

## PLANNING & LICENSING COMMITTEE

17<sup>TH</sup> NOVEMBER 2020

### ADDENDUM REPORT

Report no.	Item no.	Application no.	Applicant	Parish
150/2020	1	2020/0142/FUL	GODWIN DEVELOPMENTS	GREETHAM

#### Further consultation responses

A Committee Briefing Note has been received from the applicant's agent and this has been circulated to Members and a copy is attached for information.

Greetham Parish Council have made the following additional comments:

"Greetham Parish Council is in favour of the redevelopment of the site and believes that the current application is significantly better than the previous one. However, there are some issues which we would like to press which do not appear to be represented in the Planners recommendations that you have before you.

Firstly, the residents of Greetham do not wish to lose access to the petrol station and shop. The road layouts in the original application documents did not give us any cause for concern but we note that there is a new road layout which would appear to prevent access to the petrol forecourt from the B668 as it would be against a one way system. The drawing in Appendix 1 does not make this entirely clear as a tree is obscuring the detail of the road junction at the critical point. So we would like clarification on this matter.

Secondly, in line with RCC's policies of promoting pedestrian and cycle routes to improve sustainability, we believe there is a strong case for there to be a requirement for a S106 Agreement for the applicant to fund the extension of the pedestrian / cycle route from Greetham to the Ram Jam site. This would also complete the link to Oakham. We note that there is the prediction for there to be 160 jobs created by the development, who otherwise will have to travel by car as there is no bus service.

Thirdly, we are concerned at the almost inevitable increase in rubbish that there will be along the B668. Greetham takes great pride in keeping our village clean and tidy. Villagers regularly partake in litter picks within the village and the B668 is a gateway into Rutland. There is ample evidence that roads leading from such fast food outlets to centres of local population will be subject to significant quantities of rubbish which is simply thrown out of the car windows. This is highly regrettable, but a fact of life. It would be very undesirable if rubbish is not regularly cleared from the verges and as it is the product of the fast food outlets they should have the responsibility to clear it up. It is likely that the rubbish will continue all the way to Oakham as this will be the point at which the food has been consumed."

Comments have also been made by the proprietor of Greetham Garage:

"There are 4 trees shown on the plan to be planted along our boundary between our building and the back of unit 2.

The roots of these trees will interfere with

- The mains sewage,
- the water supply to the Ram Jam Service Station and
- The pipe taking water from our Garage roof to our Rainwater harvester, all of which run along this boundary.

I am just submitting this comment in writing as it need not take up discussion time, however it is an important point.”

An objection letter has also been received from Mr & Mrs Harrison and is copied below:

“We would be most obliged if you would put before the members of the Planning and Licensing Committee the following, for their consideration relating to the above Planning Application.

We write on behalf of the many people who had expressed publically their unhappiness to the original, rejected, application and this subsequent revised application. Appreciating the short notice and the need to be brief and concise, we would ask that the following bullet points are evaluated fully.

Yours sincerely,  
Mr and Mrs R. Harrison.

- Committee members should remember that the Planning Inspector confirmed their decision to not accept the Planning Officers recommendation for this type of development on this site.
- It is very unusual for the Planning Inspector to go against Planning Officers advice and even when the applicants Leading Council and two junior barristers made their submissions he was not persuaded that there was sufficient merit in allowing such an inappropriate use of this site to take place.
- That the applicant has an authorised, and we understand, fully approved development 2017/0278/FUL for this site. They have already started work on the site to keep this permission alive and RCC Planning have approved Building Cladding etc. There is absolutely no impediment to this development taking place.
- This current application is very similar to the one rejected and except for some creative tinkering possesses all the same problems the original application had.
- Rutland has a duty to ensure all new developments are appropriate for the sites location, and the Planning Inspector made it very clear that this site is not regarded as suitable or appropriate for this type of development.
- The Planning Inspector also felt that the Historic and Iconic Ram Jam Inn should be retained. Its retention was key to the already approved Planning Permission, which is eminently more in keeping with the site, and one which RCC Planning Officers insisted upon when development of the site was first proposed.
- Highways England may well alter their opinion in light of their recent objection to 2020/0842/MAF, where they confirm that this section of the A1 has problems of safe and suitable access. It is not as if there are no alternative fast food, drive through, and sit-downs available. There are 6 at Colsterworth, 2 at South Witham, 1 at Tickencote as well as Food and Beverage Vans in lay-bys etc.
- We also applaud Rutland County Council’s initiative, alongside our MP Alicia Kearns, to form the A1 working group. This group has already written to the Transport Secretary (as issued by Alicia Kearns and published in the Rutland

and Stamford papers) calling for urgent and targeted action to resolve the issues with this Major Trunk Road.

