



Rutland County Council

Catmose Oakham Rutland LE15 6HP.
Telephone 01572 722577 Facsimile 01572 75307

Minutes of the **PLANNING AND LICENSING COMMITTEE** held in the Zoom on Tuesday, 20th October, 2020 at 7.00 pm

PRESENT: Mr I Razzell Mr P Ainsley
 Mr W Cross Mr E Baines
 Mrs S Harvey Mrs K Payne
 Mr N Begy Mr M Oxley
 Miss M Jones Mr A Brown
 Mr N Woodley

OFFICERS PRESENT Mr N Hodgett Principal Planning Officer
 Mr J Johnson Development Manager
 Mr C Mead Highways Engineer (Development Control)
 Mr P Milne Planning Officer
 Mr K Silcock Governance Officer
 Mr S Sprason Senior Environmental Services Manager
 Mr S Turnbull Planning Lawyer (Peterborough City Council)
 Mr A Waskett-Burt Planning Officer

1 APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Mr Woodley and Ms MacCartney.

2 MINUTES

The minutes of the Planning and Licensing Committees held on 22 September and 6 October 2020.

3 DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

Mr E Baines	Item 1 2019/0076/FUL 2019/0147/LBA	Mr Baines declared a non-pecuniary as his Grandson plays for Uppingham Town Cricket Club and when the pavilion was built Mr Baines made a modest contribution. Mr Baines stated this would not affect his decision.
-------------	--	---

Mr N Begy	Item 1 2019/0076/FUL 2019/0147/LBA	Mr Begy declared a pecuniary interest as his son was going through a bursary at Uppingham and would not take part in the debate or vote
Mr M Oxley	Item 3 2020/0478/FUL	Mr Oxley declared a pecuniary interest as he owned a holiday let in Uppingham and would not take part in the debate or vote.
Miss M Jones	Item 1 2019/0076/FUL 2019/0147/LBA	Miss Jones declared a personal interest as she used to work at Uppingham School and spent a lot of time at the cricket pavilion. Miss Jones stated she would not take part in the debate or vote.

4 PETITIONS, DEPUTATIONS AND QUESTIONS

In accordance with the Planning and Licensing Committee Public Speaking Scheme, the following deputations were received:

In relation to planning application item 1, item number, Mr Stephen Lucas would speak as the agent on behalf of the applicant.

In relation to planning application item 2, item number, Mr Ross Thain, would speak as the agent on behalf of the applicant.

In relation to planning application item 3, item number, Mrs Kirsty Brooks would speak as the applicant.

In relation to planning application item 4, item number, Mr John Judge would speak on behalf of residents or Morcott against the application.

---oOo---

The following questions had been received from members of the public:

ITEM	NAME	QUESTION
1.	Linda Muir	<i>My residential property is directly opposite the Cricket Pavilion on Seaton Road. If the planning application is successful, will the venue be used for parties and other events and possibly hired out to third parties and if so what measures will be put in place to ensure that noise and parking do not become a nuisance to residents?</i>

ITEM	NAME	QUESTION
3.	Steve Kind	<p>I note with interest planning condition number 12 re highways in relation to the above application which is being considered by the P&L Committee on 20th October 2020.</p> <p>I am surprised that this condition states that this is 'prior to any operational use of the development'. Is not highway safety and visibility a fundamental planning consideration which needs to be agreed PRIOR to any planning permission being granted there-by providing affected neighbours the reassurance that this has been properly assessed and signed-off by relevant technical consultants rather than being left as an afterthought? Can you also please confirm the process for approval of this point.</p> <p>In addition, I note that both other locality and similar outdoor operations both at Spindleberry Woods, Belton and at Vineyard and Canvas, Preston, both only operate as seasonal venues from April to October each year. What is the rationale for allowing for this site to operate through-out the year?</p>
4.	John Judge	<p>The response from the council to a FOI request indicate that no specific risk assessment was made when deciding to reopen the North Luffenham Site and continuing the closure of the Cottesmore site. There has also been no environmental impact or a local highways impact assessment made and there is no formally documented review process in place.</p> <p>Given this, could the council explain how they have achieved a robust, quantitate assessment this application how have they would not have a detrimental impact on the highway network or highway safety, local amenity or the surrounding area.</p>

5 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Report No. 125/2020 was received from the Interim Strategic Director for Places.

