

Deputised statement of objection to proposal: **2018/0096/FUL**

**Presented to Rutland County Council Planning and Licensing Committee - 18<sup>th</sup> Dec 2018**

Presented by: Ben Firth, Old Farmhouse, Main St, Barrow, Rutland. LE15 7PE

We petition to object to the proposal on the fundamental conflict of Paragraph 28 of the “National Planning Policy Framework” - reflected locally by Policies SP7 and SP 25 and the Rutland Core Strategy (CS);

- SP7 and SP25 states that *sustainable rural tourism will be supported provided it would be in ‘an accessible location and not generate an **unacceptable increase** in the amount of traffic movements’.*
- In reality most journeys in & out of Barrow would be made by car. Lack of transport choice would force visitors to do the same.
- The proposed access road was not selected by Highways during the initial planning proposal for good reason:
  - It has no footpath (nor any scope to add one), it’s narrow and impossible for 2 cars to pass.
  - 8 children (Well over 50% of the children in Barrow) live on and use this road daily.
  - There are 6 properties on the road, so the addition of 3 tents will result in an increase in traffic of 50% as an absolute minimum (6 “families” in situ and 1 extra “family” per tent = 50%). Add the Health and safety risk attached due to the absence of a footpath and it begs the question of Highways why no subsequent objections have been raised by them?
  - At the top of the access road is a very narrow fork; any obstruction here is not passable in a vehicle any bigger than a standard hatchback. The Recommendation states compliance with the highway safety elements of SP15 – so how are the villagers’ and their children’s safety considered within these elements? This road is fundamentally a shared drive – it has no capacity for **any** increase in traffic flow.
- CS1 Sustainable Development Principles – paragraph C: *to be located where it minimises the need to travel and wherever possible where services and facilities **can be accessed safely on foot, bike or public transport.*** There is very limited public transport, and travelling by foot to local amenities or villages requires walking alongside a dangerous 60mph limit road with no footpath.
- The Recommendation cites four contemporary applications that have been accepted nearby, we would argue that the conditions of ease of access are dramatically different. These are scantily balanced by 1 rejected site in Preston. **All** of these villages have networked roads, footpaths and facilities – **Barrow does not**, nor is it even comparable as it is classed a small village (1 or 2 rungs down the hierarchy from these Local and Smaller service centres)
- CS15 Tourism – paragraph D; *allow new tourism provision and initiatives where these would also benefit local communities and support the local economy.* - Similar, under-subscribed facilities already exist within a 5 mile radius so this application would not contribute to the local economy (especially at 40% occupancy).

- Barrow's classification as "Small Village" according to a recent Background Paper "Sustainability of Settlements Assessment Update July 2017" means that it is "*not considered sufficiently sustainable to justify further development unless it is small scale **to meet the local needs within the village.***". This scheme would appear to be in conflict with this.
- To state in the local Planning Officer's conclusion that "*the scheme is consistent with some decisions made elsewhere*" is vague and misleading – this comment (which constitutes half of the conclusion) needs in our opinion to be disregarded completely.
- The Residential Amenity Section and The Executive summary of the Recommendation document discuss creating "*a sustainable tourist facility that would not be obtrusive in landscape*". The reality is in direct conflict with The Rutland Landscape Character Assessment 2003; ..... the addition of tents and associated traffic and disruption **will not** "*conserve, enhance and restore the quiet calm, rural, pastoral or mixed agriculture vale character*"
- Additionally - there are several incorrect references of compliance to "The Rutland Core Strategy 2011" in the recommendation document which we feel need to be scrutinised by the committee – Namely:

*"make use of previously developed land or conversion or redevelopment of vacant and under-used land and buildings within settlements before development of new green field land ;(see Policy CS4)"*

The site is very obviously green field

*"be located where it minimises the need to travel and wherever possible where services and facilities can be accessed safely on foot, by bicycle or public transport; (see Policy CS4 and CS18)"*

Services and facilities cannot be accessed safely on foot– this statement is not true.

*"respect and wherever possible enhance the character of the towns, villages and landscape; (see Policies CS19, 20, 21, 22)"*

This statement is ridiculous; the scheme will very much change the character and nature of the village forever.

- Finally - The conclusion on the recommendation by the Local Planning Officer **does** actually contain one partially correct statement, "*it might not be the most sustainable of locations*" – **NO IT IS NOT** - And we respectfully urge the committee to refuse this application on this basis and on the points raised in this statement.