



© Crown copyright and database rights [2013]
Ordnance Survey [100018056]

Scale - 1:2500
Time of plot: 15:46
Date of plot: 01/10/2014



Rutland County Council

Catmose,
Oakham,
Rutland
LE15 6HP

Application:	2014/0581/RES	ITEM 4	
Proposal:	Reserved matters application for the construction of 187 new residential dwellings, garages and associated infrastructure (Area 10).		
Address:	Land between Barleythorpe and Burley Park Way, Barleythorpe		
Applicant:	Larkfleet Homes	Parish	BARLEYTHORPE
Agent:	N/A	Ward	Oakham North West
Reason for presenting to Committee:	Major Development – local objections		
Date of Committee:	14 October 2014		

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The reserved matters scheme is for Phase 10 of the Hawksmead development and follows the approved Masterplan and Design code in its design and layout. There have been objections to the scheme but they are not material to the approval of reserved matters on layout, design and landscaping.

RECOMMENDATION

APPROVAL, subject to the following condition:

The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, numbers..... .

Reason - For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

Site & Surroundings

1. This site comprises the western half of the former RAS Showground at the southern end of the overall Hawksmead site. It comprises open grassland and was until recently used for rugby and junior football. There is a row of redundant buildings used for changing etc by the Rugby Club. It is bounded by Phase 1 to the north, Phase 9 (yet to be submitted) to the east and hedgerows and Main Road Barleythorpe to the south and west.

Proposal

2. This is a submission seeking approval of Reserved Matters following the original outline permission. Those matters only relate to layout, scale and appearance of the buildings to be erected and the landscaping. Any other issues are dealt with by discharge of outline conditions for this phase and are not included in this submission.
3. The scheme provides 187 dwellings and apartments in various forms from 1½ storey to 3 storey. Although not a reserved matter, the application states that 16 affordable housing units would be provided on this site.
4. Density is around 43 dwellings per hectare and parking is provided both on plot and in garage courts and under flats. There are 386 spaces shown, together with 35

designated visitor spaces also shown. All conventional dwellings have their own off street parking, 32 of which have 3 spaces on plot. This equates to 2.25 spaces per unit on this phase.

Relevant Planning History

Application	Description	Decision
2009/1309	Outline application for the overall site.	Approved July 2011

Planning Guidance and Policy

National Planning Policy Framework

Para's 56 – 66 – Requiring Good Design

Members will be aware that the Site Allocations and Policies DPD: Submission document with modifications recommended by Inspector (August 2014) is recommended for formal adoption at Full Council on 13 October 2014.

If adopted, its policies will immediately replace the Saved Policies of the Rutland Local Plan (2001) and will form part of the Development Plan, thereby carrying full weight for the purposes of decision making. Members are aware that decisions must be made in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The DPD Policies identified in this report have also been renumbered as a result of the Modifications recommended by the Inspector. They are set out below within a schedule of policies that assumes the DPD has been adopted, and within another schedule that would apply if it is not adopted.

Members will be updated further via the addendum report.

Option 1: DPD is adopted

Development Plan

The Rutland Core Strategy

CS19 – Good Design

Site Allocations and Policies DPD (2014)

Policy SP15 – 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.

Option 2: DPD is not adopted

Development Plan

The Rutland Core Strategy (2011)

CS19 – Promoting Good Design

Rutland Local Plan (2001)

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 Material Considerations

Site Allocations and Policies DPD: Submission document with modifications recommended by Inspector (August 2014)

SP15 – Design & Amenity

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

See **APPENDIX 2**

Neighbour Representations

Agents on behalf of Meccalte, Lands End Way

5. Although our clients site does not adjoin the application site, , they still wish to comment in relation to layout plan 300-SK-03 submitted with the application. This shows an indicative layout for Phase 9 and Mecc Alte are concerned that it shows dwellings close to their factory. On Phase 1, allotments were used to mitigate the proximity of the houses and similar treatment should be used in the case of Phase 9.

