



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



### Rutland County Council

Catmose,  
Oakham,  
Rutland  
LE15 6HP

Application:	<b>2020/1254/MAF &amp; 2020/1249/LBA</b>	<b>ITEM 3</b>	
Proposal:	<b>2020/1254/MAF - Demolition of Existing Modern Buildings, Conversion and Extension of Barns to 6 no. Dwellings and 2 no. offices, Erection of 9 no. Dwellings, and Alteration to Access.</b>  <b>2020/1249/LBA - Application for Listed Building Consent for the Conversion and Extension of Listed Dovecote to a Dwelling.</b>		
Address:	<b>Home Farm, High Street, Ketton, Rutland</b>		
Applicant:	<b>Beeson Wright Ltd</b>	Parish	<b>Ketton</b>
Agent:	<b>Barker Storey Matthews</b>	Ward	<b>Ketton</b>
Reason for presenting to Committee:	<b>Objections received</b>		
Date of Committee:	<b>11 January 2022</b>		

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The site is allocated for development in the development plan. The scheme involves converting traditional buildings and the erection of new dwellings. The scheme has evolved during the lifetime of the application and matters of design, access and residential amenity have been satisfactorily resolved.

## RECOMMENDATION

**APPROVAL**, subject to the completion of a S106 agreement to secure an off-site affordable housing contribution and the following conditions:

### 2020/1254/MAF 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, labelled; HF-PR-PL-01A, HF-PR-PL-02, HF-PR-PL-03, HF-PR-PL-04, HF-PR-PL-05 Rev A, HF-PR-PL-06, HF-PR-PL-07, HF-PR-PL-08, HF-PR-PL-09, HF-PR-PL-10, HF-PR-PL-11 Rev A, HF-PR-PL-20, HF-PR-PL-21, HF-PR-PL-22, HF-PR-PL-23, HF-PR-PL-24 Rev A, HF-PR-PL-25, HF-PR-PL-26, HF-PR-PL-27, HF-PR-PL-28, HF-PR-PL-100, 1116-PP02 Rev 06, Soft Landscape Specification, Landscape Maintenance Schedule, 20111-001 Rev P6, 20111-003 Rev P1 and the Inspired Ecology Report (August 2021).  
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 agreed, 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 the character and appearance of the conservation area, and because final details have not been submitted with the application.

4. Prior to occupation, at least 12 new swallow nest cups in groups of 3-4 in suitable locations shall be fitted on the site, in accordance with details previously submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and retained thereafter.  
Reason: To mitigate against the loss of swallow nests that are present on site that would be lost as a result of the development, and because final details have not been supplied during the lifetime of the application.
5. Car parking including garages and turning shall be provided in accordance with the approved layout plans prior to the first occupation of the dwelling to which it relates. It shall thereafter be retained and not used for any other purpose other than the parking and turning of vehicles.  
Reason: In order to ensure that sufficient car parking and turning remains available on site.
6. A scheme of off-site highway works shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority, and thereafter implemented in full prior to first occupation.  
Reason: In the interest of highway safety.
7. No dwelling shall be occupied until the access road or driveway linking that dwelling to the public highway has been completed to a minimum of base course level and footways/cycleways shall be completed to surface course level. In the event any of the dwellings will be occupied prior to the access road serving that property being fully surfaced then a timetable and phasing plan for completing the roads shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The access roads and driveways shall thereafter be completed in accordance with the approved timetable and phasing plan.  
Reason: In the interests of highway safety
8. Prior to first occupation of any dwelling, vehicle to vehicle, vehicle to pedestrian and forward visibility splays shall be provided in accordance with the details shown on the approved layout plans and kept free of any obstructions over 600mm in height above ground level.  
Reason: In the interest of highway safety.
9. The developer shall carry out a pre-condition highway survey and carry out a joint inspection of the condition with the highway authority of the public highway before site traffic commences. The extent and detail of the survey shall previously have been agreed in writing with the local planning authority. The results of the inspection will be provided by way of a photographic survey by the developer to the Local Highway Authority. A similar inspection will take place on completion of the development.  
Reason: In the interests of highway safety.
10. No development shall take place, including any demolition work, until a Construction Management Plan has been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, which will include the following: -
  - a) A scheme for monitoring, reporting and control of construction noise and vibration including hours of working and scope for remedial action.
  - b) A scheme for the control of dust and scope for remedial action in the event that dust is identified as an issue or any complaints are received.
  - c) A scheme of chassis and wheel cleaning for all construction vehicles to include the details of location and specification of a fully working jetted drive-thru bath type wheel wash system together with hard surfacing laid between the apparatus and public highway in either concrete or tarmac, to be maintained free of mud, slurry and any other form of contamination during the period of construction with all exiting vehicles passing through. A contingency plan including, if necessary, the temporary cessation of all construction operations and movements to be implemented and any affected public highway thoroughly cleaned immediately with mechanical sweepers in the event that the approved vehicle cleaning scheme fails to be effective for any reason.
  - d) Haul routes to the site and hours of delivery
  - e) Measures to ensure that vehicles can access the site immediately upon arrival to ensure

there is no park, waiting, loading/unloading or queuing on the public highway.

- f) Details of site compounds, storage area and contractor/visitor parking/turning.
- g) Details of the site enclosure or part thereof and gated site security.
- h) Confirmation of any tree protection measures.
- i) Confirmation that any demolition will be carried out in accordance with the ecological assessment.
- j) Details of site notice with contact details and a scheme for dealing with complaints.
- k) Details of any temporary lighting which must not directly light the public highway.
- l) Phasing plans where necessary.
- m) A scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from the demolition and construction works.
- n) The erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate.

The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved Construction Management Plan.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity and highway safety.

11. All changes in ground levels, hard landscaping, planting, seeding or turfing shown on the approved landscaping details shall be carried out during the first planting and seeding season (October - March inclusive) following the commencement of the development or in such other phased arrangement as may be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any trees or shrubs which, within a period of 5 years of being planted die are removed or seriously damaged or seriously diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species.

Reason: To ensure that the landscaping is carried out at the appropriate time and is properly maintained.

