



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



Rutland County Council

Catmose,
Oakham,
Rutland
LE15 6HP

Application:	2021/0083/FUL	ITEM 1	
Proposal:	Development of the land on the south side of Church Farm, Ridlington to create 1 no. detached 2.5 storey C3 dwellinghouse with associated driveway, parking and garage with first floor habitable space.		
Address:	Church Farm, 2 Church Lane, Ridlington, Rutland, LE15 9AL		
Applicant:	Daniel Lount	Parish	Ridlington
Agent:	Class Q Ltd	Ward	Braunston & Martinthorpe
Reason for presenting to Committee:	Policy considerations		
Date of Committee:	11 January 2022		
Determination Date:	22 March 2021		
Agreed Extension of Time Date:	24 December 2021		

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This scheme for a new house in Ridlington raises issues of policy and the impact on heritage assets.

Overall the scheme is recommended for approval because the locational policies of the development plan are out of date as the Council can no longer demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply and the design of the proposal is acceptable in terms of its impact on heritage assets.

RECOMMENDATION

APPROVAL, subject to the following conditions

1. The development shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
Reason – To comply with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.
2. The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, numbers.
Reason - For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
3. No development above ground level shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority a scheme of hard and soft landscaping works for the site, which shall include any proposed changes in ground levels, boundary treatments and also accurately identify spread, girth and species of all existing trees, shrubs and hedgerows on the site and indicate any to be retained, together with measures for their protection which shall comply with the recommendations set out in the British Standards Institute publication "BS 5837: 2012 Trees in Relation to Construction."
REASON: To ensure that the landscaping is designed in a manner appropriate to the locality and to enhance the appearance of the development.
4. 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.

5. No development above damp course level shall be carried out 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 because no details have been submitted with the application.
6. Notwithstanding the provisions of Article 3, Schedule 2, Part 1 Classes A-E of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no enlargement, improvement or other alteration to the dwelling shall be erected or carried out nor shall any structure be erected within the curtilage, except in accordance with the prior planning permission of the local planning authority.
Reason: The dwelling would be sited in a prominent position within the conservation area, adjacent to listed buildings. Any further additions or windows would be likely to have a detrimental impact on heritage assets and residential amenity and hence need to be considered by the local planning authority.
7. The development shall not be occupied until the applicant has made provision for the deposition of the archaeological archive from their investigation of the development site. The arrangements for the archive will be submitted to and approved by the planning authority.
Reason: To ensure satisfactory archaeological investigation and recording.
8. Provision and retention of visibility splays Prior to commencement of the development, the verge area to the northeast of the vehicular access between the new beech hedge and the channel line of the carriageway in Church Lane will be clear of all obstruction above 650mm above ground level for a distance of 50m along Church Lane from the channel line of Holygate Road, and thereafter maintained free of any obstruction at all times.
Reason: To provide adequate inter-visibility between vehicles using the access and those approaching along Church Lane in the interest of highway safety.
9. The design of the resurfaced existing access should incorporate measures to ensure that no loose surfacing material or surface water shall cross from the access onto the public highway.
Reason: To ensure that no loose material or private surface water flows on to the public highway in the interests of highway safety.

Site & Surroundings

1. The site is located on the corner of Church Lane and Holygate Road in Ridlington. The site is located within both the Planned Limit to Development (PLD) and the Article 4 Ridlington Conservation Area, the boundary of which runs along the opposite side of Holygate Road.

2. The site is raised above the level of the 2 roads and comprises open unkempt land. There are conifer trees along the Holygate Lane frontage with an informal low dry stone wall on the Church Lane side.
3. To the rear is the yard to Church Farm which comprises utilitarian agricultural buildings. To the west is a substantial listed house known as The Dower House, which has a modern extension nearest the application site boundary, beyond which is The Old Rectory, also listed together with its front boundary wall.
4. To the north is Church Farm house, also listed, beyond which is the Parish Church (Grade II*). On the east side of Church Lane is the listed Ridlington House
5. The site is subject to an Important Frontage designation in the development plan. This applies to the boundary around the front and Church Lane sides of this site

Proposal

6. It is proposed to erect as new 2½ storey dwelling on the site, details of which are shown in the Appendix.
7. The materials would be ironstone and slate reflecting the local vernacular.
8. The scheme would involve the removal of the conifers along the Holygate Road boundary and replacement with more appropriate species.



