



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

Scale - 1:1250  
Time of plot: 14:05  
Date of plot: 06/12/2017



### Rutland County Council

Catmose,  
Oakham,  
Rutland  
LE15 6HP

Application:	<b>2017/0379/FUL</b>	<b>ITEM 1</b>	
Proposal:	<b>Demolition of an existing bungalow and detached garage, and the erection of 2 no. two storey dwellings with detached single garages.</b>		
Address:	<b>5 Glaston Road, Wing, LE15 8RU</b>		
Applicant:	<b>Swainpark Properties</b>	Parish:	<b>Wing</b>
Agent:	<b>Staniforth Architects</b>	Ward:	<b>Martinsthorpe</b>
Reason for presenting to Committee:	<b>Chairman referral</b>		
Date of Committee:	<b>19 December 2017</b>		

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This is a minor scale of development in a Smaller Service Centre. Amended plans indicate an acceptable layout and design, in accordance with Development Plan policies

## RECOMMENDATION

**APPROVAL**, subject to the following conditions:

1. The development shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.  
Reason – To comply with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
2. The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans: 1449 – P01, P03c, P04b, P05b, P06c, P07c, P09c, & P10b.  
Reason – For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
3. No development above ground level shall be commenced until precise details of the manufacturer and types and colours of the external facing and roofing materials to be used in construction have been submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority. Such materials as may be agreed shall be those used in the development.  
Reason – To ensure that the materials are compatible with the surroundings in the interests of visual amenity, and because insufficient such details have been submitted with the application.
4. Prior to residential occupation of any part of the development, a drainage scheme intended to prevent the discharge of surface water onto the highway shall be implemented in its entirety and shall be retained as such at all times.  
Reason – To prevent flood risk to neighbouring properties caused by water flowing onto the highway and, in the interests of highway safety, to avoid the formation of ice on the highway. This condition is also required because such details were not submitted with the planning application.
5. No unbound material shall be used in the surface treatment of the vehicular access within 5 metres of the highway boundary, but the material and construction details used shall be porous.  
Reason – To avoid displacement of loose material onto the highway in the interests of highway safety and to ensure that drainage is sustainable

- |   |
|---|
| <p>6. No development shall take place unless it is fully in accordance with the mitigation strategy, specified in Section 7 of the Bat Survey (Hillier Ecology Ltd: September 2017), submitted as part of the planning application. This shall include provision of the required bat boxes prior to first residential occupation of any part of the development. Reason – In order to maintain an available bat habitat on the site, given that bats are a protected species.</p> |
|---|

## Site & Surroundings

1. The application site is a detached bungalow located on the eastern side of Glaston Road, Wing. It is within the Planned Limits to Development of the village, but outside its conservation area. Ground levels rise gently southwards along Glaston Road, with a recently constructed row of four dwellings on lower ground at the north of the application site, close to the junction with Morcott Road. There is a detached one and a half storey dwelling on higher ground at the south.
2. On the opposite (west) side of the road is an area of public open space and playing fields, with a scheduled monument (maze) further south. Beyond the rear (east) of the site is agricultural land. A small allotment site is at the rear of the neighbouring properties at the north. Its boundary also runs partly along the rear garden boundary of the application site.

## Proposal

3. The current application involves demolition of the existing bungalow and replacement with two new detached houses. These are one and a half storeys in height, with first floor accommodation in the roofspace, and additional single storey accommodation at the rear. Each dwelling has its own separate access, with on-site parking, including a detached single garage.

## Relevant Planning History

Application	Description	Decision
75/0280	Extension, garage and altered access	Approved 10-09-1975

## Planning Guidance and Policy

### National Planning Policy Framework

Introduction:	Achieving Sustainable Development
Section 6	Housing
Section 7	Design
Section 11	Natural Environment
Section 12	Historic Environment

### The Rutland Core Strategy (2011)

CS1	Sustainable Development
CS3	Settlement Hierarchy
CS4	Location of Development
CS19	Design

CS21 Natural Environment  
CS22 Historic Environment

### **Site Allocations and Policies DPD (2014)**

SP1 Sustainable Development  
SP5 Build Development within Towns and Villages  
SP15 Design and Amenity  
SP19 Biodiversity  
SP20 Historic Environment

### **Draft Local Plan**

The Consultation Draft Rutland Local Plan completed its consultation stage on 25 September 2017.

Although it is a material consideration, it has not been subject to any post-consultation examination, and therefore carries only limited weight at this stage. It does not outweigh the current development plan.

### **Consultations**

4. Two rounds of consultation were undertaken; firstly on receipt of the application and then on receipt of amended plans. The following responses have been received.
5. Wing Parish Council (First only)  
Object to:
  - Disproportionately high roof
  - Poor architectural style, with no evidence of sustainable principles
  - Layout does not address the sloping nature of the site
  - No on-site turning, resulting in cars reversing out onto Glaston Road
  - Out of keeping with the area and not an improvement on the existing bungalow
  - Setting of the maze and village green should be considered
6. Highway Authority (Second only)  
No objections, subject to proceeding with the revised site layout plan, and subject to conditions regarding surfacing materials and surface water drainage.
7. Historic England (Both)  
Does not wish to offer comment
8. Ecology Consultant (Both)  
Initial response that a bat survey is required, due to the available bat habitat in the immediate area, and potential for bats to be roosting in the roofspace. Subsequent response that the submitted bat survey is satisfactory, subject to a condition requiring the proposed mitigation strategy to be implemented.

### **Neighbour Representations**

9. Again, two rounds of consultation were undertaken; firstly on receipt of the application and then on receipt of amended plans.