- We can see nothing that has been done to eliminate the cross traffic problem with Southbound drivers accessing and egressing the development. This will have major implications to the villagers of Stretton and Clipsham, particularly the children in the Shires Residential Special Needs School.
- Parish Councils and Consultees have all expressed opposition to this development. Having looked carefully at this application we feel very little, if anything, has been done to address those varied and substantiated concerns, most of which, if not all were supported by the Planning Inspector in his rejection of the appeal. Committee members have these points to hand and can easily determine for themselves if and how they have been addressed.
- There is no tangible support for this development and unlike the approved and granted development for this site the type of jobs this development will deliver are low paid, insecure and involve travel to and from the site from Peterborough, Nottingham and Newark etc. The County Council has also approved the new Prison development at Stocken which will further exasperate the present overloaded sewage system affecting the villages of Stocken, Stretton, Greetham and Cottesmore. Everyone local can testify to these problems but to-date they are largely ignored.
- All we can ask is that the current Planning Committee reflects fully on the Planning Inspectors statement, made when he supported your previous Planning Committee's rejection. In this he stated ***'that the retention of the Ram Jam Inn is important as it possesses local distinctiveness and a sense of place because of its local vernacular construction and landscaped nature. Its removal would be detrimental to the landscape and appearance, and visual amenity of a site that is set in an attractive rural area surrounded with fields, substantial hedgerows and trees.'*** And again refuse this application, support the Planning Inspector and other Consultees and safeguard this part of Rutland for this and the generations to come. The present granted development for the site does it."

### Officer comments

Concern has been raised by the adjoining occupier about proposed trees shown on the site plan and their close proximity to the building. Condition 15 requires full details of all hard and soft landscaping to be agreed in writing and this issue can be controlled via that condition to ensure that any landscaping does not impact on adjacent buildings.

With regards to the comments about the need for cycle and footpath links the applicants have proposed to install at the request of the Local Highway Authority a 3m shared footway/cycleway which extends northbound to tie in with the existing provisions, and provide the beginning of a route southbound for approximately 15m past the proposed junction into the site. This would enable a future link to be put in by the authority to the south if required.

Concern has also been raised in relation to litter at the site. Following further consideration an additional condition is proposed in order to mitigate this impact.

### Amended/new conditions

- 21. Prior to the occupation of any units hereby approved details of a strategy to deal with litter from the site including the provision of on-site litter bins shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The strategy shall then be implemented in accordance with the agreed details prior to the use commencing.**

## COMMITTEE BRIEFING NOTE

2020/0142/FUL - Demolition of the existing Ram Jam Inn and redevelopment of the site to provide two drive-thru units (Use Class A3/A5), one drive-to unit (Use Class A1) and one drive-to unit (Use Class A3/A5) with associated parking and landscaping.

November 2020

## INTRODUCTION

This Briefing Note has been prepared by Rapleys LLP (Rapleys) on behalf of Godwin Developments (the applicant), in support of a full planning application at the site of the existing Ram Jam Inn, Great North Road, Greetham, Oakham.



Figure 1. CGI of the proposed scheme

## PLANNING HISTORY

Following the closure of the Ram Jam Inn in 2012, the site was subject to a mixed use development (Ref: 2017/0278/FUL) approved 29<sup>th</sup> August 2017, and an application for the demolition of the Ram Jam Inn and redevelopment of the site to provide three drive-thru units and one drive-to unit (Ref: 2018/0539/FUL). This application was refused and the subsequent appeal (Ref: APP/A2470/W/18/3218899) dismissed 18<sup>th</sup> June 2019.

## CURRENT PROPOSAL

The proposal is to demolish the existing building and erect two drive-thru units and two drive-to units including new landscaping, car parking and alterations to the site access. The proposal will provide a total of 72 no. parking bays, including 5 no. disabled bays. In total, the proposal will provide 961 sq. m (GIA) floorspace (1,097 sq.m GEA). The end users for the development have yet to be confirmed however it is proposed that the units will be occupied by nationally recognised operators.

In the dismissed appeal, the Inspector commented that the design would result in a dominant and oppressive environment. The scheme has been redesigned to include sympathetic materials and has a character more in keeping with the local vernacular and the character of the former Ram Jam Inn. The retention of the existing building is not possible due to the structural integrity of the existing building along with the commercial operational requirements of modern retailers.