Revised CGI Image of proposal

Planning History

None

Planning Guidance and Policy

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2019

Chapter 2 – Achieving Sustainable Development (inc Para 11(d))
Chapter 5 – Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
Chapter 12 – Achieving well designed places
Chapter 16 – Conserving the historic environment

Site Allocations and Policies DPD (2014)

SP1- Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development
SP5 - Built Development in the Towns and Villages
SP15 – Design & Amenity
SP20 – The Historic Environment
SP21 – Important Open Spaces and Frontages

Core Strategy DPD (2011)

CS03 - The Settlement Hierarchy
CS04 - The Location of Development
CS19 – Good Design
CS22 – Historic Environment

Neighbourhood Plan

There is no NP for Ridlington

Officer Evaluation

Principle of the use

9. Ridlington is classified as a Restraint Village in Policy CS3 of the Core Strategy. These were villages that were considered unsustainable. CS4 did not permit development in such areas.
10. The recently withdrawn Local Plan Review (LPR) had re-assessed the settlement hierarchy and Ridlington was to be designated as a Smaller Village. The criteria was not greatly dissimilar to CS4. However, other than the 'other villages' identified in the settlement hierarchy, all other settlements are considered sustainable in terms of applying control in the situation where there is an out of date policy (as per Para 11(d)). Whilst the LPR has been withdrawn, the settlement hierarchy has been appraised and can still be taken into consideration.
11. The Restraint Villages Policy is therefore out of date as this has now been superseded by National Planning Guidance and the NPPF.
12. The Site Allocations & Policies DPD, includes Policy SP1 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development. This policy is now more relevant where the Council cannot demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing. The policy states the Council will take a positive approach when considering development proposals that reflect the Framework presumption in favour of sustainable development in line with Paragraph 11(d). This includes applications involving the provision of housing, where the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites. Where relevant policies are out of date then the Council will grant permission unless material considerations indicate otherwise, taking into account whether this proposal will lead to

any adverse impacts, which would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the scheme in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

13. Given the current shortfall in the required five-year housing supply, consideration needs to be given whether the adverse impacts of developing the site significantly outweighs its benefits. As such the development will need to be in compliance with the National Planning Policy Framework.
14. In terms of location of the site, the Framework advises that when planning for development i.e. through the Local Plan process, the focus should be on existing service centres and on land within or adjoining existing settlements. The National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) states that all settlements can play a role in delivering sustainable development and so blanket policies restricting housing development in some settlements and preventing other settlements from expanding should be avoided unless their use can be supported by robust evidence.
15. The Council has produced a background paper 'Sustainability of Settlements Assessment Update' (November 2019). Ridlington is classed in the Smaller Village category. These villages tend to have only some of the key facilities and/or are less accessible to higher order centres than villages in the Local Service Centre category. Small scale development on infill sites, redevelopment of previously developed land and the conversion or reuse of existing buildings will be supported.
16. The site is thereby in a sustainable location and meets the Frameworks core approach to sustainable development. The Council will need to consider whether the proposal will harm the character and setting of the countryside.
17. Overall, the Council will need to be satisfied that this proposal is sustainable development in accordance with the Framework and that it is unlikely to have an adverse impact on the surrounding environment or character of the area that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the application, when assessed against the policies of the NPPF as a whole.
18. The site is within the PLD and whilst it may be former agricultural land, and thereby not classed as previously developed, other than the important frontages policy, it does not contribute positively to the character of the Conservation Area.
19. The opportunity therefore exists for the development of the site to make a positive contribution to the character, subject to design and other issues considered below.

