

PLANNING & ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
COMMITTEE

TUESDAY 10 JULY 2012 AT 1.30PM

		Page No:
1.	Procedure for Speaking	1
2.	List of Persons Wishing to Speak	2
3.	Briefing Update	3
Item 5.2	Email from Mr and Mrs Fordham - Applicants	5
Item 5.3	Local Resident Objections	6
Item 5.7	Email from Councillor David Over	16

**UPDATE REPORT &
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

BLANK

PETERBOROUGH CITY COUNCIL

PUBLIC SPEAKING SCHEME - PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Procedural Notes

1. Planning Officer to introduce application.
2. Chairman to invite Ward Councillors, Parish Council, Town Council or Neighbourhood representatives to present their case.
3. Members' questions to Ward Councillors, Parish Council, Town Council or Neighbourhood representatives.
4. Chairman to invite objector(s) to present their case.
5. Members' questions to objectors.
6. Chairman to invite applicants, agent or any supporters to present their case.
7. Members' questions to applicants, agent or any supporters.
8. Officers to comment, if necessary, on any matters raised during stages 2 to 7 above.
9. Members to debate application and seek advice from Officers where appropriate.
10. Members to reach decision.

The total time for speeches from Ward Councillors, Parish Council, Town Council or Neighbourhood representatives shall not exceed ten minutes or such period as the Chairman may allow with the consent of the Committee.

The total time for speeches in respect of each of the following groups of speakers shall not exceed five minutes or such period as the Chairman may allow with the consent of the Committee.

1. Objectors.
2. Applicant or agent or supporters.

BLANK

PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COMMITTEE – 10 JULY 2012 AT 1.30PM
LIST OF PERSONS WISHING TO SPEAK

Agenda Item No.	Page No	Application	Name	Objector/Applicant/Agent/Supporters/Parish Council/Town Council/Neighbourhood Representatives
5.1	13	12/00329/OUT – GREAT NORTHERN RAILWAY HOTEL, STATION ROAD, PETERBOROUGH, PE1 1QL	Mr Peter Lee (The Civic Society)	Objector
5.2	31	12/00609/HHFUL – 12 MAIN ROAD, ETTON, PETERBOROUGH, PE6 7DA	Councillor Peter Hiller Mr Martin Brook (Local Resident)	Ward Councillor Objector
5.3	39	12/00758/NONMAT – 9 WILLIAMS CLOSE, NEWBOROUGH, PETERBOROUGH, PE6 7RZ	Councillor David Harrington Mr Colin Noble (Local Resident) Mr Anthony Nelder	Ward Councillor Objector Applicant
5.4	45	12/00717/R3FUL – CITY OF PETERBOROUGH ACADEMY, FORMER HEReward COMMUNITY COLLEGE, REEVES WAY, EASTFIELD, PETERBOROUGH	Councillor Marion Todd	Ward Councillor
5.6	65	T.P.O 7_11 – 34 SCHOOL ROAD, NEWBOROUGH, PETERBOROUGH	Councillor David Harrington	Ward Councillor

BLANK

BRIEFING UPDATE

P & EP Committee 10 July 2012

ITEM NO	APPLICATION NO	SITE/DESCRIPTION
1.	12/00329/OUT	Great Northern Railway Hotel, Station Road, Peterborough, PE1 1QL , Extension of existing hotel together with new office building with retail A1 restaurants A3 and six apartments

Notwithstanding the detailed description contained within the committee report, for clarification and the avoidance of doubt the indicative scheme would comprise commercial uses at ground floor, office development on floors 1-7 and residential on floor 8 – totally an 8 storey building.

Additional Condition

C21 Prior to the commencement of any development a construction management plan shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The construction Management Plan shall include (but not exclusively) the following:-

- Haul Routes to and from the site
- Hours of working
- Parking, Turning and Loading/Unloading areas for all construction/contractors vehicles
- Site compounds/storage areas
- Temporary Access points
- Wheel cleansing facilities capable of cleaning the underside of the chassis and wheels of all vehicles entering and leaving the site during the period of construction.

In the interests of the safety of all users of the public highway in accordance with Policy CS14 of the adopted Peterborough Core Strategy DPD 2011

2.	12/00609/HHFUL	12 Main Road, Etton, Peterborough, PE6 7DA , Proposed single storey side and rear extensions with additional living space in roof
----	----------------	--

No Further Comments

4.	12/00717/R3FUL	City Of Peterborough Academy, Former Hereward Community College, Reeves Way, Eastfield , Refurbishment and development of the former Hereward school buildings and site to create the new City of Peterborough Academy, work consists of refurbishment of the existing buildings including construction of a new two storey link block, two additional classrooms and a small extension to the changing rooms, demolition of existing plant room A new single storey SEN school for 90 pupils will also be constructed on the site
----	----------------	--

Landscape Officer - Confirms that the additional tree information requested has been received and is acceptable.

