

56 Esmead
Monkton Park
Chippenham
Wilts.
SN15 3PS

Tel 01249 654926

Date 10 Sept. 2007

E-mail address bperrett56@tiscali.co.uk

Overview and Scrutiny Committee Meeting 13 September 2007

1) It was admitted at the meeting on August 1 that the roof heights on a number of the new homes, at the new Linden Homes site at the former Cattle Market, were built above the approved dimensions but because the exceeded dimensions were regarded as minor to the approved plans retrospective planning approval was granted. Surely irrespective how much the dimensions exceeded the passed and approved plans is irrelevant the fact remained that the developer had not constructed the buildings to the approved plans therefore not complying with these plans should therefore have resulted in dismantling the relevant errors and re-building to comply.

2) The purpose laid tarmac road providing access to the back of the site parallel to Darcy Close, and also providing access to the contractor's car park, is still a temporary provision according to the approved plans. During the construction programme many of the contractor's vehicles are not using the provided car park and therefore being parked on Cocklebury Road, Esmead and College Close causing traffic congestion and blocking of resident's entries and exits from their driveways. This has been reported to the site management of Linden Homes on a number of occasions from which occasional movement has occurred to rectify the situation. Could it be confirmed that according to the plans on completion of the site development this road will revert back to a non - vehicle access and form part of the land reserved for a future by-pass in conjunction with Darcy Close.

3) Could it also be confirmed that it is the intention of the contractor to complete the landscaping on the Cocklebury Road side with more trees to follow the line of those already planted along Cocklebury Road along with the removal of the wooden fencing erected on the housing side of the access road. The original plans also included landscaping within the purpose constructed recesses on the front of the main building currently coloured green.

4) Because of the approved high soft timber facia effect on the front building it has now become very apparent that the weathering is beginning to show and the protective finish is rapidly fading. Is it intended to re-treat this timber on a contractual regular

maintenance basis in order to prevent the timber from rotting or will it be left to the decision of the property owners.

6) With the new three storey building development on the old Hartwell site it has added further skyline dominance to the all bungalow area of Esmead, Cocklebury Road and College Close dramatically reducing visual amenities. I assume appropriate building control of the approved plans for this area is being closely monitored.

Bruce Perrett

56 Esmead

Overview and Scrutiny Committee NWDC
13 September 2007

1. Why were developers allowed to make extremely late amendments to their plans for consideration at very short notice by the planning committee? I am informed that the most extreme example was the submission of amendments to the plans in the afternoon of the day on which the planning committee was due to meet in the evening (this was the meeting at which the plans were approved). This tactic does not allow members time to scrutinise the plans and must cause problems for officers.
2. How and why was approval given to the placing of the largest buildings in the development fronting on to Cocklebury Road? This made them the closest buildings to the nearby bungalows; overlooking them, and being totally out of character with the existing area.
3. Why was no effective traffic survey on the pinch points of the top and bottom of Station Hill carried out before planning permission was granted? The survey that was carried out only considered a distance about 300 yards of Cocklebury Road in front of the site, which has never had a traffic problem. I did point out this problem in my letter of 13 June 2006, file 05/02558/OUT. The traffic problems are without a doubt going to become much more severe when this site and the Hartwells site become fully occupied.
4. How and why were drawings supplied by the developer, which did not show the heights of the blocks of flats, accepted by the planning office without challenge? It seems quite incredible that any system of control would allow this to happen especially as height had been established to be of particular concern to the planning office. It was admitted at the meeting on 1 August that the effect of this was to create ambiguity and this undermined the strength of the case of the many objectors to retrospective permission being granted.
5. It was established during the meeting that it was only the wooden 'penthouse' structures on the roofs that exceeded the height approved by the Council. However it was stated categorically by Councillor Sturgis *as a chartered surveyor*, that the construction of both buildings was such that these wooden 'penthouses' could not be reduced in height without imperilling the structural integrity of both buildings. This struck many of us in the public gallery as nonsense, particularly as residents in College Close watched the 'penthouses' arrive on site in flat pack form to be erected on to the roofs of the virtually complete buildings. This statement eloquently made by a professionally qualified person clearly misled other councillors who voted to grant retrospective approval, despite many strong objections. It is requested that this point be investigated and the truth made known.

Jim Belk.

12 September 2007