A comparison of the previous scheme and the current scheme are shown below:

<p>Previously proposed Unit 1 elevations</p>	<p>Previously proposed Unit 2 elevations</p>	<p>Previously proposed Unit 3 and 4 elevations</p>
<p>Current proposed Unit 1 elevations</p>	<p>Current proposed Unit 2 elevations</p>	<p>Current proposed Unit 3 and 4 elevations</p>

It is considered that the revised proposal will contribute positively to the area and is of an appropriate scale, density and layout and the Appeal Inspectors comments have been addressed. A presentation to Rutland County Council Members on 28<sup>th</sup> November 2019 of the revised scheme was also welcomed and well received.

#### STATUTORY CONSULTEE COMMENTS

The applicant has worked with the Council to address any comments. Following a number of discussions, the scheme was slightly revised to remove the access from the site into the Petrol Filling Station. Whilst this connection was included as Members and local residents wanted to retain an access the Petrol Filling Station, it has been removed at the request of the Council to be compliant with highways safety concerns. There is now no highways objection to the scheme. Similarly, all other comments from statutory consultees have been addressed to the satisfaction of the Council and there are no objections from statutory consultees to the application.

#### CONCLUSION

This Briefing Note has demonstrated how the comments relating to the previous scheme design have been addressed through the current proposal. Members will appreciate that the applicant has taken onboard the comments relating to the previous scheme and proposed an attractive scheme which has a character more in keeping with the local vernacular and the character of the former Ram Jam Inn. The applicant has also worked constructively with statutory consultees to address their comments leading to a position where there are no statutory objections to the application. On this basis, the applicant is hopeful that Members can support the application.

Report no.	Item no.	Application no.	Applicant	Parish
150/2020	2	2020/0891/FUL	BARROWDEN PARISH COUNCIL	BARROWDEN

### Further consultation responses

#### The Local Highway Authority has provided the following information following discussions with officers:

“In terms of the relative floor spaces and parking standards (note that the parking standards for community uses have been taken from the emerging plan as there is no comparable in the existing standards) then I am satisfied that within the community use of the facilities that the local burden on parking pressure is reduced as a consequence of the proposals. The parking position is:

Existing  
25 spaces required 12 provided

Proposed  
30 spaces required 26 provided.

However in the absence of any information pertaining to potential wider use of the facility, especially the hall then I have taken to the floor space available for normal use and noted it as 142sq.m.

In the absence of any other work done I have taken the correct assumption that any highway concerns should relate to the maximum occupancy of the facility and the possibility that emergency services may need to arrive at the facility, most notably the fire service.

I could not support any occurrence where the ability for emergency access to the site was undermined by the capacity of the highway and on this basis the risk of indiscriminate parking arising, the risk only being greater the larger the number of persons making use of the community facility at any one time. There is an automatic threshold for the difference between a small (60 persons) and medium (300 persons) when considering numbers. The CLG Fire Safety Risk Assessment is abundantly clear on this matter:

‘Some premises or structures may be leased as an empty and unsupervised facility (e.g. village halls, temporary structures and marquees). The fire safety responsibilities of those leasing the building or structure (and, therefore, in charge of the activities conducted within the building or structure), and those of the owner/leasee, need to be established as part of the contract of hire....

‘The responsible person for each individual unique, occasional or separate event or function will need to be clearly established and documented, and their legal duties made clear to them. In particular, and where necessary, the responsible person will need to take account of their own lack of familiarity with the layout of the premises, the fire safety provisions, and the duties of other responsible persons within the premises.’

Based on the building regs Appendix C I envisage the capacity of the hall can for certain functions be within the range of max 282 – 103 based on 0.5sqm – 1.5sqm as possible areas required per person.

I am also relatively satisfied that for larger events there would also be a greater likelihood of arrival by car. I see nothing unreasonable is assuming that for events over 100 person that 25% of arrivals could be by car which would begin to trigger the car park as being over capacity. I could also not, simply ignore, the current circumstances or changes in fire safety since the first hall was established and could not wilfully allow risk to occur, in this case blocked emergency access, when it can be appropriately protected against.

As such when considering safety it is appropriate to work to the lower threshold of 60 persons.

Therefore in the interest of Highway Safety the following condition is proposed:

Prior to operational use of the building the applicant shall provide in writing an event management and fire strategy for all functions for 60 persons or more, to include a mitigation strategy – to protect fire access. The applicant shall submit the event management and fire strategy in writing to the Local Planning Authority ensuring that any function for medium capacity events up to and including maximum occupancy fully address car parking occupation and direct access for emergency vehicles, in the interest of highway safety.

#### Construction Method Statement

*No development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The approved Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period. The Statement shall provide for:*

- I. *the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors*
- II. *loading and unloading of plant and materials*
- III. *storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development*
- IV. *the erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate*
- V. *wheel washing facilities*
- VI. *measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction*
- VII. *a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works*
- VIII. *residents liaison*

#### **SWNO13 Working Hours**

##### Guidance Note

This condition can be used when hours need to be controlled for a reason other than noise.