Item 1 (2019/0076/FUL & 2019/0147/LBA) Uppingham School, Uppingham Cricket Pavilion, Glaston Road, Uppingham

Alterations, upgrading, extension with balcony to the Uppingham School First XI Cricket Pavilion at the Upper Playing field.

(Ward: Uppingham; Parish: Uppingham)

Mr Nick Hodgett, Principle Planning Officer for the Council, addressed the committee and gave an executive summary of the application, recommending approval.

During the executive summary Mr Hodgett made reference to the question from Mrs Muir who was unable to attend the meeting. Mr Hodgett stated that there was provision for overspill parking on the planning application drawings and that the use of the pavilion would not be hired out for events but the use of the pavilion for other events was currently uncontrolled.

Mr Lucas, speaking as the agent on behalf of the applicant, addressed the Committee.

During questions to the applicant, the following points was noted:

- Cladding was used to give the building a more contemporary look.

During discussion the following points were noted:

- Concern was raised that new cladding on the side would detract from the existing building.
- Mr Brown noted that the building was currently unfit for purpose and the proposals complimented the existing thatched building.
- Mr Ainsley stated that due to the access to the new player's balcony was only via stairs, this may limit player's with a disability to access the area.
- Mr Baines noted that in all years of dealing with planning matters he had not seen Historic England show such a strong opposition.

Mr Baines proposed that the application be refused on heritage grounds, that the benefits of the new building would not benefit impact on the listed building.

A recorded vote was taken and the votes cast were as follows:

COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAINED
AINSLEY	X		
BAINES	X		
BROWN		X	
CROSS	X		
HARVEY	X		
OXLEY	X		
PAYNE		X	
RAZZELL		X	

RESOLVED

2019/0076/FUL & 2019/0147/LBA be **REFUSED** on heritage grounds against the recommendation set out within Report No. 125/2020.

---oOo---

Item 2 (2019/0800/FUL) Silverwood Farms, Grange Farm Barns, Main Street, Thistleton

New dwelling houses.

(Parish: Thistleton; Ward: Greetham)

Mr Justin Johnson, Development Manager for the Council, addressed the Committee and gave an executive summary of the application, recommending approval.

Mr Thain, speaking as the agent on behalf of the applicant, addressed the Committee.

During discussion the following points were noted:

- A Class Q prior approval application was granted in 2017 for the conversion of the barns on site to dwellings. This application seeks to demolish the barns and erect two new stone dwellings. It was felt by officers that this would be of a

- higher level design than the Class Q conversion and the building proposed in this application would look more of a traditional agricultural building.
- ii. It was felt that the benefits of the new application outweighed the Class Q approval.

A recorded vote was taken and the votes cast were as follows:

COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAINED
AINSLEY	X		
BAINES	X		
BEGY	X		
BROWN	X		
CROSS	X		
HARVEY	X		
JONES	X		
OXLEY	X		
PAYNE	X		
RAZZELL	X		

RESOLVED

2019/0800/FUL in accordance with the recommendation set out within Report No. 125/2020, that the application be **APPROVED**.

---oOo---

Item 3 (2020/0478/FUL) Brook Farm, Littleworth Lane, Belton-In-Rutland

Construction of 3 no. wooden moveable pods; 2 no. shepherds huts; on site facilities pod; Reception hut. Installation of 2 no limestone pathways. Creation of gated access into field one. Creation of limestone tracks. A wooden foot bridge to enable access to the back field.

(Parish: Belton; Ward: Braunston & Martinsthorpe)

Mr Paul Milne, Planning Officer for the Council, addressed the Committee and gave an executive summary of the application, recommending approval.

During the executive summary Mr Milne made reference to the question from Mr Steve Kind who was unable to attend the meeting. Mr Milne stated that the applicant applied for all year round opening hours. Need for justification to restrict hours on an application. No reason to put restriction on times of month can open.

A highways condition had been put on in relation to splays. The highways officer believed that such a condition was reasonable both to the applicant and to the highway authority, necessary in the interest of highways safety. The condition is sufficiently worded that if the applicant did not discharge the condition prior to operation of use, the matter could be enforced.

Kirsty Brooks spoke as the applicant.

During discussion the following point was noted:

- The shepherd huts could be moved for maintenance, however due to conditions within the submitted plans, if the shepherds huts were moved to a different location the development would not be built in accordance with plans and would be a breach.

A recorded vote was taken and the votes cast were as follows:

COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAINED
AINSLEY	X		
BAINES	X		
BEGY	X		
BROWN	X		
CROSS	X		
HARVEY	X		
JONES	X		
PAYNE	X		
RAZZELL	X		

RESOLVED

2020/0478/FUL in accordance with the recommendation set out within Report No. 125/2020, that the application be **APPROVED**.