Resident of Stud Road

6. Were not consulted direct. Concerned that others were not notified and that due to holiday period they have not had a chance to comment. The proposal is for a very high density development of which there are 2 parts Area 10 West & Area 9 East - to follow. We moved to Rutland from Birmingham and have some very poor experiences of the social impact of such developments in our professional lives. The planned height of many of these buildings at 3 storeys creates a canyon effect as the roads are narrow and insufficient parking has been allowed. Oakham Plan states that there should be 1.5 to 2 parking spaces per 4+ roomed dwelling. The density of the housing and very small sized rooms on the plan is not conducive to family living especially when it is terraced into blocks. There appear to be no planned variation in

styles or building materials. In the original Rutland Plan for Oakham North Compliance condition 4 states taller properties of 2.2 and 3 storeys at Key Vistas and pause points. These indicate that 2.2 and 3 storey would be a feature and an exception not a norm. There are no small bungalows planned within the development. There are insufficient green spaces planned within the development. Hedges and trees should be retained. Can the original large white gates that marked the original Rutland Showground entrance stay? This would enhance the entrance to the development. Larkfleets proposal for housing on the employment site could relieve the pressure from them to have such a high density development on area 9 & 10. There is also growing pressure on the education and medical facilities within Oakham with so much development. Can it be a stipulation that the site traffic is prohibited from using Stud Road, Racecourse Road and Blacksmiths Avenue on Leighfield Park. Could a compound be sited away from Leighfield Park Area where we have put up with incessant noise, mud and dust for the past year+ and into the foreseeable future while this part is completed. The original plan for Oakham North was 1000+ houses, do we actually need them? Many of the houses on Leighfield Park have been bought as Buy to Let (not terribly successfully!) and others are already trying to sell but finding it impossible as the development is crowded and insufficient parking spaces are leading to problems with parking on pavements.

Resident of Blacksmiths Avenue

7. As residents living adjacent to the tree belt to the north of the proposed development we wish to raise some points for consideration. In the 10 months we have lived here on the Larkfleet development we have noted tawny owls, buzzards, green woodpeckers, bats and a wide variety of other birds, butterflies and dragonflies. The former playing fields designated for building at present provide an important wildlife resource, eg ants for woodpeckers, and mice, voles and shrews for owls. The compliance document (C32-34) describes this area as having 'no significant ecology' but, given our direct observations, this cannot be true! The proposed development could be considerably enhanced for both wildlife and humans by giving more attention to wildlife corridors. The proposed apartment blocks would create large sterile areas of tarmac car-parking and no garden spaces, whereas providing small individual homes would add gardens and gravel driveways, as on previous phases of the development. Impermeable car parks increase surface run-off and decrease infiltration, robbing adjacent trees, hedgerows and plants of water.. Other responses, including those from Langham Parish Council, also query the acceptability of three-storey apartment blocks for a variety of reasons and we hope you will consider these carefully, possibly visiting the apartment block on Stud Road to assess its environmental impact compared with other alternative designs nearby. We chose to retire to Oakham because of its predominantly rural character. We chose to live on Leighfield Park because it promised a mixed community with imaginative and varied designs of property. We feel that some minor alterations to the new proposals could enhance the future environmental quality for everyone living here - and for the wildlife too!

Planning Assessment

8. Members are reminded that the only issues that can be considered in a Reserved Matters submission are layout, scale and appearance of the buildings to be erected and the landscaping. Other issues raised cannot be considered in this application.
9. The main issues are those matters set out above as reserved matters.

Layout

10. The overall layout of streets follows very closely that shown on the MasterPlan and the Design Code. The dwellings themselves are at a relatively high density but are all considered to meet normal standards.
11. A revised layout showing tracking for highway purposes has been received and further comments are awaited.

Scale and appearance of the buildings to be erected

12. The scale and design of the proposed units follows that approved on Phase 1 to the north. Additional 3 storey units are located along the main spine road, in accordance with the scale heights plan approved at outline stage which indicated up to 3 storey along the spine road.
13. The design of the properties follows those on other phases, with additional 3 storey units being located along the Spine Road and along the central south-west to north-east road in the centre of the Phase.
14. 2 storey dwellings would face onto the open space (outside this application site) which runs along the Barleythorpe edge so 3 storey would not be prominent and would generally be set back into the development. This is in accordance with the approved Building Height Parameter plan approved at outline stage. It would also compliment existing 3 storey dwellings on Main Road nearer to the railway station.
15. The dwellings facing Main Road would be 60-90 metres back from the Main Road boundary hedge. The open space in between will eventually be equipped with some play equipment and surfacing (currently subject to separate discussion with Hawksmead) as well as providing general open space.

Landscaping

16. Final details of the landscaping are still awaited and will be included in the Addendum. There is unlikely to be any major issue with landscaping.