The working hours in connection with the use/building(s) shall only be between ..... am and ..... pm Monday to Saturday; and no work shall be carried out on Sundays, or Public Holidays, or outside the specified hours.”

**Additional information has also been received from the applicant and Public Statement to RCC Planning Committee from the Barrowden Village Hub Development Group in relation to the proposals and comments on the Neighbourhood Plan Policies these are attached in full below.**

**Comments have also been received from Mrs J Mitchell and are reproduced in full below.**

**Comments have also been received from Mr Philpott a local resident:**

"Whereas I support the continued provision of facilities for the village community, as an immediate neighbour of the plot my concerns over the above development are as follows :

1. Nuisance through increased use. If these facilities are required for Barrowden, why are there 25 car parking spaces being provided ? Villagers should in the main be walking or cycling. The implication is that these facilities are intended for greater use. I do not support increased traffic within the village and especially down Kings Lane - the narrowness, lack of footpaths being documented by others.
2. Nuisance through noise and emphasis on 'outside space'. Having a coffee/ an annual dog show outside is one thing - but the potential for noisy social events spilling outside is obviously a cause for concern to any close neighbour. What assurances are there to prevent this ?
3. Car park - ideally the Kings Lane car park should be pretty much empty the majority of the time and only required for occasional events. However it is still approximately 30% of the total site and I am unable to find details of the carpark materials/landscaping/lighting that indicates it sympathetic to the village environment and not some 'urban tarmac eyesore' with unnecessary lighting and lineage.
4. Tree at the surgery. 'Convenience' is not a reason to fell the tree at this time. It would be more sympathetic to keep the tree initially (even with pollarding) and allow the site and other landscaping to mature for 5-10yrs before replacing this tree. This fits in with the architect's statements regarding shielding, and the pictorial representation of the design."

**Comments have also been received from Rosamund Cotton in an email to Cllr G Brown these are set out in full below:**

I have been told that the committee meeting about the village Hall is next Tuesday. that the report written by Nick Hodges shows no complaint about lighting noise or parking. You have my previous emails which I forwarded to the council as you advised .They show both lighting, noise and parking problems mentioned at present when the complex is much smaller  
Thank you for your offer of support and representation at the meeting.

Below is the text from previous parking matters outside our drive which show the dangers of the narrow road.

This was sent in 2018 when the Parish council discussed such matters and we mentioned the dangers of the parking arrangements then.

" It is really important to us that there is no parking where the drain and new kerb is. If people park there we cannot turn into our drive.  
As we have said before and even more important, vehicles such as tractors and lorries climb up the bank over our water meter, this will damage our drive and the meter."  
Please say if any further action should be taken to inform people

with regards  
Rosamund

A link to the Barrowden & Wakerley Neighbourhood Plan is attached for ease of reference for tonight's meeting:

<https://www.rutland.gov.uk/resources/assets/attachment/full/0/92975.pdf>

## Officer comments

Additional information has been provided by the highway authority as outlined above and this shows that existing parking provision at the site is substandard for the existing amount of floor space with the policy indicating that the existing buildings require 25 spaces but only 12 provided. This is a shortfall of 13 spaces. The proposed development requires 26 spaces given the increase in floor area but provides 26 spaces on site. This leaves a shortfall of 4 spaces. Although there is a shortfall of parking provision it is considered that in most cases users of the site will be local and walk to the venue. However there will be occasions when it is highly likely that visitors will drive to the site. In these instances whilst the proposed parking provision is slightly under the emerging policy standard it is better than the current level of provision and is therefore likely to reduce the potential for on-street parking.

Additional conditions have also be recommended in order to mitigate any disturbance during the construction phase of the development and it is also proposed to limit the hours of use of the hall in order to protect residential amenity.

Comments have been raised in relation to the design and use of the proposed materials in the building. The site is in a conservation area where there is a requirement for new developments to preserve or enhance the area. In this instance it is considered that the proposed design of the building and the proposed materials are appropriate for the area and will significantly enhance this part of the Conservation Area. The use of timber cladding along with stone on the building will help to break up the mass and bulk of the structure which would otherwise look overly bulky and heavy if constructed wholly from stone. The use of a zinc roof will also blend in with the colour of slate roofs in the area and will not appear out of character or overly prominent. It is considered that these are an appropriate design approach.

