

Addendum to Agenda Items Tuesday 30th June 2015

5. MATTERS OF URGENCY

N/2015/0415

Construction of a 2.5 kilometre dual carriageway (A43 Bypass) and associated landscaping, drainage and infrastructure works – Consultation by Northamptonshire County Council

Land to the east of Moulton Village

Further to the Committee resolution on 9th June 2015 in relation to the above proposal additional information has now been received from the County Council regarding this.

Members will recall that an objection was raised in respect of the proposed re-connection of Thorpeville to the existing alignment of the A43 and the possibility of this becoming a 'rat-run'. In response to this a further plan has been produced indicating the following measures:

- Gateway features incorporating a reduction in speed limit to 30 mph with village signing and roundels at either end of the bypassed A43;
- Four alternating priority/give way buildouts, with raised pedestrian crossings where appropriate; and
- A raised table at the junction of the existing A43, Ashley Lane and The Avenue.

It is considered that these measures are welcome and may make Thorpeville less attractive as a 'rat-run'. However the potential for this still exists.

In addition a further plan has also been submitted indicating the phasing of the whole scheme. The County Council has also confirmed that Parishes, Councillors and the contributing neighbours including the Thorpeville Resident Association have been notified of the additional information.

It is recommended that the Committee **note** these proposals and the County Council is to be informed that the concerns expressed previously regarding this element of the scheme remain in place.

7. OTHER REPORTS

Variation of S106 Agreements pursuant to planning permissions N/2004/0930 Harvey Reeves Road and N/2004/0931 Southern Development Link Road

No update.

9. NORTHAMPTON BOROUGH COUNCIL APPLICATIONS

9a

N/2015/0389

Pond excavation and two shallow scrapes, linked in sequence by short ditches within the field

Wetland Habitat site, Duston Mill Lane

River and Canal Trust: No objection.

Revised Recommendation:

As the only outstanding consultee River and Canal Trust has now responded to the consultation, the recommendation as stated in paragraph 1.1 of the report can now be changed to **APPROVAL** subject to conditions.

10. ITEMS FOR DETERMINATION

10a

N/2014/1272

**Change of use from dwelling (Use Class C3) to house in multiple occupancy for four people (Use Class C4)
84 Turner Street**

No update.

10b

N/2014/1291

**Erection of 34 new dwellings comprising 10no. 1 bed flats, 14no. 2 bed houses and 10no. 3 bed houses and associated access roads
Development land between Talavera Way and Booth Rise**

Withdrawn from agenda.

10c

N/2015/0282

**Change of use to 3no one-bed apartments together with two storey rear extension.
15 Beaconsfield Terrace**

Councillor Danielle Stone - object on the grounds of overdevelopment and the fact this area is already saturated with HIMOs.

Officer's Comments:

In respect of this objection, it should be noted that the application is for a change of use to 3 no. apartments, rather than to a House in Multiple Occupation.

10d

N/2015/0431

**Laying of hard surface and creation of seating areas with associated landscaping to form memorial garden
Towcester Road Cemetery, Towcester Road**

No update.

10e

N/2015/0555

**Proposed single storey extension to rear, two-storey front extension, a new first floor window in side elevation, alterations to first floor rear windows and front porch (part-retrospective)
14 Woodland Avenue**

A further 12 letters of objection from **3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 15, 16, 19 and 21 Woodland Avenue** have been received from neighbours, summarised as follows:

- Application almost identical to that previously refused;
- Application does not address reasons for refusal of previous application, and with only minor alterations;
- The extensions exceed what was granted in the first application and overshadow/overbear neighbours at nos. 12a and 16;
- The developer had the opportunity to appeal the previous planning decision;

- Development would alter the character of the area, particularly if multiple occupancy emerged as the ultimate objective;
- Application should be rejected for the same reason as previous application, owner should comply with committee's ruling;
- Previous objections still apply;
- Owner has been working on property without planning permission, expect that some enforcement of the decision that has been made;
- Plans of approved application were not followed;
- Applicant appears to be just trying to wear down the committee so that they will give in and say yes;
- Proposed front porch window will afford overlooking to front bay window of no.16.
- The Local Planning Authority should decline to accept the application as one similar application has already been refused.

Officer's Comments:

In addressing the issue of overlooking from the proposed porch window to adjoining property, a porch is not classed as a habitable room (where occupants spend significant periods of time), and therefore the issue of overlooking is not considered significant and warrant a refusal of the application. Other issues raised above are taken into account within the main Committee Report.

As regard to the issue on why the Planning Authority accepted the application, the current proposal is materially different from the previous scheme and only one other scheme was previously refused by the Council. The Local Planning Authority has a duty to determine each valid planning application according to its merits.