



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



**Rutland County
Council**

**Catmose,
Oakham,
Rutland
LE15 6HP**

Application:	2023/0074/FUL	ITEM 3	
Proposal:	Retrospective application for the erection of a two storey and single storey extension to dwelling, raising of the roof of the original house with a new thatch roof, addition of a window on the North East elevation, re-positioning of two windows on the South West elevation, the addition of an extra chimney and the raising of the height of the existing chimney with new rear door access, 2 no. garden sheds, parking and landscaping works.		
Address:	21 Main Street, Cottesmore		
Applicant	Mrs J Burgess	Parish	Cottesmore
Agent:	Mr Timothy Bale	Ward	Cottesmore
Reason for presenting to Committee:	At the request of Cllr Harvey		
Date of Committee:	8 th August 2023		
Determination Date:	10 th April 2023		
Agreed Extension of Time Date:	11 th August 2023		

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

It is considered that the works as carried out are appropriate for the location by virtue of the design, scale and materials used. The work enhances the host dwelling and is in keeping with the streetscene and surrounding context, causing no harm to adjacent listed buildings or the character of the Cottesmore Conservation Area whilst not impacting on highway safety or the private residential amenities of neighbouring properties.

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 is the development carried out in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, numbers: 3194/4 Rev B and 3194/5 Rev G.
Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
3. Should any of the new planting shown on the approved Drawing Number: 3194/5 Rev G 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.

4. Notwithstanding the provisions of Article 3, Schedule 2, Part 1 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), the window in the first floor bathroom shall be non opening below a height of 1.7m measured from the floor of the room it serves and glazed in obscure glass before the development hereby permitted is first occupied and shall thereafter be permanently retained in this approved form.
Reason: To protect the private amenity of neighbouring properties.
5. Notwithstanding the provisions of Article 3, Schedule 2, Part 1 Classes A, B, C & D 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 except with prior planning permission.

Site & Surroundings

1. The site lies within the Cottesmore Conservation Area. The dwelling has been built from stone with a thatched roof.
2. The plot itself to which the dwelling lies is mainly level for the length of the building with higher ground to the rear with brick retaining walls to the amenity area.
3. The site has an existing access from Main Street. Access to the Cottesmore Sports Club runs alongside the rear of the property.
4. To the southwest of the site lies a mix of terrace, detached and semi-detached properties. To the north east of the site is the Sun Inn public house.

Proposal

5. This is a retrospective application for the erection of a two storey and single storey extension to dwelling, raising of the roof of the original house with a new thatch roof, addition of a window on the North East elevation, re-positioning of two windows on the South West elevation, the addition of an extra chimney and the raising of the height of the existing chimney with new rear door access, 2 no. garden sheds, parking and landscaping works.
6. The building was previously occupied as a dwelling but had been vacant for many years and over time had come into serious disrepair. The works have been carried out to bring the building back into its permitted use.

Relevant Planning History

7. Application 2020/0540/FUL for similar development was withdrawn at the request of the planning officer.

8. The extension did not appear subservient to the host property and was a large extension with a bigger footprint than the original house. This was considered over development of the site which is compounded by the close proximity of Nos. 17 & 19, Main Street. The mass of the building would have created a dominant and oppressive environment in relation to the rear elevations of these properties and their amenity spaces.
9. The position of the new build element would have also impacted on levels of light to the rears of these neighbours and create additional overshadowing.
10. Application 2020/0959/FUL was approved for proposed demolition of existing outbuilding and garage. Erection of a two and single storey extension to dwelling, raising of the roof on the existing house and clad with a thatch roof.
11. The proposal was to extend the cottage on the elevation opposite to the road (south east elevation) with a two storey and a single storey. The walls were to be repaired where necessary and built up over the ground floor windows to roughly half way up the first floor windows and a new Thatch roof was to be installed using reed over the two storey element with pantiles over the single storey element. The first floor windows had an eye brow style roof over as traditional thatch cottages.
12. Application 2022/0715/FUL was a Section 73 application to vary Condition 2 (Approved Plans) of 2020/0959/FUL to add a window on the north east elevation and slightly move two windows on the South west elevation. Addition of an extra chimney and raise the height of the existing chimney to satisfy fire regulations. This application was withdrawn.
13. Following a site visit and assessment of the submitted plans the dwelling was found to be built in variance with the proposed plans as submitted.
14. Furthermore, application 2022/0715/FUL was to amend condition 2 which relates to the approved plans. As part of approval 2020/0959/FUL the decision notice also included other conditions which had to be adhered to. These included tree conditions such as the following:

