



© Crown copyright and database rights [2013]  
Ordnance Survey [100018066]

Scale - 1:1250  
Time of plot: 13:00  
Date of plot: 07/12/2016



## Rutland County Council

Catmose,  
Oakham,  
Rutland  
LE15 6HP

Application:	<b>2016/0930/RES</b>	<b>ITEM 1</b>	
Proposal:	<b>Details of Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale in relation to 2013/0956/OUT</b>		
Address:	<b>Greetham Garden Centre, Oakham Road, Greetham, OAKHAM, Rutland, LE15 7NN</b>		
Applicant:	<b>Mr Jack Murray, Lovell</b>	Parish	<b>Greetham</b>
Agent:	<b>Mr Geoff Perry, Geoff Perry Associates Ltd</b>	Ward	<b>Greetham</b>
Reason for presenting to Committee:	<b>Objections</b>		
Date of Committee:	<b>20 December 2016</b>		

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The application is for approval of the matters reserved in the outline permission that was granted on Appeal in May 2015. These matters are scale, appearance, layout and landscaping. All other matters, including drainage, archaeology, ecology and materials are to be discharged separately under the other outline conditions. The appeal permission tied the layout of the site to a Masterplan that was submitted with the outline application. The layout of the development is therefore restricted to that plan, notwithstanding that the layout could be better. The reserved matters reflect the Masterplan and are therefore acceptable and should be approved.

## RECOMMENDATION

**APPROVAL**, subject to the following conditions:

- The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out except in complete accordance with the details shown on the submitted plans, numbered:

A700 001A	A700 019A
A700 002B	A700 020A
A700 003A	A700 021A
A700 004A	A700 022A
A700 005B	A700 023C
A700 006A	A700 024A
A700 007A	1810516_LSA001
A700 008	1810516_TCP001A
A700 009B	1810516_LS001A
A700 010G	1810516_AIA001A
A700 013B	1810516_GA001A
A700 014C	AS001 Arb Report (received 22 Nov)
A700 015B	15641-210D
A700 016B	15641-211
A700 017B	15641-130B

Reason - For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

Notes to Applicant:

This approval does not relate to the materials details submitted with the application. These were withdrawn from the application by e-mail on 22 November 2016.

You are advised to contact the Highways Authority at your earliest convenience to enter into a s.38 agreement. This will ensure the further detailed assessment of the scheme ensures functionality and receives technical approval.

## Site & Surroundings

1. The site is located on the western edge of Greetham, on the site of the former Garden Centre, which closed down in 2013. Some of the temporary/polytunnel/glasshouse buildings have been removed from the site with only the more permanent masonry structures remaining.
2. The site extends northwards towards a watercourse which receives the treated water from the adjacent Sewage Treatment Works (STW) to the west. The nearest 'pond' on the STW appears to be approximately 100 metres from the site boundary.
3. There are several semi-mature trees on site but most are conifers which do not add significantly to the amenities of the area.
4. To the east is a track which serves adjacent land and beyond that are the rear gardens of properties on North Brook Close.
5. The site is outside the Planned Limits to Development (PLD) for Greetham but the principle of development has been established by the appeal decision.

## Proposal

6. The proposal is for the approval of the 'reserved matters' referred to in the outline permission granted on appeal. These are matters relating to scale, appearance, layout and landscaping only.
7. Other matters such as drainage are dealt with separately as discharge of outline conditions. Access was included in the outline permission for full approval, simply utilising the existing single point of access into the site.
8. The original submission did include materials details but these have now been withdrawn from the submission and will also be dealt with as discharge of conditions.
9. The scheme includes 35 dwellings (including 12 affordable houses) as per the outline permission. The layout is in accordance with Condition 4 on the outline permission which states that: 'The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plan (i.e. illustrative Masterplan No. 5420-L-02). This condition has the effect of limiting the way the site can be laid out.
10. The accommodation schedule is as follows:
  - 7 x 2 bed houses (all affordables)
  - 7 x 3 bed houses (inc 5 x affordables)
  - 16 x 4 bed houses and;
  - 5 x 5 bed houses.
11. The delivery of the affordable unit housing on site is controlled by a Unilateral Undertaking, submitted at outline stage, which states that the developer will enter into a S106 agreement to deliver an affordable housing scheme. This is not a reserved matter so does not need to hold up this application.

## Relevant Planning History

Application	Description	Decision
348/72	Residential Development	Refused July 72

## Planning Guidance and Policy

### National Planning Policy Framework

Supports sustainable development  
Promotes good design

### The Rutland Core Strategy

CS10 – Housing Density and Mix – 30 Dwellings per hectare in the villages  
CS19 – Promoting Good Design

### Site Allocations and Policies DPD (2014)

SP5 – Built development in towns and villages  
SP15 – Design & Amenity

## Consultations

### 12. Greetham PC

Greetham Parish Council objects to this application on the following grounds:

