70 cms. It is not apparent from the plan how the layout would be achieved in the absence of any cross sections.

3. Local Plans comments –

“Where in making any determination under the Planning Acts, regard is to be had to the development plan, the determination shall be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Relevant Policies:
BOWLP: G6 (Open Countryside), G1 (General), G22 (Landscaping), L2 (Community Facilities)
CSP: T9 (Parking Standards)
RSS8: Policy 44 (Traffic Growth Reduction), Policy 47 (Car Parking Standards)
SPG: V (Parking)

Comments:
The site is outside the Village Policy Line and is therefore defined as Open Countryside where Policy G6 applies.

Given that the car park is proposed to serve the village hall it could perhaps be argued that Policy L2 applies. This would permit community facilities on the edge of the village provided they were designed to meet the village’s needs.

The main question is therefore whether the car park is actually necessary. National policy in respect of parking is to restrict parking to act as a demand management tool to influence and encourage more sustainable travel behaviour. Given that the village hall will be primarily used by residents of Little Harrowden it
is not unreasonable to expect most of them to be capable of walking or cycling to activities. The Hall does currently seem to have a few spaces to accommodate the elderly or disabled user. It would appear that the additional parking would exceed the maximum parking standards in the SPG. It is therefore considered that the additional parking should not be permitted. The additional parking is not necessary and therefore this would be an inappropriate use in the open countryside.

Notwithstanding the above, if the consent is granted, secure cycle parking facilities should be provided in accordance with SPG V (see Fig 10). In addition the site should be suitably landscaped."

4. Third Party Objections - (2, 3 and 4 Albion Court, Little Harrowden) Summary:

- Impact on privacy.
- Noise pollution.
- Environmental pollution upon health of occupants from exhaust pollution.
- Light pollution.
- Loss of wildlife and natural flora and fauna.
- Concerns over loss of area of natural drainage.
- Security implication; access to rear gardens.
- Site outside of Village Policy Line.

**ASSESSMENT:**
The principal issues surrounding the recommendation of this application are concerned firstly with any impact upon the amenity of neighbouring properties; the loss of the site as an area for nature, parking implications any policy issues.

**Affect upon Neighbours Amenity**
It is conceded that the application would (through vehicular movements) result in an increase in noise to the properties in Albion Court but this increase is unlikely to be of any great significance when compared to the present situation. Similarly any increase in air pollution, through vehicle emissions is unlikely to be of significance to justify the refusal of the application. In any event any pollution in the vicinity including light pollution would be dealt with by the Environmental Protection department, under a separate legislation. Any lighting proposed, should the application be approved, would be conditioned to ensure that written permission of the local planning authority is sought.

**Loss of Amenity Space**
Although the area is currently not utilised as a garden, the effort taken to turn the site into a 'pocket park' for example would be small. Its is acknowledged that the site is not designated as an area of significance, nevertheless the site is considered to contain certain trees of note and be in an attractive setting with agricultural land beyond. The site is also located outside of Little Harrowden’s Village Policy Line and therefore greater regard should be given to any intended development, although in this proposal the development is for hard-paving only.

The concerns of the Landscape Officer regarding the lack of information is also a cause for concern when determining the application.
Character and Setting of Locality
Although the site is located to the rear of the Hall and therefore cannot easily be viewed without access to the site or from neighbouring properties. However, the Hall is a communal, municipal building and therefore receives a number of visitors, who may if allowed frequent the garden. It is therefore considered that the loss of the area would detract from the setting of the locality and would not be enhanced by the area becoming hard-paved.

Planning Out Crime Implications
Having consulted Supplementary Planning Guidance IV: Planning Out Crime in Northamptonshire there are no crime implications with regard the application, primarily due to the surveillance from neighbouring properties and the presence of a gated entrance, although it is acknowledged this may be seldom used.

Highway Implications
Notwithstanding the above arguments, in relation to the impact upon the local environment, it is also important to judge whether or not there is sufficient demand for the proposed spaces. Having judged the application in accordance with Supplementary Planning Guidance for Parking, a D1 use (Village Hall) of this size (266m²) would require 10.64 parking spaces. Although the rear area does not have formalised parking spaces, it is envisaged following a site inspection that the amount of spaces currently available on the site would be between 10-15 vehicles, depending on how these vehicles were parked. In addition there are also 2 garages to the rear, not included in this figure. It is acknowledged that the Design and Access Statement provided with the application indicates that the parking could also be used for parents dropping off and picking up children and the nearby school, but there are no guarantees that parents would use these additional spaces. In any event it is not felt that the loss of the landscaped area would be justified in providing parking spaces solely for the use of parents for a limited period of time per day.

In addition the Design and Access Statement suggests that the development would mean that disabled parking bays could be provided close to the building, although it would currently be possible to provide 2 bays in close proximity to the rear access, which would be considered to be sufficient for a public hall of such a size.

Response to Representations
The advice given by the highways authority and the landscape officer has been taken into account and the relevant guidance applied as discussed above. The concerns of the neighbouring properties in respect to various types of pollution have been considered and discussed above.

Summary
On balance, although there may well be a need for parking spaces during a limited time period the existing spaces are deemed sufficient for a Village Hall of this size and therefore the addition of more spaces would be unnecessary in this instance, especially when coupled with the location of the site outside of the village policy line and the loss of the area as an environmentally attractive parcel of land.
RECOMMENDATION:
Refusal.

1. The proposed development would result in a loss of land, which is considered to be of landscape value. Its transformation to a hard-surfaced area, providing additional parking spaces and resulting in the loss of some mature trees would detract from the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policies G1.1, G6.1, H12.2 and T9 of the adopted Borough Council of Wellingborough Local Plan and Policy T9 of the Northamptonshire County Structure Plan.

POLICY G1

PROPOSALS FOR DEVELOPMENT WILL NORMALLY BE GRANTED PLANNING PERMISSION WHERE THE DEVELOPMENT:

1. IS OF A HIGH STANDARD OF DESIGN WHICH RESPECTS AND ENHANCES THE CHARACTER OF ITS SURROUNDINGS.

POLICY G6

DEVELOPMENT IN THE OPEN COUNTRYSIDE WILL NOT BE GRANTED PLANNING PERMISSION UNLESS:

1. IT CANNOT BE ACCOMMODATED OTHER THAN IN THE OPEN COUNTRYSIDE.

POLICY H12

PLANNING PERMISSION WILL BE GRANTED FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT PROVIDED THAT:

2. A VISUALLY ATTRACTIVE ENVIRONMENT IS CREATED.

POLICY T9

IN RELATION TO PROPOSALS INVOLVING THE LAYOUT OF NEW ROADS, A CHANGE IN THE CHARACTER OR VOLUME OF TRAFFIC, OR THE FORMATION OR ALTERATION OF A VEHICULAR ACCESS, PLANNING PERMISSION WILL BE GRANTED WHERE:

1. HIGHWAY STANDARDS ARE SATISFACTORILY MET;

2. THE SCHEME IS NOT DETRIMENTAL TO THE ENVIRONMENT BY REASON, FOR EXAMPLE, OF NOISE, VISUAL INTRUSION OR AIRBORNE POLLUTION;
3. IN THE CASE OF NEW ROADS OR ALTERATION TO EXISTING ROADS A SATISFACTORY LANDSCAPING SCHEME IS INCORPORATED, WHERE PRACTICAL; AND

4. SATISFACTORY PROVISION IS MADE FOR PEDESTRIANS, CYCLISTS, THE DISABLED AND PUBLIC TRANSPORT, WHERE APPROPRIATE.

POLICY T9 (Northamptonshire County Structure Plan)

MAXIMUM STANDARDS FOR CAR PARKING WILL BE IDENTIFIED FOR ALL FORMS OF DEVELOPMENT, TAKING ACCOUNT OF NATIONAL AND REGIONAL GUIDANCE. MINIMUM CYCLE PARKING STANDARDS (INCLUDING STANDARDS FOR POWERED TWO-WHEELERS) WILL APPLY TO ALL NON-RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT.
APPLICATION REF: WP/2006/0747/F

PROPOSAL: Demolition of existing buildings and erection of two dwellings.

LOCATION: 96 Overstone Road, Sywell, Wellingborough.

APPLICANT: Mr C Lanza.

This application is referred to the Regulatory Committee for determination because the Parish Council has objected to the proposal along with more than two local residents. A visit from the Site Viewing Group has been requested by the Sywell Parish Council and the Ward Councillor.

PROPOSAL AND DESCRIPTION OF SITE:
As described above including the part demolition of no. 96 to achieve the access road through to the rear of the site. The density of the proposed development is 13 dwellings per hectare.

The application site is currently occupied in its northeastern corner by a large garage building that is being used for car repairs. To the front of the garage is an area of concrete hardstanding together with a gravelled apron and behind the building are a number of cars in various states of repair and other items. The rest of the site is laid to grass.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:
WR/72/427 Residential development – refused.

NATIONAL, REGIONAL AND LOCAL PLANNING POLICY:
Regional Spatial Strategy 8
Northamptonshire County Structure Plan – AR6, GS5, H3, H5 and H6
Borough of Wellingborough Local Plan – G1, G4, G6, G13, H3, H4, H12 and T9
Supplementary Planning Guidance – Parking, Building Better Places and Planning Out Crime
Planning Policy Statement 1; Delivering Sustainable Development
Planning Policy Guidance 3; Housing
Planning Policy Statement 3; Housing – comes into force on 1st April 2007, but its content is capable of being a material consideration before the start date.
Planning Policy Statement 7; Sustainable Development in Rural Areas
Planning Policy Statement 23; Planning and Pollution Control.

SUMMARY OF REPLIES TO CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED:
1. NCC Highways – refer to NCC publication for highways advice.
2. Sywell Parish Council – has concerns regarding the application as to whether the application would result in building outside the village confines. The Parish Council goes on to request a visit from the Site Viewing Group.
3. Neighbours – no comment received.

ASSESSMENT:
Material planning considerations:
• Compliance with policy
• Effect on the visual amenity of the area
• Effect on neighbours amenities
• Crime and disorder
• Biodiversity

Compliance with policy
The application is accompanied by a Design and Access Statement that attempts to justify the proposal with regards to the following local plan policies: H1, H3 and H12 together with a reference to PPS 3’s requirement for new housing development to be achieved on brownfield land. The references to local plan policies in the applicant’s statement are noted, but the explanation of current planning policy fails to address any of the issues raised by the site being located outside of the Village Policy Line and the allied restrictive open countryside development plan policies which are examined below.

The Village Policy Line (VPL) for this part of Sywell runs along a line that travels in a roughly southwest - northeast direction approximately 10m to the rear of northern elevation of no. 96 Overstone Road. The purpose of the VPL is to differentiate between what is considered to be open countryside and the confines of the village which is referred to in Development Plan policies. The route of the VPL results in the larger parts of the garden areas associated with the ribbon of dwellings that run from the Borough border to the west to the cul-de-sac that is Pie Corner to the east, which includes the application site, being situated in the open countryside in terms of planning policy.

Policy H3 of the County Structure Plan states that housing development will be limited to within the established confines of villages and the confines will be set out in the local plans. The Borough of Wellingborough Local Plan identifies the confines of Sywell with its defined VPL and the proposal site clearly falls outside it. The proposal is therefore contrary to both County Structure Plan Policy H3 and Borough of Wellingborough Local Plan Policy H3 because the site is, despite its appearance, situated in the open countryside.
As identified above the proposal site is located in the open countryside and Policy H5 of the County Structure Plan and Policy H4 of the Borough of Wellingborough Local Plan both specify restrictive criteria for housing development to be acceptable in this situation which involves the following: replacement of an existing dwelling or a dwelling that is justified for reasons of agricultural or forestry necessity. The proposal does not involve the replacement of a dwelling, nor was it accompanied by an agricultural or forestry justification to indicate that the scheme should benefit from any of the exemptions to the constraining policies mentioned above. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to Policy H5 of the County Structure Plan and Policy H4 of the Borough of Wellingborough Local Plan. It is accepted that the site is brownfield in nature, but it is further considered that the mere fact of its previous use in an unacceptable location should not carry sufficient weight to counter the opinion that the site is in the open countryside and is therefore contrary to development plan policies.

**Effect on visual amenity of the area**
The proposed dwellings display no particular architectural merit, but they will not however, affect the visual amenity of the area to any significant degree. This is because of the site’s location at the rear of a ribbon of dwellings and their design which accords with the appearance of the built surroundings.

**Effect on neighbours’ amenities**
It is accepted that the proposed scheme will have an effect on the standard of amenities that are currently enjoyed by the adjacent occupiers. It is considered however that the effects will be insufficient to warrant refusing the application for the following reasons:

- Adequate privacy separation distances between the proposed and existing dwellings.
- Dormer bungalow configuration of the intended dwellings which will also reduce potential loss of privacy and massing effect.
- Blank flank wall in the elevation of no. 94 facing the access.
- Residential use of the site could result in less vehicular movements and noise than the existing use of the land.

**Crime and disorder**
There are not considered to be any crime and disorder issues pertinent to the determination of this application.

**Biodiversity**
There have not been any biodiversity issues identified within the scope of this application.

**CONCLUSION**
It is recognized that the proposal will not adversely impact on the standard of amenities that are currently enjoyed by the occupiers of the adjacent dwellings and the likely effect on the visual amenity of the area will also not be sufficiently detrimental to warrant refusal of the application.

It is acknowledged that the site is brownfield in nature because of the building on the land together with its use. It is considered however, that the existing use of the proposal site which is located outside the village policy line and in the open countryside
is not a sufficiently sound justification to disregard the restrictive development plan policies.

**RECOMMENDATION:**
Refuse for being contrary to the following Development Plan policies:
- H3 and H5 of the County Structure Plan
- H3 and H4 of the Borough of Wellingborough Local Plan

1. The proposal represents an unacceptable development in the open countryside and in the absence of any very special circumstances, it would be contrary to Policies H3 and H5 of the County Structure Plan and Policies H3 and H4 of the Borough of Wellingborough Local Plan.

**POLICY H3**

**WITHIN THE RESTRICTED INFILL VILLAGES, SMALL SCALE RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT WILL BE PERMITTED WITHIN THE VILLAGE POLICY LINES PROVIDED THAT THE PROPOSAL:**

1. INVOLVES A SITE ALLOCATED FOR HOUSING ON THE PROPOSALS MAP; OR

2. WILL HAVE NO ADVERSE IMPACT UPON THE SIZE, FORM, CHARACTER AND SETTING OF THE VILLAGE AND ITS ENVIRONS; AND

3. WILL, WHERE APPROPRIATE IN THE CONTEXT OF CRITERION 2, CONSIST OF A SMALL GROUP OF DWELLINGS OR INFILLING OR THE REDEVELOPMENT OR CONVERSION OF EXISTING BUILDINGS.

**POLICY H3 (Northamptonshire County Structure Plan)**

HOUSING DEVELOPMENT WILL BE LIMITED TO WITHIN THE ESTABLISHED CONFINES OF VILLAGES. LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITIES WILL ESTABLISH THE VILLAGE CONFINES AND IDENTIFY THESE IN LOCAL PLANS, TAKING ACCOUNT OF LAND WITHIN OR ADJOINING THE VILLAGE.