7 Before construction works commence Tree Protection measures should be erected in accordance with the Tree Survey, Impact Assessment & Method Statement by RJ Tree Services Ltd dated 13th July 2020.

Reason: To protect trees which make an important contribution to the character of the area.

8 The development hereby approved shall be carried out in strict accordance with the Tree Survey, Impact Assessment & Method Statement by RJ Tree Services Ltd dated 13th July 2020.

Reason: To protect trees which make an important contribution to the character of the area

15. From the information that the applicant provided regarding the loss of certain trees which should have been retained, conditions 7 & 8 were not complied with.
16. It was considered that with all the changes that the existing permission was not being and could not be complied with. The application was requested to be withdrawn. A new full application (not a Section 73 to vary the existing permission) was requested to be submitted which should include within the description the retrospective works which have been carried out to dwelling. This has led to the submission of the current application which the committee are considering. (2023/0074/FUL).

Planning Guidance and Policy

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2019

Chapter 2 – Achieving Sustainable Development

Chapter 12 – Achieving well designed places

Chapter 16 – Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

Site Allocations and Policies DPD (2014)

SP5 – Built Development in the Towns and Villages

SP6 - Housing in the Countryside

SP15 – Design & Amenity

SP20 – The Historic Environment

SP23 – Landscape character in the countryside

Core Strategy DPD (2011)

CS04 – The Location of Development

CS19 – Promoting Good Design

CS22 – The Historic and Cultural Environment

Officer Evaluation

Heritage impact and impact on the character of the area

17. The fall- back position in this case are the approved details of planning approval 2020/0959/FUL. The applicant has provided plans which show the differences in

the window positions (to the South West Elevation) from those approved as part of 2020/0959/FUL and those as built.

18. Other differences to the details which were approved as part of 2020/0959/FUL include the building of an additional chimney, the raising of an existing chimney, changes to the road side gable windows as drawn and the insertion of a door to the rear north east elevation.
19. The proposal includes the siting of two garden sheds. These are to be constructed from timber boarding and will be of a size and appearance which will ensure that no adverse visual impact will result.
20. While the dwelling is orientated sideways on it is nevertheless visible from public viewpoints, and the scale of the proposed development would increase its prominence but in a positive way compared to the original building which was in severe disrepair.
21. The extensions, alterations and resultant building are considered to be of a scale/height commensurate to dwellings in close proximity to the existing house and as such the impact upon the character appearance of the locality is reduced and its form justified.
22. Issues were raised during the course of the application regarding incorrectly drawn plans, particularly regarding size and position of openings. Amended plans have been submitted to address these points.
23. The two windows to the 'existing roadside gable' are existing. These differ from the approved plans as part of 2020/0959/FUL but to clarify the windows to the roadside gable are original openings and as such the size and position are shown as such on the submitted plans.
24. Listed Building Apps - The Local Planning Authority is required to ensure that special regard to preserving the Listed Buildings and their settings in relation to Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the 'Act').
25. Conservation Area Apps - The Local Planning Authority is required to ensure that with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area, through the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 at Section 72.
26. NPPF - Furthermore, the importance of considering the impact of development on the significance of designated heritage assets is expressed in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2019). The NPPF advises that development and alterations to designated assets and their settings can cause harm. These policies ensure the protection and enhancement of the historic buildings and environments. Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make

a positive contribution to or better reveal the significance should be treated favourably.

27. The Conservation Officer has been consulted and has no objections commenting as follows:

'The site lies within the Conservation Area for Cottesmore and as such the Local Planning Authority has a statutory duty under section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act, 1990 to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.