12. The development hereby permitted shall not commence until details of the maintenance and management of the surface water drainage scheme have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Those details shall include:

- A management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include the arrangements for adoption by an appropriate public body or statutory undertaker, management and maintenance by a Residents' Management Company or any other arrangements to secure the operation of the surface water drainage scheme throughout its lifetime.

Reason: To ensure that the SUDS Scheme is properly maintained to prevent flooding.

13. No development approved by this planning permission shall commence until a remediation strategy to deal with the risks associated with contamination of the site in respect of the development hereby permitted, has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. This strategy shall include the following components:

1. A preliminary risk assessment which has identified:
  - all previous uses
  - potential contaminants associated with those uses
  - a conceptual model of the site indicating sources, pathways and receptors
  - potentially unacceptable risks arising from contamination at the site
2. A site investigation scheme, based on 1 to provide information for a detailed assessment of the risk to all receptors that may be affected, including those offsite.
3. The results of the site investigation and the detailed risk assessment referred to in 2. and, based on these, an options appraisal and remediation strategy giving full details of the remediation measures required and how they are to be undertaken.
4. A verification plan providing details of the data that will be collected in order to demonstrate that the works set out in the remediation strategy in 3. are complete and identifying any requirements for longer-term monitoring of pollutant linkages, maintenance and arrangements for contingency action.

Any changes to these components require the written consent of the local planning authority. The scheme shall be implemented as approved.

Reason: To ensure that the development does not contribute to and is not put at unacceptable risk from or adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of water pollution in line with paragraph 170 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

14. Prior to any part of the development being occupied, a verification report demonstrating the completion of works set out in the approved remediation strategy and the effectiveness of the remediation shall be submitted to, and approved in writing, by the local planning authority. The report shall include results of sampling and monitoring carried out in accordance with the approved verification plan to demonstrate that the site remediation criteria have been met. Reason: To ensure that the site does not pose any further risk to the water environment by demonstrating that the requirements of the approved verification plan have been met and that remediation of the site is complete. This is in line with paragraph 170 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

15. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the recommendations in Para 5.1.2 of the Inspired Ecology Report (August 2021).

Reason: To ensure that protected species are dealt with in an appropriate manner.

#### Notes to applicant

1. With regard to the new swallow nest cups condition, please note that suitable locations would be within open sheds, carports, open fronted garages and stores, extended gables at eaves. It is not possible to install swallow replacement nests under 'normal' eaves; swallows need to go into a dark shelter in order to nest.
2. There are nests of other species (besides swallows) within other buildings on the site. Care is needed to ensure birds are not nesting when demolition takes place, or works begin on conversion. If works are planned within the bird-nesting season, a pre-demolition or pre-works check will be needed.
3. Anglian Water has assets close to or crossing this site or there are assets subject to an adoption agreement. Therefore, the site layout should take this into account and accommodate those assets within either prospectively adoptable highways or public open space. If this is not practicable then the sewers will need to be diverted at the developers cost under Section 185 of the Water Industry Act 1991. or, in the case of apparatus under an adoption agreement, liaise with the owners of the apparatus. It should be noted that the diversion works should normally be completed before development can commence.
4. Notification of intention to connect to the public sewer under S106 of the Water Industry Act Approval and consent will be required by Anglian Water, under the Water Industry Act 1991. Contact Development Services Team 0345 606 6087.
5. Building near to a public sewer - No building will be permitted within the statutory easement width of 3 metres from the pipeline without agreement from Anglian Water. Please contact Development Services Team on 0345 606 6087.
6. The developer should note that the site drainage details submitted have not been approved [by Anglian Water] for the purposes of adoption. If the developer wishes to have the sewers included in a sewer adoption agreement with Anglian Water (under Section 104 of the Water Industry Act 1991), they should contact our Development Services Team on 0345 606 6087 at the earliest opportunity. Sewers intended for adoption should be designed and constructed in accordance with "Design and Construction Guidance for foul and surface water sewers" for developers, as supplemented by Anglian Water's requirements.
7. Rutland County Council became a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Authority on 1st March 2016. Full details of CIL are available on the Council's website

www.rutland.gov.uk. The approved development may be subject to a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) liability.

**IMPORTANT NOTE:** The required CIL forms must be submitted to [cil@rutland.gov.uk](mailto:cil@rutland.gov.uk) and acknowledged prior to commencing the development. Failure to do so could result in additional financial penalties. If you have not received an acknowledgement by the time you intend to commence development, then it is imperative that you contact [cil@rutland.gov.uk](mailto:cil@rutland.gov.uk).

If the development hereby approved is for a self-build dwelling, residential extension or residential annexe you may be able to apply for relief from CIL. Further details can be found on the Planning Portal:

[https://www.planningportal.co.uk/info/200126/applications/70/community\\_infrastructure\\_levy/2](https://www.planningportal.co.uk/info/200126/applications/70/community_infrastructure_levy/2)

#### 8. Street Naming & Numbering - Section 17 - 18 Public Health Act 1925

The development will result in the creation of new street(s) and/or new dwelling(s) and/or allocate appropriate street names and property numbers. This procedure is applicable to the sub-division of premises, which will provide multiple occupancy for both residential and commercial buildings. Before development is commenced an application should be made, allowing 8 weeks to complete. Details are available on our website at the following link:-

<https://www.rutland.gov.uk/myservices/planning-and-building-control/planning/street-name-and-numbering/>

Should you require assistance please email [snn@rutland.gov.uk](mailto:snn@rutland.gov.uk). Please note this is not a function covered by your planning application but is a statutory obligation of the Local Authority, and must be dealt with as a separate matter following planning approval.

#### Pre-Commencement Highway Survey

Prior to the commencement of any work on the site, a joint inspection of the existing public highway, extent to be agreed, should be carried out with the Highway Authority, including photographic evidence. The route should then be inspected again, after completion of the development and any damage to the highway resulting from traffic movements generated by the application site should be repaired to an acceptable standard and at nil cost to the Highway Authority. The Area Highway Manager may also wish to secure a commuted sum for special maintenance to cover the damage caused to the existing roads used as access for vehicles accessing the application site.