Impact of the development on the character of the area

20. There is a statutory obligation on the Local Planning Authority to ensure that the character of the Conservation Area and the setting of Listed Buildings be preserved or enhanced by a new development pursuant to S66(1) Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
21. Paragraph 134 of the Framework states:
22. Development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes. Conversely, significant weight should be given to:
 - a) development which reflects local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes; and/or

- b) outstanding or innovative designs which promote high levels of sustainability, or help raise the standard of design more generally in an area, so long as they fit in with the overall form and layout of their surroundings.
23. Overall, the principle for development in this location would have been contrary to the development plan, but the locational policies are now out of date. The council should be satisfied that the scheme meets the criteria set out in Para 134, Policies CS19, CS22, SP15 and SP20.
24. The scheme has been amended to reduce its impact in relation to the listed building next door. The design is of generally high quality using appropriate materials and detailing, reflecting a) above.
25. This is a large new dwelling, but it is on a large plot and is commensurate with the scale of the listed buildings adjacent.
26. The scheme does not impinge on this important frontage and landscaping can be designed to enhance its contribution to the conservation area, which is currently poorly defined, in accordance with Condition 3 in the recommendation.

Impact on the neighbouring properties

27. The proposed house would be set forward of the adjacent listed building (Dower House). This property has trees along its front side boundary that provide some screening effect. There would be one first floor window on that side, to an en-suite. There are also 2 rooflights to bedrooms on that side, a minimum of 1.6m above floor level. The floor level of the new house would be below existing site levels to reduce the impact.

Heritage

28. As set out below the Conservation Officer had some initial concerns about the scheme. These have now been addressed, including by reducing the height of the wing adjacent to the Dower House.
29. The proposal would preserve or enhance the character of the conservation area and would not detract from the setting of the nearby listed buildings.

Highway issues

30. No highway objections. The existing access is to be used which would have catered for farm machinery at one time. One additional dwelling will not have an undue impact on traffic in the village where traffic counts are actually very low.
31. This scheme does not warrant contributions to resolve other highway issues in the village.
32. For clarity, regarding Para 41 below, the recommended Condition 8 covers the requirements of the highway authority and there is no objection from a highway safety point of view.

Crime and Disorder

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

Human Rights Implications

34. 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.
35. It is considered that no relevant Article of that act will be breached.

Consultations

36. **Conservation Officer**

Initial Comments

Application site is prominently located within the Ridlington Article 4 Conservation Area amongst a group of several Listed buildings. There is a gentle fall across the site northwards from the Holygate Road frontage and it sits significantly higher than Church Lane that runs along the eastern boundary. Whilst old photographs show the site was once an open working yard associated with the agricultural buildings to the north. The site is currently laid to grass with a row of mature Leylandii on the Holygate Rd frontage, a few mature trees of differing species scattered across the site and newly planted saplings on the eastern boundary.

As stated at the time of the Pre-app enquiry, I see the proposal for a dwelling on this site to be an opportunity for enhancement as the views across the site from the south/south-east are marred by the group of unsightly agricultural buildings of various inappropriate materials occupying the land between the Dower House (Grade II) and Church Farm House (Grade II).

There are views across the site from the south-east and east to the Dower House (recently extended towards the application site) and roof of the, three storey, Old Rectory to the west and Church Farm House sits prominently views northwards along Church Lane.

The proposal is to erect a house with an L-shaped floor plan in the north-west corner of the site, close to the boundary with the Dower House. A detached triple garage with, as is frequently the case nowadays, accommodation in the roofspace accessed via an external staircase.

The proposed house would comprise a 2½ storey element on an east/west alignment and a 1½ storey element on slightly higher ground and aligned parallel with and in close proximity to the western site boundary with the Dower House. This latter element includes a floor to ridge height glazed dining area with a stone gable wall.

Church Farm House dates from the C18, is constructed of ironstone and has a thatched roof. It is understood to have been associated with the farm buildings to the north of the application site and the former use of the site itself. The application site has, therefore, a historical connection with the application site.

Materials are specified to be Ironstone for the external walls, natural blue slate for the roofs, timber doors and metal windows.