The present build offers an improvement and is of a scale and massing that complements the street scene, as such it does not compete architecturally, (with the addition of minor alterations) to the neighbouring surrounding buildings and maintains the traditional local vernacular and style. In otherwards, there is no harm to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area by the resulting design to the building, the views in and out of the Conservation Area remain unaltered, hence the area remains preserved and enhanced.

Therefore, I offer no objection to the scheme from a heritage perspective as it accords with the relevant paragraphs 200-202 of section 16 of the NPPF and corresponding policies of the Core Strategy and the Development Plan Document, which seek to preserve and enhance the historic environment.'

28. In terms of the design of the dwelling it is considered that the step proposed to the end of the proposal more in keeping with the traditional linear form of historical rural buildings and appropriate within the immediate context
29. The development has been found to be acceptable, in accordance with SP6 and in order to control extensions or replacement dwellings, a planning condition has been applied that removes the permitted development rights to further extend the dwelling.
30. Policy SP23 (Landscape character in the countryside), which requires that new development be designed so as to be sensitive to its landscape setting.
31. Trees T6 and G7 which were to be retained as part of the previously approved scheme have been removed. A plan has been submitted showing replacement planting. The Rutland Tree Officer has been consulted and has no objections.
32. The further tree /planting provided to the rear maintains and protects the character and appearance this location.
33. A condition has been attached stating that should any of the new planting shown on the approved Drawing Number: 3194/5 Rev G 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.

34. By virtue of the design, scale and materials to be used, the proposal would be in keeping with the host dwelling, streetscene and surrounding context. The development would not cause harm to adjacent listed buildings or the character of the Cottesmore Conservation Area in accordance with Sections 12 and Section 16 of the NPPF (2019), Policies CS19 and CS22 of the Rutland Core Strategy (2011) and Policies SP15, SP20 and SP23 of the Site Allocations and Policies Development Plan Document (2014).

Impact on the neighbouring properties

35. The extended property has been reduced in size to the southern end and is stepped down to reduce the overall form of the dwelling and results in a proposal which does not create an over-dominant or oppressive environment for the neighbours to the west or would lead to unacceptable levels of overshadowing.
36. The window positions when compared to those as approved under 2020/0959/FUL are not now in a position where a greater impact on neighbouring privacy has resulted.
37. A condition has been attached ensuring that the bathroom window to the first floor which faces neighbouring properties remains fitted with obscure glazing in perpetuity.
38. Taking into account the nature of the proposal, small scale, and adequate separation distances, it is considered that there would be no unacceptable adverse impact on the residential amenities of the occupiers of adjacent properties in accordance with the Section 12 of the NPPF (2019), Policy CS19 of the Rutland Core Strategy (2011) and Policy SP15 of the Site Allocations and Policies Development Plan Document (2014).

Highway issues

39. Objections have been received regarding access and parking arrangements for the property.
40. The Highway Department consider the proposal to have a safe and suitable access with adequate parking provision.
41. The proposal would result in adequate access and parking facilities and would not have an unacceptable adverse impact on highway safety in accordance with the Section 9 of the NPPF (2019).

Other Matters

42. Right of Way for the applicant have been raised. Disputes regarding land ownership are a third party issue and should not be a material consideration when considering this planning application. The applicant has submitted ownership certificates and considers that they have legal rights to access the

property and own the areas used for parking. The local authority has not received any evidence to the contrary. The parking provided for the site is all clearly located within the boundaries of the property, and the applicant has stated that the right of way is and will always be honoured as a point of access for the site.

Crime and Disorder

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

Human Rights Implications

44. 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.

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

Councillor Harvey comments:

46. *MEMBER REFERRAL SCHEME: PLANNING APPLICATION REF: 2023/0074/FUL*

I wish this application to be referred to the Planning and Licensing Committee for the following reasons.

This application has become confusing because of the five applications that have been submitted and worked up.

According to the wording of this application, it is a retrospective full application covering the extensions, roofs etc. This would mean that the approved application 2020/0540 is the fallback position. I shall therefore present reasoning based on this being a new application.