#### Utility Services - Section 50 NRSWA 1991

The development is likely to involve works within the public highway in order to provide services to the site or which will affect existing services. Such works must be licenced under the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991. It is essential that, prior to the commencement of such works, adequate time be allowed in the development programme for; the issue of the appropriate licence, approval of temporary traffic management and booking of road space. Further details can be obtained from our website and any queries can be emailed to [highways@rutland.gov.uk](mailto:highways@rutland.gov.uk).

#### Off-site Highway Works - Section 278 Highways Act 1980

The development involves extensive works within the public highway. Such works must be the subject of a legal agreement under Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980. It is essential that prior to the commencement of the highway works, adequate time is allowed in the development programme for; approval by the council of the design, contractors, technical vetting, safety audits, approval of temporary traffic management, booking of road space for off-site highway and service works and the completion of the legal agreement. Works must not commence until the legal agreement is in place and road space booked. Please email [highways@rutland.gov.uk](mailto:highways@rutland.gov.uk) for

further details.

#### Penalty for Depositing on the Highway - Section 148, Sub-Sec C Highways Act 1980

It is an offence to deposit anything including building materials or debris on a highway which may cause interruption to any user of the highway (including footways and verges). In the event that a person is found guilty of this offence, a penalty may be imposed in the form of a fine. It is the responsibility of the developer and contractor(s) to ensure that no building materials or debris are placed on or remain within the highway during or after the construction period.

#### Removal of Deposits on the Highway - Section 149 Highways Act 1980

If anything is so deposited on a highway as to constitute a nuisance, the Local Highway Authority may by notice require the person who deposited it there to remove it forthwith and if he fails to comply the Local Highway Authority may make a complaint to a Magistrates Court for a Removal and Disposal Order. In the event that the deposit is considered to constitute a danger, the Local Highway Authority may remove the deposit forthwith and recover reasonable expenses from the person who made the deposit. It is the responsibility of the developer and contractor(s) to ensure that no building materials or debris are placed on or remain within the highway during or after the construction period

#### 2020/1249/LBA Conditions

1. The works shall begin before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this consent.  
Reason: To comply with the requirements of Section 18(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
2. App plans condition as above (Plot 1 plans only)
3. Prior to the commencement of works to the dovecote, and notwithstanding the information submitted, a measured survey shall be undertaken of the existing roof structure and this, along with a survey drawing, shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority, annotated to show the intensions for each component and, where proposed, details of any new structural members and their means of installation. The works shall be undertaken strictly in accordance with such details as may be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, unless the authority gives its written agreement to any variation to the approved scheme.  
Reason: The building retains elements of the original roof structure that are of historic significance and this additional information is required in order to ensure that any works of alteration are undertaken in a manner that preserves as much of the original roof structure as possible, in the interests of preserving the historic significance of the building.
4. Notwithstanding the information submitted, the existing treble-roll pantiles on the dovecote shall be retained by salvaging existing tiles that are suitable for re-use and any shortfall made up with re-claimed treble-roll pantiles to match as closely as possible the existing pantiles.  
Reason: The existing treble-roll pantiles are an important feature of the Listed building that need to be retained, in the interests of its historic significance.
5. Details of the roof structure on the listed Dovecote to be submitted for approval before works comments. All works to be in accordance with approved scheme.  
Reason: To ensure that the integrity of the listed structure is maintained wherever possible.

## Site & Surroundings

1. The existing site is Home Farm off High Street (behind the Post Office/shop) and comprises a range of traditional stone and modern agricultural buildings on an area of approximately 1.2 hectares. The site is mainly covered by buildings and hard surfacing, with little in the way of vegetation and trees, apart from the western side of the footpath which is overgrown.
2. Existing dwellings are located on High Street in front of the site, generally at a slightly lower level.
3. There is one listed building on site, a Grade II Dovecote.
4. The site is within the Planned Limit to Development and the Ketton Conservation Area.
5. A public footpath runs through the site leading up to, through and beyond the quarry.
6. The site is allocated for development in the Site Allocations and Policies DPD (2014) for the erection of 19 dwellings.

## Proposal

7. The proposal is for the demolition of the modern buildings, conversion of the traditional stone buildings to dwellings (Plots 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 and 7) and offices (Buildings 1 and 5) and the erection of 9 new dwellings (Plots 4 and 8 to 15). Plot 1 is a conversion and extension of the existing listed Dovecote on site to form a 1 bed unit.
8. The application states that the number of dwellings allocated in the Development Plan has been reduced to allow a better overall scheme and includes 2 offices for employment use.
9. Access would be from the existing access on High Street where an existing road frontage barn would be retained and converted to offices with parking behind. Building 5 behind the Post Office would also be offices with parking.
10. A separate entrance would give access to Building 5 and provide off street parking for existing dwellings on High Street
11. The site plan is attached as an Appendix.

## Relevant Planning History

No relevant planning history

## Planning Guidance and Policy

### National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Chapter 5 - Delivering a sufficient supply of homes

Chapter 9 - Promoting sustainable transport

Chapter 12 - Achieving well-designed places

Chapter 15 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

Chapter 16 – Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

### Core Strategy DPD

CS01 – Sustainable development principles

CS02 – The spatial strategy  
CS03 – The Settlement Hierarchy  
CS04 - The Location of Development  
CS09 – Provision and distribution of new housing  
CS10 – Housing density and mix  
CS11 – Affordable housing  
CS18 – Sustainable transport and accessibility  
CS19 - Promoting Good Design  
CS21 - The Natural Environment  
CS22 – The historic and cultural environment

#### **Site Allocations and Policies DPD**

SP2 – Sites for residential development – Allocation Site H6 – Home Farm Ketton – 19 Dwellings  
SP5 – Built development in the towns and villages  
SP9 – Affordable housing  
SP15 - Design and Amenity  
SP19 - Biodiversity and Geodiversity Conservation  
SP20 – The historic environment

Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document (2016)

Note – Ketton and Tinwell had a neighbourhood area designated in September 2018, with a view of creating a neighbourhood plan, though a draft plan has not been published at the time of this report.

### **Planning Assessment**

12. The main issues are the impact on the character and appearance of the area, impact on the identified heritage assets, residential amenity, highways, affordable housing and ecology considerations.