10. The first round of consultation resulted in two responses. One objector, on lower ground on Morcott Road, is concerned about surface water run-off from Glaston Road onto Morcott Road and then into their property. They suggest that this has worsened since the four new dwellings were constructed adjacent to the current application site. They object to the current proposal as it would worsen this situation.
11. The other objector is concerned at the height of the proposed dwellings, the loss of open aspect for neighbouring dwellings and additional noise nuisance.
12. The second round resulted in two further objections, raising the following concerns:
  - Overdevelopment of the site, causing overlooking and overshadowing of neighbouring properties
  - Inappropriate design for this location (including its scale, form and design details)
  - No attention given to how the proposal fits in to a village scene that includes a “historic site almost directly opposite and also one of the only green spaces on the village”
  - Inadequate on-site turning space
  - Flood risk from surface water run-off

## **Planning Assessment**

13. The main issues are:
  - Principle of Development
  - Layout, Design and Landscaping
  - Residential Amenity
  - Access and Parking
  - Historic Environment
14. Other matters are then addressed together at the end of the report.

### Principle of Development

15. Policy SP3 identifies Wing as a Smaller Service Centre, with Policy CS4 then specifying that such centres can accommodate a minor scale of development such as infill sites.
16. Consequently there is no concern with the principle of replacing one existing dwelling with two new dwellings, subject to the other detailed considerations discussed below.

### Layout, Design and Landscaping

17. The replacement of a detached bungalow with two larger detached dwellings is a more efficient use of available land within the Planned Limits to Development. However, as initially submitted, the layout and design (particularly the excessive height) had an unacceptable impact on the street scene and character of the area.
18. The amended plans have reduced the height and depth of both dwellings and introduced a staggered frontage with the northern dwelling located slightly forward of the southern dwelling. The proposed front elevations have also been redesigned, particularly via replacement of the previous twin gable features, with dormer features. This is more in keeping with the new dwellings at the north.

19. The proposed materials are brick and slate, which are acceptable in the context of the neighbouring dwellings and the wider area at this end of the village. A condition is recommended, however, to ensure that exact specifications/samples are agreed
20. The amended plans also provide more detail on how the sloping ground level will be addressed. Some existing tree cover would be lost, but this would not have a significant public impact, so a replacement planting condition is not necessary.
21. The amended plans have therefore addressed the layout and design comments raised during the consultation period.

#### Residential Amenity

22. The amended plans have limited impact on the residential amenity of the neighbouring dwelling at the south (7 Glaston Road). As the new development is at the north of no.7, there are no concerns regarding overshadowing or loss of light. There is one proposed first floor window facing the front elevation of no.7, but no concerns regarding any loss of privacy given that this window partly serves a staircase and landing area. The garage for the new dwelling adjacent to no.7 has been adjusted in response to comments from the neighbour.
23. The property at the north of the application site warrants closer scrutiny because of its northerly location, lower ground level and small rear garden area. The impact of the proposal, as initially submitted, would have been unacceptable.
24. However, despite the northerly location, the distance between the nearest proposed dwelling and the common boundary reduces any overshadowing impact, now that the amended plans have reduced the bulk of the new dwellings.
25. On initial consideration, it could be accepted that such impact on the garden of no. 4 is also reduced because the existing garage located along the common boundary is proposed for demolition, with the proposed new garage located further to the rear. However, this opens up a concern about loss of privacy, given that the proposed driveway is now adjacent to the neighbour's garden, potentially causing a loss of privacy when new residents are accessing their car. The amended plans have therefore introduced a two metre high close boarded fence in this location. This has been assessed on-site by the case officer, particularly to ensure that the fence doesn't cause either an over dominant impact on the street scene or an overbearing impact on no.4, beyond that currently resulting from the existing garage. Given that the fence is not much higher than the eaves of the existing garage, it is concluded that this does not cause any significant additional impact.
26. There is a first floor window in the proposed side elevation facing no.4, but this is acceptable for the same reason as for no.7 at the south.
27. The proposal raises no other residential amenity concerns.

#### Access and Parking

28. For both proposed dwellings there is only limited on-site vehicular turning space, so it is most likely that vehicles would have to reverse off the premises. This is not a concern on Glaston Road due to low traffic volumes, and given that the four properties at the north do not have any on-site turning space. Furthermore, the Highway Authority has not objected to the current application.

29. The three on-site parking spaces for each proposed dwelling is in accordance with Policy SP15 (l) and the associated Appendix Two.

#### Historic Environment

30. The application site is not adjacent to any listed buildings and is also some 130 metres from the nearest part of Wing Conservation Area. Consequently it has no impact on such heritage assets.
31. The Parish Council and other objectors have drawn attention to the potential impact on the public open space on the opposite side of Glaston Road, specifically that it is one of the only green spaces in the village. However, it is not a heritage asset and does not require further discussion here.
32. The same objectors have also drawn attention to the scheduled monument (maze) located some 40 metres further south, on the opposite side of Glaston Road. However, given the size and limited height of this feature, its value is not compromised by the proposed development. Furthermore, Historic England has advised that it does not wish to offer a comment.
33. The Council's Conservation Advisor accords with the comments offered in this part of the report.

#### Other Matters

34. A bat survey has been submitted, in response to the initial advice of the Council's Ecology Consultant. This has indicated that no bats were present in the roofspace. A condition is recommended, however, to secure compliance with the suggested mitigation strategy set out in the survey report.
35. A resident on Morcott Road has objected to increased flood risk from surface water run off onto the highway. The Highway Authority has reviewed this and advised that a surface water condition (intended to prevent run-off onto the highway) should be imposed on any planning permission. This is recommended above.