

BOROUGH COUNCIL OF WELLINGBOROUGH

Planning Committee -

22 January 2020

Report of the Principal Planning Manager

WP/19/00641/FUL 15 Chequers Lane, Grendon

One late neighbour letter has been received from the occupier of 26A Main Road, Grendon raising the following points:

1. The height of window significantly lower than committee's proposal. It is noted that the committee sought to suggest the proposed change to include a window in the elevation facing my property. According to the minutes the proposal was for a high-level window some 1.7m above floor level from which there could be no overlooking. It is apparent from the officer's report that the window is in fact proposed at only 0.45 metres above floor level and accordingly, entirely contrary to the committee's suggestion, would allow direct visibility out of the window. The plan submitted does not show the height and accordingly is defective.

2. Accurate site plan and levels plan not provided. Although the officer's report speaks of distances from the fence and my property, and of the window overlooking a garage, no plan forms part of the application which shows this, so it is unclear how the officer's report can have drawn that conclusion. The report and application are accordingly defective. Further, it remains the case that complete and accurate plans have not been submitted in relation to this application. The levels plan remains inaccurate – clearly because it has not been drawn from a survey (see point 3, below). The site plan and the elevations continue to appear to be drawn to different scales, and dimensions taken from the scale shown on the site plan do not accord with those referred to by the officer's Report. All of these issues render the application defective in itself and it is submitted mean that it is not open to the committee to approve the application in any event.

3. Council's proposal based on incorrect assumption of difference in levels. The minutes on the basis of which the committee considered the position record a 6 metre deviation in levels between the application site and my own. This is not so. As noted above, no accurate levels plan has yet been produced, and no access has ever been requested by the developer to produce the same. At the site visit the developer's agent was in possession of photographs of my property, apparently taken by the council's officer, from which he purported to have scaled a plan. You will know that it is not possible accurately to scale from a photograph. It is also unclear on what basis the council's officer regarded themselves as empowered to provide photographs taken of private property to the agent for the purposes of revising his application, and without seeking any authority so to do.

4. The remaining comments in my earlier letters, a number of which do not appear to have been considered by the committee, remain pertinent and should please also be taken into account. Without limitation, these include the issues of the lack of consultation with residents directly impacted by the re-classification of the site within the village boundary; the impact on traffic and infrastructure at the junction of Chequers Lane particularly given the absence of any inspection of the site by the highway authority; and the failure to achieve planning consistency with the previous decisions of the council.

Clarification by officers

The planning committee resolved to defer the application from the meeting held on 20 December 2019 for the window which overlooked number 9 Chequers Lane to be re-located in the rear elevation which faces the boundary with number 26 A Main Road. The committee resolution did not include any specification as to the size of the window or the height above first floor level which the window should be positioned. The applicant has submitted amended plans and officers have re-consulted on the amended plans with the occupiers of 9 Chequers Lane, 26a Main Road and Grendon parish council.

WP/19/00556/FUL 46 - 48 Cannon Street Wellingborough

The applicant has confirmed that the site is not entirely in their ownership as such the application has been made **invalid**. The application is likely to be resubmitted with the correctly served ownership certification and presented to committee after the required period of consultation.

WP/19/00642/VAR Vacant Land off Windermere Drive/Penrith Drive, Wellingborough

Changes to the wording of the following conditions:

Condition 1 (Plans/documents)

Omission W218 P01 (site location plan) received 23rd June 2017 and **addition** DSA-19028 LND- PL-SL-100 (site layout overview) received on 30 May 2019;
Omission DSA-19028-3B5P-D-700-A (Building Regulations information proposed Ground floor plan M4 (2) compliance) dated 15.03.2019 received 24 April 2019;
Omission DSA-19028-3B5P-D-701 (Building Regulations information proposed first Floor plan M4 (2) compliance) dated 15.03.2019 received 24 April 2019;
Omission DSA-19028-3B5P-D-702 A (Building Regulations information bathroom plans & elevations) dated 15.03.2019 received 24 April 2019;
Omission 9713 C 112 Rev B (cellular storage cross section) dated 31 May 2019 received on 3 June 2019.

WP/19/00762/EXT A509 Kettering Road

Two late letters have been received.

Isham Parish Council have sent a copy of their letter of objection to Kettering Borough Council to us. Although it is not considered appropriate to circulate the letter, we can provide a summary of the objections raised:

- The introduction of the dual carriageway will cause traffic chaos.
- The proposed location of the roundabout access to the development varies from the original bypass route.
- The dualling will only benefit DB symmetry.
- The proposed traffic management is not robust enough to prevent unwelcomed traffic through Isham.
- The DfT announced on 30 Sept. 2019 that seven transport schemes nationally had been 'given approval to apply for funding at a later stage' and the Isham Bypass was one of the schemes selected. Therefore, this application should be delayed until the results of this application are known and a better more sensible arrangement can be made for the entrance to the site.
- The consultation event held at Kettering Park Hotel was inadequate.
- Isham Parish Council suggests another consultation is undertaken at the Village Hall.

Cllr Clive Hallam has stated (21/1/2020) he cannot attend the meeting but has stated the following:

- I would respectfully ask the Borough Council of Wellingborough to continue to object to this application in the strongest terms.
- The application presented isn't significantly different from the previous application.
- It still requires a full new planning application for the Isham Bypass which will delay its completion.
- It still forms a dog leg bringing the bypass closer to housing on the North side of Isham on Fairfield Road etc.
- It is completely different to its original proposal which was to put a roundabout on the A509 then a link to the new Bypass which ran in a smooth arc around the northern and western side of Isham keeping it further away from housing.
- The roundabout is built on an area again subject to recent flooding and road closure. If the Isham Bypass is a real priority then it should be properly considered in conjunction with this application otherwise expensive reconstruction work will be caused.

Cllr Jennie Bone Ward Cllr has stated via email (22/1/2020) has stated her disappointment that NCC's Highway objection has been withdrawn and would like Isham's residents opposition to the application to be noted. It is also stated that the Bypass is a priority and must surely remain so.