Timber gates, similar to those of the Dower House, and stone piers would be erected at the entrance at the south-east corner of the site. It is unclear what the boundary

treatments are proposed in addition to restoration of the low boundary/retaining walls on the eastern and southern perimeters.

I would agree with the applicants' heritage consultant that "construction of a single dwelling within the defined plot is a continuation of a tradition which has resulted in the present village configuration." However, whilst I do not necessarily have any concerns with regard to the design of the house itself which should, over time, weather and blend in with its surroundings, I do have concerns about the positioning of the house and its impact on the setting of nearby designated heritage assets. By positioning such a large house in close proximity to the western boundary it would obliterate the present view across the site to the Dower House and the Old Rectory, as the submitted 'Illustrative View' demonstrates.

The question is, therefore, to what extent does the setting of the Dower House and Church Farm House contribute to their significance as designated heritage assets? The submitted elevation drawings do not show how the proposed dwelling would sit in relation to the Dower House and Church Farm House I would really like to see a drawing showing the relationship of the proposed dwelling particularly to the Dower House before coming to a final conclusion on this scheme.

Further comments

I thank the Architect for providing the additional information regarding the impact of the proposed dwelling on the setting neighbouring Grade II listed Dower House.

Having reviewed this information I can confirm that I consider that the setting issue has been satisfactorily taken into account in the design and positioning of the proposed dwelling.

However, I suggest that we take up the Architect's offer to reduce the overall height of the south-east wing by 600mm, as anything that will lessen the impact on the neighbouring Listed building is welcome from a conservation point of view.

Otherwise, I no longer see any reason, from a conservation point of view, why permission should not be granted for proposed development, subject to the usual conditions (samples of materials, etc).

Further Comments

I note the latest amendments to the proposal, in particular the reduction in height of the west wing of the proposed dwelling and can confirm that this revision to the design is welcome and I have no further comments other than to suggest that, if the development is approved, consideration be given to the removal of permitted development rights for extensions and free-standing garden structures, as these could have a significant impact on the surroundings to this prominent site and so ought to be assessed by the LPA.

37. **Ridlington Parish Council**

Ridlington Parish Council raise the following concerns in objection to the application:

- a) The height of the proposed development, compared to properties in close proximity, is of concern and should be considered.
- b) The gateway is sited on the corner of a dangerous bend and this raises road safety concerns. See attached report for further information.

- c) Previous applications for new builds in Ridlington, a Conservation Area and subject to Article 4, have been declined - 2011/0663/FUL 1 Hannah's Field erection of a bungalow was refused. Fairness to all should be maintained.
- d) The application is not accompanied with developer contributions.

Addendum:

Dear Councillor Baines

I am writing on behalf of Ridlington Parish Council in order to bring to your attention our concerns in regard to, in our opinion, an increased danger to road safety caused by a substantial increase in traffic usage along Top Road and Holygate Lane in Ridlington.

This is not just about the numbers of cars travelling this route but mainly about the increased number of commercial vehicles of all types and especially by heavy and articulated lorries coming in and out of the village from Brooke Road passing along Top Road, Holygate Lane and on up to the Parker farms properties at the top of Holygate Lane. These roads are already heavily used by agricultural traffic, the necessity for which is understood.

In June 2020 retrospective planning permission was granted by Rutland County Council for two businesses to operate from the barns situated within the Park Farm site with the possibility of further planning being approved in relation to business use at the barns.

The Parish Council sought the views of residents and the main issues identified were:

1. Top Road and Holygate Lane form part of very popular walking, cycling and riding routes in the area and are frequented not just by local villagers but by many visitors from further afield in Rutland.
2. Large sections of the route have no provision for vehicles approaching one another from opposite direction to pass safely and with large lorries this becomes an impossibility. It is difficult enough as well for walkers (often with dogs) and horse riders to get off the road to allow sufficient room for these vehicles to pass safely.
3. The narrowness of the blind double bend situated at the junction of Top Road and Church Lane makes this particularly hazardous not only to pedestrians but also cyclists, horse riders, farm traffic, cars, delivery vans and heavy commercial traffic.
4. Increased business traffic will risk increasing damage to the roadside ecology as vehicles are eroding the grass verges. The only pavement in existence starts and ends at Hannahs Field at the entrance to the village. Holygate Lane in particular is a single lane country road with no footpath and is, in our opinion, completely unsuitable for the increased usage of commercial traffic now being seen.
5. Residents of properties fronting Hannahs Field on entering the village have only limited off road parking resulting in several vehicles being parked along this stretch of road, narrowing this stretch even further.

