Present: Councillors Morrall, Old and Waters.

1. **WP/2006/0706F – 4 TITLEY BAWK AVENUE, EARLS BARTON**

   In addition to the Site Viewing Group, others present were:

   M Kilpin (Principal Development Control Officer).

   Applicant’s agent.

   11 local residents.

   The Group assembled outside the site.

   The applicant’s agent outlined the current proposal for an extension to a new building to provide a workshop unit and related parking, together with the approved scheme which was in the process of being constructed.

   The local residents raised the following issues:

   - Was the site large enough for 4 units?
   - Would the drainage for the existing scheme be able to cope with any additional surface water resulting from the extension?
   - The proposal was considered to be contrary to Policy EB1 as the overall development would result in a material increase in traffic generation and the unsatisfactory condition of Titley Bawk Avenue had not been satisfactorily rectified.
   - There was no drainage on Titley Bawk Avenue and as a consequence surface water accumulated at the junction with Wellingborough Road causing flooding problems to residential properties at that location.
   - The junction of Wellingborough Road and Titley Bawk Avenue was dangerous and the proposal would only increase the volume of traffic using it.
   - Titley Bawk Avenue was already used by HGV’s as an overnight parking area causing disturbance and congestion.

   The applicant’s agent stated that the drainage system within the site had been designed to ensure that all surface water resulting from the development would be dealt with on-site and none would discharge onto Titley Bawk Avenue.
2. **WP/2006/0737F – LITTLE HARROWDEN VILLAGE HALL, 83-85 MAIN STREET, LITTLE HARROWDEN**

In addition to the Site Viewing Group, others present were:

M Kilpin (Principal Development Control Officer).

Councillor Timms (Ward Councillor).

2 Village Hall Committee representatives.

3 local residents.

The Group assembled on site and then moved into the village hall.

The Village Hall Committee representatives outlined the proposal to change the use of the piece of land at the rear of the Hall from garden to car parking.

The garden was no longer maintained and rather than have the area remain untidy it was considered more appropriate to extend the existing car park so that when the Hall was in use more vehicles could park on site rather than on Main Street.

The local residents raised the following issues:

- The close proximity of nos. 3 and 4 Albion Court to the proposed car park extension.
- Loss of amenity.
- Loss of vegetation if the Leylandii trees, currently on the boundary, were removed.
- Increase in the risk to security of the properties in Albion Court.
- The site was outside the Village Policy Line.
- There was a difference in land levels between the existing car park, the proposed extension and the properties in Albion Court.
- Lighting of the car park.

The Group then visited nos. 3 and 4 Albion Court and viewed the proposed car parking site from the rear gardens.
3. **WP/2006/0747F – 96 OVERSTONE ROAD, SYWELL**

In addition to the Site Viewing Group, others present were:

M Kilpin (Principal Development Control Officer).

Councillor Palmer (Ward Councillor).

The applicant.

1 Parish Council representative.

The Group assembled on site.

The applicant outlined the proposal to demolish existing buildings and erect 2 dwellings.

The Parish Council’s concern was that the proposed development would be outside the Village Policy Line.

The Principal Development Control Officer confirmed that it was outside the Village Policy Line and in the open countryside.

4. **WP/2006/0753F – PLOT 18, MANOR FARM, HARROWDEN ROAD, ORLINGBURY**

In addition to the Site Viewing Group, others present were:

M Kilpin (Principal Development Control Officer).

Councillor Timms (Ward Councillor).

The applicant’s agent.

1 Parish Council representative.

1 local resident.

The Group assembled on site.

The applicant’s agent outlined the proposal for a single-storey rear extension, with mono-pitched roof, to an existing barn currently being converted as part of a residential development at Manor Farm.
The local resident stated that his main concern was the hedge between his property and the development site. Part of the hedge had already been removed as part of the redevelopment of the barn and the proposed extension would provide him with a stone wall replacement. This was acceptable to him as was the extension itself now that the originally proposed roof had been replaced by a mono-pitched roof. His concern was that now part of the hedge had been removed it could set a precedent for what may happen to the remainder of the hedge along his south-west boundary.

The applicant’s agent stated that the remainder of the hedge was outside the development site and belonged to the adjacent working farm.

5. WP/2006/0776(O) – LAND ADJACENT TO 28 SUMMERLEE ROAD, FINEDON

In addition to the Site Viewing Group, others present were:

M Kilpin (Principal Development Control Officer).

5 Parish Council representatives.

10 local residents.

The Group assembled at the site.

The Principal Development Control Officer informed those present that the application for outline planning permission for residential development was being made by the Borough Council.

The Group then inspected the site from the footpath running between Summerlee Road and Milner Road, noting the difference in land levels.