Anglian Water – Raises no objection subject to the implementation of a condition that there should be no permanent occupation of the site until the surface water strategy has been carried out.

An addendum to the Flood Risk Assessment has been sent to the Environment Agency, their comments are awaited.

3.	12/00758/NONMAT	9 Williams Close, Newborough, Peterborough, PE6 7RZ , Non-material amendment to planning permission 06/01257/FUL - Erection of single storey dwelling and detached single garage
----	-----------------	---

One of the objectors has raised concern that the Committee report does not cover the legal issues:-

- that the developer did not advise the Planning department that the plot is smaller than approved and
- that the developer did not advise the planning department that the piles were placed on site in a different position.

Response - Through the investigation, it has been demonstrated that prior to the foundation piles being put in, it was known to the developer that the development could not be built as per the approved plans because the site is actually a different size to that shown on the approved plans. The purpose of the non-material application is correct this problem.

The agent has confirmed that the piles are in the wrong place on site because of the irregular nature of the boundary and because the site is smaller than approved, mainly due to the step in on the western boundary. He has confirmed that the approved site area was 494 sq m and the actual site area now proposed is 488sqm.

Another of the objectors stated that the submitted plans not only changed the position of the piles of the property but that they also :-

- Reduced the width of the driveway from 3m to 2.7m, and it should start 1.4m from No.10 Williams Close boundary
- The shape of the driveway has changed
- The fences previously shown on the south boundary, along the south side of the drive, and on the north boundary and not now marked on this plan. These fences were to protect privacy and to reduce noise levels.

Response – The only change for which approval is being sought is the revised siting of the bungalow fences.

5.	12/00983/CTR	14 Russell Hill, Thornhaugh, Peterborough, PE8 6HL , Remove all Norway Spruce trees apart from 1 row closest to the eastern bound
----	--------------	--

Thornhaugh Parish Council object on the basis of:-

The retention of these trees was a condition of the original planning consent for the construction of these properties on what was a garden site. The reason for the retention condition was to soften the outline of the new build properties. The condition recommended that the current depth of trees be maintained to achieve this.

The unapproved tree removal already undertaken has resulted in an investigation and the requirement for 3 new trees to be planted to help off-set the visual exposure of the new houses to the neighbouring house, Montague House.

Based on the above, and in absence of any supporting reason for the complete removal of the trees, the PC recommend rejection of the application in order to maintain the visual screening of the new properties to the immediate neighbours but also from the surrounding area where the height of the trees helps to offset the impact of the new properties. This was the considered intent of the original planning condition and the PC strongly supports its retention.

Email from Mr and Mrs Fordham – Applicants

ITEM 5.2

Further to our application ref 12/00609/HHFUL I confirm that we are more than happy to work with the planning department as regards their proposals.

We have previously confirmed that we will set back the side extension as per the conservation officers recommendation and that we are more than happy to put up a mixed hedge in order to both encourage the wildlife and keep the setting similar to the existing village.

We have tried to keep our extension in keeping with the original design rather than adding adhoc 'bolt ons' and we have kept the main part of our extension on the side of the property that has no direct neighbouring property.

BLANK

Jeffs Shirley

From: Whittle Tony
Sent: 28 May 2012 07:24
To: McSherry Amanda
Cc:
Subject: FW: 12/00758/NONMAT

Hi Amanda,

As you are the case officer for the above application are you able to address the issues that have been raised by Mr Noble below?

Regards

Tony.

From: COLIN NOBLE
Sent: 27 May 2012 16:33
To: Whittle Tony
Subject: 12/00758/NONMAT

Dear Mr Whittle.

I along with my neighbours, have received the letter from the Head of Planning Transport & Engineering Services, dated 21st May 2012, relating to the above NMA application. I have also looked at the planning application on line.

I would be grateful if you could advise on a few points, relating to the on line details as shown.

Drawing 1219/PL01..04 05 12.

