



# **Rutland County Council**

Catmose Oakham Rutland LE15 6HP.

Telephone 01572 722577 Facsimile 01572 75307 DX28340 Oakham

Minutes of the **MEETING of the DEVELOPMENT CONTROL AND LICENSING COMMITTEE** held in the Council Chamber, Catmose, Oakham, Rutland, LE15 6HP on Tuesday, 29th September, 2015 at 6.00 pm

<b>PRESENT:</b>	Mr E Baines (Chairman)	Mr J Lammie
	Mr J Dale	Mr A Mann
	Mr T Mathias	Mr M Oxley
	Mr C Parsons	Mr D Wilby
<b>APOLOGIES:</b>	Mr T King	Mr A Stewart
<b>ABSENT:</b>	Mr G Conde	Mr W Cross
<b>OFFICERS PRESENT:</b>	Mr G Pullan	Development Control Manager
	Mr D Trubshaw	Conservation Officer
	Mrs H Vincent	Planning/Highways Lawyer, Peterborough City Council
	Miss M Gamston	Corporate Support Officer

**IN** Mr R Gale  
**ATTENDANCE:**

## **MINUTES**

The Chairman advised the Committee that Councillor Stewart felt that the minutes of the last meeting did not reflect the strength of opposition to the application to develop Harrier Close in Cottesmore; that as the Members' vote was unanimous against this should be reflected in the minutes as a true record.

## **RESOLVED**

With the addition of the above sentence that the minutes of the Development and Control Licensing Committee held on 1 September 2015 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

## **DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS**

Mr M Oxley	Item 1 2013/0583/FUL & 2013/0585/LBA Mr & Mrs D Coleman	Mr Oxley declared that he had officiated at the funeral of a member of the family some years ago.
Mr T Mathias	Item 1 2013/0583/FUL & 2013/0585/LBA	Mr Mathias declared that he knew the applicants and would

Mr & Mrs D Coleman      not take part in the  
discussion or the vote.

## **PETITIONS, DEPUTATIONS AND QUESTIONS**

In accordance with Procedure Rule 93 (5) the following three late questions had been received:

In relation to Agenda Item 5, application 1, 2013/0583/FUL & 2013/0585/LBA, Mr & Mrs D Coleman, three late questions were received from Audrey Riley.

### Question 1

Mention continues to be made in the application and discussion of the 'screening' between my home and the eastern elevation of the Rectory. This 'screening' is nothing more than scrub Ash and other saplings, which have been allowed to grow beyond the height allowed for a high hedge. It does not constitute screening, nor does any other kind of planting of trees and such like which cannot be considered permanent. I will be applying for a high hedge order as very soon I will be completely towered over. Why does the council keep accepting that this scrub greenery is reasonable protection of my privacy and therefore a reason for approving the application to develop?

The Conservation Officer responded that the presentation on the application would include photographs showing the layout distance involved. That in his view distances of 15 metres for a single storey and 18 metres for a two storey elevation were adequate to avoid a loss of privacy with there being no windows on the first floor rear elevation. That the decision had not been based on the two metre fence/vegetation alone.

### Question 2

Mention continues to be made of the acceptable size of the extension as it 'replicates the original'. Why does the council continue to ignore the fact that the building did not have the habitation around it that has now, making this argument irrelevant?

The Conservation Officer responded that extensions had previously been considered acceptable and that given the distances involved the impact was acceptable.

### Question 3

It is admitted in the recommendation for approval that there will be impact on neighbouring properties. As closest, and nearest to the Eastern side of the Rectory I will be most impacted. But the council considers that the impact will not be 'overbearing'. Does the council not agree that this is a qualitative statement? That there will be impact, but it will not be 'overbearing' in the council's view? I disagree and say that I will find it overbearing, and question the point of the consultative process if qualitative statements are to be used in the process of final decision-making.

The Conservation Officer advised that, in his professional judgement, he considered the impact to be acceptable; that he was satisfied that relevant planning matters had been taken into consideration.

## **DEPUTATIONS RELATING TO PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

No deputations relating to planning applications were received.

## **REPORT NO. 180/2015 DEVELOPMENT CONTROL APPLICATIONS**

Report No. 180/2015 from the Director for Places (Environment, Planning and Transport) was received.

### **ITEM NO. 1 (2013/0583/FUL & 2013/0585/LBA) THE OLD RECTORY, 6, RIDLINGTON ROAD, PRESTON, RUTLAND, LE15 9NN**

Application for the construction of two storey and single storey extensions to the east elevation of dwellinghouse.

(Ward: Braunston & Belton; Parish: Preston)

## **RESOLVED**

**2013/0583/FUL & 2013/0585/LBA** In accordance with the recommendations set out in Report No. 180/2015 Item 1, the addendum to that report and conditions contained therein, that both applications be **APPROVED**.

### **ITEM NO.2 (2015/0699/FUL) 1, HORN CLOSE, OAKHAM, RUTLAND, LE15 6FE**

Application to remove a fence between the garage and house and replace with a brick wall.

(Ward: Oakham South East; Parish: Oakham)

## **RESOLVED**

**2015/0699/FUL** In accordance with the recommendations set out within Report No. 180/2015 Item 2 that this application be **APPROVED**.

## **ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS**

1. The Development Control Manager, Mr Pullan advised Members that in relation to the windfarm at Woolfox the developer, RES had proposed a trip to see a windfarm in Peterborough and a Questions and Answers session for Members. Mr Pullan had spoken with the portfolio holder who was agreeable to this being arranged for Members and affected parish councils. Officers would be attending. Members to be advised when a date had been arranged.
2. The Chairman, Mr Baines (Ward Member for Wing Grange) advised that an application relating to Wing Grange would be taken at Committee next month. Given the nature of the application it was felt that it would be worthwhile to organise a formal site visit. Members requested that a visit be arranged for a Thursday. A minibus would not be required. The Principal Planning Officer, Mr Hodgett to arrange.

---oOo---

**The Chairman declared the meeting closed at 7.44 pm.**

---oOo---

## DECISION SUMMARY, 29 SEPTEMBER 2015

### Applications approved in accordance with the report and addendum of the Director for Places

Minute No.	Application	Detail
268	2013/0583/FUL & 2013/0585/LBA	Construction of two storey and single storey extensions to the east elevation of dwellinghouse. (Ward: Braunston & Belton; Parish: Preston)
269	2015/0699/FUL	To remove a fence between the garage and house and replace with a brick wall. (Ward: Oakham South East; Parish: Oakham)

### Applications approved NOT in accordance with the report and addendum of the Director for Places

Minute No.	Application	Detail

### Applications refused in accordance with the report and addendum of the Director for Places

Minute No.	Application	Detail

### Applications refused NOT in accordance with the report and addendum of the Director for Places

Minute No.	Application	Detail

### Applications deferred in accordance with the report and addendum of the Director for Places

Minute No.	Application	Detail

### Applications deferred NOT in accordance with the report and addendum of the Director for Places

Minute No.	Application	Detail