APPENDIX 1

House Type Schedule - Phase 1

1	2015-2016	1
2	2017-2018	2
3	2019-2020	3
4	2021-2022	4
5	2023-2024	5
6	2025-2026	6
7	2027-2028	7
8	2029-2030	8
9	2031-2032	9
10	2033-2034	10
11	2035-2036	11
12	2037-2038	12
13	2039-2040	13
14	2041-2042	14
15	2043-2044	15
16	2045-2046	16
17	2047-2048	17
18	2049-2050	18
19	2051-2052	19
20	2053-2054	20
21	2055-2056	21
22	2057-2058	22
23	2059-2060	23
24	2061-2062	24
25	2063-2064	25
26	2065-2066	26
27	2067-2068	27
28	2069-2070	28
29	2071-2072	29
30	2073-2074	30
31	2075-2076	31
32	2077-2078	32
33	2079-2080	33
34	2081-2082	34
35	2083-2084	35
36	2085-2086	36
37	2087-2088	37
38	2089-2090	38
39	2091-2092	39
40	2093-2094	40
41	2095-2096	41
42	2097-2098	42
43	2099-2100	43
44	2101-2102	44
45	2103-2104	45
46	2105-2106	46
47	2107-2108	47
48	2109-2110	48
49	2111-2112	49
50	2113-2114	50
51	2115-2116	51
52	2117-2118	52
53	2119-2120	53
54	2121-2122	54
55	2123-2124	55
56	2125-2126	56
57	2127-2128	57
58	2129-2130	58
59	2131-2132	59
60	2133-2134	60
61	2135-2136	61
62	2137-2138	62
63	2139-2140	63
64	2141-2142	64
65	2143-2144	65
66	2145-2146	66
67	2147-2148	67
68	2149-2150	68
69	2151-2152	69
70	2153-2154	70
71	2155-2156	71
72	2157-2158	72
73	2159-2160	73
74	2161-2162	74
75	2163-2164	75
76	2165-2166	76
77	2167-2168	77
78	2169-2170	78
79	2171-2172	79
80	2173-2174	80
81	2175-2176	81
82	2177-2178	82
83	2179-2180	83
84	2181-2182	84
85	2183-2184	85
86	2185-2186	86
87	2187-2188	87
88	2189-2190	88
89	2191-2192	89
90	2193-2194	90
91	2195-2196	91
92	2197-2198	92
93	2199-2200	93
94	2201-2202	94
95	2203-2204	95
96	2205-2206	96
97	2207-2208	97
98	2209-2210	98
99	2211-2212	99
100	2213-2214	100
101	2215-2216	101
102	2217-2218	102
103	2219-2220	103
104	2221-2222	104
105	2223-2224	105
106	2225-2226	106
107	2227-2228	107
108	2229-2230	108
109	2231-2232	109
110	2233-2234	110
111	2235-2236	111
112	2237-2238	112
113	2239-2240	113
114	2241-2242	114
115	2243-2244	115
116	2245-2246	116
117	2247-2248	117
118	2249-2250	118
119	2251-2252	119
120	2253-2254	120
121	2255-2256	121
122	2257-2258	122
123	2259-2260	123
124	2261-2262	124
125	2263-2264	125
126	2265-2266	126
127	2267-2268	127
128	2269-2270	128
129	2271-2272	129
130	2273-2274	130
131	2275-2276	131
132	2277-2278	132
133	2279-2280	133
134	2281-2282	134
135	2283-2284	135
136	2285-2286	136
137	2287-2288	137
138	2289-2290	138
139	2291-2292	139
140	2293-2294	140
141	2295-2296	141
142	2297-2298	142
143	2299-2300	143
144	2301-2302	144
145	2303-2304	145
146	2305-2306	146
147	2307-2308	147
148	2309-2310	148
149	2311-2312	149
150	2313-2314	150
151	2315-2316	151
152	2317-2318	152
153	2319-2320	153
154	2321-2322	154
155	2323-2324	155
156	2325-2326	156
157	2327-2328	157
158	2329-2330	158
159	2331-2332	159
160	2333-2334	160
161	2335-2336	161
162	2337-2338	162
163	2339-2340	163
164	2341-2342	164
165	2343-2344	165
166	2345-2346	166
167	2347-2348	167
168	2349-2350	168
169	2351-2352	169
170	2353-2354	170
171	2355-2356	171
172	2357-2358	172
173	2359-2360	173
174	2361-2362	174
175	2363-2364	175
176	2365-2366	176
177	2367-2368	177
178	2369-2370	178
179	2371-2372	179
180	2373-2374	180
181	2375-2376	181
182	2377-2378	182
183	2379-2380	183
184	2381-2382	184