1. Can you please confirm the width of the plot is indicated as 19.660m, where the original approved plan, 300/01/B, indicates a width of 20.600m?
2. Can you please confirm the depth of the plot is indicated as 23.650m, where the original approved plan indicates a depth of 24.000m?
3. The original plan included details of fencing and patio areas, the current plan does not include these. Should they have been included on the revised application?
4. The original plans indicate a patio area at the end of the front drive, covering a distance of approx; 3.000m from the side of the property to the boundary of 7 Hawthorn Cl.

As the property is now proposed to be only 1.500m from the Hawthorn Cl boundary rather than 2.400m, as indicated upon the original approved drawing, will this result in the patio area being shorter, thus bringing the drive forward and closer to the boundary of 7 Hawthorn Cl?

Thank you for your assistance.

Regards
Colin Noble
7 Hawthorn Cl.

Jeffs Shirley

From: Plng Control Enquiries
Sent: 08 June 2012 15:46
To: Woodley Danielle
Subject: FW: 12/00758/nonmat..Mrs D Horton/Miss A McSherry

Objector letter please .

Gina George
Technical advisor
Planning Services
Peterborough City Council
Stuart House East Wing
St John's Street
Peterborough
PE1 5DD

Ph: 01733 453 587
Fax: 01733 453 505
Email: regina.george@peterborough.gov.uk

To find out more about Peterborough City Council go to www.peterborough.gov.uk

Please consider the environment before printing this email

From: COLIN NOBLE
Sent: 08 June 2012 12:57
To: Plng Control Enquiries
Subject: 12/00758/nonmat..Mrs D Horton/Miss A McSherry

From Colin & Marie Noble
7 Hawthorn Close
Newborough
Peterborough
PE6 7QY

8th June 2012.

Re: Non Material amendment 12/00758/NONMAT.

Dear Mrs Horton/Miss McSherry

Thank you for the opportunity for us to comment regarding the above NMA application, relating to the revised position of the proposed building on the plot next to 9 Williams Cl Newborough, in relation to the boundaries.

We wish to register our objections and comments ,to this amendment application.

1) The bringing of the east facing gable wall of the proposed dwelling closer, not only to my property boundary but also to the boundaries of all Hawthorn Cl residents who's properties face the plot, will be detrimental to the amenity of these residents. Due to the increased overshadowing and overbearing of the building.

2) The proposed closer proximity of the building to the boundaries will bring significant threat to the boundary trees and hedges belonging to the Hawthorn Cl residents. This threat has in fact already started, where the developer has commenced the cut back of trees and bushes, to allow space for the construction to take place closer to the boundary.

In both cases,the effect is an increase in loss of privacy.

The amendment application is classified as "Minor"

If the building was on a plot where the boundaries were say 10m away,a difference of nearly 1m could be said to be insignificant but where the original distance was only to be 2.4m and now proposed to be reduced to 1.5m behind my property,this we would believe to be more of a major change.

The developer in his application,indicates the space between the east wall and the eastern boundary is less than on the approved drawings.

We believe the question should be raised,why is this?

The main reason being,the area for "construction" of the building is smaller than as indicated upon the approved plans..300/01-02B

These plans, which were provided to the Planning Dept, indicate a construction area width of 20.6m

Being:

Garage drive way. 3.8m

House 14.4m

Distance to boundary..2.4m

The revised plan 1219/PL01,indicates a construction area width of 19.66m,behind my boundary.

Being:

Garage drive way 3.76m

House 14.40m

Distance to boundary 1.50m

Incorrect information was provided to the Planning Dept,to make their original decisions upon.

The developer proceeded with the construction Piles,knowing they would have to be placed out of specification.The developer did not advise the Planning Dept that the Piles would not be in the approved position.

We would believe,providing wrong information and not advising the Planning Dept of changes,should not assist as a valid reason for an amendment.

We would hope the Planning Dept legal team would check the rights and wrongs of the apparent miss information.

The original planning application was refused by the Peterborough Planning Dept: but the appeal to build was passed by the Planning Inspectorate.We the local residence,had to agree with the decision.We would believe this decision and the details relating to it should be adhered to.

If this means making the size if the proposed building smaller to fit to the land and maintaining the approved distance from the Hawthorn CI boundaries,as passed,then that is what we believe should happen.

Please acknowledge receipt of this e mail.

Regards

Colin & Marie Noble.

Jeffs Shirley

From: COLIN NOBLE |
Sent: 04 July 2012 17:34
To: Harding Nicholas
Cc: Cllr Harrington David; McSherry Amanda
Subject: Re: Planning and EP committee 10 7 2012/points

Dear Mr Harding

Thank you for your e mail.