As a minimum to mitigate this, if planning cannot be avoided, it has been suggested that developers should consider the installation of footpaths/bridle ways all along the route but especially along Holygate Lane. It is understood that this could be made possible by utilising Section 106 or equivalent before planning is granted.

We understand there is no substantiated data in existence of accident history along Top Road or Holygate Lane, but residents are aware of a number of "near misses" over recent time as well as there having been three known separate collisions between delivery vans over the last couple of years or so.

The voluntary recording of accidents, near misses and other incidents occurring along these roads is to be raised at our next Parish Council meeting and a suitable action plan agreed.

We are of course aware of the way in which Covid 19 has restricted working practices and officer time being diverted to Covid related work streams. However, we feel it essential to raise these safety concerns with you and that these be noted and actioned when possible.

We should emphasise that as a Parish, we are not against any future plans for change of use of disused agricultural buildings provided such use is within permitted boundaries but we feel RCC, in conjunction with our Parish Council, has a responsibility to ensure that individual's safety is not compromised by this increased traffic.

We would appreciate your views on this matter and how we might achieve a conclusion to all parties' satisfaction.

38. Historic England

Thank you for your letter of 9 February 2021 regarding the above application for planning permission. On the basis of the information available to date, we do not wish to offer any comments. We suggest that you seek the views of your specialist conservation and archaeological advisers, as relevant.

It is not necessary for us to be consulted on this application again, unless there are material changes to the proposals. However, if you would like detailed advice from us, please contact us to explain your request.

39. Archaeology

Following appraisal of the above development scheme, we recommend that you advise the applicant of the following archaeological requirements.

The supplied desk based assessment and the Leicestershire and Rutland Historic Environment Record (HER) notes that the application lies within an area of high archaeological potential.

We suggest if you have not already, to consult with Historic England and the conservation officer regarding the setting impact on the scheduled monument and listed buildings. The preservation of archaeological remains is, of course, a 'material consideration' in the determination of planning applications. The proposals include operations that may destroy any buried archaeological remains that are present, but the archaeological implications cannot be adequately assessed on the basis of the currently available information. Since it is possible that archaeological remains may be adversely affected by this proposal, we recommend that the planning authority defer determination of the application and request that the applicant complete an Archaeological Impact Assessment of the proposals.

This will require provision by the applicant for:

A field evaluation, by appropriate techniques including trial trenching, to identify and locate any archaeological remains of significance, and propose suitable treatment to avoid or minimise damage by the development. Further design, civil engineering or archaeological work may then be necessary to achieve this.

This information should be submitted to the planning authority before any decision on the planning application is taken, so that an informed decision can be made, and the application refused or modified in the light of the results as appropriate.

Without the information that such an Assessment would provide, it would be difficult in our view for the planning authority to assess the archaeological impact of the proposals.

Should the applicant be unwilling to supply this information as part of the application, it may be appropriate to consider directing the applicant to supply the information under Regulation 4 of the Town and Country Planning (Applications) Regulations 1988, or to refuse the application. These recommendations conform to the advice provided in DCLG National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Section 16, paras. 189 & 190).

Should you be minded to refuse this application on other grounds, the lack of archaeological information should be an additional reason for refusal, to ensure the archaeological potential is given future consideration.

The Historic & Natural Environment Team (HNET), Leicestershire County Council, as advisors to the planning authority, will provide a formal Brief for the work and approve a Specification for the Assessment at the request of the applicant. This will ensure that the necessary programme of archaeological work is undertaken to the satisfaction of the planning authority, in a cost-effective manner and with minimum disturbance to the archaeological resource. The Specification should comply with relevant Chartered Institute for Archaeologists 'Standards' and 'Code of Practice', and should include a suitable indication of arrangements for the implementation of the archaeological work, and the proposed timetable.