WHEN ESTABLISHING THE CONFINES AND IDENTIFYING SITES REGARD WILL BE HAD TO:

- THE IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT ON THE FORM, CHARACTER AND SETTING OF THE VILLAGE;
- THE AVAILABILITY OF PUBLIC TRANSPORT;
- THE NEED TO RETAIN AND PROVIDE LOCAL FACILITIES AND EMPLOYMENT;
- THE ABILITY OF LOCAL FACILITIES AND SERVICES TO SERVE THE NEW DEVELOPMENT;
- THE NEED TO MEET LOCAL NEEDS THAT WILL HELP SECURE A MIXED AND BALANCED COMMUNITY; AND
- THE IMPACT ON LOCAL AMENITY AND TRAFFIC.

POLICY H4

PLANNING PERMISSION WILL NOT BE GRANTED FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT IN EITHER THE OPEN COUNTRYSIDE OR THE RESTRAINT VILLAGES OF EASTON MAUDIT, STRIXTON OR SYWELL OLD VILLAGE. EXCEPTIONS MAY, HOWEVER, BE MADE FOR ESSENTIAL AGRICULTURAL OR FORESTRY WORKERS DWELLINGS, REPLACEMENT DWELLINGS, THE CONVERSION OF SUITABLE BUILDINGS IN RESTRAINT VILLAGES AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING IN THE OPEN COUNTRYSIDE ON THE EDGE OF OTHER VILLAGES WHERE THIS DEVELOPMENT IS IN ACCORDANCE WITH POLICY H9.

POLICY H5 (Northamptonshire County Structure Plan)

IN THE OPEN COUNTRYSIDE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT WILL ONLY BE PERMITTED WHERE:

- IT REUSES A BUILDING WHERE EVERY REASONABLE ATTEMPT HAS BEEN MADE TO SECURE SUITABLE BUSINESS RE-USE; AND
- IT REUSES A BUILDING THAT WILL NOT REQUIRE COMPLETE OR MAJOR RECONSTRUCTION AND THERE ARE NO DETRIMENTAL EFFECTS ON THE BUILDING OR ITS SURROUNDINGS; OR
- IT REPLACES AN EXISTING DWELLING, PROVIDED THAT THE DWELLING IS OF THE SAME GENERAL SIZE, MASSING AND BULK AS THE ORIGINAL DWELLING AND SITED ON THE SAME FOOTPRINT; OR
- IT IS ESSENTIAL FOR THE EFFICIENT RUNNING OF AN AGRICULTURAL OR FORESTRY HOLDING. A FUNCTIONAL AND FINANCIAL TEST OF THE HOLDING MAY BE REQUIRED TO ESTABLISH IF IT IS ESSENTIAL TO PROVIDE THE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT IN THE OPEN COUNTRYSIDE. WHERE AN ESSENTIAL NEED IS PROVEN PREFERENCE WILL BE GIVEN TO THE CONVERSION OF AN EXISTING BUILDING BEFORE THE CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW DWELLING.

WHEN CONSIDERING SUCH PROPOSALS, THE APPROPRIATENESS OF THE MATERIALS, DESIGN AND SITING WILL BE FUNDAMENTAL TO THE
GRANTING OF PLANNING PERMISSION.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drawing Numbers</th>
<th>Date Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site location plan, 624-1, 624-2, 624-3 and 624-4</td>
<td>21st December 2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BOROUGH COUNCIL OF WELLINGBOROUGH  AGENDA ITEM

SITE VIEWING (Date of visit 27\textsuperscript{th} February 2007 at 2.00 p.m.)

Regulatory Committee  28/02/2007

Report of the Executive Director

APPLICATION REF: WP/2006/0753/F

PROPOSAL: Single storey rear extension to barn (barn approved as dwelling, planning reference WP/2005/0751/F). (Amended Plans received).

LOCATION: Plot 18 Manor Farm, Harrowden Road, Orlingbury, Wellingborough.

APPLICANT: Grace Homes Limited.

PROPOSAL AND DESCRIPTION OF SITE:
The application site is located within an ongoing residential development site off the Harrowden Road, Orlingbury and within the designated conservation area. The property is an existing barn currently being converted with the proposed development being a single storey mono-pitched extension to the barns rear elevation.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:
No relevant planning history.

NATIONAL AND LOCAL PLANNING POLICY:
Borough Council of Wellingborough Local Plan Policies: G1 and G12.

SUMMARY OF REPLIES TO CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED:
1. Orlingbury Parish Council -
   
   “Although appreciating the applicant revising the application to a single pitch roof rather than double this council still considers it to be an overdevelopment of the site and fully supports the concerns expressed by Mr and Mrs West of Little Barn, Harrowden Road, Orlingbury with regards to footings and loss of a long established hedge.”

2. Neighbour (Little Barn, Harrowden Road) -
   
   “The problem that the old hedge forming the boundary might be damaged if the barn extension is allowed to encroach too close to our boundary as the footings will have to extend well beyond the wall they support. The boundary hedge is an important feature of the Little Barn property.”
3. Conservation Officer -

“No objection to amended scheme”

ASSESSMENT:
This application is concerned primarily with the impact of the extension; the conversion currently enjoys planning approval.

Affect upon Neighbours Amenity
The extension is proposed to the rear elevation and therefore will have no impact upon properties fronting the site, once they are occupied. The property is backed to the north-west by non-residential farm units within the curtilage of Manor Farm. Adjoining the property is the rear elevation to 1 Church Farm Yard, there are no windows in this elevation. Little Barn, Harrowden Road, the neighbouring property to north-west, is located on a slightly higher ground level, with the proposal located on the south-west boundary, 14m from the property. It is considered that the extension would not detrimentally impact upon Little Barn any more than the current barn, in addition there are no windows proposed in the side elevation with Little Barn. It is therefore considered that there are no loss of light or overlooking issues with regard this application and is therefore in accordance with Policy G1 of the Local Plan.

Loss of Amenity Space
Due to the relatively small size of the extension the loss of amenity is considered sustainable within the site and therefore is not considered overdevelopment and does not justify refusal of the application.

Character and Setting of Locality
The site is located within Orlingbury Conservation Area it is therefore important to carefully consider the impact the extension may have on the character of the area. It is considered that due to the scale of the extension and its siting to the rear of the property together with the negotiation to alter the pitch of the roof and various other design alterations such as the inclusion of a ventilation slot in the north-west elevation the proposed development is not believed to detrimentally impact upon the special qualities of the area and its setting. This if further ensured with the condition relating to materials to be approved before construction. It is therefore considered that the application is in accordance with Policies G1 and G12 of the Local Plan.

Planning Out Crime Implications
Having consulted Supplementary Planning Guidance IV: Planning Out Crime in Northamptonshire there are no crime implications with regard the extension.

Response to Representations
The comments received from the Parish Council in relation to overdevelopment of the site are discussed above.

Summary
Having considered the above, there are no material planning considerations to justify refusal of this application and is therefore in accordance with Policies G1 and G12 and is hereby recommended for approval.
RECOMMENDATION:
Approval 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.

Reasons:
1. Required to be imposed pursuant to S51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
2. In the interests of amenity.

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: G1 and G12 of the Borough of Wellingborough Local Plan.
2. The applicant is advised that this decision relates to the following drawing numbers received on the date shown:
   - Drawing Number: 3984/42 F & 3984/52 D
   - Date Received: 22/01/2007
BOROUGH COUNCIL OF WELLINGBOROUGH

AGENDA ITEM

SITE VIEWING (Date of visit 27th February 2007 at 12.45 p.m.)

Regulatory Committee 28/02/2007

Report of the Executive Director

APPLICATION REF: WP/2006/0776/O

PROPOSAL: Outline application for residential development.

LOCATION: Land adjacent 28 Summerlee Road, Finedon, Wellingborough.

APPLICANT: Borough Council of Wellingborough.

This application is referred to the Regulatory Committee for determination because the Borough Council of Wellingborough is the applicant. Also, the Parish Council has requested that the application site be the subject of a visit from the Site Viewing Group.

PROPOSAL AND DESCRIPTION OF SITE:

The application is in outline, with all matters reserved for future consideration. This notwithstanding, indicative plans have been submitted that show a detached bungalow with one off-street parking space within the curtilage of the site.

The application site is a vacant triangular shaped area of land situated towards the end of Summerlee Road which is characterized by terraced housing with little or no off street parking. Opposite is a pair of contemporary bungalows and at the end of the road is Townside Farmhouse.

The front part of the site is relatively flat but it then slopes down steeply to meet the rear boundaries of dwellings that front onto Milner Road. Growing within the site is a variety of immature self-set trees and undergrowth. Running along the northwestern boundary of the site is a public footpath which links through to Milner Road. Along the rear boundary is a number of fences.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

WP/2006/0402/O Residential development – withdrawn.

NATIONAL, REGIONAL AND LOCAL PLANNING POLICY:

Regional Spatial Strategy 8
Northamptonshire County Structure Plan - GS5, H3 and H6
Borough of Wellingborough Local Plan – G1, G4, H2, H12, T9 and T10
SUMMARY OF REPLIES TO CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED:

1. NCC Highways – recommends that access, turning and parking details form part of the any reserved matters application.

2. NCC Public Rights of Way Officer – no objection but recommends that the boundary fence which will be adjacent to the Public Right of Way that is adjacent to the site is not as high as 2m to assist in surveillance of the route.

3. Finedon Parish Council – considers that the proposals is an overdevelopment of the site and it raises the issue of the steep slope at the rear of the site. The Parish Council also comments that the scheme would result in the loss of a parking area which is used by Summerlee Road residents.

4. Environmental Protection Service – advises that a further Environmental Risk Assessment should be submitted to address the issues of the site being previously used as a quarry and the Northamptonshire sand strata that underlies the site, which may contain elevated levels of naturally occurring arsenic.

5. Anglian Water – in a letter dated 22nd January 2007 the company states that it would be able to deal with the low water pressure query in approximately 6 weeks.

6. Council's Property Manager – reports that the current parking on the site is completely unauthorised. The Property Manager goes on to comments that the pavement to the front of the site should be properly made up and also makes reference to possible future developments nearby.

7. Neighbours – letter of support for a single storey dwelling has been received from the occupier of 27 Milner Road. The writer goes on to opine that the proposal would remove some of the problems that have plagued the area and would greatly improve the locality.

Letters of objection have been received from the occupiers of 27 and 29 Summerlee Road who cite the following reasons for opposing the application:

- Development will result in the loss of an area that is used as a turning space during the day and parking facility at night. The resulting loss will cause more chaos and reference to new houses that add to the problem.
- Concern that emergency services will have a problem with turning and access.
• Ongoing water pressure problems.
• Belief that countryside and space give Finedon its character and soon it will be another town made out of nothing but bricks and mortar.

ASSESSMENT:
The material planning considerations are:
• Compliance with policy
• Effect on the visual amenity of the area
• Effect on neighbours amenities
• Highway safety and parking
• Crime and disorder

Compliance with policy
Finedon is designated in the local plan as a limited development village. It is considered that the principle of a new dwelling that is to be located within the built up area of the village, and on land that is thought to have been previously used as a quarry, is entirely consistent with elements of national guidance, regional and development plan policy that seeks to direct new residential development in the rural areas to such sites. Other aspects of policy will be examined below.

Effect on visual amenity
The drawings that supplement the application show a single storey dwelling of modest proportions and design. It is considered that the scheme which will develop an area of land that is currently unmaintained will have a positive effect on the visual amenity of the street scene.

Effect on neighbours’ amenities
It is acknowledged that the proposal will have an effect on the standard of amenity that is currently enjoyed by the occupiers of the surrounding dwellings. It is considered however, that any diminution will not be sufficient to warrant refusing the application on the grounds of undue harm to residential amenity for the following reasons:

• Despite the differing ground levels there is an adequate privacy distance of 21m between any windows in the rear elevation of a single storey dwelling and the backs of the existing houses that front onto Milner Road.
• No undue massing effect or loss of light associated with the development of a single storey dwelling.

Highway safety and parking
It is clear that part of the application site which abuts the public highway has been used for informal parking by Summerlee Road residents for some time and the development will inevitably result in the car drivers having to find other locations to park their cars. It is considered however, that the number of cars that will have to find alternative parking spaces is relatively small and their relocation to the nearby streets will not result in significantly increased parking problems locally that will be appreciably detrimental to the overall car parking situation in Summerlee Road. The plans that accompany the application illustrate one off road parking space for the proposed dwelling, which is considered to comply with the provisions of the adopted parking Supplementary Planning Guidance and Government advice. The comments of the Council’s Property
Manager regarding the unauthorized nature of the existing car parking use should perhaps also be borne in mind.

**Crime and disorder**

It is considered that the development of a vacant piece of land that abuts residential boundaries could have a positive effect on crime and disorder by denying access to rear garden fences.

The comment of the Public Rights of Way Officer regarding the height of any boundary fence is noted, but the right of any resident to enjoy an adequate standard of security is also a legitimate consideration. The elevation of the application site in relation to the adjacent footway will result in some habitable rooms of any dwelling looking down onto the Right of Way. Furthermore, the outline consent will contain a condition that requires the boundary treatment to be agreed before development commences.

**None material consideration**

Pressure of water supply to nearby houses.

**CONCLUSION**

The scheme is in accord with Government guidance and development plan policy regarding the use of brownfield land in villages in the rural areas for housing. Neighbours' amenities can be protected to ensure a reasonable standard with a single storey only condition. It can be seen therefore that there are no demonstrable reasons to merit withholding outline planning permission.

**RECOMMENDATION:**
Grant outline planning permission with conditions.

1. Application for approval of reserved matters must be made not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission and the development must be begun not later than whichever is the later of the following dates:
   (a) the expiration of five years from the date of this permission; or
   (b) the expiration of two years from the final approval of the reserved matters or, in the case of approval on different dates, the final approval of the last such matter to be approved.

2. Before any development is commenced, detailed plans, drawings and particulars of the layout, scale, external appearance and the means of access thereto, together with landscaping and screen walls/fences shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority and the development shall be carried out in accordance therewith.

3. Before development commences an Environmental Risk Assessment (ERA) that identifies the potential for contamination of the site from naturally occurring arsenic shall be submitted to the local planning authority. Should the ERA identify that the site is contaminated it shall contain measures for its remediation that shall be approved in writing by the local planning authority. The site shall be remediated to the satisfaction of the local planning authority before the hereby approved development is first occupied.

4. The hereby approved dwelling shall be single storey only.
5. Before development commences the finished floor levels of the hereby permitted dwelling in relation to its curtilage shall be submitted to the local planning authority and approved in writing. The development shall be carried out in accord with the approved levels.

Reasons:
1. Required to be imposed pursuant to Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
2. To secure satisfactorily planned development.
3. To protect residents from the potential effects of arsenic contamination.
4. To protect the standard of privacy of nearby residential occupiers.
5. To protect the standard of privacy of nearby residential occupiers.

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
   - Northamptonshire County Structure Plan - GS5, H3 and H6
   - Borough of Wellingborough Local Plan - G1, G4, H2 and H12
   - Supplementary Planning Guidance - Parking, Trees on Development Sites, Planning Out Crime and Building Better Places
   - Planning Policy Statement 1; Delivering Sustainable Development
   - Planning Policy Guidance 3; Housing
   - Planning Policy Statement 3; Housing - comes into force on 1st April 2007, but its provisions are capable of being a material consideration before that date.
   - Planning Policy Statement 7; Sustainable Development in Rural Areas
   - Planning Policy Guidance 13; Transport.