#### Impact on the character and appearance of the area

13. The site is allocated for development of up to 19 dwellings in the development plan. The scheme is at a lower density than was suggested. The site is not on the roadside in the village and has modern bungalows on the frontage adjacent to the Post Office/shop.
14. The conversions use existing building shells and appropriate new materials including corrugated metal sheeting for the roofs, reflecting the previous use. The new build units are well proportioned with relatively narrow gables in a traditional form.
15. The development is served by a narrow road, generally 3.5m wide, to give the impression of a 'lane' rather than a street or road. This would be for both vehicles and pedestrians to demonstrate that it is not a car led layout. There are passing places to minimise conflict on a narrow lane. There is a 1m wide footpath at the entrance to the site alongside a 4.8m roadway.
16. Overall, the scheme will make a neutral or positive contribution to the character of the area generally.

#### Heritage Assets

17. The Conservation Officer was concerned about the extension to the dovecote in that it should be provided by a lightweight link so that the existing rear wall of the building would remain exposed. The applicant has requested that the extension be approved as submitted as a link would make it difficult to retain privacy without blocking out the glazing.

18. With regard to the use of a concrete floor in the Dovecote, the Conservation Officer still considers that a Limecrete or similar floor should be used, thus allowing the building to continue to breathe. He states that evidence should be sought from the manufacturers that the material cannot carry the weight of new structures internally. This will be updated in the Addendum.
19. Subject to clarification of issues surrounding the dovecote, the overall scheme will preserve the character of the conservation area and the setting of the listed building.

#### Trees and Landscaping

20. The Arboricultural Assessment submitted with the application concludes that trees on site are in average condition at best and reflect the fact that the individual specimens have been neglected and naturally regenerating scrub has colonised parts of the site.
21. The Norway Maple should not be seen as a constraint to development due to the fact that it is growing out of a bank and the included union is a defect that cannot be managed via arboricultural works. As such, it would be best to replace this specimen in order to have a blank canvas in terms of the landscape design process.
22. G4, the Hazel stools, should be retained, if possible, these are of an impressive age and are in reasonable condition - they are retained as part of the scheme.
23. The off-site trees need to be considered in terms of RPAs and shade patterns, in particular, the mature Lombardy Poplar.
24. The Assessment suggests that in relation to sustainability and longevity, the rest of the site is cleared of the existing vegetation, in mitigation, a robust and more sustainable, detailed landscape scheme has been submitted with the planning application.
25. This Landscape Architect designed scheme will look to put forward a detailed proposal for the planting of significant native hedgerows, trees and low-level shrubs across the site that will ultimately offer a landscaping scheme of a quality, extent and life expectancy that will far exceed that of the existing overgrown and generally poor-quality specimens presently found on site.
26. The landscaping design and species have been chosen for ecological value and to facilitate a character of transition between built development and the rural character of the countryside beyond the site.
27. The submitted landscape scheme includes 48 new trees, over 3000 new hornbeam hedging plants to form boundaries, 600 new native hedge plants for external boundaries and over 1400 other shrubs. The landscaping plan is accompanied by a landscape specification and maintenance schedule.
28. Boundaries to plots facing the access lane would be defined by hedging.

#### Ecology

29. Surveys for protected species have been carried out to the satisfaction of the Ecology consultee. No further surveys are required but the mitigation in the report should be imposed as a condition (see above).

#### Impact on the neighbours' residential amenities

30. The numerous objections from local residents, the Parish Council and other consultees are noted and have been given due consideration.

31. The layout will have minimal impact on existing dwellings. The dwelling at 72 High Street is separated from the new building plots by an existing high stone wall.
32. The front of Plot 2 (conversion) would be 21m from the rear of the bungalows on High Street. Other buildings adjacent to e existing dwellings are for conversion and all new builds have no impact on the amenities of adjacent residents.
33. The occupier of the bungalow adjacent to the main access is concerned about the impact of the increased use of the access and use of the frontage barn as an office in that this will disrupt the use of the garden. The allocation of the site as a housing site will inevitably include the use of this access to the overall site. The office use will be relatively quiet, especially at night and weekends. It is not considered that this is a reason to refuse permission.
34. It is considered that the scheme would not result in an unacceptable adverse impact on the residential amenities of the occupiers of adjacent properties in accordance with Section 12 of the NPPF (2021), Policy CS19 of the Rutland Core Strategy (2011) and Policy SP15 of the Site Allocations and Policies Development Plan Document (2014).

#### Highway issues

35. Ketton is one of the more larger sustainable settlements in the County.
36. The proposal uses a 4.8m wide access from High Street, allowing the retention of the frontage barn which makes an important contribution to the street scene and character of the conservation area.
37. As set out above the scheme uses a very low road heirarchy to retain a flavour of the character of a village lane. Whilst this makes it tight, it slows down vehicles and allows more of a shared use of the lane so has double benefits.
38. All plots have parking to meet adopted standards
39. In terms of the public footpath running through the site, the access lane does follow the existing route and whilst it would preferable be on a separated alignment to the road, in this case it would be difficult to disrupt the layout by providing a separate PROW route through the development. In terms of the overall length of the footpath this short section on the development is a minor part.
40. The applicant points out that part of the existing footpath is hard surfaced as would the new one be, and points out that walkers already follow the proposed line rather than the actual line as it is mis-signposted.
41. The proposal would result in adequate access, parking and turning facilities and would not have an unacceptable adverse impact on highway safety in accordance with Section 9 of the NPPF (2021) and Policy SP15 of the Site Allocations and Policies Development Plan Document (2014).

#### Drainage

42. Surface water drainage would be to soakaways and permeable paving. There would be grass filter strips alongside the main lane. All drainage is to the satisfaction of the Lead Local Flood Authority and is controlled by conditions set out above.

#### Affordable Housing

43. The scheme does not provide any affordable housing on site. It has been through an independent viability exercise by the District Valuer who has confirmed that an off-site contribution can be made in addition to CIL payments.
44. This contribution would be secured by a S106 agreement.

#### Crime and Disorder

45. It is considered that the proposal would not result in any significant crime and disorder implications.

#### Human Rights Implications

46. Articles 6 (Rights to fair decision making) and Article 8 (Right to private family life and home) of the Human Rights Act have been taken into account in making this recommendation. It is considered that no relevant Article of that act will be breached.