---oOo---

Item 4 (2020/0961/RG3) Civic Amenity Site, North Luffenham Road, Morcott

Regulation 3 application to create a new vehicular exit route from the site.

(Parish: Morcott; Ward: Braunston & Martinthorpe)

Mr Andrew Waskett-Burt, Planning Officer for the Council, addressed the Committee and gave an executive summary of the application, recommending approval.

Mr John Judge as a member of the public, asked his question to the Committee/

Mr Steve Sprason, Senior Environmental Services Manager provided Mr Judge with the following answer:

“The most recent response for the Freedom of Information request went out on the 15th October which stated ‘The risk assessment undertaken by the Council in relation to the re-opening of the North Luffenham site is attached. There is no documented risk assessment associated with the closure of the Cottessmore site’. The risk assessment was done to show the site could re-open in a COVID-19 safe way. Because we already have in place a full planning consent to use the site for the purposes as we are now we did not need as part of the process to consider the wider highway implications. The reality of the situation is, from my point of view, if for any reason the new access is not built we would simply continue operating on the site as we are today.”

Mr Judge asked the following supplementary:

“Given that the prior to the closure of the Cottesmore site and North Luffenham taking on the services, Cottesmore was taking 50% more of the waste that was being processed within Rutland. On that basis you are stating that the site now has got 50% more traffic, 50% more heavy goods going through the villages and the narrow roads that surround the area. Do we not feel that this wouldn’t warrant a proper local highways impact assessment and proper consultation with the residents?”

Mr Sprason responded that there was a full consent in place to operate the site as we do currently, as part of the application process there has been no requirement placed to submit the impact assessments.

Mr Judge, speaking on behalf of residents of Morcott against the application, addressed the Committee.

During questions to Mr Judge from the Committee, the following point was noted:

- Mr Judge was unsure how the opening of the new access could improve the one way system that was currently in place. In Winter, further issues will arise with agricultural vehicles dragging mud on to the roads. Mr Judge stated that the roads were currently unsuitable for the increase in traffic, and would get worse.

---oOo---

The Committee proposed and seconded to extend the meeting for 15 minutes.

---oOo---

During discussion the following points were noted:

- i. Mr Turnbull noted that the application should be considered on material considerations only.
- ii. Members of the committee supported the idea of a strategic review of waste disposal within the county to take place. Mr Razzell stated he would write to the relevant portfolio holder representing the strong views of the residents, ward members and committee members for a strategic review to take place.

---oOo---

The Committee proposed and seconded to extend the meeting for a final 15 minutes.

---oOo---

Mr Cross proposed to defer the application until a routing strategy had been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This was seconded by Mrs Harvey.

A recorded vote was taken and the votes cast were as follows:

COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAINED
AINSLEY	X		
BAINES	X		
BEGY			X
BROWN			X
CROSS	X		
HARVEY	X		
JONES		X	

OXLEY		X	
PAYNE		X	
RAZZELL		X	

RESOLVED

The vote ended as a tie. The Chairman made the deciding vote and voted **AGAINST** the motion. The motion fell.

---oOo---

Mr Oxley proposed that the application be approved as per the officer recommendation. This was seconded by Mrs Payne.

A recorded vote was taken and the votes cast were as follows:

COUNCILLOR	FOR	AGAINST	ABSTAINED
AINSLEY			X
BAINES		X	
BEGY			X
BROWN	X		
CROSS		X	
HARVEY			X
JONES	X		
OXLEY	X		
PAYNE	X		
RAZZELL	X		

RESOLVED

2020/0961/RG3 in accordance with the recommendation set out within Report No. 125/2020 and the additional conditions listed in the addendum that state:

- The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, numbers; 001 (block plan), 003 (layout proposed), 004 (layout proposed with visibility splays shown), and the details within the submitted 'North Luffenham HWRC Operating Models Document 7 October 2020'.
- Prior to the new access coming into use, a routing strategy shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall then proceed in accordance with the agreed strategy.

That the application be **APPROVED**.

6 APPEALS REPORT

Report No. 126/2020 was received from the Interim Strategic Director for Places.

RESOLVED

That the Committee **NOTED** the report.

7 ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS

No items of urgent business had been previously notified to the person presiding.

---oOo---

The Chairman declared the meeting closed at 10.00 pm.

---oOo---