



Scale - 1:2500 Time of plot: 15:34 Date of plot: 01/10/2014



Rutland County Council

Catmose, Oakham, Rutland LE15 6HP

24

Application:	2014/0386/RES		ITEM 2	
Proposal:	Reserved matters application for the erection of apartment block comprising 12 x 1 bedroom and 18 x 2 bedroom apartments, associated parking and infrastructure following planning application APP/2011/0832.			
Address:	Land To The South Of, Burley Park Way, Barleythorpe, Rutland			
Applicant:	Larkfleet Homes	Parish	Barleythorpe	
Agent:	Larkfleet Homes	Ward	Oakham North West	
Reason for presenting to Committee:		Local	Local objections	
Date of Committee:		19 Aug	19 August 2014	

Background

- 1. This application was deferred at the meeting in August to consider:
 - i) Late detailed plan submission
 - ii) Officers to meet applicant to discuss design and how the scheme meets the spirit of the Design Code including highways/parking throughout estate
 - iii) Bin/cycle store location/size
 - iv) Overall Affordable housing provision
 - v) Re-use of trees elsewhere on site
- 2. Officers met with the applicant and went through the design issues. As stated previously, the outline permission dictates the overall situation and the consideration of this application can only be against the parameters set out in the outline. On that basis the parking provision is in line with the Design Code and will not detract from the overall provision of 1.5 spaces per unit across the site. In reality this figure will be comfortably exceeded. The applicant is not willing to reduce the number of units. Even with this scheme the overall provision of units on site is forecast to be around 80 below the outline number.
- 3. The principle of 3 storeys along the spine road is also set out in the building height Parameter plans in the outline permission so is established.
- 4. The scheme has been amended to show 2 extra parking spaces (now 34 for 30 units), and details of the bin stores and cycle parking are included. The revised plan is now at **Appendix 1**. A street scene plan is at **Appendix 2**. The applicant has confirmed that the saplings on site will be used on this site and elsewhere within the overall Hawksmead development where it is possible to transplant them. It must be made clear that not all will be suitable for transplant.
- 5. The report below has been modified to take account of the revised plans and the Addendum from the previous meeting.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The scheme has objections related to scale and parking requirements. The scale is similar to elsewhere on the Hawksmead site and is acceptable. Parking provides 1 space per unit with 4 spare. This is in accordance with the Design Code that calls for an average of 1.5 spaces per unit across the overall development.

RECOMMENDATION

APPROVAL, subject to the following conditions:

The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete
accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, numbers PL-01B, PL-02A,
SS01-A, all received on 1 October 2014, plan numbers MH/L74/DS/01A, 02A, 03A, 04B,
05B, and the Materials schedule received on xx.
REASON: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

Site & Surroundings

- 1. The site is located in the centre of the wider Hawksmead development site, immediately to the north of land identified as a Local Centre.
- 2. Opposite the site to the north are a row of affordable properties on the Bellway site which is being developed by Larkfleet.
- 3. To the east is the boundary of the employment land which has the benefit of outline permission but has not yet been developed. The site is bounded to the west by the new spine road through the development beyond which is partly open space and partly the Continuing Care/Retirement site.
- 4. The site comprises mainly self set saplings and was identified as a site for the Community Hall in the Master Plan. That development will not now go ahead on this site and an alternative financial contribution has been agreed by Cabinet and Council.

Proposal

- 5. The proposal is for a 3 storey apartment block comprising 30 apartments, 12 x 1 bed and 18 x 2 bed units. There are no affordable units in this scheme, the applicant has chosen to incorporate the provision in the adjacent 'Local Centre' where there is a pending application for a further 30 units above retail.
- 6. The building would be sited on the frontage of the site with parking behind for 34 vehicles.
- 7. The design in similar to the apartment block under construction on Phase 1. Materials would be red brick on buff brick plinth, render, reconstituted stone, horizontal boarding and a slate replica rather than flat concrete tiles as originally specified.

Relevant Planning History

Application Description

2009/1306 Outline permission for

Hawksmead Development

Decision

Approved July 2011

Planning Guidance and Policy National Planning Policy Framework

Para's 56 – 66 – Requiring Good Design

The Rutland Core Strategy

CS19 - Good Design

Rutland Local Plan

HT4 – Permission will not be granted for development which would be likely to result in an increase in ...parking on roads unsuited for such use, if it would cause a road safety hazard or be detrimental to amenity.

HT5 – Adequate and Safe Access

Other considerations

Site Allocations and Polices DPD – (Submission Draft, April 2013)

Policy SP14 – Design & Amenity – Adequate vehicle parking must be provided to serve the needs of the development, with provision for vehicles and cycle parking. Provision should meet the standards in Appendix 2. In exceptional circumstances in town centres the standards maybe varied to reflect the accessibility of the site by non car methods.

Appendix 2 – Parking Standards

There are no specified standards for 1 bed units. For 2 bed units the standard specifies 1 allocated space and 1 share/communal space per unit.

Consultations

Consultation Responses

8. Planning Ecology LCC

Our records indicate that badgers have previously been recorded close to the application site. We would therefore recommend that an updated badger survey (completed within the last two years i.e. since May 2012) is completed and submitted in support of the application. As badgers are mobile and regularly move their setts, there is a chance that badgers have moved into the current application site, particularly with the disturbance in the wider area. It is therefore important that any badgers on site are identified and mitigated for as appropriate.

9. Environment Agency

No objection.

10. RCC Highways

Parking is insufficient and will cause obstruction and congestion on the surrounding highway. Cycle or two wheeled vehicular parking has not been supplied

11. Housing Strategy

There is no reference in the application to the provision of affordable housing. I am seeking further information from the applicant but in the meantime requested that an objection be raised to the application on this basis.

