

**SITE VIEWING GROUP VISIT
20 AUGUST 2019**

Present: Councillors Morrall, Skittrall, and Scarborough.

(Apology received from Councillor Bell)

(Councillors Griffiths and G Lawman also joined the site viewing group for some of the visits).

1. WP/19/00273/FUL – LAND BETWEEN 34 AND 34A CASTLE STREET, WELLINGBOROUGH

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

J Thomas (Director of Planning and Strategic Growth)

D Kirk (Senior Development Management Officer)

R Luck (Customer Service and Executive Support Officer)

Interested parties: Aiden Matthews (38, Castle Street), Mr Allen (45, Castle Street), Karen Metcalfe (40, Castle Street), Mr Cross (42, Castle Street), Janet Westcott (46, Castle Street), Mr Nowells (5, Castle Street), Tony Round (36, Castle Street), Ged Carey (22, Castle Street)

Agent: Barry Waine

The site viewing group assembled with the interested parties. The Senior Development Management Officer explained the proposal for a detached infill dwelling of 2.5 storeys in height to be built in the side garden of number 34 Castle Street, between numbers 34 and 34A Castle Street. She also explained that some windows on number 34 would be filled in, namely the large side windows facing into the application site at ground and first floor level. Some trees would need to be removed, and a parking survey was carried out revealing they did not need to provide parking spaces as part of the application, as there would be parking available on the streets within the vicinity of the site.

The following concerns were raised:

Parking

The residents explained that parking is very difficult as the street becomes very crowded and busy, especially when people return from work in the evening. When the house is built and occupied there will be many bedrooms and the potential for a least two cars to park on the street. They explained if it goes ahead, in the future it could be turned into flats and result in even more on street parking. The residents applied for their own parking survey and the result indicated that the street was 100% stressed. They also consulted the Police who advised that residents should be able to park near to their houses.

Councillor Morrall advised that parking is a material planning consideration in the application, and that the application should provide two parking spaces, but if construction works were to go ahead it would generate short-term parking congestion and councillors are unable to take that into consideration.

Lack of light

They also expressed concern at the lack of light, with the windows being blocked off in number 34 Castle Street. This was also an issue for the occupier of 36A as that address is next to the site and has glass blocks in the flank elevation. Taking out the windows on number 34 would damage the historic style and design of that house.

No room between houses

There would be no adequate space between houses for maintenance, and with the trees close by this could attract damp and become a health issue between each house. Councillor Scarborough asked the Agent if there would be a substantial gap between the houses and was told that there would not be.

Loss of gardens

They are worried about the loss of extensive gardens that are very old, and when removed would never be returned to their former size and style.

Heritage/look of street

That the street is full of beautiful historic houses and gardens, and the look and feel of this new build would be detrimental and ugly.

The site viewing group and interested parties then looked around the rear garden, which is split into two by a wall and archway, and the Agent explained on the existing building where over many years additions or alterations had been made.

2. WP/19/00296/FUL – 37 MAIN ROAD, GRENDON

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

J Thomas (Director of Planning and Strategic Growth)

D Kirk (Senior Development Management Officer)

R Luck (Customer Service and Executive Support Officer)

Interested parties: representatives from Grendon Parish Council and St Mary's Church Warden (Debra Rush), and Parish Cllr Sandra Bailey

Applicant

The site viewing group assembled with the Parish Council parties. The Senior Development Management Officer explained the proposal for demolition of the existing conservatory, and building of a two storey side extension with a first floor balcony on the side elevation. A single storey rear extension, and lower level garage extension. A sunken terrace and works to the garden, lower, middle and upper deck with hot tub.

Front terrace alterations and additional stairway. Recladding/rendering of dwelling and replacement windows/doors.

The applicant advised that on the paper plan the side elevation looks wide but is actually 45° on the application. They advised that the current car port would be converted to a garage, and once works were finished the whole building would be clad/rendered so it all matched; any stone would be retained to be in keeping with the village. They then showed the councillors and interested parties where the new line would be for the side extension and platform, explaining that the very steep garden would be landscaped. The view from the applicant's back garden is of the Nene Valley.

The following concerns were raised:

View of roofline

The representatives from Grendon Parish Council were concerned that the view of the Nene Valley from the cemetery further up the hill would be partially obscured by the proposed plans.

The site viewing group and interested parties then made their way up a public right of way next to the boundary of the applicant's back garden, which led up to the cemetery at the back of the applicant's property. The cemetery is positioned on the same steep hill above the applicant's back garden and house, and shares the same view of the Nene Valley. The church of St Mary is not visible next to the cemetery but some distance away and behind houses. The applicant explained to the group that the roofline of the side balcony would be the same height as the cemetery wall and not intrusive, and that the view of the valley would remain.