2. The applicant is advised that this decision relates to the following drawing numbers received on the date shown:
   - Drawing Number: Date Received:
     - Site location plans, layout plans and indicative sketches 22\textsuperscript{nd} December 2006

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

AGENDA ITEM

SITE VIEWING (Date of visit 27th February 2007 at 4.15 p.m.)

Regulatory Committee 28/02/2007

Report of the Executive Director

APPLICATION REF: WP/2006/0779/F

PROPOSAL: 2 storey side and rear extension with single storey rear kitchen/family room providing bedrooms and bathroom and alteration to garage (to include Juliet balcony on front elevation).

LOCATION: 70 Northampton Road, Earls Barton, Wellingborough.

APPLICANT: Mr R and Mrs A Leighton.

This application is subject to the Regulatory committee due to the objection and request for site viewing by the Earls Barton Parish Council and the level of third party objection. A ward councillor has also requested that this application be heard by the committee on the grounds that it represents overdevelopment and the adverse impact on properties.

PROPOSAL AND DESCRIPTION OF SITE:
A 1920s/1930s two storey, detached dwelling and its surrounding curtilage form the application site. The surrounding properties are considered to be of similar age and design. The existing dwelling at no. 70 is situated on a relatively large plot. A log cabin providing annexe residential accommodation, which was granted planning permission in 2005, is positioned in the rear curtilage. Northampton Road, which runs along the western edge of Earls Barton, runs to the front of the application site. Open countryside lies on the other side of the highway.

This application seeks planning permission for a two storey side and rear extension with single storey rear kitchen/family room providing bedrooms and bathroom and alteration to garage (to include Juliet balcony on front elevation).

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:
The most recent applications made on this site as detailed below:

WP/2003/0663/F Two storey side and rear extensions to dwelling for accommodation for elderly person to include kitchen/diner, bedroom and garage – withdrawn.

WP/2005/0106/F Single storey timber garden annexe – approved with conditions.
WP/2006/0367 2 storey side and rear extension with single storey (rear) - kitchen/family room/bedrooms/ensuite/utility (to include front balcony at first floor and balustrading at rear first floor) – withdrawn.

Since the last application a Juliet balcony design feature has been added to first floor level door opening positioned on the front elevation.

NATIONAL AND LOCAL PLANNING POLICY:
G1 of the Borough of Wellingborough Local Plan.

SUMMARY OF REPLIES TO CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED:
1. Highways Authority – recommends that the highway standards and planning conditions set out in the NCC document ‘Minor Planning Applications that have an effect on the highway’ be applied to this planning application.

2. Earls Barton Parish Council – concerns regarding the scale of development. A site viewing is requested.

3. Third Parties – 8 letters of objection from third parties. Grounds of objection are as follows:
   - Overlooking
   - Loss of light
   - Detrimental to the health and quality of life of adjacent occupier (letter from local doctor received).
   - Previous annexe in the rear garden was agreed to by neighbours as a compromise to major development at no. 70. The compromise has not been honoured.
   - Detrimental impact on visual amenity.
   - Damage to the environment.
   - Terrace effect would be caused by the two storey side extension.
   - Detrimental to the streetscene and character of dwelling and locality.
   - Balconies/balustrading is not necessary.
   - Overdevelopment of the site.
   - Exacerbate existing detrimental impact on amenity caused by the annexe accommodation in the rear curtilage.
   - Alternatives should be considered by the applicant.

ASSESSMENT:
Size and Massing
The scale of the extension is considered to be acceptable in relation to the size of the plot which the existing dwelling at no. 70 occupies and the characteristics of other properties in the locality. An adequate amount of private amenity space will also be retained to the rear of no. 70 even with the siting of the annexe in the rear curtilage.

Residential Amenity
Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) II: Residential Extensions gives guidance on how far extensions can project in relation to neighbours windows to ensure adequate
light to their rooms. Single storey extensions should not project beyond a line drawn at 60° from the middle of the nearest ground floor window of a habitable room of an adjacent property. First floor or two storey extensions should not project beyond a line taken at 45°. Habitable rooms include kitchens, living rooms and bedrooms but exclude bathrooms, toilets, halls and landings. In this case the proposed extensions comply with both the 45° and 60° angle tests with regards the nearest ground floor windows to habitable rooms of no. 72 and no. 68 Northampton Road, which are positioned to either side of the site. There is a ground floor window in the side elevation of no. 72 about which the neighbouring occupier is particularly concerned regarding loss of light. This side window however is a secondary window with a principal window being positioned in the front elevation of the dwelling. It is considered that refusing this application on the basis of loss of light to this side window is unsustainable.

Overlooking and loss of privacy has also been raised as concerns by neighbouring occupiers. A Juliet balcony design feature has been added to the front elevation so that there is no potential for overlooking of the adjacent properties. With regards doors proposed at first floor level to the rear and side elevations, balustrading is proposed at a number of points. It is considered that balustrading should be erected to both the rear and side first floor doors to prevent the external roof space being used as balconies and for these to be design features only. It is therefore considered that a condition should be imposed to ensure that appropriate balustrading is erected and maintained on a permanent basis. This will ensure that the neighbouring occupiers do not suffer from any loss of privacy. It is also recommended by way of condition that the proposed openings at first floor level in the side elevations of the extensions should remain permanently obscurely glazed.

Overall it is considered that with appropriate conditions attached there will be no significant detrimental impact on the amenities currently enjoyed by the occupiers of neighbouring properties.

Proposal Design and Effect on the Streetscene

It is considered that the design of the extensions will be in keeping with the overall design of the existing dwelling and will not detrimentally affect the streetscene. The proposed two storey side extension is however positioned nearly up to the boundary. Two storey side extensions up to the boundary are normally discouraged unless site specific factors can help prevent the creation of the terrace effect. In this case the frontages of the properties positioned along Northampton Road are varied and are not in a line with one another. Specifically, the frontage of the existing dwelling at no. 70 is set back in relation to the neighbouring property to the north no. 72 and is set forward of no. 68, which is located to the south of the site. It is considered that the varied frontage and the current gap that exists between no. 72 and the site boundary will help to maintain separation between properties and avoid the terrace effect. Any future proposal to extend no. 72 two storey up to the boundary would have to be considered on its merits if a proposal was submitted.

Summary

It is considered that this application, with appropriate conditions attached, is acceptable with regards the policies of the development plan and is therefore recommended for approval. It is considered that there are no other material planning considerations which constitute a sustainable reason for refusal.
**RECOMMENDATION:**
Approve with conditions.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>The development shall be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>The external walls and roof of the extension shall be constructed with materials of the same type, texture and colour as the external walls and roof of the existing building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>The proposed windows and openings in the side elevations at first floor level facing toward No. 72 and No. 68 Northampton Road shall be obscurely glazed and remain so at all times thereafter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995, or any order revoking or re-enacting that order, no additional windows or other openings shall be formed at any time in the side elevations at first floor level of the extensions hereby permitted that will face toward No. 72 or No. 68 Northampton Road without the express prior permission in writing from the Local Planning Authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Balustrades shall be provided across the frontage of the first floor door openings positioned on the rear and side elevations. Prior to the commencement of development full details of the positioning and design of the balustrades shall be submitted to and agreed by the local planning authority. The agreed details shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the local planning authority.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reasons:**

1. Required to be imposed pursuant to S51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
2. In the interests of amenity.
3. To ensure that the amenities of the neighbouring occupiers are not adversely affected by loss of privacy.
4. To ensure that the amenities of the neighbouring occupiers are not adversely affected by loss of privacy.
5. To ensure that the amenities of the neighbouring occupiers are not adversely affected by loss of privacy.

**INFORMATIVE/S**

1. Pursuant to Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the proposed development complies with 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 Regional Spatial Strategy 8 and the following policy: G1 of the Borough of Wellingborough Local Plan.
2. The applicant is advised that this decision relates to the following drawing numbers received on the date shown:
   - Drawing Number: Date Received:
   - 1 of 2
   - 2 of 2 29/12/2006
BOROUGH COUNCIL OF WELLINGBOROUGH

AGENDA ITEM

SITE VIEWING (Date of visit 27th February 2007 at 1.30 p.m.)

Regulatory Committee 28/02/2007

Report of the Executive Director

APPLICATION REF: WP/2007/0024/F

PROPOSAL: Two bedroom bungalow - re-submission following the withdrawal of application WP/2006/0759/F.

LOCATION: Land at rear 18 Church Street, Isham, Wellingborough.

APPLICANT: Mr R Reading.

This application is referred to the Regulatory Committee for determination because more than two letters of representation have been received from nearby residential occupiers. The Isham Parish Council has objected to the proposal and has also requested that the application be the subject of a visit from the Site Viewing Group.

PROPOSAL AND DESCRIPTION OF SITE:
As described above.

The site was formerly part of the rear garden area of no. 18 Church Street and is situated in the Isham Conservation Area. Number 18 is a grade II listed building as are numbers 12 and 16 Church Street.

Number 18 is built up to the back edge of the footpath and the neighbouring dwelling to the east (no. 20 Church Street) is set at an irregular angle to the road frontage and has a 1.1m high fence on its front boundary. There is a gate post at the entrance to the site’s access and the measurement from the front corner of no. 18 to the gate post is 4.5m. The access to the site narrows to 3.0m wide at a point 8.0m back from the highway boundary. Number 18 is situated on the inside of a slight bend in the road and has a footpath that measures as 1.5m at this point. The driveway has received a covering of gravel and there is a boundary fence and wall along the side and rear boundaries of no. 18 that only have a pedestrian gate for an entrance to the rear of the dwellinghouse. The fencing has resulted in no off road parking provision for no. 18 Church Street which appears to be the situation with some other properties in the historic part of the village.

The land noticeably slopes up from the north to the south and on the boundaries is a variety of fencing and walls of differing ages. The wall on the site’s southern boundary has three distinct sections and elements of it are integral parts of outbuildings associated with a terrace of cottages that are numbered 27 – 31 Middle Street that all
have minimal amounts of rear amenity space. The lowest part of the rear boundary wall measures as 1.4m high. The next lowest measures as 1.65m above the existing ground level and in the elevations of the dwellings that back onto the proposal site are windows at ground and first floor levels. The higher sections of wall measure as approximately 2.2m and 3.2m high respectively. Within the site there is evidence of felled trees and demolished outbuildings.

Locally the development comprises of a variety of dwellinghouses and a farm with the Isham Primary School some 100m to the west.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:
WP/2005/0062/F Single storey rear extension - conditionally approved.
WP/2006/0320/F Habitable dwelling – refused.
WP/2006/0759/F Two bedroomed bungalow – withdrawn.

NATIONAL, REGIONAL AND LOCAL PLANNING POLICY:
Regional Spatial Strategy 8.
Northamptonshire County Structure Plan – AR6, GS5, H3, and H6.
Borough of Wellingborough Local Plan – G1, G4, G9, G12, G21, H1, H3, H12, and T9.
Planning Policy Statement 1; Delivering Sustainable Development.
Planning Policy Guidance 3; Housing.
Planning Policy Statement 3; Housing - from 1st April 2007, but contents are capable of being a material consideration before that date.
Planning Policy Statement 7; Sustainable Development in Rural Areas.
Planning Policy Guidance 13; Transport.
Planning Policy Guidance 15; Planning and the Historic Environment.
Planning Policy Statement 23; Planning and Pollution Control.
Northants County Highway Authority Guidance Notes - ‘Minor Planning Applications that have an Effect upon the Highway’.

SUMMARY OF REPLIES TO CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED:
1. Isham Parish Council – objects to the application for the following reasons:
   - Insufficient access width
   - Road safety. The Parish Council state that the occupiers of numbers 18 and 20 Church Street both have two cars and park in the road; the parking for no. 18 having been previously on the application site. Reference to visibility issue and amount of traffic in Church Street due to the school and the public house at certain times.

   The Parish Council request a visit from the Site Viewing Group.

2. NCC Highway Authority –

   “Subject to it being confirmed that the means of access to the proposed dwelling is to be used solely for that purpose and that satisfactory alternative provision is
to be made to provide parking accommodation for the existing dwelling, 18 Church Street, then no objection will be raised to the application on highway grounds.

To prevent loose material being carried onto the highway at least the first 5m of the driveway must be hard-paved.”

3. Environmental Protection – no comment received.

4. Council’s Design and Conservation Officer (CDCO) – is happy with the principal of a backland infill plot for reasons given in reply to earlier consultation. On points of detail however, the CDCO requests that amendments be sought regarding the chimney design and asks for conditions to be imposed covering the submission of details of windows, doors eaves and verges.

The CDCO previously commented that he was conscious there may be planning problems with the proposal but in conservation terms has no objection to the application. This is because the medieval layout of a traditional village such as Isham often had cottages built in arbitrary locations. Requests minor amendments to elements of the design of the proposal, which are not traditional, and imposition of conditions that control the exterior facing materials and other matters of detail.

5. Neighbours – letters of objection have been received from the occupiers of 20, 25 and 33 Church Street; 27 Middle Street in which the respondents cite the following reasons for opposing the proposal:

- Opinion that the proposal does not comply with policies H1.1, H3.3 and H12.4.
- Proposal is tandem development and does not meet the Councils adopted spacing standards.
- Loss of privacy due to proposed dwelling not being compliant with required spacing standards.
- Inadequate amenity space for occupiers of the proposed development and the existing dwelling no. 18.
- Dwelling is too close to the boundaries of properties in Middle Street.
- Belief that the submitted plans and design statement are misleading and opinion that the proposal will result in a loss of privacy.
- Could become a dormer bungalow.
- Application does not comply with County Highway Authority visibility requirements.
- Proposal has stripped no. 18 of a parking space and forced the occupiers to park on the road adding to congestion in the area, which is one of the few areas of Isham that has on-street parking.
- Occupants of nos. 16 and 18 have pedestrian access along the proposed driveway to access their garden, which is clearly dangerous.
- Danger to highway/pedestrian safety.
- 3m. wide access is cause for concern.
• Reference to usual traffic generation by a nearby livery business and the school.
• Increased on street parking problems and residents have to walk back to their dwellings when they cannot park outside their homes due to events at the village hall, primary school etc.
• Detrimental effect on the character of the Conservation Area and the nearby listed buildings.
• Reference to trees that were on the site, which could have acted as a screen and reduced noise.
• Noise from traffic entering and leaving the site.
• Belief that there is insufficient space for vehicles to turn around inside the site to ensure that they do not have to reverse out onto Church Street which would be very dangerous.
• Noise, disruption and disturbance caused by construction.
• Dangerous precedent for future backland development.
• Development is not in character with its surroundings.
• Development is not in accord with the Council’s spacing standards.
• Plans are lacking in detail regarding facing materials. Also, the ridge heights over the bedrooms on the east and west elevations do not appear to be drawn the same as the ridge heights over the bedrooms on the north and south elevations.
• Opinion that the design of the bungalow, footprint, form and massing does not emulate a barn conversion or is in keeping with the surrounding properties.
• Loss of view.
• Fears for value of neighbouring property.