Thank you also for ensuring that the points from my e mail will be highlighted to the Committee.

It does appear strange to an outsider that the developer can provide incorrect information to the Council and the Appeals Inspector, proceed with construction not in accordance with the approved plan and that nothing lawfully can be taken into account for these actions.

Relating to an appeal by the developer, if the NMA were to be refused.

I am still confused over this issue, by your reply.

You confirm Gemma's e mail that there can be no appeal against the refusal of the application, by the applicant.

Then your e mail indicates, if the committee refuses the application, then the City Council would then have to go forward and take enforcement action.

The next sentence indicates this refusal & enforcement action can be appealed against?

Thank you for your assistance with this matter.

Regards

Colin Noble

From: Harding Nicholas <Nicholas.Harding@peterborough.gov.uk>
To: COLIN NOBLE < >
Cc: Cllr Harrington David <David.Harrington@peterborough.gov.uk>; McSherry Amanda <amanda.mcsherry@peterborough.gov.uk>
Sent: Wednesday, 4 July 2012, 14:01
Subject: RE: Planning and EP committee 10 7 2012/points

Dear Mr Noble

Thank you for your email which has been forwarded on to be for a reply.

You are quite correct in raising these points and I will see to it that they are highlighted to the Committee at the meeting next week. With regard to the size of the plot and the siting of the dwelling being different to that originally approved, this matter is being 'corrected' by virtue of the application that is being considered. The fact that the builder did not advise us of the differences is not a matter that we can lawfully take into account. In addition, the appropriate process to have the changes approved is now being taken.

With regard to the issue of appeals, there can be no appeal against the refusal of the application by the applicant as Gemma has said. It is understandable that Gemma made the error in her original reply as I had done the same (it is down to the fact that having published a guidance to say there was a right of appeal, the Govt changed its mind...but neglected to update the document on its web site until recently..and even now they have not removed the link to the out dated document).

If the committee refuses the application, then the City Council would then have to go forward and take enforcement action. This can be appealed against and as part of the appeal, the Inspector can consider whether or not revised development should actually be approved. Alternatively, the applicant could decide to make a brand new planning application and appeal the decision, if the Council refuses it.

I'm sorry that you have been inconvenienced.

If you have any follow up questions, please get in touch.

Regards

09/07/2012

Nick Harding
Group Manager – Development Management
Planning Services
Peterborough City Council

Tel 01733 454441

From: Cllr Harrington David
Sent: 04 July 2012 09:11
To: Harding Nicholas
Cc: COLIN NOBLE
Subject: FW: Planning and EP committee 10 7 2012/points

Good Morning Nick

I would appreciate if you could cast your eye over the points raised by Mr Noble of no7 Hawthorn Close and, if possible, give some clarity

Thank you,

Regards

David

From: COLIN NOBLE
Sent: 03 July 2012 16:12
To: Cllr Harrington David
Subject: Planning and EP committee 10 7 2012/points

Hello David.

I believe you have been copied in on the Planning Depts report.

I have been in correspondence with Miss George relating to matters regarding the meeting. Following my questions relating to Miss George's replies, she has provided two changes to the original information. Details are below and at 5 in her first e mail.

Can you help on a point.

No where in the Planning Depts report is there any mention, other than our comments, relating to what we believe to be a possible legal issue, over the developer not advising the PD about the size of the plot being smaller than approved and placing the piles in a different position without advising the PD.

Would you believe this could be a legal issue?

Would the PD legal team have looked into possible legal issues prior to the report being published?

Is this an issue that you would believe we could raise prior to, or at the meeting?

Interesting under section 1 proposal..The report appears to indicate that the reason why the building is being moved over is due to the irregular nature of the boundary.

Nothing about the building area size being smaller than approved.

Thank you for any assistance you can provide.

Regards
Colin

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: George Gemma <Gemma.George@peterborough.gov.uk>
To: 'COLIN NOBLE'
Sent: Tuesday, 3 July 2012, 15:21
Subject: RE: Non material changes 12/00758/nonmat..Miss G George

Hello Mr Noble

Thank you for your email.

I've done a further bit of digging with our Legal Team and you are correct, there is no right of appeal on this particular issue. This is the relevant paragraph within the legislation:

Appeals

59.

Is there a right of appeal for refusal or non-determination?

No. Decisions made by local authorities on non material amendment applications do not constitute an 'approval of the local planning authority' for the purposes of section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. There is therefore no legal basis for an Inspector (on behalf of the Secretary of State) to hear an appeal or to make a decision in a non-material amendment case.