Should the decision be made that this is an alteration to 2020/0540 then I present reasoning for that too.

Section 1 – As new standalone application.

1 – Material Planning Considerations

SP15 – No appropriate waste management and storage for bins, loss of trees

SP19 / COT E & C 3– There is a net loss of biodiversity from the original application in July 2020

SP20/ COT E & C2/ COT H4 & H5 a) Conservation area i, ii & iii – concern with appearance(size), setting and streetscene b) Listed Buildings – v – the setting detracts from the neighbouring listed buildings which have always been prominent

SP21 C & F – The property directly fronts the village green – access to the property is across the village green via permitted access.

CS20/ COT EN 1 – no use of renewable energy. Property utilises gas central heating.

CS22 Does SP6, and specifically the extension limit of 50% apply in a conservation area?

2 - Why it needs to go to Committee

Plans submitted are not correct to the built form – NE Elevation

Objections from neighbours and request from Parish Council – Neighbours and PC have stated they will be satisfied by either decision from committee.

Section 2

1. Material planning considerations

SP15 – No appropriate waste management and storage for bins, loss of trees

SP19 / COT E & C 3– There is a net loss of biodiversity from the original application in July 2020

SP20/ COT E & C2/ COT H4 & H5 2. Conservation area i, ii & iii – concern with appearance(size), setting and streetscene 3. Listed Buildings – v – the setting detracts from the neighbouring listed buildings which have always been prominent

SP21 C & F – The property directly fronts the village green – access to the property is across the village green via permitted access.

CS20/ COT EN 1 – no use of renewable energy. Property utilises gas central heating.

CS22 Breach of planning control Section 171A of Part VII of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)

“the carrying out of development without the required planning permission or failing to comply with any condition or limitation subject to which planning permission has been granted”

2020/0959/FUL was approved on 26/08/20, subject to eleven conditions, the build has progressed and seems to have deviated from six of those conditions: 2,5,7,8,9,11

Additional Chimney : From plans it is difficult to follow the history of this fireplace and chimney as it is not shown on the early drawings, however it appears that this is the existing fireplace from the living room of the original cottage. Indeed, the heritage statement dated 30/01/23 states it was always going to be retained and not demolished as per the approved plans

Windows: In the officer report from the approved application reference is made to the rear windows namely “The re-positioning of the first-floor windows to the rear, north east elevation follows discussions onsite and removes the direct overlooking the local authority previously outlined.”

However, comparison of the rear view plans show the withdrawn scheme 2020/0540/FUL had six windows, four on first floor, two on the ground.

This revised scheme also has six windows, including a larger triple, in the same positions as the original withdrawn application.

On the front scene / SW Elevation, four windows overlook the near neighbours' yards and gardens, not including the bathroom window with privacy glass) – all off line, only two had previous approval

Rear (looks onto the village hall drive) – NE Elevation

- *Revised plans 3194/1 are still not correct to the built form*
- *Ground floor window near the gable end is shown vertical in plans, the window fitted is horizontal and therefore appears larger (according to the plans this was the only window in the original building on this side, in its vertical position) The plans erroneously show the position of the horizontal window, on the plans it is further towards the door, between the double aspect and single upstairs windows. The attached photo shows the true build position between the two single aspect windows.*

Trees (Condition 7 & 8) –

- *The tree survey and the Forestry Officers comments do not include the removal of the trees onsite. The original tree survey submitted under and the conditions set under approved 2020/0959 –*
- *Further approval to landscape was permitted under 2020/1362 – Discharge of condition 4*
- *T6 and G7 were meant to be retained and protected during the build, as per the tree method statement. It appears that both T6 and G7 have been cleared and I can find no record on the applications of permission being sought. On the new tree survey, there is no mention of these trees and bushes at all. Indeed, this is now the site for the sheds. Condition 7 & 8 are now breached. Should the sheds be granted, they cannot be replanted.*

Streetscene

The building is within the conservation area of the village and is in a central location to the village green. The revised built building and windows are imposing on the street scene and detract from the neighbouring listed properties, the additional chimney gives the impression of a larger building and with the additional hares on the roof, give the impression of greater height. From the village green parking you can now barely see the roof of the listed properties further down Main Street.