ASSESSMENT:  
The material planning considerations are:
• Compliance with policy
• Effect on the conservation area and setting of a listed building
• Effect on neighbours amenities
• Access and highway safety
• Crime and disorder
• Biodiversity

Compliance with policy
Isham is classified in the local plan as a restricted infill village and the proposal could be considered to be in accord with elements of national guidance and development plan policy with regards achieving new housing development in the rural area on brown field sites within the recognized confines of villages. With regards the Local Plan, Policy H3 refers to a small group of dwellings or infilling which is defined in the explanatory text (paragraph 3.14) as “the filling of a small gap which, having regard to the width of neighbouring residential curtilages and the general character of the site and surrounding area, is capable of accommodating a single dwelling, a pair of dwellings or a small terrace of dwellings not normally exceeding four in number in an otherwise built up street frontage.” The proposal is clearly a form of tandem development and does not readily fit into the criteria mentioned above that describes what form of housing development would be acceptable. One interpretation of the policy could be that the
proposal is contrary to Policy H3.3 of the Local Plan, but there is Officer opinion which considers that the scheme does not adversely impact on the character of the village due to its historic street pattern. Other aspects of policy will be discussed below.

**Effect on the visual amenity the conservation area and setting of listed buildings**
The local planning authority is required to pay special regard to applications in conservation areas to ensure that they preserve or enhance their visual amenity. The position of the plot is at the rear of a mainly built up street frontage and the public will only be afforded a brief glimpse of the proposal through the gaps between nos. 18 and 20 Church Street. The proposed dwelling could possibly be visible through the existing larger gap in the street frontage in Middle Street to the southeast, but the single story nature of the development would reduce its visual impact significantly. Also, this gap in the Middle Street frontage has an extant permission for residential development WP/2006/0060/F refers.

Residents have expressed their own views regarding the effect of the development on the character of the conservation area and the setting of nearby listed buildings. The advice from the Council’s Conservation Officer however is clear and it is therefore considered that the application cannot reasonably be refused for detrimental impact on the conservation area or adversely affecting the setting of nearby listed buildings.

**Effect on neighbours’ amenities**
The applicant has supplied plans that illustrate a reduced ground level to accommodate the proposed dwelling together with a detailed layout plan. It is clear that the single storey height of the development and the intended reduction in ground level will result in no overly detrimental impact on the standard of amenities that are currently enjoyed by the occupiers of the neighbouring dwellings sufficient to withhold planning permission. The specific points of detail are examined below:

The Building Better Places SPG in paragraph 3.34 promotes a minimum privacy distance of 21m between the rear facing windows of neighbouring dwellings. It is perhaps unfortunate that it is not mentioned specifically in the SPG, but it is suggested that the stated privacy distance is to be used for establishing the privacy distance between opposing two storey dwellings. Clearly, the 10.5m garden length also mentioned in the SPG is the distance that any two storey dwelling should have to meet the 21m back to back standard. The plans illustrate a single storey building and therefore the view from the ground floor windows that will be afforded to the potential occupants will not materially impact on the privacy of the residents who live around the application site.

One objecting resident has helpfully supplied a cross section based on the submitted plans that shows a line of sight across the lowest part of the boundary wall between the respondent’s property and the proposed dwelling. The sketch illustrates an indicative line from the top of the window in the existing building to the top of the window in the proposed building, which aptly demonstrates that there will be an adequate standard of privacy for both the potential and existing residents. The SPG states that dwellings must be provided with adequate standards of amenity space and it is considered that the front and rear gardens associated with the proposed dwellings and the residual amount of curtilage serving no. 18 Church Street is satisfactory.
Policy H1 states that consent will be granted for residential development in residential areas, except where the proposal is a form of tandem development involving the construction of one dwelling immediately behind another and sharing the same access, which would result in deterioration in residential amenity. It has been demonstrated that there will not be any undue loss of amenity as a result of the proposal and the application therefore cannot reasonably be refused on the grounds of loss of residential amenity for nearby neighbours.

**Access and highway safety**
The arrangement of the boundary fencing of no. 18 has resulted in no off street parking provision for its occupiers and it would appear that locally there are dwellings that further away in the historic core of the village that also do not have the benefit of off road parking. However, there are dwellings nearby in Church Street that do have this benefit and noticeably, there is a stretch of blank wall on the opposite side of the road that does not serve residential properties. It is suggested therefore that the weight which is afforded to neighbour objections relating to on street parking problems should be significantly moderated.

Many respondents to the planning publicity and consultation procedure have mentioned traffic problems in Church Street and in particular the possible danger to school children. The traffic problems associated with delivering and picking up school children are not exclusive to Isham. The Northamptonshire County Council Education Department web page states that the academic year 2007 – 2008 will be 195 days long and there will also be 5 additional training days when pupils will not be required to attend school. If this information is expressed as a percentage of the year when the schools are actually open it produces a figure of 52%. It should also be noted that during the day there are normally only two periods of time in which most of the traffic and parking congestion occurs which amounts to approximately 40 minutes; apart from parents’ evenings and school plays etc.

It is considered that the numbers of cars parked on Church Street as a result of the development will not make matters materially worse than they are already with regards to pressure for on street car parking spaces and danger to highway traffic. The comments of the Highway Authority are noted, but the numbers of vehicles that could use the access would be no different from when the residents of no. 18 had its exclusive use and it is considered that the proposed access arrangement is not sufficiently dangerous to refuse the application on the grounds of highway safety.

It is further considered that the short lived demand for on street car parking spaces caused by other nearby uses such as the school, livery stables, public house and the demand by householders who do not have any off road car parking, or those that do have off road space but choose not to use it, is also not a sufficiently robust reason to withhold consent.

**Crime and disorder**
Access to the rear gardens that adjoin the application site can be gained via the existing ungated entrance. It is considered that this application could have a beneficial effect on crime prevention by establishing additional levels of natural surveillance and security measures in the garden area of the application site.
Biodiversity
It is considered that there are no material biodiversity issues identified within the scope of this application.

None material considerations
- If noise and dust emanating from a building site constitutes a nuisance powers are vested in the Council’s Environmental Protection Service to take action as necessary.
- Loss of view.
- Loss of property value.

CONCLUSION:
It is accepted that the proposal could be considered to be contrary to the strict interpretation of Policy H3.3 of the local plan. However, it is considered that the scheme would not have any demonstrable harm on:

- the size, form and character of the village.
- visual amenity of the Conservation Area.
- setting of a listed building.
- residential amenity.
- standards of highway safety.
- crime and disorder.

It is clear that the proposal is in accord with the majority of the Council's planning polices and the one policy where there is a degree of conflict, by itself, does not represent a substantial or sustainable reason for refusal when the scheme is in accord with the other relevant policies and Supplementary Planning Guidance. The application is therefore 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 shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before the development is commenced and it shall be carried out using the approved materials.
3. Before development commences detailed plans that illustrate the intended windows, doors, eaves and verges of the hereby approved dwelling, together with an amended chimney design shall be submitted to the local planning authority and approved in writing. The development shall be carried out in accordan with the approved plans.
4. Notwithstanding the provisions of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995, or any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order, no windows (including roof lights) shall be inserted into the roof of the hereby approved dwelling without the express planning permission of the local planning authority.
5. Before the development is first occupied the first 5m. of the driveway in the rear of the public highway shall be hard surfaced to the satisfaction of the local planning authority.

6. A scheme for screen fencing/walling shall be agreed with the local planning authority before the start of construction. The agreed scheme shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the local planning authority before the hereby approved house is first occupied.

7. The existing vehicular access onto Church Street shall ensure for the benefit of the residents of the hereby approved dwelling only.

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 order to preserve and enhance the character of the Isham Conservation Area.
4. In order to protect the privacy of occupiers of surrounding residential properties.
5. In the interests of visual amenity and privacy.
6. 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
   - Northamptonshire County Structure Plan - AR6, GS5, H3, and H6
   - Borough of Wellingborough Local Plan - G1, G4, G9, G12, G21, H1, H3, H12, and T9
   - Supplementary Planning Guidance - Building Better Places, Parking and Planning Out Crime
   - Planning Policy Statement 1; Delivering Sustainable Development.
   - Planning Policy Guidance 3; Housing
   - Planning Policy Statement 3; Housing - from 1st April 2007, but contents are capable of being a material consideration before that date.
   - Planning Policy Statement 7; Sustainable Development in Rural Areas
   - Planning Policy Guidance 13; Transport
   - Planning Policy Guidance 15; Planning and the Historic Environment
   - Planning Policy Statement 23; Planning and Pollution Control
   - Northants County Highway Authority Guidance Notes - 'Minor Planning Applications that have an Effect upon the Highway'.

2. The applicant is advised that this decision relates to the following drawing numbers received on the date shown:
   - Site location plan and 07 Rev A  11th January 2007

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

AGENDA ITEM

SITE VIEWING (Date of visit 27th February 2007 at 12.15 p.m.)

Regulatory Committee

Report of the Executive Director

APPLICATION REF: WP/2007/0032/F

PROPOSAL: First floor extension to bungalow to form 2 storey house. Two storey extensions to front and south east side. (Resubmission following the withdrawal of WP/2006/0713/F).

LOCATION: 38 Hardwick Road, Wellingborough.

APPLICANT: Mr and Mrs J Walia.

This application is to be heard by the Regulatory Committee due to the level of third party objection.

PROPOSAL AND DESCRIPTION OF SITE:
A detached bungalow and its surrounding curtilage form the application site. The site is located within a residential area of Wellingborough and is positioned within the Hatton Park special policy area (Policy U11 applies to new dwellings only). Two storey dwellings are predominantly found within the area surrounding the site.

This application seeks planning permission for a first floor extension to the bungalow in order to form a two storey dwelling and two storey extensions to the front and south east elevations.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:
WP/2006/0713/F First floor extension to bungalow to form two storey house plus two storey extension to front and first floor balcony to the rear – withdrawn.

This current application is a resubmission of this previously withdrawn scheme. The first floor rear balcony, external staircase and first floor door opening in the rear elevation have been removed from the scheme. A flat roof section and supporting columns have been retained within the proposal in order to create a single storey covered area to the rear of the dwelling.

NATIONAL AND LOCAL PLANNING POLICY:
G1 of the Borough of Wellingborough Local Plan.
SUMMARY OF REPLIES TO CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED:

1. Highways Authority – recommends that the highway standards and planning conditions set out the NCC document ‘Minor Planning Applications that have an effect on the highway’ be applied to this planning application.

2. Third Parties – 6 letters of objection from third parties have been received. Grounds of objection are:
   - Overlooking and loss of privacy
   - Loss of light
   - Impact on amenity
   - Intrusive development
   - Incongruous in general appearance against surrounding plots of land
   - Extensions will not be used for residential purposes – possibility of multiple occupation/guest house accommodation
   - Overdevelopment
   - Unsustainable development
   - Poor access - site is located on a dangerous bend
   - Congestion
   - Obstruction of the highway by construction vehicles/materials
   - Noise pollution
   - Problems with sewerage system
   - Covenants may prevent two storey dwelling being erected on site

ASSESSMENT:

Residential Amenity

Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) II: Residential Extensions gives guidance on how far extensions can project in relation to neighbours windows to ensure adequate light to their rooms. Single storey extensions should not project beyond a line drawn at 60° from the middle of the nearest ground floor window of a habitable room of an adjacent property. First floor or two storey extensions should not project beyond a line taken at 45°. Habitable rooms include kitchens, living rooms and bedrooms but exclude bathrooms, toilets, halls and landings. In this case the proposed extensions comply with the relevant angle tests and it is therefore considered that no detrimental impact will be caused in terms of loss of light.

A balcony positioned at first floor level at the front of the dwelling has been retained within the proposal. It is considered that this will not cause a loss of privacy to the neighbouring occupiers at no. 40 Hardwick Road. The proposed windows positioned at first floor level in the side elevations are considered to overlook the neighbouring properties and consequently it is considered that conditions should be imposed to ensure that these remain permanently obscurely glazed and non-opening. Overlooking and loss of privacy will thereby be prevented. A number of windows are proposed at first floor level in the rear elevation of the dwelling. These windows will be approximately 12 metres from the rear site boundary. This distance is considered to be sufficient to prevent a significant loss of privacy to the neighbouring occupiers positioned to the rear of the site. Overall having considered the positioning of proposed windows and openings and the potential for conditions to be imposed, refusal on the grounds of privacy is considered to be unsustainable. SPG VIII: Building Better Places
recommends that a minimum rear garden depth of 10.5 metres should be afforded to dwellings. This will be achieved on site with a rear garden depth of 12 metres being retained. The dwelling will therefore have an adequate amount of private amenity space.

The dwellinghouse will be used for residential purposes only and no commercial use is proposed as part of this application.

Overall it is considered that, with appropriate conditions attached, this proposal will not result in any detrimental impact on the amenities currently enjoyed by the occupiers of neighbouring occupiers.

Streetscene and Character of the Area
Two storey dwellings predominantly comprise the area surrounding the application site. It is considered that a two storey dwelling on this site will not have a detrimental effect on the streetscene or the character of the area. Refusal of this proposal on the grounds of it being out of character with the site surroundings is considered to be unsustainable.

Access
The Highways Authority has not raised an objection to this application and consequently it is considered that the proposal will not have a prejudicial impact on the highway. Adequate parking accommodation is also provided on site to serve the dwelling. The concerns regarding obstruction of the highway by construction vehicles or materials is noted however is not considered to be a material planning consideration. If this were to emerge as a problem the appropriate enforcement authority would need to be informed.

Other Considerations
The details of covenants are a private legal matter and are not within the scope of planning control. Whether this development is contrary to covenants on the land is not grounds for refusal in planning terms.

Summary
It is considered that the proposal is in accordance with the relevant policies of the development plan and there are no other material planning considerations which would constitute sustainable grounds for refusal.

**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. The external walls and roof of the extension shall be constructed with materials of the same type, texture and colour as the external walls and roof of the existing building.
3. The ensuite/bathroom windows proposed at first floor level in the side elevations of the hereby approved extensions shall be obscurely glazed and non-opening and remain so at all times thereafter.
4. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995, or any order revoking or re-enacting that order, no additional windows or other openings shall be formed at any time at first floor level in the side elevations of the extensions hereby approved without the express prior permission in writing from 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 amenity.
3. To ensure that the amenities of the neighbouring occupiers are not adversely affected by loss of privacy.
4. To ensure that the amenities of the neighbouring occupiers are not adversely affected by loss of privacy.

INFORMATIVE/S
1. Pursuant to Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the proposed development complies with regional guidance and the applicable development plan policies and there are no other material considerations that would constitute sustainable grounds for refusal. These include Regional Spatial Strategy 8 and specifically the following policy: G1 of the Borough of Wellingborough Local Plan.
2. The applicant is advised that this decision relates to the following drawing numbers received on the date shown:
   Drawing Number:              Date Received:
   Location Plan
   Block Plan
   MCS 06/45 - 01
   MCS 06/45 - 02
   MCS 06/45 - 03A
   MCS 06/45 - 04A
   MCS 06/45 - 05A
   MCS 06/45 - 06A   12/01/2007
APPLICATION REF: WP/2007/0041/F

PROPOSAL: 4 bed detached house.

LOCATION: Land adjacent 2 Irthlingborough Road, Finedon, Wellingborough.

APPLICANT: Mr John Bolton.

This application is referred to Regulatory Committee for determination on request from Finedon Parish Council because of highway concerns. A visit by the Site Viewing Group is also requested.

