

BOROUGH COUNCIL OF WELLINGBOROUGH

Planning Committee -

14 December 2016

Report of the Head of Planning and Local Development

WP/16/0614/FUL 3 Green Lane, Isham

Borough Council of Wellingborough Landscape Architect (01/12/2016) –

‘There are a lot of trees in the rear garden and only the apple tree which is rather close to the back of the existing house would be lost with this scheme. The trees were plotted on the previous application. Most are further back but some are close to the boundary and a condition for root protection in accordance with BS5837:2012 is recommended.’

WP/16/00191/FUL 145 And Rear Of 145 Doddington Road, Earls Barton

Additional Conditions –

Conditions

- 6 Prior to construction of the dwellings a plan and elevation indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatments to be erected has been submitted and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To secure appropriate landscaping of the site in the interest of visual amenity and security in accordance with policy 8 of North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy and guidance contained in the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 7 A positive means of drainage must be installed to ensure that surface water from driveways does not discharge onto the highway.

To prevent loose material being carried onto the public highway driveways must be paved with a hard bound surface for a minimum of 5m in rear of the highway boundary.

Shared private drives serving parking areas and any more than a single dwelling must be no less than 4.5m wide for a distance of 10m in rear of the prospectively adoptable highway boundary.

Pedestrian to vehicle visibility of 2.0m x 2.0m above a height of 0.6m must be

provided and maintained on both sides of vehicular accesses.

Footways no less than 1.8m wide must be provided on both sides of the access road

Vehicle to vehicle visibility of 2.4m x 43m must be provided and maintained in both directions at the junction between the proposed access road and Doddington Road.

Reason: In the interest of highways safety in accordance with policy 8 of the Joint Core Strategy

Informatives

- 2 The Development would benefit from being built to attain the Secured by Design accreditation.
- 3 The existing vehicular crossing must be closed and all highway surfaces reinstated in accordance with the specification of the Local Highway Authority and subject to a suitable licence/agreement under the Highways Act 1980.
- 4 Vehicular crossings over footways must be constructed in accordance with the specification of the Local Highway Authority and subject to a suitable licence/agreement under the Highways Act 1980.
- 5 In addition to planning permission the applicant may require an Environmental Permit from the Environment Agency

WP/16/00315/FUL Tower Caravans, 101C Irthlingborough Road, Finedon

Mr G Wilton, 41 Irthlingborough Road (12/12/2016) –

Committee report doesn't show full history – reference is not made to the refused application BW/78/1000 this application shows the Councils resistance to development on this site. This refusal was upheld on appeal. The site was also subject to Enforcement Notices.

Particular significance is the fourth reason for refusal *“The proposed development if allowed would create a precedent which would be likely to encourage further applications of a similar Nature which would be difficult to resist “*

The amended scheme reduces the turning circle for fire engines and refuse vehicles which should be a concern.

Pedestrian safety concerns as there would be a conflict with pedestrians and vehicles against Health and safety.

WP/16/00438/FUL Flat 3, 10 Fellows Close, Wollaston

Michael Walker, McCallum Homes Ltd (13/12/2016) -

Further to our meeting at the property recently I have now had an opportunity to consider your comments regarding the application and the previous Statements made by the appeals inspector.

Appeal A WP/2012/0269/F was for **4 No two** bedrooms flats and it was this that the inspector said was over development.

You will remember that in our conversation I said the inspector had stated that she could not rule on 4 One bedroom flats as we requested as this had never formally been applied for.

I would ask you to reconsider this now in the light of my comments and hopefully come to the same conclusion as the officer who left telling us he was recommending for approval.

WP/16/00496/REM 129 London Road, Bozeat

Northamptonshire Highways (29/11/2016) –

Recommends the application be refused on the grounds that the applicant has provided insufficient information to demonstrate that development would not have a detrimental effect on highway safety and capacity.

David Brown on behalf of the residents of 131 – 139 London Road (30/11/2016) -

Note that the revised scheme takes no account of the private right of way across the site.

Bozeat Parish Council (12/12/2016) –

Bozeat Parish Council is pleased with the glazing detail now shown on the revised plan but is disappointed the lack of dimensions. The parish council recommends that the application be refused for the following reasons:

- impact on light reception for no 129A
- possible changes to the development after completion
- massing impact on no. 129A
- bin storage not addressed
- Northamptonshire Highways objection

WP/16/00497/FUL Land Rear of 129 London Road (fronting Little Close), Bozeat

Northamptonshire Highways (29/11/16) –

Makes reference to the parking standards it has adopted and recommends that the

application be refused on the grounds that the applicant has failed to demonstrate that the development would not have a detrimental effect on highway safety and capacity.