2 Why it needs to go to Committee.

Objections from two neighbours who have asked me to call in to committee and Parish Council Chair support the call in.

This is a retrospective application, variation to approved plans were made at build stage and this application was only submitted once our enforcement officer had been alerted. Even then the plans submitted did not show the extent of the changes that have been completed and that application (2022/0715/FUL) was withdrawn after I requested it went to committee. This new application still is demonstrating erroneous plans (with no dimensions) to the built house and does not give any regard to the missing trees. The amount of deviation from the approved plans appear to show a pattern of behaviour.

Further information The ownership certificate on the application form is incorrect. There is a boundary dispute on the NE Elevation. Whilst not a material fact for planning, the signed declaration is incorrect.

Irrespective of outcome, the work done too and loss of trees in the conservation area without permission must be addressed.

Consultations

47. **Highway Department:** No Objections if built in accordance with Drawing 3194/5 Rev G.
The principle of the dwelling with parking is established and the amount of parking showing meets highway requirements and therefore the LHA have no objections.

48. **Rutland Tree Officer:** No objections

49. **Conservation Officer:** No objections

50. **Cottesmore Parish Council**

Cottesmore Parish Council wish to make the following comments in relation to the above application:

The Parish Council believes that clarification/confirmation in relation to the Right of Way for all 3 properties should be agreed

The Parish Council is concerned regarding the loss of trees, which were in a Conservation Area, and would want to see replacement trees

The Parish Council would like Rutland County Council to make it clear that there is to be no Parking, no Encroachment or Manoeuvring of vehicles on the Green from either residents or vehicles visiting for all 3 of these residences

The Parish Council supports the request from a resident that the determination of this application should be by the Planning Committee and not delegated officers.

Neighbour Representations

51. Astill On Behalf Of Mr Colin Smith And Mrs Mandy Reilly Astill Planning Consultants have prepared this letter on behalf of 17 Main Street Cottesmore, Rutland. It sets out material planning objections made by a neighbour demonstrating significant adverse impacts of the proposal. On these grounds it is kindly and respectfully requested that this planning application should be called into the Planning and Licensing Committee in accordance with Section 11 of Part 3 of Rutland County Council's Constitution.

1.1 Our client reiterates their comments in their letter dated the 21st of February 2023. The residual impacts are detrimental, pedestrian movements are being compromised and regular user conflict is being generated. The proposed highway, parking and access arrangements do not accord with paragraph 111 or 112 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Nor are they consistent with Policy SP15 and Appendix 2 - Parking Standards or Policy CS18. They also do not accord with Rutland Design Guidelines.

1.2 The proposal provides no turning space and vehicles cannot both enter and egress the site in a forward-facing gear. The impact of these arrangements is exacerbated by the now proposed double parking of vehicles and the positioning of bin storage behind double parked cars. This is compounded with dimensioned car parking spaces which do not meet minimum design requirements.

1.3 The original cottage only provided one parking space for a two-bedroom dwelling. This level of use prevented conflict between users. Planning Permission ref. 2020/0959/FUL granted two designated car parking spaces at 45o (angle parked) from the boundary. These spaces were provided with 8.5m of unobstructed space with turning space. This was to facilitate entry and egress in a forward-facing gear as a means of mitigation of user conflict.

1.4 Development Control Highway Engineer comments to Planning Application ref. 2020/0540/FUL (dated 22nd June 2020) raised that:

"It is important that the parking spaces are provided with adequate dimensioned and demonstrated to work in terms of adequate manoeuvring in/out the site in a forward direction".

1.5 Planning Application ref. 2020/0540/FUL was subsequently resisted. The Officer's report for Planning Permission ref. 2020/0959/FUL notes permission was only granted because the proposals:

"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 the Section 9 of the NPPF (2019)".

1.6 The latest set of highways comments for the application site for ref. 2023/0074/FUL raise no objection. However, they do not provide any comment on the matter of turning space and the increase in spaces. Nor

do the comments discuss the design of the parking spaces against Rutland Design Guidelines.