185	2383-2384	185
186	2385-2386	186
187	2387-2388	187
188	2389-2390	188
189	2391-2392	189
190	2393-2394	190
191	2395-2396	191
192	2397-2398	192
193	2399-2400	193
194	2401-2402	194
195	2403-2404	195
196	2405-2406	196
197	2407-2408	197
198	2409-2410	198
199	2411-2412	199
200	2413-2414	200
201	2415-2416	201
202	2417-2418	202
203	2419-2420	203
204	2421-2422	204
205	2423-2424	205
206	2425-2426	206
207	2427-2428	207
208	2429-2430	208
209	2431-2432	209
210	2433-2434	210
211	2435-2436	211
212	2437-2438	212
213	2439-2440	213
214	2441-2442	214
215	2443-2444	215
216	2445-2446	216
217	2447-2448	217
218	2449-2450	218
219	2451-2452	219
220	2453-2454	220
221	2455-2456	221
222	2457-2458	222
223	2459-2460	223
224	2461-2462	224
225	2463-2464	225
226	2465-2466	226
227	2467-2468	227
228	2469-2470	228
229	2471-2472	229
230	2473-2474	230
231	2475-2476	231
232	2477-2478	232
233	2479-2480	233
234	2481-2482	234
235	2483-2484	235
236	2485-2486	236
237	2487-2488	237
238	2489-2490	238
239	2491-2492	239
240	2493-2494	240
241	2495-2496	241
242	2497-2498	242
243	2499-2500	243
244	2501-2502	244
245	2503-2504	245
246	2505-2506	246
247	2507-2508	247
248	2509-2510	248
249	2511-2512	249
250	2513-2514	250
251	2515-2516	251
252	2517-2518	252
253	2519-2520	253
254	2521-2522	254
255	2523-2524	255
256	2525-2526	256
257	2527-2528	257
258	2529-2530	258
259	2531-2532	259
260	2533-2534	260
261	2535-2536	261
262	2537-2538	262
263	2539-2540	263
264	2541-2542	264
265	2543-2544	265
266	2545-2546	266
267	2547-2548	267
268	2549-2550	268
269	2551-2552	269
270	2553-2554	270
271	2555-2556	271
272	2557-2558	272
273	2559-2560	273
274	2561-2562	274
275	2563-2564	275
276	2565-2566	276
277	2567-2568	277
278	2569-2570	278
279	2571-2572	279
280	2573-2574	280
281	2575-2576	281
282	2577-2578	282
283	2579-2580	283
284	2581-2582	284
285	2583-2584	285
286	2585-2586	286
287	2587-2588	287
288	2589-2590	288
289	2591-2592	289
290	2593-2594	290
291	2595-2596	291
292	2597-2598	292
293	2599-2600	293
294	2601-2602	294
295	2603-2604	295
296	2605-2606	296
297	2607-2608	297
298	2609-2610	298
299	2611-2612	299
300	2613-2614	300
301	2615-2616	301
302	2617-2618	302
303	2619-2620	303
304	2621-2622	304
305	2623-2624	305
306	2625-2626	306
307	2627-2628	307
308	2629-2630	308
309	2631-2632	309
310	2633-2634	310
311	2635-2636	311
312	2637-2638	312
313	2639-2640	313
314	2641-2642	314
315	2643-2644	315
316	2645-2646	316
317	2647-2648	317
318	2649-2650	318
319	2651-2652	319
320	2653-2654	320
321	2655-2656	321
322	2657-2658	322
323	2659-2660	323
324	2661-2662	324
325	2663-2664	325
326	2665-2666	326
327	2667-2668	327
328	2669-2670	328
329	2671-2672	329
330	2673-2674	330
331	2675-2676	331
332	2677-2678	332
333	2679-2680	333
334	2681-2682	334
335	2683-2684	335
336	2685-2686	336
337	2687-2688	337
338	2689-2690	338
339	2691-2692	339
340	2693-2694	340
341	2695-2696	341
342	2697-2698	342
343	2699-2700	343
344	2701-2702	344
345	2703-2704	345
346	2705-2706	346
347	2707-2708	347
348	2709-2710	348
349	2711-2712	349
350	2713-2714	350
351	2715-2716	351
352	2717-2718	352
353	2719-2720	353
354	2721-2722	354
355	2723-2724	355
356	2725-2726	356
357	2727-2728	357
358	2729	