PROPOSAL AND DESCRIPTION OF SITE:
The proposal is in the existing garden of 2 Irthlingborough Road, Finedon.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:
WP/2006/0084/O Outline planning permission – approved.
WP/2006/0719/F Five bedroom detached house – withdrawn.

NATIONAL AND LOCAL PLANNING POLICY:
Regional Spatial Strategy 8
Northamptonshire County Structure Plan – AR6, GS5, H3, H5 and H6
Borough of Wellingborough Local Plan – G1, G4, G6, G13, H3, H4, H12 and T9
Supplementary Planning Guidance – Parking, Building Better Places and Planning Out Crime
Planning Policy Statement 1; Delivering Sustainable Development
Planning Policy Guidance 3; Housing
Planning Policy Statement 3; Housing – comes into force on 1st April 2007, but its content is capable of being a material consideration before the start date.
Planning Policy Statement 7; Sustainable Development in Rural Areas
Planning Policy Statement 23; Planning and Pollution Control.

SUMMARY OF REPLIES TO CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED:
2. Finedon Parish Council – request committee determination and Site Viewing Group for highway reasons.
ASSESSMENT:
The proposal is situated in the garden of the existing dwelling. The access would be relatively close to the A6 roundabout junction. There was no objection from Northamptonshire County Council on the previous application. The proposal is considered to be compliant with policy.

RECOMMENDATION:
Full planning permission.

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.
3. Full design arrangements for the front porch and window detailing shall be submitted to and be approved by the local planning authority prior to the commencement of development.

Reasons:
1. Required to be imposed pursuant to S51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
2. In the interests of amenity.
3. In the interests of visual amenity.

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 specifically policies of the Northamptonshire County Structure Plan and of the Borough of Wellingborough Local Plan.
APPLICATION REF: WP/2006/0578/O

PROPOSAL: Outline application for residential development - Additional plans and information.

LOCATION: Land adjacent 14 Hardwick Village, Hardwick, Wellingborough.

APPLICANT: Borough Council of Wellingborough.

This application is referred to the Regulatory Committee for determination because the Borough Council of Wellingborough is the applicant.

PROPOSAL AND DESCRIPTION OF SITE:
As described above with siting, design, external appearance, access and landscaping reserved for subsequent approval.

Additional plans and information were received on 12th December 2006 that illustrated a single large dwellinghouse on the plot and another publicity/consultation exercise was undertaken.

The applicant has written again in a letter received on 1st February 2007 that again confirms that the application is for a single dwelling but also disassociates the application with the sketch details submitted on 12th December 2006.

The application site is a rectangular area of land located on the edge of the village that measures approximately 23m wide on the frontage and 42m in depth. At the time of Officer Inspection it appeared to be in use as part of the garden of no. 14 Hardwick. The southern boundary of the site forms part of the village policy line beyond which is an animal husbandry operation. The northern and eastern boundaries adjoin the back gardens of adjacent dwellinghouses. Growing in the site and on the boundaries is a variety of mature and semi-mature trees and hedgerow plants. Access to the site is via a metalled spur road that starts close to the centre of the village.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:
None relevant.
NATIONAL, REGIONAL AND LOCAL PLANNING POLICY:
Regional Spatial Strategy 8
Northamptonshire County Structure Plan – GS5, H3, and H6
Borough of Wellingborough Local Plan – G1, G4, G21, H3, H12, and T9
Supplementary Planning Guidance – Building Better Places, Trees on Development Sites, Parking and Planning Out Crime
Planning Policy Statement 1; Delivering Sustainable Development
Planning Policy Guidance 3; Housing
Planning Policy Statement; Housing – Comes into force on 1st April 2007, but its content is capable of being a material consideration before that date.
Planning Policy Statement 7; Sustainable Development in Rural Areas
Planning Policy Guidance 13; Transport
Planning Policy Statement 23; Planning and Pollution Control
Northants County Highway Authority Guidance Notes - ‘Minor Planning Applications that have an Effect upon the Highway’.

SUMMARY OF REPLIES TO CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED:
1. Hardwick Parish Meeting – no comment received to additional plan and information.
2. NCC Highway Authority – refer to NCC publication for highways advice.
3. The Wildlife Trusts – welcomes the production of the Bat Report that belatedly accompanied the application and finds that the methodology, results and conclusions within the survey to be satisfactory and acceptable. The Wildlife Trusts makes suggestions regarding the provision of bats roost boxes and bird nesting boxes within the site. The Trusts goes on to point out the legal responsibilities of any developer in relation to wildlife during construction and promotes an indigenous landscaping scheme to provide food and cover for wildlife. Finally, The Wildlife Trusts points out that it is a charity and does not have sufficient resources to respond to all planning applications and advocates that the Council appoints its own in-house ecologist.
5. Council’s Design and Conservation Officer –
   “I have the following comments on the indicative design for the above outline application:
   
   I feel that the architecture is far too grand and "busy" for this village location. Design references ought to be taken from the simple vernacular form of the adjacent Council houses and other simple cottages elsewhere in the village.

   As it stands, I would suggest either refusal of the scheme, or granting outline permission not extending to the details submitted.”

“Prior to commencement of any works to connect the property to the sewer the customer must make a formal application under Section 106 of the Water Industry Act 1991 to obtain consent. Anglian Water have a duty of care towards its customers, if we were to approve a sewer connection relating to the proposed development, we would be duty bound to ensure that the receiving sewerage system is adequate to serve its purpose.”

6. Council’s Landscape Officer – considers that the submitted sketches show the proposed building too close to the ash trees on the site frontage. Also comments that other trees on the site have not been plotted on the submitted plans.

7. Neighbours – one letter of objection has been received in response to the second round of neighbour publicity and the respondents cite the following reasons for opposing the scheme:

- Public sewerage system is not adequate.
- Wildlife and trees on the site.

**ASSESSMENT:**

The material planning considerations are:

- Compliance with policy
- Effect on visual amenity
- Effect on neighbours amenities
- Access and highway safety
- Crime and disorder
- Biodiversity and trees

**Compliance with policy**

Hardwick is classified in the local plan as a restricted infill village. The proposal site is an infill plot located inbetween an existing dwellinghouse and the village policy line. The residential use of the site results in it being classed as brownfield land.

The location of the plot respects the form of the village and the proposal is therefore considered to be in accord with elements of national guidance and development plan policy with regards achieving new housing development in the rural area within the recognized confines of villages on previously used land. Other policy issues regarding the effect on the street scene and impact on the standard of the neighbours’ amenities will be examined below.

**Effect on visual amenity**

The applicant has supplied an indicative sketch of a large dwellinghouse on the plot, but its design has met with opposition from the Council’s Design and Conservation Officer. The applicant has since indicated that the submitted sketch be disassociated with the application. The appearance and siting of the development is reserved for future approval and it is considered that the design of any future house can be adequately controlled at that stage.
Effect on neighbours’ amenities
It is acknowledged that the proposal could have an effect on the standard of amenity that the adjacent residents currently enjoy. The plot however, does have a commodious width and it is again considered that the design of any future development can be adequately controlled at the reserved matters stage to ensure that it does not materially affect the residential amenity of nearby occupiers.

Access and highway safety
The Highway Authority has signalled its unconcern with the development by merely making reference to its published highway standards. It will be consulted again for its comments at the approval of reserved matters stage.

Crime and disorder
It is considered that there are no pertinent crime and disorder issues relevant to the determination of this application.

Biodiversity and trees
Natural England has stated that it has no objections and The Wildlife Trusts is content with the Bat Assessment. The Councils Landscape Officer was not happy with the sketch position of the building on the plot in relation to the trees, but that plan has since been rescinded.

It is considered that there are no other biodiversity issues relevant to the determination of this application.

Other considerations
The adequacy of the local existing foul sewage disposal system to accommodate the proposed development is controlled by the Building Regulations and Anglian Water Services Limited. Under the provisions of section 106 of the Water Industry Act 1991 developers have the right to communicate with the available public sewerage system.

Conclusion
It is considered that there are no sustainable reasons to warrant refusing the outline application.

RECOMMENDATION:
Approve with conditions.

1. Application for approval of reserved matters must be made not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission and the development must be begun not later than whichever is the later of the following dates:
   (a) the expiration of five years from the date of this permission; or
   (b) the expiration of two years from the final approval of the reserved matters or, in the case of approval on different dates, the final approval of the last such matter to be approved.

2. Before any development is commenced, detailed plans, drawings and particulars of the layout, scale, external appearance and the means of access thereto, together with landscaping and screen walls/fences shall be submitted to and
approved by the local planning authority and the development shall be carried out in accordance therewith.

3. Before development commences a tree survey that details the location and species of the trees on the site and the specimens that are to be retained shall be submitted to the local planning authority and approved in writing. During construction of the hereby permitted development the retained trees as agreed with the local planning authority shall be protected in accordance with British Standard BS5837:2005 Trees in Relation to Construction, until construction on the site ceases.

Reasons:
1. Required to be imposed pursuant to Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
2. To secure satisfactorily planned development.
3. In order to identify and protect the trees on the site that have amenity and biodiversity value.

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
   Northamptonshire County Structure Plan - GS5, H3, and H6
   Borough of Wellingborough Local Plan - G1, G4, G21, H3, H12, and T9
   Supplementary Planning Guidance - Building Better Places, Trees on Development Sites, Parking and Planning Out Crime
   Planning Policy Statement 1; Delivering Sustainable Development
   Planning Policy Guidance 3; Housing
   Planning Policy Statement; Housing - Comes into force on 1st April 2007, but its content is capable of being a material consideration before that date.
   Planning Policy Statement 7; Sustainable Development in Rural Areas
   Planning Policy Guidance 13; Transport
   Planning Policy Statement 23; Planning and Pollution Control
   Northants County Highway Authority Guidance Notes - 'Minor Planning Applications that have an Effect upon the Highway'.

2. The applicant is advised that this decision relates to the following drawing numbers received on the date shown: 10th October 2006

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

AGENDA ITEM

Regulatory Committee

28/02/2007

Report of the Executive Director

APPLICATION REF: WP/2006/0665/F

PROPOSAL: Installation of a 1KW domestic wind turbine under the Windsave scheme on western gable end on existing dwelling.

LOCATION: 20 Wantage Road, Irchester, Wellingborough.

APPLICANT: Mr Keith Clements.

NOTE:
This application was deferred at the meeting of the Regulatory Committee on 31st January 2007 for additional information to be obtained with regards the noise generation of the turbine. Below is an extract from the Windsave web site with regards to noise:

“Our system is 3-bladed and, as with all similar dynamic generator systems, there is a degree of noise caused by the wind-rush on the structure and by the blade tips cutting through the air. Customer feedback is positive, the sound often being described as a swishing sound. Our Plug ‘n’ Save™ inverter is a solid-state technology producing similar noise to a PC (Personal Computer) etc.

Typical Noise Profile
- Free spinning (loudest noise potential)
- 5 metres behind blades gusting to 5m/s/12 miles per hour, LAeq 33.0dB (decibels)
- 5 metres behind blades gusting to 7m/s/16 miles per hour, LAeq 52.0dB
- 3 metres behind blades, height 1.5m ‘background noise’ LAeq 36.0dB

Note – an example is erected at Castle Lodge, Castle Rod, Wellingborough which can readily be seen and heard from the public highway.
O R I G I N A L   R E P O R T

BOROUGH COUNCIL OF WELLINGBOROUGH

Regulatory Committee

Report of the Executive Director

APPLICATION REF: WP/2006/0665/F

PROPOSAL: Installation of a 1KW domestic wind turbine under the Windsave scheme on western gable end on existing dwelling.

LOCATION: 20 Wantage Road, Irchester, Wellingborough.

APPLICANT: Mr Keith Clements.

This application has been referred to the Regulatory Committee for determination because more than two objections have been received from the occupiers of nearby dwellings.

PROPOSAL AND DESCRIPTION OF SITE:
As described above.

The site is a semi-detached dwellinghouse that has a relatively large side garden area which is located at the bottom of a conspicuous dip in Wantage Road. Growing on the site’s front boundary is a maturing conifer, euonymus shrub and other immature deciduous trees. Wantage Road is residential in character and has been developed with both houses and bungalows, many of which have been altered or extended in a variety of designs. With regards to telecommunications paraphernalia in the locality, there is a plethora of satellite dishes attached to the dwellings on the northern side of the road. Noticeably, the conventional television aerials are all mounted on poles some way above the roof ridges of the host buildings.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:
BW/85/191 Two storey side extension – conditionally approved.

NATIONAL, REGIONAL AND LOCAL PLANNING POLICY:
Regional Spatial Strategy 8.
Northamptonshire County Structure Plan – EN1 and GS5.
Borough of Wellingborough Local Plan – G1 and G24.
Planning Policy Statement 1; Delivering Sustainable Development.
SUMMARY OF REPLIES TO CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED:

1. Irchester Parish Council – no comment received at time of writing the report.

2. Environmental Protection Service –

   “I write further to the above application to erect a wind turbine on the above property. I understand that several members of the public have objected and cited potential noise problems.

   There is limited information available on the effects upon amenity of small wind turbines as relatively few have so far been erected in residential areas and those that are, have not yet been present for long.

   The potential for the wind turbine noise to affect other residents will generally be dependant upon its relative loudness compared to the ambient noise. There will be background noise from traffic in the area.

   The manufacturers do provide some data on the noise output of the wind turbines which basically shows that the noise produced from the turbine gets louder as the wind speed increases. The ambient noise will increase considerably due when it is windier and should mask the extra turbine noise. If the turbines operate to the stated levels there is unlikely to be significant noise produced compared to ambient levels.

   However the information provided is for a typical noise profile and it is not clear whether there could be a significant variation for individual turbines or whether individual audible tones could be generated with a potential to cause a loss of amenity.

   If the application was granted and complaints were received Environmental Protection would investigate and action could be taken if a problem were confirmed.”

3. NATS NERL Safeguarding (Air Traffic Control) – no objection.

4. Neighbours – representations that convey concern and objection have been received from the occupiers of 8, 10 and 12 Arkwright Road; 18 Wantage Road and the writers mention the following issues:

   - Effect on view.
   - Height of turbine above the roof top and size of the blades will not be visually acceptable. Reference to other forms of producing energy e.g. solar panels which are less visually intrusive.
   - Support expressed for turbines in the countryside but not in residential areas.
   - Noise and vibrations emanating from the turbine.
   - Loss of property value and effect on saleability near to the turbine.
ASSESSMENT

Material planning considerations:
- Compliance with policy and SPGs
- Effect on residential amenity
- Effect on the visual amenity of the street scene
- Crime and disorder
- Publicity procedure

Compliance with policy and SPGs
Government advice, development plan policy and the Building Better Places SPG all promote the notion of energy generation through renewable sources; the only caveat being the effect on neighbours’ amenities and visual amenity which will be examined below.

Paragraph 10 of the Climate Change and Sustainable Energy Act 2006 directs the Secretary of State to review the existing permitted development rights afforded for developments within the curtilage of a dwellinghouses. Sub paragraph (2) states “The purpose of the review is to enable the Secretary of State to form a view as to what provision (or further provision) such development orders should make to facilitate development in England consisting of the installation, within the curtilage of a dwellinghouse, of equipment, apparatus or appliances for microgeneration.”

