

PLANNING & LICENSING COMMITTEE

1ST JUNE 2021

ADDENDUM REPORT

Report no.	Item no.	Application no.	Applicant	Parish
70/2021		2021/0117/FUL	EMPINGHAM MEDICAL CENTRE	EMPINGHAM

Consultation Response

Amenity Group

Comments made in support of the planning application;

The NHS long term plan includes providing a variety of new clinical roles to increase general practice capacity. In addition practices are asked to ensure safe cohorting of patients - keeping those who are vulnerable safe from the risk of Covid infections. Empingham Medical Practice needs more consulting space to enable the practice to continue to provide a high level of care to increased patient numbers, keep patients safe, and to allow patients to access additional clinicians.

A further email has been received from Chairman of Empingham Parish Council stating:

Empingham Parish Council (EPC) wishes to make representation to the Committee "for" Planning Application 2021/0117/FUL relating to the Empingham Medical Centre. I will forward the EPC statement as soon as possible and assume it will be made available to the committee should an EPC representative is not able to attend the meeting.

No further comments have been received.

An email has been received by Governance from a local resident entitled

A message to Councillor Baines (in his role as Chair of the Planning and Licensing Committee)

As someone who had passed written comment on this application, I was invited to speak at Tuesday's Planning Committee Meeting. At that point in the process, most all of my concerns had been fully answered, and I was content to leave my contribution to the discussion at that. In particular, the more recently posted details of the access ramp and of the area allocated to pedestrian passage more than satisfy the needs that I had identified. So I turned down the opportunity.

I have since seen and read the Officer's Report, and am now rather wondering if I made the right choice.

He is, of course, quite correct in his calculation of the number of parking spaces that are needed, and although quite how anyone could possibly achieve such a biblical-strength miracle

as building on an area of car parking and at the same time creating an additional nine spaces is something that I find very difficult to get my mind around?

Whatever, I dispute the simplistic conclusion that the proposed reduction in off-street car parking spaces will lead to an inevitable increase in on-street parking in the area immediately surrounding the Medical Centre. In reality, it can't. The area immediately around the Centre is already known and understood to be heavily parked, and sometimes to capacity. Rather, if there is to be any more on-street parking as a result of the proposal, then by definition this will be further away from the Centre and will also to an extent counteracted by the (un)willingness and (in)ability of the patients to park at greater distances away. The truth is that the link between reduced on-site parking and off-site parking is not in any sense simple, and it is certainly not as direct as the Officer's Report appears to claim. Both the users of the Centre and the local community can over time cope perfectly well with the outcome. A new normal would be established, and life would go on.

In any case, anyone who understands (and who cares about?) Primary Health Care provision in East Rutland surely cannot let this proposal fall just because of insufficient car parking provision. With what is quite a modest scheme, and certainly a remarkably cost-effective one, East Rutland and North Stamford can continue to be served by what is widely and officially recognised as a very significant and highly successful part of the County's healthcare provision. The EMC needs this expansion, and so does Rutland - and both need it now. We have heard a great deal over the last year that "Advisors advise - Politicians decide" and I suggest that this is one of those occasions when the maxim really does apply. On this occasion, the Officer's advice should be rejected.

The application should be approved.

Yours
Neil Johannessen