The representatives of Grendon Parish Council explained that they had asked for a Planning Officer (Kate Skingley) to visit ahead of the site viewing. They are concerned that when standing in the cemetery you would be able to see the roofline as you look over the valley. They had nothing further to add explaining that their comments had already been made on the website. They were however concerned that the comments from St Mary's Church had still not been added to the website, and they should be added as they are part of the public comments.

3. WP/19/00356/FUL – 39 FAIRFIELD ROAD, ISHAM

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

J Thomas (Director of Planning and Strategic Development)

D Kirk (Senior Development Management Officer)

R Luck (Customer Service and Executive Support Officer)

Councillor Hallam (Ward Councillor)

Interested parties: Jane Gillard (Isham Parish Council), Simon and Dorothy Radcliffe (1, Ryehill Close), Hilda Kelland (5, Ryehill Close), Diane Longhurst (4, Ryehill Close), Francis Key (8, Ryehill Close), Mike Harris (2, Ryehill Close), Sue Moriarty (6, Ryehill Close) and Peter Priest (7, Ryehill Close) who was not able to be present but wanted to be included

Applicant absent

The site viewing group and interested parties assembled. The Senior Development Management Officer explained the scheme for the proposal of a single storey bungalow on part of the rear garden, with the garden then being sub-divided to provide the bungalow private amenity space, with two parking spaces and vehicular access onto Ryehill Close.

The Site Viewing group and interested parties then went to look in the back garden of 39 Fairfield Road. The applicant had laid out wooden planks and sticks to mark the dimensions of the bungalow and the two parking spaces.

The following concerns were raised:

Parking spaces too small and visitor parking

The interested parties expressed concern that the proposed parking spaces were very narrow, and that previous new builds in their close had very narrow parking spaces. Explaining that they are concerned about more cars and visitor parking, as there was no longer spare parking on Fairfield Road and Ryehill Close was not very wide and parking was becoming a problem. The Senior Development Management Officer advised that if parking was a problem in Ryehill Close, this can be taken into account. Also advising that the two parking spaces need to be 6 metres wide by 5 metres deep, as a minimum.

Roof height and light

Residents were concerned about the roof height and whether it would block any light, and that the amenity area around the proposed bungalow would be very small, with the garden being split 1 metre from the proposed bungalow.

Councillor Scarborough noted that at present there are five windows from number 1 Ryehill Close overlooking number 39 Fairfield Road.

4. WP/19/00370/FUL – LAND ADJACENT TO 149 MAIN STREET, LITTLE HARROWDEN

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

J Thomas (Director of Planning and Strategic Development)

D Kirk (Senior Development Management Officer)

R Luck (Customer Service and Executive Support Officer)

Councillor Hallam (Ward Councillor)

Interested parties: representatives from Little Harrowden Parish Council, Cllr Martin Jeffery and Yvonne Blood

Agent: Barry Waine

Applicant

The site viewing group and interested parties assembled. The Senior Development Management Officer explained the scheme for the proposal for a general purpose agricultural building (barn), which would be used for storage of crops, vehicles and equipment. The present access into the field from Hilltop Road will be a gated access sitting back by 15 metres into the field itself from the road.

The following concerns were raised:

Access problems/speeding traffic

The interested parties explained their concerns about gaining access in or out of this field, due to the Hilltop Road being used by the public as a cut-through to Park Farm, with cars regularly exceeding the 40 mph limit on this road. The Parish Council carries out its own speed watch programmes periodically.

Usage of new barn

They also expressed concern about the usage of the barn, what will it be used for and whether this would increase the traffic on an already very busy road.

The Agent explained that the building would only be used for storage of grain, farming vehicles and equipment. That it would not increase the traffic on Hilltop Road at all, and they have the support of the Highways Authority as the proposal would improve the access from Hilltop Road by gating the field 15 metres deep inside the field away from the road. This should make access and exit much safer and cause less disruption to the traffic.

Councillor Scarborough confirmed with the Agent that the building would not be used as grain dryer, and the Agent confirmed that it would not be used for that purpose just purely as storage. Councillor G Lawman enquired about farming equipment currently located in George Street and Gisburn Road in Wellingborough. The applicant advised that this equipment belongs to them and is currently stored in Wellingborough.

Councillor Hallam asked where the site on Hilltop Road sits in relation to the site of the new Wellingborough North development. Both the Director of Planning and Strategic Growth, and the Senior Development Management Officer advised that this development is not in the same area and should not be an issue. They directed the councillor to the website to look at the plans in relation to this proposal.