#### **Consultee Responses**

47. **Ketton Parish Council**  
Objection, on the following grounds;

##### Access to site

- Concerns over highway safety due to width of access/road
- Visibility splays do not take account of parked cars
- Any proposed removal of on-street parking along High St would not be acceptable for existing residents
- Community parking within the the development could mitigate issue?

##### Public Right of Way

- Same points raised as PROW Officer's objection (contrary to DEFRA Rights of Way Circular – any alternative alignment should avoid the use of estate roads)
- 'Step off' points along the road onto raised verges to avoid traffic are not practicle for less mobile users of the footpath
- Contrary to (emerging) Policy EN3
- Disagree with prelim advice that the site should have 'tighter street with shared surfaces as fits with the local urban form of most historic parts of the village'.

##### Affordable housing

- No affordable housing or robust justification provided
- Proposes no homes below market cost and only 3 homes with 3 bedrooms or less

##### Sustainability

- Questions 'regular bus service to Stamford and Uppingham due to limitations of timetable
- The Transport Assessment states that a good range of shops and facilities, and a cafe, lie within an 800m walk from the site - there is only one shop/Post Office in Ketton, and no cafe.
- Questions results, and conclusions of Transport Assessment, conducted during pandemic restrictions and missing busy times (commute times and school runs)
- No electric vehicles charging points
- No mention of 'Fibre to the Premises' infrastructure (broadband)

### Self build houses

- All new build houses (not the 6 conversions) are intended to be 'self-build', though will be built by the same developer/builder – i.e. not self build (owners would only decide house interiors) – Implications for CIL relating to self-build

### Surface Water Drainage

- Concerns about possible impact on properties on the SE side of High St.
- note that Anglian Water require more details of the Surface Water Disposal Strategy on this site.

### Cumulative effects of all 3 High Street developments

- If all 3 housing schemes go ahead, it will result in 86 more houses along a 600m stretch of the High Street, and a possible increase in population of at least 10%.
- Extra pressure on school, sewerage system, traffic through the village and doctors' surgeries
- If all 3 building at same time or consecutively, impact as a result of construction and traffic significant
- Essential all construction traffic from the East (A1 direction)

### Long Paddock

- Long Paddock in same ownership as Home Farm
- Potential to plant a new, publicly accessible, community orchard on Long Paddock, in partial mitigation of the proposed destruction of the traditional orchard on the Chater Field site?
- Would see this a mitigation for development at Chater Field (2020/1263/MAF), which will result in the destruction of the traditional orchard,
- Essential that the new orchard is transferred to a trust (or Ketton Parish Council) in order that it should be for the community in perpetuity.

### Other Issues

- Lack of detailed landscaping scheme to include mitigation, or ideally Biodiversity Net Gain, to compensate for tree and habitat loss, especially with respect to bats and swallows.
- The detrimental impact on the wall of no 72 High Street of any possible levelling of the ground on plots 10 and 11.
- The unsuitability of gravel as a surface for mobility scooters, pushchairs and those of limited mobility.
- Fuller archaeological survey required.
- The area with the fuel tank and pump needs to be assessed for contamination.

### Further objection following revised plans:

Archaeology and site investigation reports 1 to 4, storm water calculations, exceedance flow diagrams and manhole detail - noted.

Plot 3 plans (revised) - no objections.

Proposed site plan (revised) - objections.

Although the revision to Plot 8 boundary will improve the width of the road as it curves through the site, we were disappointed to note that there are still no plans for a continuous dedicated footway/pavement through the site. Users of the popular Public Right of Way (part of the Hereward Way) will still be sharing the route with vehicles, with few options of 'step off points for refuge.

We have no objections to the plans for 'flush laid cobblestones' and the drainage channel at the site entrance, and the stone boulder at the corner of building 1. However, the white line on the road, across a widened entrance to the site, will remove the only parking spaces available for 78 High Street. Providing some parking within the development site for nearby residents with no off-street parking options is essential in terms of safety and lessening the impact of this development on the village as a whole.

Proposed site plan (revised) - objections.

We were very disappointed to note that it was not possible to provide parking for the 2 bungalows and the shop (and see comment above).

The use of a 2016 Dept for Transport traffic survey data to justify not repeating their traffic survey out of lock down and at times to include the 'school run' is not acceptable. The DfT data is 5 years out of date, and there is no indication as to where between Ketton and Tinwell the survey was carried out - it could be missing traffic that turns off at Steadfold Lane, which is a well-used route to N Stamford from Ketton.

#### Drainage Strategy – objections

We refer to Anglian Water's comments from Nov 2020, section 4, with respect to surface water disposal plans for this site "The preferred method of surface water disposal would be to a sustainable drainage system (SuDS) with connection to a sewer seen as the last option.....The environment Agency should be consulted if the drainage system directly or indirectly involves the discharge of water into a watercourse" We note that these proposals are for all surface water to drain into the main surface water/clean sewer which would take the water across the road and the field beyond, into Sinc Stream and thence into the R Chater, as based on the dye tracing exercise carried out. The dramatic effects of this dye tracing exercise on Sinc Stream and the Chater were observed by chance by several villagers, including parish councillors. The proposed surface water disposal system is unacceptable in terms of the possible detrimental effects on the water quality, and hence biodiversity, of Sinc Stream and the Chater.

#### 48. **Ketton and Tinwell Neighbourhood PlanGroup**

- 1) The JNPSG opposes this application. Whilst recognising that this is a site designated for development by RCC, it is clear that this proposal falls on a number of counts. In our view it should be rejected by RCC. In taking this view, we are drawing on our evidence base for the Neighbourhood Plan (in preparation) and our information about residents' views obtained via public consultation, which included a Survey in 2020 across all residents of their opinions on a wide range of matters, to which we received 315 responses across Ketton and Tinwell, 293 being from Ketton residents.
- 2) In addition to our own views, set out below, we also completely endorse the submission made by Ketton Parish Council in opposing this Application, together with the series of very detailed points they make, which we will not repeat here.
- 3) Concerning Housing type, the Survey concluded that 88% of those with an opinion felt the village needed properties with two and three bedrooms, directly in line with RCC's own policy and the conclusions of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment for the area.