Concern has been raised about noise and disturbance and lighting. The site is already used for as a shop, doctors surgery and community hall. It is however proposed to condition the hours of use of the shop and hall to protect residential amenity. The Environmental Protection Officer has been consulted and raised no objections to the proposals and it is considered that it will not result in any significantly greater impact on residential amenity than the existing uses do.

## Amended/new conditions

11. Prior to operational use of the building the applicant shall provide in writing an event management and fire strategy for all functions for 60 persons or more, to include a mitigation strategy – to protect fire access. The applicant shall submit the event management and fire strategy in writing to the Local Planning Authority ensuring that any function for medium capacity events up to and including maximum occupancy fully address car parking occupation and direct access for emergency vehicles, in the interest of highway safety.
12. *No development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The approved Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period. The Statement shall provide for:*
  - I. *the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors*
  - II. *loading and unloading of plant and materials*
  - III. *storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development*
  - IV. *the erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate*
  - V. *wheel washing facilities*

- VI. *measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction*
- VII. *a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works*
- VIII. *residents liaison*
- IX. *details of the days and hours construction will take place*

- 13. The community hall hereby approved shall only be used between the hours of 06:00 and 24:00 on any day.

**Public Statement to RCC Planning Committee from the Barrowden Village Hub Development Group.**

Dear Councillors,

Re: Barrowden Village Hall Planning Application 2020/0891

The vision is to develop a new drop-in community hall, linked to a health and wellbeing facility, centred on a new community shop which is the beating heart of the village.

Our 1927 hall has major structural problems, with very limited life left and it is quite small for some activities. The Shop is in a prefabricated unit, with temporary planning permission, needing better facilities, and the 1980's branch surgery does not meet modern standards. We hope the plans offer a more aesthetically attractive solution.

Supported by the National Lottery we carried out a professional study in 2017, with a community needs survey, interviews, and village meetings. This work identified issues of loneliness and isolation, health and wellbeing and a need to address intergenerational tensions, all of which have been underlined in the present Covid situation. In July 2019, architects Acanthus Clews carried out a Feasibility Study, with the present site being the only feasible location in the village, and they have produced this planning application.

There has been extensive consultation in the village and close dialogue with neighbours on the preferred design option. A public exhibition over two days in February 2020 included a special session for the Barrowden Parish Council.

In April 2020 a pre-application was made to the Planning Department. Plans were placed on the Barrowden Parish Council web site. No major issues were raised at this time and the Parish Council subsequently submitted the full planning application on our behalf.

The proposal allows the shop, hall and surgery, opening at different times, to operate independently, whilst being linked and flexible. The scheme preserves an open landscaped area, is accessible and improves car parking.

The Village Hub will respect the historic and distinctive character of Barrowden. This will be a high quality, distinctive, public building that will enhance the scene in the village and will blend into its setting and will be as carbon neutral as possible.

There is strong support from the local community and Burghley Estates and Planning permission is essential for further fundraising. We urge you to enthusiastically support this exciting proposal to meet the needs of future generations in Rutland.

Yours sincerely,

Valerie Fraser, Chair Village Hall Committee

Brian Edwards, Chair VHDG

## Supplementary Information in response to Neighbourhood Plan Policies

### BW1 Landscape character and important views

1. *Development shall conserve and enhance positive characteristics and features of the local landscape outlined in the Barrowden and Wakerley Landscape and Character Assessment. Proposals will be supported where these do not detract from, or have adverse impact on the landscape.*
2. *Views important to Barrowden and Wakerley are set out on the map in figure 4. Development proposals shall safeguard and if possible enhance these views into and out of the villages and should use sensitive layout, design and mitigation measures to minimize any adverse impact on the landscape. (Note: the view from the North toward the site is identified at number 5 on Fig 4)*

Policy BW1.1 is exactly the approach adopted here for the design of the project and chimes with our design approach to all projects on sensitive sites. Of particular importance is the need to provide a high-quality design that responds directly to both the uniqueness of the brief for a community building as well as the distinctiveness of the site. Our approach to incorporate stone, timber and zinc responds to both the historic character of the village as well as the rural setting. The proposal enhances the conservation area by removing the disparate and unsightly existing surgery, shop and hall, replacing it with a much more considered and sympathetically located community hub.

A significant amount of work has been done over a number of years to identify and prioritise the village needs. This was pulled together in a report by Focus Consultants having undertaken comprehensive consultations and explored potential sites with the local authority. Since then, further detailed work with the Village Hall, the Shop and the Surgery has been undertaken to ensure the scale of the new hub provides them with the most flexible and sustainable spaces possible. This analysis is based on an assessment of the size of the current facilities and whether they are adequate or not. To summarise the brief development process: the shop would benefit greatly from being larger to provide better storage, staff office space and an associated café area better capable of meeting demand. The Village Hall has identified it needs to be slightly larger as well in order to accommodate a wider range of activities for a broader spectrum of the community. Overall, however the new hub offers an opportunity to dramatically improve the efficiency of the site by bringing together the three separate elements into one hub space with rationalised outdoor space, car parking and access. As with every new development a balance has to be sought between ensuring the building is fit for purpose internally whilst minimising its impact externally on its surroundings. In summary the proposed design enhances the landscape setting of the site.