I hope this answers your question.

Kind regards
Gemma

From: COLIN NOBLE
Sent: 03 July 2012 13:21
To: George Gemma
Subject: Re: Non material changes 12/00758/nonmat..Miss G George

Dear Ms George.
Thank you for your e mail.

Thank you for your comments relating to section 5 ,I wonder how long the incorrect wording has been used within these letters.

Can you please confirm your answer number 6.

I have now been able to read the Planning Depts on line report.

Section 5 Assessment of the planning issues,sub section a) last paragraph.
The NMA can either be approved or refused.The applicant has no right of appeal.

Your reply to 6 indicates the applicant does have the right of appeal.

I look forward to your early reply.

Regards
Colin Noble

From: George Gemma <Gemma.George@peterborough.gov.uk>
To: 'COLIN NOBLE'
Sent: Tuesday, 3 July 2012, 12:19
Subject: RE: Non material changes 12/00758/nonmat..Miss G George

Hello Mr Noble,

Thank you for your email.

Please find responses to your questions below:

1. It is a set speech with questions from the Committee to the speaker. Speakers are not permitted to ask questions of any other party.

2. Objectors receive 5 minutes in total (therefore if there is more than one objector we advise a representative to be nominated), the same is true of Supporters, they receive 5 minutes.
3. As above, anyone can register to speak in objection or support but they must be aware that time is limited, therefore if there are many people – a nominated representative would be the best way forward.
4. The Committee will consider the proposal before it on the day, that being the Non-material amendment to planning permission. They will not discuss previous applications.
5. Any application can be called in by 30% of the Members present at the meeting where the resolution was passed. This has to be done in writing within two working days of the meeting. The call in will be heard by the Planning Review Committee (not Council as in the letter – although this letter has my name on it, it actually comes from Planning so I will contact them now as this sentence needs amending).
6. Yes the applicant can appeal against any decision of the Planning Committee and this would be done to the Planning Inspectorate in Bristol .

I hope this information is helpful. Please be advised that if you wish to register to speak I will need to know in what capacity you wish to speak (objector / supporter) and you will need to register by noon on Friday.

Kind regards
Gemma

From: COLIN NOBLE
Sent: 01 July 2012 17:50
To: Democratic Services
Subject: Non material changes 12/00758/nonmat..Miss G George

Dear Miss George.
With ref: to Planning Services letter 29 June 2012, relating to the above ref:

I am almost certain that I will be requesting to speak at the Planning & Environmental Protection Committee, set for 10 July 2012.

I would appreciate if you could advise on the following please.

1. Would the speaking element be as a set speech, or an open discussion?
2. If set speech, is there a length of time allocated?
3. Are all those with views on the subject allowed to speak, or is only open to one person from the group?
4. Is the committee meeting restricted to views relating to the " Proposed Non Material Changes" request? Or is open for all subjects relating to the approved planning application of 06/01257/ful?
5. Can you please expand upon the last paragraph of the 29 June letter.
Under what circumstances could a member of the P&EPC refer the decision to the Full Council?
6. Can the developer appeal against the decision of the P&EPC/Full council, if it rejected the Non Material changes application?
To whom would the appeal be made?

Thank you for your assistance.

Yours Sincerely.
Colin Noble
7 Hawthorn Cl
Newborough
PE6 7QY.

~~~~~ Conditions apply to the confidentiality, copyright, legal liability and use of this email. For full information relating to the transmission and use of this email please visit [www.peterborough.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer](http://www.peterborough.gov.uk/emaildisclaimer)

## Jeffs Shirley

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** 05 July 2012 12:30  
**To:** Plng Control Enquiries  
**Cc:** Cllr Harrington David  
**Subject:** Fw: 12/00758/NONMAT

Dear Miss McSherry

Please confirm that you have received the details below and you will be dealing with before the date of committee meeting. There was no mention of this on the report for committee.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Ken & Helen Smith  
----- Original Message -----

**From:** [George Gemma](#)  
**To:**  
**Cc:** [McSherry Amanda](#)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 04, 2012 12:16 PM  
**Subject:** FW: 12/00758/NONMAT

Dear Mr Smith,

In response to your query below, please be advised that the best person to talk to would be the Planning Officer dealing with the application.

This is Amanda McSherry, and I have copied her into this email. Her contact number is 454416.

Kind regards  
Gemma George  
Senior Governance Officer

**From:**  
**Sent:** 03 July 2012 18:27  
**To:** Democratic Services  
**Subject:** 12/00758/NONMAT

Dear Miss George

Thank you for your letter dated 29 June 2012 in respect of the above.

Whilst we accept that this application is for the incorrect placing of the piles the plans submitted by the applicant to support this do show other differences to the original plans submitted. This was mentioned in our letter dated 7 June 2012 when we sent in our comments.

We refer to paragraph 5 of our letter and 1, 2 and 3 the questions that followed.

Please advise when and who will address this as this could have an impact on 10 Williams Close our property. The landscaping is a concern to us.

Please advise when these issues and concerns will be addressed.

Regards

Kenneth and Helen Smith