1.7 Our client is concerned that a recommendation to approve the application would be materially contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework and the Development Plan as a whole. It would also be contrary to previous decisions at a time when the National Planning Policy Framework and Development Plan has remained substantially unchanged since then. It would also be contrary to the council's own officer's comments across the history of the application.

1.8 The reduced quality of the scheme, inadequate highways and parking arrangements and divergence with previous highways comments would materially diminish the scheme at the application site between permission and completion. The reduced quality conflicts with paragraph 135 of the NPPF:

Local Planning Authorities should seek to ensure that the quality of approved development is not materially diminished between permission and completion, as a result of changes being made to the permitted scheme".

1.9 It is on these grounds that our client considers the application should be refused unless satisfactory carparking and access arrangements in accordance with previous highways comments can be found. Should a recommendation for approval be made, our client requests that this planning application should be called into the Planning and Licensing Committee in accordance with Section 11 of Part 3 of Rutland County Council's Constitution. This is because:

The decision would be contrary to previous decisions at a time when the National Planning Policy Framework and Development Plan has remained substantially unchanged since then. It would also be contrary to the council's own officer's comments across the history of the application.

Also:

- The proposal provides no turning space and vehicles cannot both enter and egress the site in forward-facing gear.
- The impact of these arrangements is exacerbated by the now proposed double parking of vehicles and the positioning of bin storage behind double parked cars
- This is compounded with dimensioned car parking spaces which do not meet minimum requirements
- Parking spaces are now positioned immediately abutting main habitable rooms with consequences for occupier amenity.
- Car movements are damaging village green
- The proposed access and car parking arrangements are not sufficient for the quantum of redevelopment at the application site

- The current red line boundary is not sufficient to allow control of the induced impacts of the proposed development
- Reduced quality conflicts with para 135 of NPPF
- Proposed amendments materially diminish the quality of approved development by reason of creating a visual intrusion of the second chimney and peculiar window alignment which causes unacceptable effects on heritage assets and the visual amenity of neighbouring occupiers
- No landscape details
- No drainage details
- Previous trees to be retained have been removed
- Bat and bird boxes should be provided

52. Mr Derek Simmons This new house that has replaced the old run down shell is a credit to the owner/builder, as the new property is such an asset to the village, as its done with style and in-keeping with the character buildings in the street. The 2 chimneys are a beautiful finish to an elegant cottage. The windows have such character and are a great addition to this property, anyone in the village would love to own it. When we are driving or walking through the village with friends and neighbors the cottage always comes up in conversation as how elegant the building is and how tasteful the finish is.
53. Mrs Tania De La porte As local residents, we were pleased to see the Shambles (21 Main street) being renovated. It was a very run down and overgrown old building that has been carefully and sympathetically designed with its stonework and thatch, to fit in beautifully with its neighbouring and surrounding buildings, particularly those that are listed as it is in keeping with the overall appearance of those that are similar in the street. We do not feel that 21 Main street has any impact on surroundings conservation areas and are in full support of it as it's built.
54. Dr Richard Thompson Having read, online, the associated documents relating to this retrospective planning application, and the objections to it, I cannot see why approval by RCC would not be granted. I am left asking what is the motivation behind the objections? Issues concerning highways, parking, access, tree planting etc., raised in the report submitted by Astills of Leicester on behalf of an Objector, all appear to have been resolved on behalf of the Applicant. The only remaining issues concern (1) a chimney and (2) two windows. (1) In reference to Diagram 3194.4 Proposed Layout, the Applicant is requesting retrospective permission for a new chimney topping positioned on the building's original pile. The objection to this appears to be that the decision to restore the chimney wasn't on the original planning application, NOT that there is some deleterious effect that the rebuilt structure has upon the property, its neighbours or environs. Given the care and attention taken by the builder to replace what was an eyesore of

a building at the centre of our Conservation village, with a house entirely in keeping with the period properties within the conservation boundaries, I cannot see how retrospective permission would not be granted.