Regarding the position and height of the new development in relation to the existing buildings: The development combines all facilities in an integrated building as far to the east of the site as possible, retaining the view to the south whilst also allowing for adequate parking provision off Wakerley Road. The proposed building extends only 5.2m further to the west than the existing shop (in the 88m wide site) and references the long residential facades that line the streets of Barrowden (refer to page 33 of the design and access statement). The height of the proposed hall is less than 1m taller than the existing and positioned at the north of the sloped site to minimise its impact to the residential buildings to the south. The ridge height of the proposed hall aligns with the heights of the residential buildings that are located to the east and west of the site.

## **BW6 Design Principals for Barrowden and Wakerley**

1. *New development, including extensions, will be expected to be of high quality and shall preserve, and enhance the positive and distinctive characteristics described in the Barrowden and Wakerley Landscape and Character Assessment.*
2. *e) Proposals shall incorporate traditional steeply pitched roofs, where appropriate, and traditional roofing materials*  
*g) Elevations visible from the public realm shall be in local style rubble stone with traditional architectural features and windows and doors of wooden construction.*
5. *Modern innovative designs using contemporary materials will be supported where it can be demonstrated that the development will be of the highest quality and can be successfully integrated into the existing context.*

The existing buildings do not contribute positively to the conservation area or the view over the field to the north. Although the new development is slightly larger than the existing buildings (to meet existing and future needs and ensure its financially sustainable), the palette of traditional high-quality materials is an improvement on the current building materials made from materials that include UPVC windows, rendered prefabricated panels, cement tiles and felt lined flat roofs.

A key design concept was to ensure the protection of the open space paddock to the north and to ensure the views from this towards the open countryside to the south are maintained. This is achieved by locating the building to the east of the site behind the bank of trees, not building on the surgery site and keeping ridge heights to a minimum. The appreciation of the open space is also improved by giving the buildings a direct view of it, currently none of the existing community buildings address the open space in any way, the shop actually turns its back on it.

We do not believe it is appropriate to adopt a steeply pitched roof for this building typology on this particular site. Due to the proportions of the community hall internally and the large spans needed a steep roof pitch would result in a far higher ridge height and a building that would have too big an impact in its context and could obscure views to the countryside to the south. In terms of the roofing material, we assume that 'traditional' refers to stone slates, blue slate or thatch but we would argue that metal roofs are also 'traditional' in churches and agricultural buildings. As described previously the use of a zinc roof is not to stand out from its context as it is dark coloured and non-reflective, it is simply to ensure that the identity and character of the building is not confused for a large residential barn conversion. We are using stone and timber for the external walls and we have a real worry that new replica slates would in this case deliver a very bland result that fails to deliver on the quality of design that the neighbourhood plan and conservation area requires. There must be a recognition that this is a significant community funded project so the specification of reclaimed welsh slates or stone slates would be a serious financial burden to the project. In addition to this we fundamentally believe the crispness of the weathered standing seam zinc finish to match a lead roof is the most appropriate way to express this building as a new community hub for all and to encourage the most vulnerable to access it as a welcoming public resource.

**It is not clear whether policy 6.2 g relates primarily to residential dwellings or to all building typologies.** Either way we believe the design of a significant new public community building needs to explore potential design solutions from a wider palette of materials than just stone and timber windows. We would argue that timber is used throughout the local area as cladding (for example large barn doors) and is far from a non-traditional material. In order to achieve a high-quality holistic design that also conforms to the NPPF and the Local Plan we have taken the view that a combination of sustainably sourced timber and local stone is a more balanced, sustainable and appropriate

approach. The design philosophy is to root the building in its context with the stone base and a lighter timber framed and clad structure above. The location of the timber cladding on the north west corner helps to reduce the scale of the building when viewed from the north and west. It also contributes to the contextually sensitive yet contemporary appearance of the new development.

Design in sensitive locations is complex and in our view, it is very difficult to label projects as simply as 'traditional' or 'contemporary', the reality in our view is that high quality architecture is a combination of both. We are proposing a scheme that has traditional and contemporary materials which are incorporated to deliver the most balanced design response we can find for this particular community on this unique site. The scheme meets policy BW6.5 as well as complying with BW6.1, they are not mutually exclusive. The application via its consultations, drawings, reports and correspondence has demonstrated that the development will be high quality and successfully integrated into the existing context.