Consultation Responses

1. Environment Agency
We have no objection to the reserved matters application as submitted. The applicant is reminded that they will need to comply with the requirements of the drainage strategy for the proposed development as agreed in application APP/2011/0832.
2. Natural England
No objections.
3. Network Rail - York
No observations to make.
4. Planning Ecology
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. We have concerns about the cumulative impact of development in this area on the local badger population. Our records indicate that a main badger sett has previously been recorded to the east of Oakham Office Park (along the watercourse corridor). If this badger sett is still occupied, the development to the south may cause both the loss of badger foraging grounds and the badgers into the developed area. Has this been considered? An updated survey of this area would be useful in order to assess the impact of the current development on the badger population. Without a more detailed mitigation plan for the whole of the Barleythorpe area there is a real risk that the badgers will become isolated and trapped. The significant loss of foraging grounds for the badger are likely to encourage badgers into private gardens to forage. This often causes conflict between badgers and homeowners and should be avoided.
5. Archaeology
Following appraisal of the above development scheme, we recommend that you advise the applicant of the following archaeological requirements. The Leicestershire and Rutland Historic Environment Record (HER) notes the presence of significant heritage assets within the affected development area, including cropmark, and geophysical evidence for a pair of probable Early Bronze Age round barrows (HER ref.: MLE5020 & 5021), these form part of a small barrow cemetery including the excavated remains of a barrow recorded prior to the development of Phase 1 (MLE16640). The archaeological investigation of the latter demonstrated good quality preservation of buried remains, including in situ human burials, flint and pottery as well as less well preserved environmental evidence. It can be assumed, subject to the effects of differing land use, that the expected barrows within the development area offer a similar level of archaeological information, overall the complex of features can be assessed as of at least regional importance. Additional archaeological remains of other dates and differing types are also recorded within and in the immediate vicinity of the development area, adding to the potential of the site, however the extent, quality and character of these remains is yet to be established. In each of

the above two cases the developer must make provision for the further investigation by trial trenching of the archaeological deposits, this should be submitted in support of their development proposals. The preservation of archaeological remains is, of course, a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. The proposals include operations that will impact upon the expected archaeological remains present, however, the archaeological implications of this cannot be adequately assessed on the basis of the currently available information. Since it is possible that archaeological remains will be adversely affected by this proposal, we recommend that the planning authority defer determination of the application and request that the applicant complete an Archaeological Impact Assessment of the proposals. This will require provision by the applicant for: A field evaluation, by appropriate techniques including trial trenching, if identified necessary in the assessment, to identify and locate any archaeological remains of significance, and propose suitable treatment to avoid or minimise damage by the development. Further design, civil engineering or archaeological work may then be necessary to achieve this. This information should be submitted to the planning authority before any decision on the planning application is taken, so that an informed decision can be made, and the application refused or modified in the light of the results as appropriate. Without the information that such an Assessment would provide, it would be difficult in our view for the planning authority to assess the archaeological impact of the proposals. Should the applicant be unwilling to supply this information as part of the application, it may be appropriate to consider directing the applicant to supply the information under Regulation 4 of the Town and Country Planning (Applications) Regulations 1988, or to refuse the application. These recommendations conform to the advice provided in DCLG National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Section 12, paras. 128, 129 & 135). Should you be minded to refuse this application on other grounds, the lack of archaeological information should be an additional reason for refusal, to ensure the archaeological potential is given future consideration. The Historic & Natural Environment Team (HNET), Leicestershire County Council, as advisors to the planning authority, will provide a formal Brief for the work and approve a Specification for the Assessment at the request of the applicant. This will ensure that the necessary programme of archaeological work is undertaken to the satisfaction of the planning authority, in a cost-effective manner and with minimum disturbance to the archaeological resource. The Specification should comply with this Department Guidelines and Procedures for Archaeological Work in Leicestershire and Rutland and relevant Institute of Field Archaeologists Standards Code of Practice and should include a suitable indication of arrangements for the implementation of the archaeological work, and the proposed timetable. Information on suitable archaeological organisations to carry out this work can be obtained from HNET. Should you have any further queries please do not hesitate to contact us.