Effect on residential amenity
It is considered that the proposal will not have any materially harmful effect on the standard of amenities that are currently enjoyed by the occupiers of the adjoining dwellings sufficient to warrant the refusal of planning permission for the following reasons:

- The Council’s Environmental Protection Service has been consulted on the application their response is summarised above. Should the turbine produce noise that is loud enough to impinge on neighbours there are adequate powers vested with the Council’s Environmental Protection Service to act as necessary if a statutory noise nuisance occurs.

- It is clear from the above Government guidance, legislation and strategy that it thinks that domestic wind turbines (microgeneration) can play an important part in reducing carbon emissions in accordance with its stated targets. The Government also looks set to take domestic wind turbines out of planning control as a part of its plans to lessen the regulatory burden for individuals and organisations that want to contribute to the nation’s future sustainable electricity supply.

Effect on the visual amenity of the street scene
The western elevation of no. 20 could be prominent in the street scene due to the gap in an otherwise built up street frontage and this will result in the turbine being visible from a westerly direction along Wantage Road. It is accepted that the turbine will at first look unusual in the street scene; but noticeably the host building does currently have a satellite dish on its side wall in the position that is intended for the proposed turbine. It must be said that previously television aerials and satellite dishes looked odd in the streetscape when they first started appearing on the exteriors of dwellings, but they are
now both embedded as part of the normal street scene and do not attract any undue attention because of their proliferation and standard design. The blades of the turbine have a relatively small diameter and it is considered that the effect that they will have on the visual amenity of the street scene will not be sufficient to recommend refusal given the significant weight that the Government and development plan policy give to promoting sustainable sources of energy generation. Furthermore, given the likely escalation of energy prices in the future, the desire of the public to produce green sources of energy and availability of wind turbines ‘off the shelf’, there will be increasing numbers of domestic turbines appearing in the street scene under a more relaxed planning regime.

Crime and disorder
It is considered that there are no pertinent crime and disorder issues relevant to the determination of this application.

Non-material considerations
- Loss of view. The view that a householder is entitled to up to the property boundary.
- Loss of property value and saleability.

CONCLUSION
It is accepted that there will be an effect on the visual amenity of the street scene but the effect will not be so serious as to override the weight that is accorded to Government guidance and development plan policy relating to renewable energy production.

RECOMMENDATION:
Approve.

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
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.
   Northamptonshire County Structure Plan - EN1 and GS5.
   Borough of Wellingborough Local Plan - G1 and G24.
   Planning Policy Statement 1; Delivering Sustainable Development.
Climate Change and Sustainable Energy Act 2006.
Department of Trade and Industry Microgeneration Strategy - Our Energy Challenge, Power from the People; March 2006.

2. The applicant is advised that this decision relates to the following drawing numbers received on the date shown: 4th December 2006
BOROUGH COUNCIL OF WELLINGBOROUGH

Regulatory Committee

Report of the Executive Director

APPLICATION REF: WP/2006/0773/F

PROPOSAL: Proposed 7 no. starter homes, residential development.

LOCATION: Land adjacent 16 Cromer Road, Finedon, Wellingborough.

APPLICANT: Mr Nick Lewis, Woodshire Homes Limited.

This application is referred to the Regulatory Committee for determination because the Borough Council of Wellingborough is the applicant and more than two letters of objection have been received.

PROPOSAL AND DESCRIPTION OF SITE:
Terrace of 7 no. two bed dwellings. The density of the proposed development is 70 dwellings per hectare.

The application site is a vacant area of flat land in Cromer Road that is surrounded by residential properties of no clear architectural style. Nearby are terraces, detached and semi-detached dwellings of varying ages that display a wide variety of designs and exterior facing materials. Growing on the southwestern boundary is a row of mature conifers and at the time of Officer Inspection there was evidence that another row had been recently felled which previously grew on the site’s northwestern boundary.

The highway to the front of the application site widens on both sides in a semi-circular fashion.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:
WP/97/0232/O Site for erection of 9 detached dwellings – conditionally approved.
WP/2001/0491/O The erection of 3 dwellings – conditionally approved.
WP/2006/0231/O Outline application for residential development - conditionally approved.

It should be noted that outline permission WP/2006/0231/O was granted with all matters, including the number of dwellings, reserved for further approval. Also, there was no condition imposed on the consent for the retention of the trees that were growing on the site at that time.
NATIONAL, REGIONAL AND LOCAL PLANNING POLICY:
Regional Spatial Strategy 8.
Northamptonshire County Structure Plan - GS5, H3 and H6.
Borough of Wellingborough Local Plan - G1, G4, H2 and H12.
Planning Policy Statement 1; Delivering Sustainable Development.
Planning Policy Guidance 3; Housing.
Planning Policy Statement 3; Housing - comes into force on 1st April 2007, but its provisions are capable of being a material planning consideration before that date.
Planning Policy Statement 7; Sustainable Development in Rural Areas.
Planning Policy Guidance 13; Transport.

SUMMARY OF REPLIES TO CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED:
1. NCC Highways – as the proposed dwellings are largely replacements for earlier demolished properties, it is unlikely that an objection to the proposal could be sustained on highway grounds. Cromer Road generally exhibits the geometry and road widths of an access collector and is considered to be capable of accommodating the proposed development. Other than containing a slightly widened feature from an earlier layout, the road configuration is not considered to be unduly unusual and can accommodate vehicular crossings and access points as the relatively recent development on the opposite side of the road.

2. Finedon Parish Council – no comment received at time of writing the report.

3. Environmental Protection Service – requests that the comment made in respect of the outline application be repeated. This relates to a further Environmental Risk Assessment being submitted to address the issue of the Northamptonshire sand strata that underlies the site and which may contain elevated levels of naturally occurring arsenic.

4. Northants Police Crime Prevention Design Advisor – comments that the boundary treatment detail is vague and goes on to say that last year there were many reported incidents of juvenile nuisance in Cromer Road and the intended car parking could be a crime initiator.

5. Anglian Water – has telephonically communicated that all dwellings are guaranteed a minimum of one bar water pressure from the company and any resident who thinks that they are suffering from low pressure should contact the Anglian Water Operations Team on 01522 341976.

4. Neighbours – letters of objection/concern have been received from the occupiers of 10, 14, 17, 17a, 19, 19a, 23, 25a, 27, 29, 33 and 39 Cromer Road who cite the following issues:

- Comment received regarding the statement on the application form for outline permission that indicated that the trees on the site would be retained and report that the trees were felled on or around 10th January 2007. Trees are a haven for wildlife.
- Outline permission was granted for four dwellings.
Overdevelopment of the site and seven properties on such a small site cannot be aesthetically pleasing, especially when 21 wheelie bins are positioned in front of the properties.

Density of development is more in keeping with a town and could cause problems later.

Question regarding the need for the type of proposed housing and mention to other housing developments nearby.

Reference to the proposed off road parking provision and opinion that most properties in Cromer Road have two cars. Width of local roads supplied: Cromer Road 5m, Milner Road 6m and Ewenfield Road 7m. There are already parking problems in Cromer Road and its narrowness will make matters worse and cause a danger to pedestrians, including those that are disabled and use mobility scooters. Also, emergency vehicles could be impeded.

The path at the rear of the dwellings will encourage crime by being providing an easy access for criminals to climb fences attack properties in Ewenfield Road and Cromer Road. Reference to existing crime and disorder issues in Finedon and belief that the pathway will give youths an area in which they can smoke, drink and trade in drugs.

Opinion that the fronts of the proposed dwellings should have space for landscaping.

Query regarding the repositioning of a streetlight.

Water pressure is very low in Cromer Road.

**ASSESSMENT:**
The material planning considerations are:

- Compliance with policy
- Effect on the visual amenity of the area
- Effect on neighbours amenities
- Trees
- Car parking
- Crime and disorder
- Biodiversity

**Compliance with policy**
Finedon is designated in the local plan as a limited development village. It is considered that the principle of new dwellings that are to be located within the built up area of the village and on brownfield land is entirely consistent with elements of national guidance, regional and development plan policy that seeks to direct new residential development in the rural areas to such sites. Other aspects of the scheme in relation to development plan policies are examined below.

**Effect on visual amenity**
It is considered that the effect on the visual amenity of the street scene will be acceptable due to the modest scale of the dwellings that do not dominate any of the adjacent or nearby buildings, combined with the unpretentious design which reflects the mass of the newer housing developments nearby.
With respect of the wheelie bins, the applicant in the accompanying Design and Access Statement points out that the access path to the rear of the dwellings will afford the potential residents the opportunity to store the three bins that are currently necessary for the Council’s collection arrangements in their rear gardens. It is considered that it would be beyond the bounds of planning control to compel any future residents to store the bins in the rear gardens by way of a condition, should they chose to locate them in their front gardens.

It is recognized that the widths of the houses are relatively narrow but the plans do illustrate some space at the front that is not hard surfaced. These spaces will allow the residents to personalize their frontages with planting that will, in time, soften the visual effect of the new build as evidenced by the pleasant appearance of the modern terraces on the other side of the road.

**Effect on neighbours’ amenities**

It is acknowledged that the amenities of the occupiers of the surrounding dwellings will be affected, but it is considered that the effects will not be so serious to warrant refusing the application for the following reasons:

- More than adequate privacy distance between the backs of the proposed dwellings and the rear elevations of the properties that front onto Ewenfield Road, even if the conifers on the rear boundary are removed.
- The position of the terrace on the plot will not result in the occupiers of nos. 16 and 26 losing an unacceptable amount of light.
- The terrace is shown as being the same height as the adjacent buildings and set in from the boundary by 1m. There will therefore, not be any overly harmful massing effect on the neighbours due to the bulk of the new terrace.

**Trees**

Since the granting of outline permission the conifers that were growing on one of the application site’s boundaries have been removed. The felling of these trees was within the right of the land owner because their removal had not been precluded by way of a Tree Preservation Order or planning condition. It should be noted that under of The Anti Social Behaviour Act the conifers could have been reduced in height to a minimum of 2m if they were deemed to deprive neighbouring residents of amenity.

**Car parking**

The plans illustrate that one car parking space has been provided for each of the proposed dwellings. This off road car parking provision is in accorded with the Council’s adopted Parking Supplementary Planning Guidance and Government advice and is not seen as a sustainable reason for refusal.

**Crime and disorder**

The comments of the local residents regarding the general crime and disorder issues in the village have been passed onto the Police for its action as necessary.

The side boundaries of nos. 16 and 24 Cromer Road and the rear boundaries of nos. 11, 13 and 15 Ewenfield Road are currently exposed to any person of ill intent who would want to peregrinate across the site. The issues related to possible unauthorized access have been put to the applicant and it has supplied a plan, received on 30th
January 2007, which indicates that lockable gates will be provided to the paths that run along the site’s side and rear boundaries. It is considered therefore that the development of a vacant piece of land that abuts residential boundaries could have a positive effect on crime and disorder by denying access to previously exposed rear and side garden fences.

With regards to car crime, it is accepted that the parked vehicles belonging to the potential new residents could be targeted. It is considered however, that it would perhaps be a leap of imagination to believe that the vehicles owned by occupiers of the proposed dwellings would be the only ones in the street that could attract criminal behaviour. It could be argued that a busier street with a greater degree of pedestrian and vehicle movements could increase the amount of natural surveillance, thus reducing criminal activity.

Biodiversity
There are considered to be no significant biodiversity issues raised within the scope of this application.

None material consideration
- Pressure of Anglian Water’s supply.
- Relocation of a street light.

CONCLUSION
It is recognised that the proposed development is relatively dense, but it does however reflect the characteristic of the terraces on the other side of the road. There have been comments made regarding the off road car parking provision, but the amount of off road space that is to be made available is in accord with the Council’s adopted car parking standards. The Police has identified that there is a juvenile crime problem locally, but this is not seen as a sufficiently robust reason for refusing the application.

It is considered that there are no other matters sufficiently material to warrant withholding the grant of planning permission.

RECOMMENDATION:
Grant planning permission with conditions.

1. The development shall be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.
2. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the amended plan(s) deposited with the local planning authority on 30th January 2007.
3. 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.
4. Notwithstanding the provisions of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995, or any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order, no window shall be inserted above ground floor level in the southeastern elevation of the plot adjacent to no. 30 Cromer Road without the consent in writing of the local planning authority.
5. Notwithstanding the provisions of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995, or any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order, the hereby approved dwellings shall not be extended without the express planning permission of the local planning authority.

6. A scheme for screen fencing/walling shall be agreed with the local planning authority before the start of construction. The agreed scheme shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the local planning authority before the houses are occupied.

Reasons:
1. Required to be imposed pursuant to S51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
2. To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the agreed amendments.
3. In the interests of visual amenity.
4. In the interests of privacy
5. In order to prevent overdevelopment of the site.
6. In the interests of amenity and privacy.

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
   - Northamptonshire County Structure Plan - GS5, H3 and H6
   - Borough of Wellingborough Local Plan - G1, G4, H2 and H12
   - Supplementary Planning Guidance - Parking, Trees on Development Sites, Planning Out Crime and Building Better Places
   - Planning Policy Statement 1; Delivering Sustainable Development
   - Planning Policy Guidance 3; Housing
   - Planning Policy Statement 3; Housing - comes into force on 1st April 2007, but its provisions are capable of being a material planning consideration before that date.
   - Planning Policy Statement 7; Sustainable Development in Rural Areas
   - 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:
   L/176/1 and L/176/2    21st December 2006
   L/176/1 detail A       30th January 2007

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.
APPLICATION REF: WP/2006/0774/F

PROPOSAL: Detached bungalow and single garage.

LOCATION: Land to rear of 12 Duck End, Wollaston, Wellingborough.

APPLICANT: Mr and Mrs G Prince.

Application referred to Regulatory Committee as a result of objections from the Parish Council and local residents.

PROPOSAL AND DESCRIPTION OF SITE:
Full planning permission is sought for the erection of a bungalow in the rear garden of 12 Duck End, Wollaston. The new unit would share the existing access with no. 12 and each would have dedicated garaging and manoeuvring space. Although on a similar footprint to the scheme refused by Committee in October 2006, it differs in the following respects:

- It is a conventional rather than a dormer-bungalow;
- It is moved slightly to the west and south, allowing retention of existing boundary screen hedging to the east and north;
- The earlier double garage is reduced to a single garage.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:
An application (ref. WP/06/456/F) for a dormer-bungalow on the present site was considered by Committee at its meeting on 11 October 2006. This was refused planning permission because it was considered to be overdevelopment, unacceptable tandem development, detrimental to adjacent residential amenity and injurious to the character of Wollaston Conservation Area.

NATIONAL AND LOCAL PLANNING POLICY:
Local Plan Policies G1, G9, G12, H1, H2 and H12.
Structure Plan Policy AR6 (items 2 and 3).
SPGs V (Parking) and VIII (Building Better Places).
SUMMARY OF REPLIES TO CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED:

“Our objections were voiced in relation to application no. WP/2006/0456/F and the Parish Council believe there is no material change in this application.”

The objection then reiterates the reasons for refusal on the decision notice in respect of application no. WP/2006/0456/F. The Parish Council’s earlier objection stated that the scheme was inappropriate in the conservation area, is overdevelopment, creates access and parking difficulties and will exacerbate existing drainage problems.


4. Environment Agency – no objection. Notes history of odour complaints from Scott Bader premises affection this part of the village.