12. Langham Parish Council

Access: Access to the site is acceptable. Appearance: Some effort has been made to include different building materials in the construction of these apartments, but it is difficult to agree that the design is of a high order as claimed in the application. Large apartment blocks are not typical of this rural area and proposed large L shaped block will be particularly intrusive and more suited to an urban area. A more imaginative design, able to blend in more easily with this development, would be acceptable to both new and existing residents and to prospective purchasers. We acknowledge that single bedroom and small two bedroom apartments are now a priority housing need, but do not agree that this should absolve the need for good spatial and visual environment for these smaller units. Layout. The proposed large block of apartments, of considerable height and close to the road, will have considerable visual impact and an overbearing effect on the adjacent roads and dwellings situated directly opposite. The proximity to the low cost two storey homes, will create an unacceptable local environment for these homes with their outlook upon a large building with windows above and overlooking them. Some additional tree planting may lessen the impact to some extent but it is difficult to see how the building, as planned, can blend in easily with the rest of the development. It would be better to exchange the position of the L shaped block with that of the proposed carparking so that the tree and shrub planted block is positioned in front of the L shaped block, thus alleviating the proximity of the block and the low cost housing, and also the awkward dominance of the block to the corner of the road. The proposed car parking provision of one space per dwelling is totally inadequate. There is no provision for visitor parking or for those apartments where there are two car owners, particularly as 18 of the apartments are two bedroomed. This is unrealistic and will surely lead to parking on roads and perhaps pavements. The space allocated for bin storage is also totally inadequate. If the same system is used as for the rest of the county and assuming no green bins are provided, this still equates to a total of 60 bins, which requires more space than is shown on the plans. Landscaping. The proposed landscaping is generally good, but some additional tree planting within the parking area would be welcome in order to lessen the impact of so many parked cars on the area. Scale The proposed large, L shaped block of apartments is completely out of scale for this development. It may possibly be acceptable within a large city, but even urban areas are choosing to develop several smaller units rather than large 1960s type blocks. Flood Risk. The flood risk assessment for the proposed area has been thorough and makes good sense in present times. Although the point is made that it is a very low risk location, there are three points noted where flooding may be triggered. Details may need to be more secure if it is finally to be effective. A commercial company and the Environment Agency are named as overseers Formal responsibility for actual regular works need to be more locally based, considering the thousand homes in the vicinity of the Barleythorpe Brook, in the event of blockage at the bridge or culvert. Oakham Town Council may wish to see that the named responsible bodies have undertaken their works. Access - Recommend Approval.

- 1. Appearance Recommend Refusal
- 2. Layout Recommend Refusal
- 3. Landscaping Recommend Approval.
- 4. Scale Recommend Refusal

13. Oakham Town Council

Recommend Refusal, on the grounds of inadequate parking.

14. Archaeology

I've checked the scheme against the previous archaeological investigation and the site has a low potential. Consequently, no further archaeological involvement is required

Neighbour Representations

15. None

Planning Assessment

16. The main issues for this Reserved Matters submission are those set out in the outline condition. These are layout, scale, appearance and landscaping.

Layout, Scale and Appearance

- 17. There are no particular planning policy issues to raise on this application provided that it meets the requirements of Core Strategy Policy CS5 in terms of scale and design, phasing, affordable housing, density and other matters. The proposed density is 116 dwellings per hectare (dph), which is well above the 40 dph required in the policy. However, there was always going to be a range of densities across the development, the Design Code stating up to 55 dph. It is necessary to incorporate some of these apartment schemes into the overall development to give a mix of house types, to add to the affordable housing provision for 1 and 2 bed units and to enable the overall numbers to be maintained.
- 18. One such block has already been appoved and there will be several more on Phases 9 and 10 on the former showground and rugby pitches at the southern end of the development. All of these are along the main central spine road through the development. The 3 storey height is also in accordance with the approved Design Code storey height plan.
- 19. The design is similar to that approved elsewhere on the site. The applicant has been requested to consider a better quality roof material and has confirmed that this will be done and an alternative has been specified.

Landscaping

20. A revised landscaping scheme has been submitted and is considered satisfactory for this site.

Parking Provision

- 21. The applicant points out that the Design Code requires an average of 1.5 spaces per dwelling across the overall development with additional on street parking where appropriate. A revised plan is awaited showing cycle parking and a better location/detail for the bin stores.
- 22. Whilst there is an 'under provision' on this site, the scheme would meet the overall average parking figure set out in the Design Code. The only way to achieve a higher parking ratio would be a dramatic reduction in the number of units on the site which is not desirable. To date the average provision over the Larkfleet, Bellway and Charles Church phases is approximately 2.69 spaces per unit.
- 23. In addition, a lower figure on this site would ensure that more parking is provided for the 3 or 4 bed family dwellings elsewhere on site.

24. The approved apartment block on Phase 1 was for 24 units with 24 spaces plus bin stores, so this scheme is not materially different.

Other Issues

Ecology

25. The badger issue has been raised with the applicant; however, ecology is not a Reserved Matter issue so the developer will need to make a Statement of Conformity as required by other outline conditions. It need not hold up a decision on this submission.

Affordable Housing

26. It is not possible to insist on affordable housing provision in the scheme as it is not a specified Reserved Matter and the S106 agreement requires an overall percentage to be provided across the development and the developer is able to choose where they go to some extent. Affordable units have been swapped around the development so some could still be provided in this block in the future. The Housing Strategy Officer confirms that social housing providers do not like separate units in apartment blocks and they are not easy to manage unless they have separate entrances and staircases.