Bozeat Parish Council (12/12/2016) –

Notes the revised plans but still believes the application should be refused for the following reasons:

- small garage size
- rare Northamptonshire Highways intervention because the application fails to meet its adopted standards
- village does not have viable public transport options resulting in high car dependency and ownership rates and proposed parking is inadequate
- chronic shortage of parking in the village

WP/16/00524/FUL Land Between 75A And 75 B, High Street, Irchester

Planning Officer (8/12/2016) –

The applicant paid the Special Protection Area contribution - £538.88p on 30/11/16. Therefore the proposed reason for refusal No.5 is no longer required.

NCC Highways were re-consulted in regard to an additional plan submitted showing the turning circle for a car in the access lane and measurements of the width of the lane. The response from NCC Highways states that refusal is still recommended.

Councillor Jon-Paul Carr (12/12/2016) –

Having restudied the drawings for the proposed two new properties at Manor Farm in Irchester – they appear to somewhat overlap with the adjoining Tithe Barn application which was given last year.

If you were to look at the Tithe Barn application you will notice that it has a Double Car Port with the entrance off the main drive.

On the current application for the two houses this has now turned into a Double Garage and the doors are from the side driveway at the entrance to these to the new dwellings – and are not associated with them in any way by providing car parking facilities.

Surely this application is overlapping with the Tithe Barn application and would be subject to a change to the Tithe Barn Application?

I also wholeheartly agree with the officers recommendation for refusal in regards to this application for two dwellings for the reasons listed.

WP/16/00602/REM Appleby Lodge 140 - 160 Sywell Road

Hardwick Parish Meeting (23/11/2016) -

Concerns raised

- Prologis exhibition in 2013 promised a distinct frontage onto Sywell Road current plans do not show this and should be reviewed
- The building is set back further which is appreciated but disappointing that a higher bund is not shown to reduce noise and pollution impact - this should be requested
- Profiled metal sheeting of various greys would have a visual impact and extremely noticeable although noted that the building is 4 meters lower the concern is that not enough effort has been applied.

WP/16/00536/EXT Land Adjacent Skew Bridge Ski Slope, Rushden Lakes , Rushden

Letter from QUOD on behalf of Applicant (12/12/2016) –

See Appendix A

our ref: Q70055
 email: matthew.sherwood@quod.com
 date: 14 December 2016



Julie Thomas
 Head of Planning and Local Development
 Borough Council of Wellingborough
 Swanspool House
 Doddington Road
 Wellingborough, NN8 1BP

FAO: JULIE THOMAS

Dear Ms Thomas,

RUSHDEN LAKES LEISURE AND RETAIL APPLICATION (EAST NORTHAMPTONSHIRE COUNCIL REF. 16/01662/FUL). LAND ADJACENT TO SKEW BRIDGE SKI LAKE, NORTHAMPTON ROAD, RUSHDEN. WELLINGBOROUGH COUNCIL REF. WP/16/00536/EXT

On behalf of LXB RP (Rushden) Limited we write in relation to the application for leisure and retail development at land adjacent to Skew Bridge Ski Lake, Northampton Road, Rushden (LPA ref. 16/01662/FUL). We are aware that the application proposals are being presented to the Wellingborough Planning Committee on 14 December 2016 (ref. WP/16/00536/EXT) and the officer's recommendation includes a number of options. Option B relates to various mitigation measures being put in place to reduce the retail impact on Wellingborough town centre.

By way of background, when compared to the previously approved (in August 2015) leisure application at the Rushden Lakes site the new application introduces 2 additional cinema screens for Cineworld as well as some additional leisure floorspace to support trampolining, indoor golf and soft play place. Three additional restaurants are proposed as well as 8 new shop units to meet demand from national retailers including Mothercare and Hobbycraft as well as outdoor clothing and adventure, furniture and home retailers. The application also provides for an extra 500 car parking spaces to address the shortfall in previous applications and will take the total number of direct jobs to 2,700 up from 1,950. Subject to planning, LXB would like to start on site in late Spring 2017.

As set out in the supporting application documentation, whilst LXB concludes that there will not be a significant adverse retail impact on Wellingborough town centre from the proposed development, they are mindful of the support that Wellingborough has given to the previous Rushden Lakes applications. LXB have no wish to see Rushden Lakes lead to any detriment to Wellingborough town centre and are therefore happy to support the types of measures identified by White Young Green in a meaningful way so as to ensure that Wellingborough town centre can continue to grow alongside Rushden Lakes. LXB are happy to discuss specific measures with Wellingborough Council to ensure that the contribution they make is targeted to achieve maximum impact.





Page 2

Should you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours faithfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "MS", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Matthew Sherwood
Associate