6. Langham Parish Council Access. The accessibility to, and within the site for vehicles, cycles and pedestrians is generally acceptable. Recommend approval. Appearance. The location of this segment of the Oakham North development is situated on the Oakham town side, originally the Rutland Showground. The 3 storey

apartment blocks, though not typical of the wider rural area, are located close to the new build surrounding Oakham train station. This is fronted by 3 storey housing. The 3 storey construction will not integrate with the rural parish of Barleythorpe, and apartment blocks of reduced size and height may be more acceptable. There is some variation of house design, but no indication of materials to be used. Chimneys are included in some house designs, but there are no working fireplaces shown on the plans. Bin stores and bin collection points are as stated on the plans, but these may not be sufficient. However, a balance must be struck in a limited local area. Parking facilities are insufficient, and parking will increase, as acknowledged in the application Planning Compliance Statement June 2014. Further consideration needs to be given to House Design 3310, a 3 storey family house with 4 bedrooms. There is little room for family scale eating in the house, only available in the kitchen/utility room. There is no further dining space available on the kitchen level unless the garage is converted. It would appear to be better if the full dining-kitchen area and the living room were adjacent on the first floor. The 4th bedroom, en-suite and WC could then occupy the ground floor. At present, it is a very poor and unrealistic design for family use. All other houses presented in the plans appear to respond to family living and needs. Recommend approval for the houses, subject to addressing the design as indicated. Recommend refusal for the 3 storey apartment blocks. Landscaping. There is some tree planting and an area of structural planting which is commendable. The area between the Main Road (old A606) and the proposed houses is not to be developed. There is to be some planting of trees in this area, but additional tree planting along the border with the Main Road would enhance this approach to Oakham, provide a habitat for wildlife and help make the development more acceptable. Apart from the latter it would be difficult to provide additional landscaping in this cramped development. Green and sport related spaces edge the development which is commendable. Recommend approval. Layout. Within the confines of such a high density development, much of the layout is acceptable. However, although the number of off road parking spaces may comply with guidelines, parking provision is inadequate. In reality, many residences will have at least two car owners as two adult occupants will need to work, usually outside the area, in order to service a mortgage. Garages are often used for storage, as modern homes are small and lack storage space. Apartments are only allocated one parking space each and there is no provision for visitor parking. It appears that some on road parking is planned, but, this too, will not be adequate for the number of proposed dwellings. There is likely to be a considerable amount on overflow parking on the roads and this will cause problems, particularly for emergency services, for those seeking access to dwellings. The Flood Risk assessment appears to be thorough and acceptable. However, as much of this land will be concreted over, consideration should be given to providing gravel or other suitable permeable materials for drives and parking areas. This would be preferable to tarmac, block paving or similar materials which do not allow water to penetrate below the surface. Many specialists now encourage the use of permeable materials in order to reduce the risk of flooding. Recommend refusal. Scale: The long, three storey blocks of apartment to be situated along the Avenue are completely out of scale for this area. Although there

is a slight staggering in two areas and a change of direction in one, these apartments will have a continuous frontage (i.e. width) of approximately 78 metres. This large block will have significant visual impact and an overbearing effect on both adjacent dwellings and on the wider area of development. Such blocks are not typical of the area and will have a detrimental effect on Barleythorpe Parish, the Hawksmead development and on the setting of the ancient market town of Oakham. Considerably smaller apartment blocks with a maximum height of two storeys may be acceptable. Is there such a high demand for so many apartments in this area or is this just a means of the developer reaching the target number of dwellings? Taking in to account the limited amount of land available for such a large development and mindful of existing outline planning consent, the scale of the other dwellings is acceptable. Recommend refusal for three storey apartment blocks. Recommend approval for dwellings other than above.

7. Sport England

The site includes the playing fields last used by Oakham Rugby Club, who also sublet part of the playing field to Royce Rovers Football Club. Condition 5 of the outline consent was intended secure the replacement rugby and football playing fields and ancillary facilities. Sport England supported the discharge of condition 5 subject to the both the new rugby and football pitches being fit for purpose and available for use. Sport England does not have an issue with the approval of the reserved matters if the replacement playing field area will, as agreed, be available for use before the start of the 2014/15 season. We would be grateful if you would advise us of the outcome of the application by sending a copy of the decision notice.
8. Oakham Town Council

We note that the application does not comply with the Core Strategy Plan (CS5) on many points. Therefore unable to approve the application, in particular the 3 storey block is out of character for the rural scene
9. Highways.

Bus stops agreed in the masterplan have been omitted..Lack of sufficient parking for residents and substandard internally dimensioned FOG garages will result in on-street parking causing obstruction and congestion.Tracking for large vehicles has been omitted. Details on visibility splays at junctions and bends has been omitted. Parking courts serving 10 or more spaces should be accessed via a kerbed radii junction, not a dropped crossing of the footway / verge. A planning meeting with the Highway Authority is still required and has not been fulfilled.