Complementary to this was a clear lack of appetite for developments with four or more bedrooms, which only 9% of those expressing an opinion supported. Yet only three of the dwellings proposed are of three or less bedrooms.

- 4) Affordability is another area in which the responses to our Survey supported both National and Local Policy. 72% of those with an opinion believed that the need was for housing NOT at a price set by the market. Yet no affordable housing is included here.
- 5) Parking issues and traffic management. In this part of Ketton these two issues are closely linked. The lack of provision for parking was perhaps the most vehemently felt area of response in our Survey. In terms of a wide range of perceived "needs" in the villages, off-road parking attracted the highest level of concern of all. In judging new developments for approval, 286 respondents felt the matter was very important, against only 9 who did not. Ketton already has a parking problem as noted in the response of Ketton Parish Council, and this development in its present form can only serve to increase that problem in several significant ways. We would also highlight the impact that these parking pressures will have on the management of traffic flow through Ketton, at a known pinch-point, with resultant safety concerns.
- 6) Heritage. We are unclear how the various self-build etc plans are intended to ensure no loss of the considerable heritage value of many of the buildings. In particular, attention should be paid to the internal structure of the old dove cote (a Listed Building) and any dwelling conversion should ensure that the design allows the preservation of its characteristic features.
- 7) Green space and Nature. Our Survey made clear the concerns of a substantial majority of residents on these matters, also supported by a number of RCC policies. This covered both Trees, hedgerows and woodlands, and also untended land of wildlife value. The Application impacts all such areas. The Survey showed that for Trees, hedgerows and woodlands, 289 respondents rated these as very important, a further 20 as slightly important, and a mere 6 as not at all important. Untended land of wildlife value rated 234 considering it to be very important, 63 slightly important and 18 as not at all important. The view of the village is clear, and yet there is no attempt in the proposal to offer mitigation in respect of the loss of biodiversity and crucially no attempt to provide biodiversity gain (see below) within the development site.
- 8) Biodiversity. Further to note 6) above, we are surprised and disappointed that there is no reference in the proposal for the requirement for "net Biodiversity gain". This is not an optional extra, or some kind of "nice to have", but rather a specific requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), paras 170 - 175, and specifically para 170(d). This is supported by RCC policy EN9. The Environment Bill currently going through Parliament is likely to elaborate further on these matters, and may well require a 10% biodiversity net gain. The Application's ecological survey, despite the problems with it that we identify below, itself identifies there is clearly a net loss to Biodiversity from the proposal as it stands, due not least to loss of habitat for a range of species in the trees, bushes and buildings presently on the site. Yet the Application makes no attempt to quantify this or suggest any mitigation process. We also have the following specific comments which in our viewpoint to difficulties in the Application relying in the ecological survey carried out:
  - a) The survey took the form of desk-checking records, and site visits in winter and early spring. Neither date would have allowed an adequate assessment of the utilisation of the whole site by wildlife, and in particular bats.
  - b) There are mentions of a possible bat hibernation roost, but no checks have been done for the possibility of summer and maternity roosts in the building.
  - c) Nor has any survey been done of the use of the buildings and surrounding area as foraging or flight corridors for the many bat species that are found in Ketton.
  - d) The lack of a summer surveys means that the presence of a large colony of mining bees in the old dove cote has not been taken into account. Whilst these are not protected species themselves, the catastrophic loss of bees, amongst other invertebrates, is widely recognised as being of extreme detriment to all ecosystems, and any loss of such a site is significant. If the current open stone structure in the old dove cote cannot be retained, lime mortar rather than conventional mortar should be

used in site works here, and should also be a condition of the works across the site as a whole.

Ann Tomlinson  
Chair, Ketton and Tinwell Joint Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

#### 49. **Highway Authority**

No Objections if built in accordance with Drawing No. HF-PR-PL-01 Rev A submitted on 7/5/2021 and subject to the following conditions/informatives;  
The Local Highways Authority understand that the access road will remain private however will have a PROW running from the south east of the site to the north west corner

##### Parking and Turning

Car parking including garages and turning shall be provided in accordance with the approved layout plans prior to the first occupation of the dwellings to which it relates. It shall thereafter be retained and not used for any other purpose other than the parking and turning of vehicles.  
Reason: In order to ensure that sufficient car parking and turning remains available on site.

##### Off-site Highway Works

A scheme of off-site highway works shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority, and thereafter implemented in full prior to first occupation.  
Reason: In the interest of highway safety.

##### Completion of roads

No dwelling shall be occupied until the access road or driveway linking that dwelling to the public highway has been completed to a minimum of base course level and footways/cycleways shall be completed to surface course level. In the event any of the dwellings will be occupied prior to the access road serving that property being fully surfaced then a timetable and phasing plan for completing the roads shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The access roads and driveways shall thereafter be completed in accordance with the approved timetable and phasing plan.  
Reason: In the interests of highway safety

##### Visibility Splays

Prior to first occupation of any dwelling, vehicle to vehicle, vehicle to pedestrian and forward visibility splays shall be provided in accordance with the details shown on the approved layout plans and kept free of any obstructions over 600mm in height above ground level.  
Reason: In the interest of highway safety.