In summary we believe this policy fully supports the project and justifies the design philosophy of using traditional materials detailed in a contemporary way. This is a once in generation opportunity to provide much needed enhanced community facilities and as such it has to be high quality. The project team have worked incredibly hard to glean from the local community what they want the project to deliver and how they want it to achieve this and the overwhelming majority of feedback from the community is positive to this project and the approach. We trust that together with the full set of application documents, the design responses included within this response demonstrate the high-quality aspirations of the proposed design, that aims to create a contemporary yet contextually sensitive building, accessible to all the residents of Barrowden.

## Comments from Mrs J Mitchell

I write in reference to the above. This is not a critique of the Integration Project for the Village Hall, Community Shop and Doctors' Surgery but an objection of the Planning Application proposed to carry it out.

### DESIGN AND MATERIALS

As a member of Barrowden and Wakerley Neighbourhood Plan Group I along with others in the group spent 5yrs carrying out hours of research, attending numerous meetings and had in-depth discussions about the Policies in our NH Plan, especially with regard to the Design Principles , because of the importance these have on the character and environment of this beautiful village .

These were endorsed by villagers. They were also APPROVED and RATIFIED by Barrowden Parish Council and Rutland County Council so LEGALLY MUST BE ADHERED TO FOR NEW DEVELOPMENTS.

In the Village Surveys we carried out, an overwhelming number of villagers said they cherish and choose to live here because of its beautiful character and environment.

So it is with some dismay that I find that the Architects for this project are proposing this, in my opinion, unsuitable replacement building, which has a more stark, commercial look than the old village hall. In fact I believe there was no reference to Barrowden NH Plan Policies in their original Submission Documents.

Having lived in this village for 37 years I have seen many other New Build. None have used materials of zinc / metal roofing, wooden cladding and very little stone on the exterior (which as stated in our NH Plan should preferably be Rubble Stone). In my opinion, this is not such an attractive building as others, by this Architect , built in the Cotswolds.

The materials proposed to be used do not conform to Policy BW6 Design Principles of our Plan which states:

NEW DEVELOPMENT SHOULD BE OF HIGH QUALITY AND SHALL CONSERVE THE POSITIVE AND DISTINCTIVE CHARACTERISTICS DESCRIBED IN THE BARROWDEN AND WAKERLEY LANDSCAPE AND CHARACTER ASSESSMENT.

My concern is, that in the effort to be innovative, with the use of non heritage materials and presumable to keep costs low and using very little stone, this proposed building will set a precedent which will have adverse repercussions for future planning projects in Barrowden and Wakerley villages and possibly other villages in Rutland.

I am sure developers will be only too pleased to be able to cite this design, in a Conservation Village, as reason to use cheaper, lesser quality materials and less characterful designs than those which have been used on other properties in these villages in the past , in an effort to reduce costs.

People living in stone properties, in these villages, especially in the many listed properties, could rightly feel aggrieved that they have to comply with rules and regulations about design and materials for any alterations, extensions and garages if this proposed plan is allowed without complying with these requirements.

The present surgery and shop are low level buildings sitting in a hollow on the present site, so are not intrusive to the landscape.

The new building is to be sited on the higher ground now housing the existing Village Hall.

Because of the size of the proposed new building, it will be a great deal more prominent and intrusive, especially viewed from the open space to the North, and will dominate the surroundings of this area. I am not sure any proposed landscaping will change that.

I am not aware that there is mention in this Planning Application of how the Solar Panels from the present Shop building are to be incorporated into the new proposed building. I have been told that it is the intention to reuse these on the new building and indeed increase the number of panels. This needs to be explained more fully before any plan is acceptable.

The open meadow space to the North of this site is an important open space and vista cited in our NH Plan . One of the few left in our village apart from the Village Greens so is an important asset to this part of the village.

I listened in to the Barrowden P C meeting on Sept 9th, when Councillors discussed this Planning Application and queries about the design and materials were voiced. One councillor suggested that it would be helpful to be able to see samples of the intended roofing material (zinc/ metal ) as this such an unknown roofing material for many people. Not an unreasonable request , I thought. This was actually done for the roofing tiles on the village Affordable Housing Project , at a public meeting in the Village Hall arranged by Rutland C C and the developers.

Modern stark designs are trendy and have a place in our modern world , I just happen to think they look best in the right setting.

I think it is disingenuous of a suggestion that this is acceptable here because this is not a residential building.