5. Third Parties - seven letters of objection have been received in respect of:
   - Inappropriateness in the conservation area
   - Overdevelopment/excessive building in village
   - Inappropriate facing materials
   - Principle of backland development
   - Loss of trees
   - Traffic congestion/on-street parking problems/emergency access
   - Unsatisfactory relationship to surrounding dwellinghouses, both aesthetically and on amenity grounds
   - Drainage
   - Landslip
   - Loss of light
   - No precedent for a house on this site.

ASSESSMENT:
Committee Members had the benefit of a Site Viewing Report at the meeting in October of last year to consider the initial dormer-bungalow proposal. They will, accordingly, have a very good recollection of the site configuration and characteristics. Perhaps the most helpful way to assess the present proposal for Members’ consideration is, therefore, to go through the issues flagged up when the first scheme [Scheme A] was considered, and factor in any changes indicated in the present plans [Scheme B]. Members will of course recall that the previous officer report recommended a grant of conditional planning permission.
ISSUES.

Objectors appear to be misreading the tandem development policy wording (Policy H1 (1)).

The key point here is not the basic principle, but whether a material deterioration in residential amenity would in fact take place. As no overlooking or substantive loss of light would be occasioned by Scheme B, it is concluded that no such harm would occur.

Issues connected with local plan policies G1 (overlooking, loss of light and other amenity considerations) and H12 (density compatibility) are/were also of concern to objectors as well as to Members themselves. In amending the development form to a conventional bungalow, the profile of Scheme B is lowered by 1.4 metres from that of Scheme A (Scheme A: height = 6.6 metres; Scheme B: height = 5.2 metres). This substantially reduces the massing and psychological sense of overlooking of Scheme A. At this level also there appears to be no material loss of light to neighbours. On the issue of development density, the proposed plot ratio, as well as the actual spatial relationship between the new unit and the neighbouring properties, is to an acceptable standard.

2. Conservation Area Character and Appearance.

The conservation area local to the proposed development is of mixed character, incorporating a variety of built forms and historic building periods. It should perhaps be stated as a general point that conservation areas will not always enjoy a consistently high standard of historic or architectural character throughout their designated areas.

In terms of its form and massing, Scheme B, as a conventional bungalow, is therefore felt to be aesthetically acceptable in its setting. Equally, the principle of its location in rear of a prevailing building line is not problematic in conservation terms, as property curtilages here and in conservation area elsewhere in the Borough are known for their occasional irregular configuration.

It was suggested in the previous officer report that Scheme A was not prominent in the street scene, and the reduction in height of Scheme B (6.6 metres to 5.2 metres) accordingly implies an even lesser visual impact.

Scheme B is considered to suitably preserve the character and appearance of the village conservation area in accordance with the requirements of local plan policy G12, and the setting of nearby listed buildings.


The access width, visibility characteristics and integral parking provision are to a standard which is acceptable to the highway authority and it is, therefore, suggested that these aspects are not valid reasons to refuse the present application.
4. **Trees.**

As indicated in the previous report in respect of Scheme A, the Council's Landscape Officer is of the view that there are no trees on the site of outstanding amenity value which would justify protection by the making of a Tree Preservation Order.

5. **Facing Materials.**

In conservation terms, although the area has a mixture of facing materials it is accepted that stone would be more traditional. It is suggested that the bungalow front elevation could be stone-faced and the rest in brick. This could be negotiated by officers pursuant to the terms of the draft condition 3, below. Additionally a natural roofing material, other than the proposed concrete, would also be required.

**Conclusion.**

There are considered to be no reasons to justify refusal of this application.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Approve, subject to conditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>The development shall be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Full details of the drainage arrangements for the scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before the commencement of development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Representative samples of all facing and roofing materials shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before the development is commenced. The roof tiles shall be in natural material rather than concrete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>The rooflights shall be the &quot;Conservation Rooflight&quot;, complete with low-reflective glass and fitted so as not to protrude materially above the plane of the roof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Rainwater goods shall be metal-type.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Full details of all windows and external doors, together with details of their surrounds, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before any work is commenced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Eaves and verges shall be traditionally detailed and an appropriate specification shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before any work is commenced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>The site shall be landscaped and planted with trees and shrubs in accordance with a comprehensive scheme which shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority before the development is commenced. 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>A scheme for screen fencing/walling shall be agreed with the local planning authority before the start of construction. The agreed scheme shall be</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
implemented to the satisfaction of the local planning authority before the
dwellinghouse is occupied.
10. The areas shown for parking and turning on the approved plans shall be laid out
and surfaced to the satisfaction of the local planning authority before the
dwellinghouse is occupied and shall be permanently set aside and reserved for
the purpose.
11. Full details of the driveway surfacing materials shall be submitted to and
approved in writing by the local planning authority before any work is
commenced.
12. The existing vehicular access shall be widened and reconstructed in accordance
with the specification of the Highway Authority, to include the following:
   (i) the access shall be 4.5m wide for a distance of 10m from the highway
       boundary;
   (ii) at least the first 10m of the drive shall be hard-paved; and
   (iii) pedestrian-to-vehicle visibility splays of 2m x 2m shall be provided and
        maintained on each side of the access.

Reasons:
1. Required to be imposed pursuant to S51 of the Planning and Compulsory
2. To ensure that the site is satisfactorily drained.
3. To protect the character and appearance of the conservation area and nearby
   listed buildings.
4. To protect the character and appearance of the conservation area and nearby
   listed buildings.
5. To protect the character and appearance of the conservation area and nearby
   listed buildings.
6. To protect the character and appearance of the conservation area and nearby
   listed buildings.
7. To protect the character and appearance of the conservation area and nearby
   listed buildings.
8. In the interests of visual amenity.
9. In the interests of amenity and privacy.
10. In the interests of the safety and convenience of users of the adjoining highway.
11. To protect the character and appearance of the conservation area and nearby
    listed buildings.
12. In the interests of the safety and convenience of users of the adjoining highway.

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:
   AR6 (items 2 and 3) of the Northamptonshire County Structure Plan, and G1,
   G9, G12, H1, H2 and H12 of the Borough of Wellingborough Local Plan.
2. The applicant is advised that this decision relates to the following drawing
   numbers received on the date shown:
   Drawing Number:       Date Received:
   4138.03.             21.12.06.
APPLICATION REF: WP/2007/0039/C

PROPOSAL: Winning and working of sand and gravel with progressive restoration to wet woodland and agriculture utilising imported inert materials.

LOCATION: Land west of Earls Barton Quarry, Grendon Road, Earls Barton, Wellingborough.

APPLICANT: Hanson Quarry Products Europe Limited.

PROPOSAL AND DESCRIPTION OF SITE:
The application site is approximately 225 hectares and includes the western extension and the current operational quarry, including the sand and gravel processing plant and associated silt lagoons. The application site lies within both the Borough of Wellingborough and the South Northamptonshire district.

This application seeks planning permission for the continuation of sand and gravel production at Earls Barton Quarry and to extend mineral extraction operations into approximately 111 hectares of land located to the west of the existing quarry processing plant and to the south of the River Nene. The total life of the development, including completion of restoration proposals, will be 12.5 years.

Restoration of the site will be progressive following mineral extraction to agricultural land, river channels and conservation areas.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:
The Earls Barton quarry has been operational, in different forms, since 1935. Since this time various planning permissions have been granted for development on the site. The site also includes a processing plant which has been in place for approximately 30 years.

NATIONAL AND LOCAL PLANNING POLICY:

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, one representation from the County Rights of Way Officer has been received in relation to this proposal. This is detailed in full below:
“I must note that despite the extensive consultation with a variety of external groups (i.e. RSPB, EA, EH, WT, EN), and local councils, I am not aware of the rights of way section having been previously contacted. This is particularly concerning as the County's premier long-distance walking route; the Nene Way abuts the site as noted in the application. This seems contrary to the 'statement of engagement'.

It is suggested that Footpaths KF20 and KF4 will need temporary diversions and, if the application is successful, we will need to be provided with further detail to provide the required orders. We must note however that at another recent Hanson site at Irthingborough, once the company had achieve its own requirements, the previously agreed access enhancements have slipped from their priorities and I need to stress that this should not happen again.

The documentation refers to the recreational and amenity possibilities afforded by the proposal. For instance 14.4 improved potential public access and enhance the quality of the landscape setting for established or new multi recreational experiences, including visual amenity.

With every rights of way sections' duties, as a function of the CROW act, now including the facilitation of access to the wider countryside by statutory routes and also permissive arrangements, on land or as part of navigation, we would be very keen to assist with the inclusion of more access opportunities.

As the proposal currently stands there is no net gain in terms of access despite the reference to environmental education, multiple recreation opportunities, and the importance of the recent GI studies and the work of the RNRP.

The restoration plan provides a tremendous opportunity for developing appropriate access on foot bicycle and horseback and also spaces for quiet recreation and appreciation of the environment. It does not however suggest any intention that these will be provided. This is reason enough for deferring approval of the application, until a satisfactory proposal for multi-use off road trails has been designed.

We would recommend that further consideration of detailed increased access arrangements and appropriate infrastructure is required. We would be very happy to assist with the development of such proposals."

**ASSESSMENT:**
The extension area is allocated for phased working and restoration in the Northamptonshire Minerals Local Plan. This allocation will contribute towards aggregate provision for the county over the next 10 years. Allocations made within this plan are those where the Minerals Planning Authority is satisfied in principle that they are capable of being worked without serious harm to interests of acknowledged importance. A mineral reserve of approximately 2.6 million tonnes has been identified within the site area subject to this planning application. Although the proposed extension is therefore accepted in principle the details of the application, including restoration, must be considered carefully.
One of the most pertinent issues is the form of restoration that is proposed following extraction of sand and gravel from the site. Restoration will involve importation and deposition of inert materials such as demolition or construction waste and will be progressive so as to minimise the area of land disturbed by the works. The Minerals Local Plan identifies that the land should be restored to mainly dry land, and of equivalent agricultural quality. Although the site is to be predominately restored to dry land/agricultural land, river channels and conservation areas will also be created. It is proposed that these be set within a framework of hedgerows and trees. The applicant has aimed to strike a balance and minimise the areas restored to water. In this respect river channels have been proposed as opposed to large bodies of open water with the aim of enhancing the local river environment and biodiversity. It is also understood that restoration to completely dry land would necessitate the importation of greater amounts of inert materials and would lead to longer-term operations.

The proposal should respect the local character and distinctiveness of the existing landscape during extraction and restoration phases. The landscape character of the county should ultimately be conserved and enhanced by the proposals. It is considered that the County should carefully consider the views of the Wildlife Trust, Natural England (formerly English Nature) and other relevant consultees in terms of assessing the environmental impacts and benefits of restoration proposals and whether more of the land should be restored to dry land. In the absence of expert advice from these consultees it is difficult to comprehensively assess the nature conservation and environmental benefits of the submitted restoration plans. If more land was to be restored to dry land it should be considered whether the resulting longer-term operations would have any detrimental impact on the surrounding area or local population.

Any adverse impact on local amenity should be minimised and measures implemented to control these to acceptable levels. It is considered that buffer zones, where appropriate, should be created around operations to limit any such impacts. The proposed hours of operation, the same as those currently permitted, are considered to be acceptable.

All minerals leaving the site will be transported by road and all lorries will continue to comply with an agreed traffic routing arrangement in order to avoid neighbouring villages. This is in line with current operations. All vehicles leaving the site should use the wheel wash facility before entering the public highway. The Highways Authority will need to satisfy themselves as to the capacity of the existing road network to absorb the additional movements created by the new operations. It is however recognised that the site is allocated in the Minerals Local Plan and the estimated yield from this site detailed in the plan is in excess of that expected to be worked. The principle of the proposal and its level of traffic generation are therefore considered to be acceptable.

The exhaustion of reserves in the southern extension has meant that quality gravels have not been readily available from the site or the locality as a whole. Therefore the Northamptonshire market has been supplied from alternative areas. It is considered that permitting the extension of mineral working at this site will allow the county’s market to be supplied locally thereby reducing transportation of materials and creating a more sustainable form of development.
A number of existing public rights of way cross the application site and will be directly affected. The proposals include the diversion of rights of way. It is considered that rights of way must be retained and opportunities to improve access to the countryside taken through these proposals. The concerns of the Rights of Way Officer are appreciated and it may be that further consultation is required in this respect. However, it is considered that if the application is approved provision should be made by way of condition to agree and implement an appropriate scheme for the development of a rights of way network over the restored site.

The historic environment is also affected by the proposals. Specifically, a scheduled ancient monument is situated within the application site. The preservation and protection of the scheduled ancient monument should be secured by condition. The recording of any other archaeological features within the site should also be secured.

Flood risk must also be considered by the appropriate consultees. If the proposal would result in increasing the risk of flooding, the application should be recommended for refusal on this basis in line with the provisions of the Minerals Local Plan.

**RECOMMENDATION:**
The above comments should be considered by the County in determining this application. In particular the Borough of Wellingborough is concerned regarding the restoration proposals and whether more of the site should be restored to dry land. It is considered that the views of Statutory Consultees should be carefully considered in this respect and if the proposals are approved reasons for this decision should be appropriately set out. Where appropriate conditions should be imposed as indicated in this assessment.
APPLICATION REF: WP/2007/0057/C

PROPOSAL: Construction of single storey extension to provide new entrance lobby and canopy.


APPLICANT: Sharon Geater (Headteacher), Hardwick Infant School.

PROPOSAL AND DESCRIPTION OF SITE:
The site is an existing school premises set within a predominantly residential area of Wellingborough. This application seeks permission for a single storey extension to provide a new entrance lobby and canopy.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:
No planning history is considered to be relevant in this case.

NATIONAL AND LOCAL PLANNING POLICY:
G1 of the Borough of Wellingborough Local Plan.

SUMMARY OF REPLIES TO CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED:
This planning application is being determined by the County Council and the Borough Council is one of the consultees. At the time of writing this report, no details of views from any of the County Council’s other consultees had been received.

ASSESSMENT:
It is considered that the proposal will not have any adverse impact on amenity and is considered to be in accordance with Policy G1 of the Borough of Wellingborough Local Plan. Consequently it is recommended that no objection be raised regarding this application.

RECOMMENDATION:
The Borough Council of Wellingborough raises no objection to this application.
© Crown Copyright. All rights reserved.
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APPLICATION REF: WP/2007/0075/C

PROPOSAL: New 2400mm high security fence.

LOCATION: The Avenue Infant School, The Avenue, Wellingborough.

APPLICANT: Northamptonshire County Council.

PROPOSAL AND DESCRIPTION OF SITE:
The site is an existing school premises within the town of Wellingborough. The site is located within a predominantly residential area.

The proposal is for a 2.4 metre high security fence to be erected for a distance of 3.54 metres along the rear site boundary. This boundary is positioned adjacent to a rear access road. Existing metal fencing approximately 1.315 metres high currently runs along part of the rear boundary.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:
No planning history is considered to be relevant in this case.

NATIONAL AND LOCAL PLANNING POLICY:
G1 of the Borough of Wellingborough Local Plan.

SUMMARY OF REPLIES TO CONSULTATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED:
This planning application is being determined by the County Council and the Borough Council is one of the consultees. At the time of writing this report, no details of views from any of the County Council’s other consultees had been received.