The local residents raised the following issues:

- If the site was developed there would be a loss of parking for residents.
- Parking in Summerlee Road was already difficult and congestion was caused by vehicles turning at the top of the road as it was a cul-de-sac. The worst times were evenings and weekends.
- The site should be laid out to provide a proper parking area.
- The difference in land levels would make it a difficult site to develop.
The Parish Council representatives referred to the report to Regulatory Committee and in particular to the reference from the Council’s Property Manager on page 23 that “the current parking on the site is completely unauthorised”. This statement was incorrect as the use of the land for parking had been authorised by the Council’s Housing Committee a number of years ago.

6. WP/2006/0779F – 70 NORTHAMPTON ROAD, EARLS BARTON

In addition to the Site Viewing Group, others present were:

M Kilpin (Principal Development Control Officer).

Councillor Blackwell (Ward Councillor).

The applicant and his surveyor.

3 Parish Council representatives.

3 local residents.

The Group assembled on site.

The applicant and his surveyor outlined the proposal for a 2-storey side and rear extension, with single-storey rear kitchen/family room, providing bedrooms and bathroom and alteration to the garage (to include a Juliet balcony on the front elevation).

Plans were displayed showing the current proposal and the previously withdrawn proposal to highlight the differences.

The local residents raised the following issues:

- The proposal would have a detrimental effect upon neighbours.
- It would have a detrimental effect on the street scene as it would introduce a ‘terracing’ effect.
- There would be a loss of light to no. 72.
- It was an overdevelopment of the site.

The Group viewed the development site from no. 72.

Councillor Blackwell stated that in his opinion the proposal did represent an overdevelopment of the site and would have an adverse effect upon neighbours.

The Parish Council representatives stated they had no objection to the proposal.
7. WP/2007/0024F – LAND AT REAR OF 18 CHURCH STREET, ISHAM

(Councillor Morrall did not take part in this visit.)

In addition to the Site Viewing Group, others present were:

M Kilpin (Principal Development Control Officer).

Councillor Timms (Ward Councillor).

The applicant.

2 Parish Council representatives.

A planning consultant on behalf of an objector and 4 interested parties.

The Group assembled on the site.

The applicant outlined the proposal to erect a 2-bedroom bungalow on the site. Drawings were displayed showing the design and position. The applicant confirmed that if additional planting or increases in the height of boundary walls was required this would be done. The ground level of the site would be reduced by approximately 1 metre. The dwelling would be constructed in the form of a barn using reclaimed bricks, pantiles and boards. Parking on the site would be provided for 2 vehicles.

The following concerns were raised by the interested parties:

- The proposal would be a form of tandem development.
- The site was not large enough for a development; it would be infill and would set a precedent for other similar small areas of land in the village.
- There would be a detrimental affect on the character of the conservation area.
- The proposal did not meet the requirements of planning guidance.
- The development would result in overlooking, loss of privacy, loss of amenity and loss of light which would be detrimental to existing dwellings.
- The access was poor.
- Increase in on-street parking.
- The position of the proposed garage could have a detrimental effect on the Ash tree in the adjoining garden.
8. **WP/2007/0032F – 38 HARDWICK ROAD, WELLINGBOROUGH**

In addition to the Site Viewing Group, others present were:

M Kilpin (Principal Development Control Officer).

Councillor Warwick (Ward Councillor).

The applicant.

4 local residents.

The Group assembled on the site.

The applicant outlined the proposal for a first floor extension to the existing bungalow to form a 2-storey house with 2-storey extensions to the front and south-east side. Apart from the 6’ foot extension to the south-east side there would be no change to the current footprint of the bungalow. The 5 windows in the first floor rear elevation would be obscure glazed with restricted openings to prevent any overlooking.

The local residents raised the following issues:

- The proposed extension on the south-east side was too close to the boundary line.
- The dwelling should remain single-storey as there was a shortage of bungalows in the area.
- Possible future use of the extended dwelling.
- Overlooking, loss of privacy and loss of sunlight.

9. **WP/2007/0041F – LAND ADJACENT TO 2 IRTHLINGBOROUGH ROAD, FINEDON**

In addition to the Site Viewing Group, others present were:

M Kilpin (Principal Development Control Officer).

The applicant and his agent.

5 Parish Council representatives.

The Group assembled on the site.

The applicant and his agent outlined the proposal to build a 4-bed detached house on existing garden land belonging to 2 Irthlingborough Road. Outline planning permission was granted in 2006.
The Parish Council representatives stated that the main concern was the proposed access onto Irthlingborough Road and its close proximity to the junction of the A6 and A510.

The Principal Development Control Officer stated that the A6 had been de-trunked and the Highway Authority had no objection to the proposed access. In the past there had been concerns when the nearby junction was traffic light controlled but since the lights had been replaced by a roundabout those concerns no longer existed.