#### NOISE AND INCREASED TRAFFIC

Because of the desire by The Project Group to have increased space and enhanced facilities there will inevitably an increase in usage from outside the village. This will increase the amount of vehicles accessing this site. This will generate more noise for neighbours.

This has been lauded as a Community Project I do not live near to this site but feel sympathy for those who do and will have the intrusion of the increased activity especially with night time events.

So has The Project Group fully explained to immediate neighbours and those impacted by increased Activity, Noise and Lighting.

1) The impact of the position of the 28 bay Car Park in Kings Lane.

2) Increase in cars and Service Vehicles down the narrow Kings Lane and Wakerley Road which do not have footpaths, especially Kings Lane which average width is only 2.7 metres and so could present a greater hazard to pedestrians such as the elderly and those walking with children and /or dogs. It is already difficult for 2 vehicles to pass on Wakerley Road if pedestrians are also using it and is impossible on Kings Lane.

3) I believe National Highways Guidelines states that any lessening of width on a Single Carriage highway from 3.5 metres has an increase risk for accidents.

4) Extra noise generated by increased usage of people travelling from outside the village.

This could all have an impact on house prices in the vicinity of the site. So have residents been made fully aware of all these factors and have they been consulted on whether these changed conditions are acceptable to them.

#### SUSTAINABILITY

At present the Surgery is not in use. It is not unreasonable to wonder if this will continue to be the case POST COVID 19 when ,it is predicted , that all GP surgery working practices are to be greatly changed.

This sturdy building has been adequate for more than all the years I have lived here and has only been used part time for the last few years,

We are likely to be experiencing the 'New Normal' and the austerity which may be visited on many facilities we are used to having. It is my understanding that there are already plans being discussed to provide Central Health Facilities, such as Surgeries and Clinics, in Rutland. This could possibly have a bearing on provision of surgery facilities for villages because of costs.

If the information is correct, that the cost for this project is going to be almost a MILLION POUNDS I have concerns about the sustainability of this present project and how this project is to be funded by such a small community.

We are not a disadvantaged community and maybe more less well off areas in the country would benefit from Public Body Grants eg. The Lottery Fund.

Maybe a more modest building should be considered and would it not be prudent for these plans to be revisited.

The only building on the site which is in need of refurbishment is the old Village Hall. Other villages in Rutland have managed to provide refurbished V Halls for less than this extravagant cost.

A smaller building replacing the Village Hall would be more affordable for this small community to support.

In any event surely the outlay and costs of maintenance of the increased sized building, including hygienic cleaning of all areas, which will be required in POST COVID times, needs to be fully explained before any money from the residents is requested. So surely a Business Plan for residents information needs to be a prerequisite.

When I was a member of the original Village Shop Group a plan was mooted to provide an extension to the Northside of the present Village Hall, where the unattractive tarmac is at present.

With landfill this would provide a level site here. Parking could be on the site of the old Surgery, so would be low down. St Peter's Church in Barrowden was closed for six months last year for complete refurbishment to provide under floor heating and a new large space for community events.

These two expensive projects need financial help from our small community ( approx. 400 people) to repay funding loans at a time of social and for some, financial constrains, which could continue for quite some time in the future and therefore could present difficulties for these projects.

Yours sincerely,  
Mrs J Mitchell

<b>Report no.</b>	<b>Item no.</b>	<b>Application no.</b>	<b>Applicant</b>	<b>Parish</b>
<b>150/2020</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2020/0739/FUL</b>	<b>MR R KING</b>	<b>BRAUNSTON</b>

### **Further consultation responses**

The following comments have been received from the applicant:

“The work we have undertaken is simply the replacement of the existing hedge and fence (we have provided photos of the old fence). We are sorry that this was done without the necessary Planning Permission. However, we did look into the matter and believed that an application for Planning Permission was not required for these works as they were permitted development under The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 because; a. the works fell under the definition of 'maintenance' of an existing boundary b. the works were not 'adjacent' to the Highway as there is a strip of land between the boundary (ditch) and the fence line. Our interpretation was, seemingly, incorrect.

It was initially planned to cut the original hedge back and let it reshoot. Once we started the work however, it was clear that much of the hedge was weed species (e.g. elder) and the thorn stumps had become out-grown and rotten. It was therefore decided to start again with a healthy set of new plants. We have ordered the hedging plants as set out in the submitted planting scheme (blackthorn, hazel, beech, holly and dog rose) and the hedge will be re-planted within the next few weeks (along with the trees which have also been ordered). The fence is necessary for security and privacy whilst the hedge grows and, as set out above, is a replacement for what was there previously.”

### **Officer comments**

None

### **Amended/new conditions**

None