Final comments

Thank you for the final archaeology report. I can confirm it is satisfactory and no further archaeological work is needed.

I note the report includes a commitment to OASIS reporting with the Archaeological Data Service and an accession number for the Rutland Museums Service, and further confirmation of a physical archive being unnecessary. These provisions are in accordance with the approved Written Scheme of Investigation, and therefore no condition regarding archaeology will be needed on the application.

40. **Ecology**

Trees on site should be retained, where removal is unavoidable trees should be replaced with locally native species. Any other planting on site should be of locally native species attractive to pollinating insects.

41. **Highways**

Visibility splays

The LHA accept the visibility plays for Church Lane that the applicant have provided. However they have not provided any details relating to the visibility splays Church Lane that passes the eastern side of the site. This is a junction - how will vehicles from this site interact with the junction/those approaching from the north

Traffic generation

This is accepted - the level of traffic from 1 dwelling will not have a significant impact on the network

Collision data

This is accepted. Generally highways would want the developer to collect the accident stats from the Council Accs Maps which is a data base from the police. CrashMaps can be unreliable. However the LHA have recently undertaken a study in this area and can confirm there are no accidents

Gradient at site access
This is accepted

Drainage
This is accepted

Neighbour Representations

42. Comments have been received from 4 residents on the following grounds:

1. The scale and height of the proposed development is completely excessive, not only for the size of the plot and relative to the historic buildings surrounding it, but also in terms of the imposing elevation visible from the corner of Top Road /Hollygate Road / Church Lane. Not only would the new property (to quote the Architectural Contextual Analysis) "overshadow, completely, the agricultural site to the north" but it would completely dominate all neighbouring (listed) properties in the village.
2. The plans would suggest that the property will sit in front (i.e. to the south) of, and not in alignment with, the Dower House, allowing a new build to completely dominate (and remove from view from the corner of Hollygate Road and Church Lane) a historically important and architecturally aesthetic Grade II listed building.

The location of the proposed development in an elevated position very close to the Dower House boundary must also be a very real concern for the owners of the Dower House. In the absence of any development being able to sit in alignment with the Dower House to the West, the aspect of any (more conservative) development would be less intrusive to the East of the site, running parallel to Church Lane (in alignment with the wider family's thatched house to the north of Church Lane) maintaining the current perspective of the Dower House.

3. The application seems to have little or no regard to the fact that Ridlington is:
i) in a Conservation Area and subject to Article 4 (in relation to which we understand previous applications in Ridlington have been declined); and (ii) classified in the Rutland County Council Local Plan 2018 - 2036 as a "Smaller Village" with the implications that (and Policy SD2 and SD3) has for the proposed development. In particular, the proposal is patently not:
- filling a small gap in a continuously built up frontage; nor
- small scale.

We would respectfully suggest that the Architectural Contextual Analysis has no objectivity to it at all; it is not based upon what is appropriate for Ridlington but on maximising returns and short term profit from land with no thought to the consequences for those living in the area (which is also evident from how the site has been maintained by the applicant's family to date).

4. We note the Highways Technical Note but we would take issue with that. The village of Ridlington and in particular, Top Road, Hollygate Road and Hollygate Lane have seen a significant increase in traffic over the last year or so, including industrial and heavy duty vehicles. The double bend to the south of the proposed development is already a hazard for walkers, cyclists and other drivers which will

be further impacted by having a frequently used access point on one of those bends.

5. We note there are no Developer Contributions accompanying the application.

The proposed development is too large in relation to the land upon which it sits and its setting. It is a very extensively sized 3 storey, 6-bedroom potential property sitting on 0.15 hectares and as such is too big for the site.

- In the Rutland County Council Local Plan 2018 - 2036, Ridlington is classified as a "Smaller Village". Policy SD2 (The spatial strategy for development) and Policy SD3 (Development within planned limits of development) are relevant to the proposed development.