##### Pre-condition Highway Survey

The developer must contact the Local Highway Authority to agree the extent of a pre-condition highway survey and carry out a joint inspection of the condition of the public highway before site traffic commences. The results of the inspection will be provided by way of a photographic survey by the developer to the Local Highway Authority. A similar inspection will take place on completion of the development.  
Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

##### Construction Management Plan Condition

No development shall take place, including any demolition work, until a Construction Management Plan has been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, which will include the following:-

- a) A scheme for monitoring, reporting and control of construction noise and vibration including hours of working and scope for remedial action.
- b) A scheme for the control of dust and scope for remedial action in the event that dust is identified as an issue or any complaints are received.
- c) A scheme of chassis and wheel cleaning for all construction vehicles to include the details of location and specification of a fully working jetted drive-thru bath type wheel wash system together with hard surfacing laid between the apparatus and public highway in either concrete or tarmac, to be maintained free of mud, slurry and any other form of contamination during the period of construction with all exiting vehicles passing through. A contingency plan including, if necessary, the temporary cessation of all construction operations and movements to be implemented and any affected public highway thoroughly cleaned immediately with mechanical sweepers in the event that the approved vehicle cleaning scheme fails to be effective for any reason.
- d) Haul routes to the site and hours of delivery
- e) Measures to ensure that vehicles can access the site immediately upon arrival to ensure there is no park, waiting, loading/unloading or queuing on the public highway.
- f) Details of site compounds, storage area and contractor/visitor parking/turning.
- g) Details of the site enclosure or part thereof and gated site security.
- h) Confirmation of any tree protection measures.
- i) Confirmation that any demolition will be carried out in accordance with the ecological assessment.
- j) Details of site notice with contact details and a scheme for dealing with complaints.
- k) Details of any temporary lighting which must not directly light the public highway.
- l) Phasing plans where necessary.
- m) A scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from the demolition and construction works.
- n) The erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate.

The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved Construction Management Plan.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity and highway safety.

INFORMATIVES (See recommendation)

#### 50. **Transport Strategy**

- Site permeability - for safety, to encourage travel by foot and ensure accessibility for all, the properties should have a suitable footway provision to the frontages and leading out to the High Street.
- Cycleway enhancement - the Parish have previously requested enhancements to the existing cycleway to the east of the village. As such, a contribution towards such improvements should be considered.

#### 51. **Public Right of Way Officer**

Objection: Based on the proposal to divert existing public footpath E229, which features on a number of promoted routes (local and national) and construct a tarmac estate road over it. The applicant's design does not appear to have taken into consideration, or be contrary to, DEFRA Circular 1/09, Rutland County Council Rights of Way Improvement Plan (second edition), and Policy RLP42 (Green infrastructure, sport and recreation) of the emerging Local Plan

DEFRA Circular 1/09

7.8 In considering potential revisions to an existing right of way that are necessary to accommodate the planned development, but which are acceptable to the public, any

alternative alignment should avoid the use of estate roads for the purpose wherever possible and preference should be given to the use of made-up estate paths through landscaped or open space areas away from vehicular traffic.

Rutland County Council Rights of Way Improvement Plan (second edition)

Action 4B - Ensure that new development not only preserves but enhances the local rights of way network, either within the limits of development or beyond, and publish guidance for developers defining best practice. Existing paths within the limits of development should be improved by the dedication of additional width and/or higher rights, whilst off-site improvements should focus on the creation of new routes to integrate the development into the wider network:

Development is often seen as detrimental to the rights of way network, and perhaps in the past we haven't always fully appreciated its value. We believe that in the future developers should be required to enhance rights of way affected by their proposals in anticipation of increasing levels of use and raised expectations.

**52. Rutland Ramblers**

Objection, on the following grounds;

- Major concerns over the impact this proposed development will have for the Right of Way access that passes through it.
- This is an important and extremely well-used footpath.
- Concern over the safety of walkers, and the potential for that to be compromised. The proposal to divert the existing public footpath (E229) and essentially construct a tarmac road over it will inevitably increase risk.
- Other concern is about the quality of the footpath in the future, and the potential for walkers to enjoy using it. We should be taking every opportunity to enhance the 'open' and 'green' nature of our RoW network in Rutland; these proposals do not appear to do that.
- Cites; DEFRA RoW Circular - 1/09, Rutland County Council - RoW Improvement Plan - Action 4B and (emerging) Rutland Local Plan - Policy RLP42.

**53. Local Lead Flood Authority (LLFA)**

No Objections if built in accordance with Drawing 20111-001 Rev P6 Drainage Strategy; and subject to the following condition:

The development hereby permitted shall not commence until details of the maintenance and management of the surface water drainage scheme have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Those details shall include:

A management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include the arrangements for adoption by an appropriate public body or statutory undertaker, management and maintenance by a Residents' Management Company or any other arrangements to secure the operation of the surface water drainage scheme throughout its lifetime

**54. LCC Archaeology**

Written Scheme of Investigation is acceptable – Trial trenching is underway

Further comments following re-consultation

The evaluation report shows that no significant archaeological evidence has been found. There is still the requirement for the historic building survey, however I am aware that this has been completed. Once the historic building report has been submitted there will be no further

archaeological requirements on this application and the previous suggested condition would not be needed.

55. **Georgian Group**

Comments limited to Dovecote and 'building 3' only. Concern over the conversion of the Dovecote – critical that the surviving nesting boxes remain both undisturbed and visible within any conversion scheme. Concern over the use of UPVC frames for the building 3, and three new openings within the first-floor principal façade.

56. **Conservation Officer**

Firstly, I can confirm that I have no objection in principle to the conversion and extension of this Grade II Listed dovecote to a dwelling although I do have several concerns about the scheme as currently proposed.

That said, I am pleased to see that the applicants are being realistic with regard to level of accommodation that is to be provided by the conversion and that the proposed extension is to be discreetly located on the northern side of the building.

However, whilst I have no issue with the proportions and proposed materials for the extension, I am concerned that there is no separation, in the form of a narrow glazed/partially glazed link between the existing and proposed elements, as usually the case with successful schemes involving this type of building. Such a link would better preserve the character and appearance of the dovecote than having virtually the entire width of the north wall concealed by the extension.

Also, the annotation on the 'proposed' drawing states that – "*Existing roof timbers retained and locally repaired where necessary*". This is good but I would still like to see photos of the roof structure just to confirm there is no feature associated with the buildings' original use that may need to be preserved.

It would also be helpful if the applicants could state their intentions with regard to damp-proofing and insulation. Ideally, I would like to see the internal walls remain exposed in their entirety, but I appreciate that may conflict with thermal insulation requirements.

Finally, I note that a concrete floor is proposed in the dovecote, and I would advise that in a building of this type the floor should be of a breathable material such as 'Limecrete', or a similar product, in the best interests of preserving the fabric of this building of traditional construction.

I would welcome opportunity to comment further should revised proposals addressing the above concerns.