~~~~~ Conditions apply to the confidentiality, copyright, legal liability and use of this email. For full information relating to the transmission and use of this email please visit [www.peterborough.gov.uk/emailsdisclaimer](http://www.peterborough.gov.uk/emailsdisclaimer)

08 JUN 2012

5 Hawthorn Close
Newborough
Peterborough
PE6 7QY

Head of Planning, Transport and Engineering Services
Stuart House East Wing
St John's Street
Peterborough PE1 5DD

8th June 2012

Dear Sir

Re Non Material Changes: 12/00758/NONMAT
Non-material amendment to planning permission 06/01257/FUL – erection of single storey dwelling and detached single garage at 9 Williams Close, Newborough, Peterborough PE6 7RZ
A 12/00758/NONMAT

I am not as affected as either John Carlin or Colin Noble my neighbours in Hawthorn Close but I have seen and entirely concur with and support the submissions they and Mr Ken Smith have made.

Of equal concern to me is the whole procedure – it has been clear from the very beginning that the developer/speculator is very experienced. His submissions for the use have been changed several times and he now proposes to sell the plot.

Many of us in the area felt and we believe most local residents would agree, that the site is totally inappropriate in view of the very restricted access and the impact on a number of adjoining properties.

However, our views, to which the Planning authority subscribed, were overruled by the Inspector and we had no alternative but to accept his decision, because we were notified that his decision was final.

We are now led to believe that his decision is only final perhaps when it suits the applicant and he can persuade the planning office to agree.

Clearly the developer/speculator is very experienced in these matters and he is aware that under some circumstances the Inspector's decision can be "overruled" if the right course of action is taken.

It is clear from all the documented evidence that here is an attempt to manipulate the system. Wrong site dimensions, wrong measurements, changes in layout, incorrect positioning of the piles, disregard of restrictions relating to hedges, carefully planned timing – only someone with a high degree of knowledge and experience with the Planning system would set out to achieve all these.

If this NMA is allowed through, it will be an example of manipulation of the Planning System – and every such event reduces Public confidence in Planning Committee decisions and by it's unfairness, brings it into disrepute.

It would have been pointless for us to have disputed the Inspector's decision for reasons of approach and local impact. Although I disagree with the location, in the circumstances I believe that if the developer/speculator wishes to go ahead I believe he should be made to keep to the decisions of the Inspector as we were, and if it means him moving the piles that he authorised, or reducing the size of the development and replacing the hedges which have now been almost removed, then so be it. At least it would uphold the Inspector's decision and avoid what at this point appears to have been a farce and it would retain the integrity of the planning system and those whose responsibility it is to maintain it. The alternative of course would be to submit a new application and start all over again.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'John Wright', with a stylized flourish at the end.

John Wright
for J A & D A Wright

Email From Councillor David Over

ITEM 5.7

Dear Gemma

I fully support the position of Helpston Parish Council.

I also believe that the main aspect for the revision of the Section 106 agreement is faulty.

The pressures on the village remain the same.

There is no reason to accept substantially lower property selling prices.

Developers are very keen to build in Helpston. The recent dispute over the Broadwheel Rd Site indicated that developers would be keen to build on that site. Indeed there was pressure to make more green field sites available.

Today, building continues in the village. 'Windfall sites' on West St and house plots are being divided and an extra new houses built and sold.

Houses sell in Helpston. The new houses on Ginton Rd directly in front of the Arbourfield Mill site were sold with published prices of £220,000 and then £240,000.

Individual houses on West St and Heath Road have sold within weeks with little sign of discounting.

Indeed, prices seem to have increased. Houses around the Crossroads have increased by hundreds of thousands of £s over the last few years and the price on one house on West St has doubled within three years.

Therefore I would suggest that new houses in Helpston would sell at a premium and the Section 106 agreement should remain.

Cllr David Over (Ward Councillor)