ASSESSMENT:
It is considered that the proposal will not have any adverse impact on amenity and will improve the security of the school premises. The proposal is therefore considered to be in accordance with Policy G1 of the Borough of Wellingborough Local Plan.

RECOMMENDATION:
The Borough Council of Wellingborough raises no objection to this application.
The following applications dealt with under the terms of the Executive Director’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/2006/0725/F</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Mr and Mrs David Unwin</td>
<td>8 Sorrel Close, Isham.</td>
<td>Single storey rear and side extension. Existing garage re-roofed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/2006/0727/LB</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Blakeney Buildings Limited</td>
<td>9 and 10 Campbell Square, West Street, Earls Barton.</td>
<td>Amendment to previously approved permission WP/2006/0519/LB. No. 10 - change the sunroom to conservatory and at no. 9 - move bathroom from the ground floor to the 1st floor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/2006/0731/F</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Miss Lucy Anne Hughes</td>
<td>25 Wollaston Road, Irchester.</td>
<td>Change of use from residential to beauty therapy business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/2006/0735/F</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Mr and Mrs P Simpson</td>
<td>Sycamore View, 19 Manor Road, Mears Ashby.</td>
<td>Two storey extension to existing house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/2006/0740/F</td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
<td>Mr Jack Scott</td>
<td>44 Hatton Park Road, Wellingborough.</td>
<td>Increase the length of the recently approved single storey rear extension by 675mm due to drainage restrictions and alter building material of all recently approved works from red brick to a render and painted finish (original approvals WP-2005/0707/F and 0836/F).</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/2006/0741/F</td>
<td>REFUSED</td>
<td>Mr Ian Warboys</td>
<td>135 Knox Road,</td>
<td>Rear dormer loft conversion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wellingborough.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/2006/0743/F</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Mr and Mrs Gray</td>
<td>13 White Delves,</td>
<td>Two storey side extension for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wellingborough.</td>
<td>bedrooms and lounge and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>single storey study extension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/2006/0745/F</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Taylor Woodrow</td>
<td>Former John Lea School Site,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Developments</td>
<td>Off Doddington Road,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wellingborough.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Substitution of house types -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plots nos. 120-131, 134-135, 210-211, 215-253 (57 in total).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/2006/0748/F</td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
<td>Opus</td>
<td>40 The Square,</td>
<td>Change of use from A1 to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Earls Barton.</td>
<td>Nail and Beauty retail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/2006/0750/TC</td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
<td>T Mobile</td>
<td>Water Tower, Hardwick Road, Wellingborough.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Replacement 20m lattice tower.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/2006/0751/F</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>David William Ansell</td>
<td>Unit 3 Enterprise Court, Newton Close, Wellingborough.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Change of use from B1/B8 to B2 (repair and maintenance of motor vehicles).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/2006/0752/F</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>John Redden Farms Limited</td>
<td>Grendon House, 200 Main Road, Grendon.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conversion of existing redundant barn to residential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/2006/0754/F</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Mr D Shah</td>
<td>20 Abbots Way,</td>
<td>Front extension, bin store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wellingborough.</td>
<td>extension and rear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>conservatory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/2006/0755/F</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Mr A Grant</td>
<td>92 Overstone Road,</td>
<td>Single storey lounge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sywell.</td>
<td>extension at rear of property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application No. Decision</td>
<td>Applicant's Name</td>
<td>Location of Proposal Description of Proposal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/2006/0757/RM AC</td>
<td>Mr and Mrs T Barley</td>
<td>Land adjacent to 56 Senwick Road, Wellingborough. Proposed detached dwelling house.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/2006/0758/F AC</td>
<td>Mr and Mrs A Williams</td>
<td>24 Gipsy Lane, Irchester. Two storey rear extension and single storey side extension.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/2006/0760/LB AC</td>
<td>John Redden Farms Limited</td>
<td>Grendon House Farm, 200 Main Road, Grendon. Conversion of existing redundant barns into a self contained dwelling.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/2006/0761/AV AC</td>
<td>Mr Ed Tucker</td>
<td>Unit 2 7-11 Claudius Way, Higham Road, Irchester. 2 no. fascia signs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/2006/0762/F REFUSED</td>
<td>Tollers</td>
<td>28 Silver Street, Wellingborough. Change of use from A1 (Retail) to A2 (Professional and Financial Services).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/2006/0766/LUD APPROVED</td>
<td>Mr and Mrs R Charles</td>
<td>43 Third Avenue, Wellingborough. Single storey rear conservatory.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/2006/0768/F AC</td>
<td>Mr Jason Lodge</td>
<td>38 Manor Road, Mears Ashby. Amendment to Planning Approval WP/2006/0439/F - changes to roof and reduction in footprint.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/2006/0769/F AC</td>
<td>Mr and Mrs A Roberts</td>
<td>8 Avenue Road, Finedon. Two storey side and ground floor rear extensions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/2006/0771/F AC</td>
<td>Mr C Hallam</td>
<td>104 Orlingbury Road, Isham. Extensions and alteration to existing bungalow. New detached double garage.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application No. Decision</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/2006/0772/F</td>
<td>Mr S Shah</td>
<td>188 Main Road, Wilby. Extension to existing dwelling.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/2006/0777/F</td>
<td>Mr and Mrs S Headland</td>
<td>36 Priory Road, Wollaston. New first floor side with single storey front and side extension.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/2006/0778/F</td>
<td>Mr and Mrs M Harper</td>
<td>23 Mears Ashby Road, Earls Barton. Extension to improve kitchen, utility and study.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/2007/0003/F</td>
<td>Mr T S Ghiorghita</td>
<td>50 Brampton Close, Wellingborough. Extension to dwelling - Amended scheme following refusal of WP/2006/0689/F.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/2007/0006/F</td>
<td>Mr and Mrs P Young</td>
<td>4 Ouse Close, Wellingborough. To erect mahogany effect PVCU conservatory to rear of property (existing unit to be removed).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/2007/0016/F</td>
<td>Mr and Mrs P Field</td>
<td>116 London Road, Bozeat. Two storey side extension.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP/2007/0020/F</td>
<td>Mr P Minter</td>
<td>16 Henshaw Road, Wellingborough. Two storey rear extension forming kitchen and bedroom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application No. Decision</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>
</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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application No.</th>
<th>Name &amp; Address</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BN/2006/0491/</td>
<td>Miss J Millward 3 High Street Ecton Northampton</td>
<td>Single storey rear garden room/WC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ACCEPTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP/2006/2741/</td>
<td>Miss S P Tobin 88 Nest Lane Wellingborough</td>
<td>New kitchen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>APPROVED C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP/2006/3262/</td>
<td>A Brijesh Mistry 105 Torrington Crescent Wellingborough</td>
<td>Proposed kitchen extension, new garage at front and existing garage conversion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>APPROVED C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP/2006/3381/</td>
<td>A Mr M Legg 42 Mile Street Bozeat Wellingborough</td>
<td>Ground Floor Single Storey Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>APPROVED C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>APPROVED C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS/2006/3518/</td>
<td>A Kettering Borough Council Bowling Green Road Kettering</td>
<td>Alterations and extensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>APPROVED C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPLICATION DECISIONS

**BOROUGH OF WELLINGBOROUGH**

Date: 13/02/06

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application No.</th>
<th>Name &amp; Address</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FP/2006/3582/</td>
<td>Northamptonshire County Council P O Box No. 128 County Hall</td>
<td>Extension to form 1.5FE Primary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPROVED C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP/2006/3630/</td>
<td>Mrs Lawson 1 The Knoll Grendon Northampton</td>
<td>Extension - new double garage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPROVED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP/2006/3716/</td>
<td>Wollaston Motors Limited Bedford Road Northampton</td>
<td>Single storey extension to existing industrial unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPROVED C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS/2006/3801/</td>
<td>Chief Building Control Surveyor, PO Box 105, Civic Offices, 1 Saxon Gate East Milton Keynes</td>
<td>Single storey extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPROVED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP/2006/3802/</td>
<td>Mrs Tite 76 Elizabeth Way Earls Barton Northampton</td>
<td>Alteration garage to form utility and shower room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPROVED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP/2006/3809/</td>
<td>Hewes Developments Ivenstone St Lukes Close Spratton</td>
<td>Erection of pair of semi-detached houses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPROVED C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## REGULATORY COMMITTEE
### APPLICATIONS DEALT WITH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application No.</th>
<th>Name &amp; Address</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FP/2006/3816/</td>
<td>Mr H Singh 108 Elsdon Road</td>
<td>Extension to retail unit at ground floor. Extension to first floor flat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPROVED</td>
<td>Wellingborough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr J Pettit 5 Prince Street</td>
<td>Two storey extension to side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPROVED</td>
<td>Earls Barton Wellingborough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Ritchie 49 Finedon Road</td>
<td>G.F Extension and invalid facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPROVED</td>
<td>Wellingborough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr and Mrs W Prince 114 Nest Lane</td>
<td>First floor extension over garage and 2 storey rear extension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPROVED C</td>
<td>Wellingborough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr M Jarvis 108 London Road</td>
<td>New bungalow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPROVED C</td>
<td>Bozeat Wellingborough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kettering Borough Council Building Control Bowling Green Road Kettering</td>
<td>Ground floor extension and extension to gable end.</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>PS/2006/3925/</td>
<td>Aylesbury Vale District Council</td>
<td>Alterations and extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPROVED C</td>
<td>66 High Street Aylesbury Bucks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP/2006/3930/</td>
<td>Mr and Mrs G Hill Milton Avenue Wellingborough</td>
<td>Room in the roof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPROVED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP/2007/0109/</td>
<td>Northants County Council Moulton Way Northampton</td>
<td>Internal alterations to subdivide existing dormitory accommodation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPROVED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP/2007/0358/</td>
<td>A J Shand Building and Plumbing 38 Denton Road Ringstead</td>
<td>Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPROVED C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP/2007/0530/</td>
<td>Playmates Day Nursery Knox Road Wellingborough</td>
<td>Conversion of store to toilet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPROVED C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BN/2007/0535/</td>
<td>Mr David Clayton Evelyn Way Irchester Wellingborough</td>
<td>Single storey side extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCEPTED</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>FP/2007/0536/</td>
<td>Mr J Ellis Northampton Road</td>
<td>2 storey extension and conservatory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPROVED C</td>
<td>Wellingborough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP/2007/0539/</td>
<td>Mr J Lyman Roche Way</td>
<td>Single storey side extension to bedroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPROVED C</td>
<td>Wellingborough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BN/2007/0543/</td>
<td>Redwell Infant School Barnwell Road</td>
<td>Diversion of foul drainage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCEPTED</td>
<td>Wellingborough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP/2007/0545/</td>
<td>Mr and Mrs W Manderville Third Avenue</td>
<td>Single storey rear extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPROVED C</td>
<td>Wellingborough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BN/2007/0546/</td>
<td>Geraldine Connolly Chatsworth Drive</td>
<td>Garage conversion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCEPTED</td>
<td>Wellingborough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BN/2007/0547/</td>
<td>Mr and Mrs S Adams Kilborn Close</td>
<td>Removal of supporting wall and replace with RSJ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCEPTED</td>
<td>Wellingborough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## REGULATORY COMMITTEE

### APPLICATIONS DEALT WITH

**APPLICATION DECISIONS  BOROUGH OF WELLINGBOROUGH**  
**Date: 13/02/06**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application No.</th>
<th>Name &amp; Address</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DI/2007/0548/</td>
<td>Mrs E Williams</td>
<td>Ramped access and new entrance door</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Windsor Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wellingborough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCEPTED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| BN/2007/0742/   | Mr N Stanyer    | Remove ground floor chimney breast |
|                 | Arkwright Road  |             |
|                 | Irchester       |             |
|                 | Wellingborough  |             |
| ACCEPTED        |                 |             |

| FP/2007/0745/   | Mr Alan Thorndyke | To remove load bearing wall |
|                 | Burford Way      |             |
|                 | Wellingborough   |             |
| APPROVED C      |                 |             |

| FP/2007/0750/   | Mr and Mrs B Thongmata | Building of extension |
|                 | West Street        |             |
|                 | Earls Barton       |             |
|                 | Wellingborough     |             |
| REJECTED        |                 |             |

| WI/2007/0751/   | Mr D Wiles        | Replacement windows (2), Replacement door (1) |
|                 | Dene Close        |             |
|                 | Wellingborough   |             |
| ACCEPTED        |                 |             |

| BN/2007/0752/   | Mrs Marion Rice  | Alter bedroom fit shower and toilet |
|                 | Streton Way      |             |
|                 | Earls Barton     |             |
| ACCEPTED        |                 |             |
### Application No. | Name & Address | Description
--- | --- | ---
DI/2007/0753/ | Mr A Wheatman<br>Franklins Close Ecton<br>Wellingborough | Level access shower 1st floor
BN/2007/0755/ | Joy Cox<br>Lewis Road<br>Kettering | Replace existing roof, re-using existing tiles - same design including Velux window. Turn large bedroom into two bedrooms, including additional window.
DI/2007/0758/ | Mr K Hogg<br>Shelley Road<br>Wellingborough | Level access bathroom adaption
WI/2007/0759/ | Mrs Taylor<br>Council Street<br>Bozeat Wellingborough | Replacement windows
DI/2007/0760/ | Mrs I Sharpe<br>King Street<br>Earls Barton Wellingborough | Level access bathroom adaption
DI/2007/0761/ | Mrs Ben Ali<br>High Street<br>Wollaston Wellingborough | Form aperture in first floor to allow installation of vertical lift
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application No.</th>
<th>Name &amp; Address</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BN/2007/0762/</td>
<td>Mr M Evans John Lea Way Wellingborough</td>
<td>Conversion of garage into another room of the house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCEPTED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BN/2007/0879/</td>
<td>Mr W Oliver Park Road Wellingborough</td>
<td>Upgrading cellar room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCEPTED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BN/2007/0881/</td>
<td>Mr David Shoesmith John Gray Road Great Doddington Wellingborough</td>
<td>Replacement windows/doors to house, rewire, change of use of existing annexe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCEPTED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BN/2007/0886/</td>
<td>Mr E Ward London End Farm 12 London End Earls Barton Wellingborough</td>
<td>Proposed toilet extension to dwelling house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCEPTED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BN/2007/0893/</td>
<td>Mr N Panther Blanford Avenue Kettering</td>
<td>Convert garage to lounge, external extension to form WC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCEPTED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BN/2007/0894/</td>
<td>Mr Paul Pride Stanwell Way Wellingborough</td>
<td>Formation of cloakroom from outside barn and new UPVC door and window</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>BN/2007/0895/</td>
<td>A A Martin</td>
<td>Installation of sewer serving building plot next door and connection to existing manhole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCEPTED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BN/2007/0896/</td>
<td>Barbara Drysdale</td>
<td>Extension of bathroom into existing outbuilding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hinwick Road Wollaston Wellingborough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCEPTED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BN/2007/0897/</td>
<td>Tom Day and Joanna Domaradzka</td>
<td>Internal work to remove a section of load-bearing wall and replace with beams/RSJ's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Gray Road Great Doddington Wellingborough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCEPTED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BN/2007/0899/</td>
<td>Mr G.A and Mrs S Wheatley</td>
<td>Utility room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eastlands Road Finedon Wellingborough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCEPTED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>