Further comments

- Agree that the works to the roof structure can be dealt with by way of condition

Secondly, glazed links are an appropriate and commonly used design solution to provide a connection between historic buildings and additions. This Authority has approved several such schemes (including a link between a former dovecote and additional accommodation at Belmesthorpe). I maintain the view that a predominantly glazed link is the most appropriate solution to connecting the main body of the extension to the dovecote. Also, the link should be narrower, so as to obscure less of the external wall of the dovecote.

Thirdly, I note the intention to leave the internal surfaces, therefore the nest boxes, exposed but is this feasible in practice? Won't some insulation be required for energy efficiency

purposes? From my point of view, it would be preferable for the nest boxes to remain entirely exposed but I query whether this is practicable.

Fourthly, the applicants discount the use of Limecrete for the floor as it would not be suitable to support the load of the free-standing mezzanine, but a concrete floor would. Have they actually investigated whether it is the case that Limecrete could not perform the purpose of supporting the mezzanine? What do the manufacturers have to say on the matter?

Lastly, something I overlooked in my original comments was the proposal to change the roof covering. At present the covering is treble-roll pantiles and the annotation on the drawing specifies Sandtoft Old English Natural Red Clay Pantiles which have an entirely different profile. I would advise that the existing type of pantile should be retained, and this will involve salvaging existing tiles that are suitable for re-use and any shortfall made up with re-claims. This is required because the existing pantiles are an important feature of the building that need to be retained.

#### Final Comments 22 December 2021

I have not seen any technical information to confirm the Agent's assertion that Limecrete would not be suitable to support the load of the free-standing mezzanine. I repeat my suggestion that the manufacturers are asked to confirm if this is the case.

As for my suggestion for a glazed link, I have reconsidered the drawings with regard to this matter and take the point regarding privacy. Consequently, as the addition to the dovecote is now narrower than the existing building and predominantly clad in horizontal timber boarding, I accept that the use of this material (allowed to weather naturally) will adequately in this instance differentiate the extension from the Listed structure.

However, my concerns with the regard to the roof covering remain, this should be triple-roll pantiles as at present, and not the type currently specified. Also, the matter insulation and exposure of the nest boxes remains unresolved.

My email of the 19/2/2021 includes a suggested condition for the roof structure.

As for the roofing materials for the remainder of the site, blue slate and plain should predominate on the new build units with pantiles confined to outbuildings (garages). Corrugated metal has become part of the agricultural vernacular and I am not concerned about its use (subject to approval of samples) on some of the converted buildings. I am not sure about its use though on the taller buildings, such as that on Plot 4.

#### 57. **Public Protection**

Following a phase II contaminated land assessment, it is required that the identified tanks are removed and allowance made for ground conditions identified in the report. Contaminated soil to be removed as work progresses. Final validation report required.

#### 58. **Affordable Housing**

There is a 30% affordable housing requirement for this site under policies CS11 (Affordable housing), SP9 (affordable housing) and the Planning Obligations SPD 2016. There is substantial need for more affordable housing in Ketton. The affordable housing should normally be on site, unless the applicant can demonstrate that there are exceptional planning reasons [not to].

The applicant states that there is no affordable housing provision because the site is not viable but offers little justification stating that conversion is more expensive than new build. The SPD states:

A viability appraisal should be sought in line the SPD, with the applicant agreeing beforehand to pay the relevant fees.

59. **Severn Trent**

Confirm that the site is out of Severn Trent Water's area for sewerage

60. **Anglian Water**

- Assets Affected - Note to applicant requested regarding assets owned by Anglian Water or subject to an adoption agreement.
- Wastewater - The foul drainage from this development is in the catchment of Ketton Water Recycling Centre that will have available capacity for these flows
- Used water network – Based on the submitted Flood Risk Assessment, the sewerage system at present has available capacity for these flows. Notes to applicant requested.
- Surface water disposal - The preferred method of surface water disposal would be to a sustainable drainage system (SuDS) with connection to sewer seen as the last option. From the details submitted to support the planning application the proposed method of surface water management does not relate to Anglian Water operated assets. Defer this point to the Local Lead Flood Authority.

61. **LCC Ecology**

Initial comments about number of surveys required.

All surveys have now been done. The applicant's ecologist was in touch in October and sent me the surveys. I don't know whether the surveys were ever submitted formally. It is now OK; no further surveys needed, but mitigation under conditions.

**Neighbour Responses**

62. 8 objections received, on the following grounds:
- Some support for the principle of development but;
  - No smaller/affordable properties
  - High risk of flooding
  - Width/capacity of access
  - Conflict for cyclists and pedestrians in the site
  - Public footpath not segregated/future impact
  - Difficulties for refuse vehicles
  - Character of conservation area
  - Loss of habitat
  - Loss of amenity for the bungalow adj the access

## **Conclusion**

63. Taking the above into account, it is considered that the proposed scheme as amended complies with the relevant policies of the Development Plan and can therefore be recommended for approval subject to the completion of a legal agreement to secure the off-site financial contribution towards affordable housing.

**Key**

- 1.2m High Livestock Mesh with 75mm Diameter Timber Posts. Native Thornless Mixed Hedge to Grow Through Mesh.
- Lawn/Grass Verge
- Low Level Shrubs/Planting
- Loose Golden Gravel
- Tarmac Road Finishes
- Permeable Block Paving – Bretts Alpha Flow 'Autumn Gold'
- Patio/Path Paving Slabs - Indistone
- Bin Store Location
- Proposed Air Source Heat Pump. Plot 2 unit to be sited within Timber Enclosure

For detailed landscaping design refer to Landscape Drawing prepared by Otis



Proposed Site Plan



<b>NOTES</b>	
REVISIONS A - General revisions in response to Highways comments: entrance details and Plot 8 boundary.	
Jon Richards Architectural Design Jasmine House 1 Red House Farm Stamford PE9 4EG +44 (0) 1979 388276 info@jad.co.uk www.jad.co.uk	
CLIENT Beeson Wright Ltd	
PROJECT Home Farm 72 High Street Kettleton Stamford PE9 3TE	
DRAWING TITLE Proposed Site Plan	
SCALE 1:200 @ A0	
DATE September 2020	
DRAWING NO HF-PR-PL-01	REV A