(2) Again, In reference to Diagram 3194.4, the Applicant is requesting retrospective permission for a marginally different positioning of two windows on the south west elevation, submitted in the original planning application. Objections to these seem not to have practical significance since, as stated above, the changes do not appear to interfere with, cause damage to, or constitute an offence to residents of neighbouring properties, nor to have a deleterious effect upon the environs.

For these reasons I support the retrospective planning application to Rutland County Council.

55. Sandra
Ross

Number 21 Main Street has been turned into a beautiful cottage from what was a derelict mess for over 20 years

Being surrounded by listed buildings and next door to the Public House "Sun Inn" this cottage now enhances the conservation area

It's been built with reclaimed stone and a thatched roof added and is totally in keeping with the historic design of Cottesmore

The extra chimney which was the original doesn't look odd as most houses surrounding this cottage have 2 chimneys, in fact the objectors chimneys are taller by about 2foot

The slight movement of 2 windows doesn't bare any weight as they are still looking out onto the stone gable end of number 19 and the side view of the yard of number 17

We are only talking a few inches with this movement

Michael and Juliet have put a lot of work into this project and it looks fantastic

The retrospective application should be approved

Highways have no concerns with the parking plan

No objections from the Forestry Officer - 4 new trees have been planted which now makes 6 trees in the garden

The Parish Council have no objections to the extra chimney or the slight movement of the 2 windows

The Design, appearance and materials used all blend in perfect with the other buildings around it

It's a shame we don't have more imaginative builders locally

I sit at the bus stop opposite the pub to go to Oakham every week

It's now a joy to look out and see the building instead of what was there before which was a derelict place

Michael Allen always does his work with love and everything he does is done with dedication to detail and I wouldn't hesitate to support him in this application

56. Mrs Jenny Laidler Comment: I am writing in support of this striking renovation at 21 Main Street, Cottesmore.
For many years, number 21 stood empty as a derelict shambles whilst being consumed by ivy. It was an eyesore and an embarrassment to the village.
However, a talented builder has taken it on board and has amazingly turned it into this very attractive thatched property. It now enhances the conservation area in the centre of the village.
The two chimneys are not in the least out of character with surrounding properties and I see the objector's property has taller chimneys that I presume comply with fire regulations as do number 21.
The slight change in the positioning of the windows is insignificant and does not really affect the objectors view (number (17) as the outlook from number 21 is still the same as previously approved.
I see there are no objections for these changes from:
- Highways
- Forestry officer
- Parish council
- Neighbour at number 19
- Therefore, I would like to see this retrospective planning application approved.
57. Mrs Susan Holden The building in question was part of the street scene of the village since I moved here 8 years ago. It was barely recognisable as a building, but now forms part of an attractive and sympathetic group with the Sun Inn and the adjacent listed cottages. The chimney in question is on the site of the original chimney and does not look intrusive from either the Main Street or the adjoining buildings. The materials used to improve the building have been chosen to be compatible with most of the villages cottages in the conservation area. I see no reason why this application would benefit anyone if it were refused.
58. Mr Kevin Swanwick Our comments are in support of the approval of the retrospective planning permission for the property known as 21 Main Street Cottesmore.
In our opinion, and having studied this application carefully, it appears clear that these additions have no detrimental effect on the surrounding conservation area together with the design, appearance and materials used being in keeping with the many listed buildings in the vicinity.
The property stands as a credit to the developer who has taken great care to complete the renovations sympathetically and to compliment

the village of Cottesmore, replacing the dilapidated 'eye sore' that stood there for many years.

Conclusion

59. Taking the above into account, it is considered that the works as carried out and two sheds are appropriate for the location by virtue of the design, scale and materials used. The work enhances the host dwelling and is in keeping with the streetscene and surrounding context. The development does not impact on residential amenity, highway safety and does not cause harm to adjacent listed buildings or the character of the Cottesmore Conservation Area in accordance with Sections 9, 12 and Section 16 of the NPPF (2019), Policies CS19 and CS22 of the Rutland Core Strategy (2011) and Policies SP15, SP20 and SP23 of the Site Allocations and Policies Development Plan Document (2014).