- Policy SD2, in relation to smaller villages states: "Small scale development on infill sites, redevelopment of previously developed land and the conversion or reuse of existing buildings. Development which is demonstrated to be necessary to support and/or enhance community facilities that are considered important to the maintenance or enhancement of a sustainable community will be supported". In clause 4.17 it states: "Infill development is defined as the filling of small gaps within the settlement and would normally involve development of a gap in a continuously built up frontage."

- Policy SD3 states that development must be: "appropriate in scale and design to its location and to the size and character of the settlement" and "the amenity of new and neighbouring occupants will be safeguarded through adequate separation and design of the development".

- The proposed development does not comply with Policy SD2 and SD3 for the following reasons:

- The Design and Access Statement provided as part of the planning application claims that the proposal is a "small scale infill development". However, the proposal is not small scale, particularly in relation to the size and location of the site. The Design and Access Statement states that the proposed dwelling is designed as a "late 17th Century Manor House" and it comprises 6 bedrooms, three floors and a three-car garage. At its highest the height of the house is almost 10 metres (9.982m according to the Elevation drawings).

- According to the Heritage Statement provided as part of the application the land has been "free of structures in living memory" and as such the development is not a redevelopment of previously developed land or the conversion or reuse of existing buildings. The development is not filling a small gap in a continuously built up frontage, it is a prominent open site at the centre of the village.

- The siting of the house is too far out of alignment with the Dower House - it does not continue the East-West axis of the Dower House, rather it is located on higher ground to the South-East of the Dower House. As such it sits too far forward from the setting of the Dower House and will be a very dominant presence, in terms of scale, height and mass. Because the land upon which the development will sit is around 1.5 metres higher than the land upon which the Dower House sits, the size and height of the new development will be even more dominant. The development will damage the amenity of the Dower House through loss of privacy, view and light. Moreover, as a consequence of the siting of the proposed development, it would have a dominating visual impact on the neighbourhood.

- The proposed house would cause a loss of existing view to the neighbouring Dower House. The proposed development comprises three floors and at its highest is almost 10m and as such would have a very significant impact on views from the front windows of the Dower House. This loss of view and light would have an adverse impact on the residential amenity of the Dower House.

- The proposed development would be overbearing and lead to a loss of privacy by the neighbouring Dower House. The proposed development is too tall and out of proportion in relation to the site and location. The rear windows of the proposed development will have direct line of sight into the Dower House windows. The

upstairs storey of the Dower House and the Dower House terrace and garden would be heavily overlooked. The proximity of the proposed house to the Dower House is also problematical as it is sited very close to the fence between the properties. The North West corner of the new proposed house is only 10.8 metres from the South East Corner of the Dower House whilst being on land about 1.5 metres higher than the Dower House.

6. Ms J Rivett

- The proposed buildings will tower above the thatched farm house as the ground is at a higher level than the farm and the proposed house has an additional floor. (The applicant is not the current occupier of Church Farm).
- The drive joins the road at a dangerous blind double bend at the junction with Church Lane.

7. Mr Nathan McAlindon

A fantastic looking scheme and a great way to optimise the land. Look forward to the land being put to good use.

Conclusion

43. The Restraint village policy is now out of date and Ridlington was considered as a smaller village in the Local Plan Review settlement hierarchy assessment. Weight can therefore be lent to approving housing proposals where a 5 year housing land supply cannot be demonstrated. The scheme is well designed and has limited impact on the setting of the listed buildings and the character of the conservation area.

EXISTING STONE WALL TO BE RETAINED AND A NEW BEECH HEDGE TO BE EXTENDED AROUND THE PERIMETER OF THE SITE TO THE NORTH. THE EXISTING DRIVE WILL BE INFILLED TO THE SURROUNDING LEVEL AND THE AREA WILL GENERALLY BE PLANTED WITH LOW LEVEL SPECIES SUCH AS JUNIPER, PYROCANTHA AND LAUREL.

2

EXISTING MATURE TREES TO BE RETAINED AND ALL CONSTRUCTION WORK TO BE CARRIED OUT OUTSIDE THE ROOT PROTECTION ZONES