1. The housing mix is not appropriate to the village needs. The views gathered as part of the developing Neighbourhood Plan show that this development has too many 4 and 5 bedroomed properties and too few lesser bedroomed properties, which is an inappropriate mix and goes against the expressed needs of the village. A review is requested to incorporate more 1, 2 and 3 bedroomed properties.
2. Design of the estate is not appropriate to the village  
The layout is unimaginative and represents an urban development in a rural setting. The housing estate design and layout proposed by the developers is not in keeping with the village character, which currently has buildings built at different angles and levels.
3. The affordable housing style and the material used appears to be different to the remainder of the estate. This is seen as divisive.
4. The proposed development will result in an increase of young children in the village and request that a play facility is built on site
5. Parking  
Plots 3 and 31 appear to have 1 garage and 1 parking space only. Please qualify this. No 5 does not appear to have any parking provision. Please qualify this.
6. Most concerned by the proposals for drainage at the site. It is requested that the development is monitored by building regulators throughout as the proximity to the stream and sewage works is of concern
7. Proposed screening from adjacent properties is not clearly outlined and would like further information on where planting will be and what it will be compiled of.
8. There are inaccuracies in the Historical Context Statement which refers to some existing village buildings as being in 'ruins'. GPC object to this representation

which gives a false image of Greetham Village. Documents which are produced for public access should be accurate. A full list of inaccuracies is included below.

- 3.0 Context – Historical Context, Locality etc.  
This expose does not give an accurate description of Greetham Village and appears to have been written, along with the photographs used as illustration, to down grade all aspects of this village in order to make the housing estate appear more attractive. Merry's Meadow – this is NOT 'unimproved' grassland but a very important SSSI Ley meadow kept and maintained that way for several hundred years.  
'Greetham House is modern' – this house is Georgian with a Victorian facade added at a later date. This is a listed property. 'the Ancient Greetham Inn is now a farmhouse' – This building is indeed ancient but it was the Crown and Anchor Inn, not the Greetham Inn, a different hostelry altogether. The Crown and Anchor, now a private house, has medieval foundations and possibly older. The Crown and Anchor took it's name from the heraldic badge of the medieval Earls of Northampton who were wardens of the cinque ports and at that time owned Greetham and it's environs. The Inn and it's name survived until 1936 when it was delicensed

6. GPC suggest that to enhance the appearance of the entrance to the village where this estate is proposed, the developers incorporate a gated style entrance with a sign which says 'Welcome to Greetham. Many concealed entrances. Please drive carefully through the village

7. Following receipt of a further revised plan to address some landscaping and highway issues, the Parish has submitted the following further comments:

Our Parish Council will not be meeting until 14th December 2016, but our Planning Focus Group would like to make the following comments in re-inforcement of the responses agreed at an earlier meeting of the Parish Council.

- We are disappointed that in the current circumstances it is not possible to insist on a change of design to one which reflects with the existing character of the village. (Particularly as RCC Core Strategy Policy Document CS2 (b) specially requires this). However we note the reasons and hope that Lovell will voluntarily recognise that it would be to both to our and their mutual benefit if they were to come up with a design which is in character with the village.
- The aspect of the current design which we are most opposed to is that of the Affordable Houses. With reference to the Street Scene Drawing A700 23 C, we believe that it is very unfortunate that the Affordable Houses look so different from the other houses. Surely it would be possible to modify the designs so that this is not the case? We do not think that it is good policy for people in Affordable Houses to be so readily identifiable.

8. **Cottesmore PC**  
No objection

9. **RCC Highways**  
No Objections based on the amended plan

10. **LCC Archaeology**  
Reiterates advice on outline application. Archaeology is to be dealt with by discharge of outline conditions
11. **LCC Ecology**  
The proposed layout is very similar to that submitted at the Outline Application stage. At that time we have the following comments to make and these are still valid. As mentioned in my previous response, we consider that the layout to the development is unacceptable and we would therefore object to the development on this basis. The proposed layout indicates that plot boundaries are immediately adjacent to hedgerows. This is of particular concern on the north and west boundaries of the site, where the development, if permitted, would form the boundary line between the edge of the village and the countryside. It is therefore important that these hedgerows are retained and protected throughout the development, in order for them to be adequately maintained as one management unit. Paragraph 117 of the NPPF recommends the retention of wildlife corridors (i.e. hedgerows). We would therefore recommend that the layout is adjusted to allow for a buffer between plots and the hedgerows on the west and north of the site. This buffer should be 5 metres in width to allow access for management.
12. **Environment Agency**  
No objection

## **Neighbour Representations**

13. 1 letter from a resident of Church Lane Greetham
14. Concern about how the applicants intend to address surface water discharge into the North Brook (and what impact the level of any discharge might have on the water levels of North Brook as it runs through the village). As I have not seen any references in the planning application material to things like sustainable drainage systems and flood attenuation ponds to capture and hold surface water from the development, I formally object to it. The potential flood risk impacts downstream arising from surface water from the development must be addressed effectively, to the satisfaction of the Environment Agency and the riparian owners in the village.
15. The second concern is about the three larger properties that exit directly out on to the 8668???. The entrances to the new properties look very bleak with no splays and with hedges and trees at the side of the entrances. we then have the main exit from the site plus a private road making four exits onto the road in a short distance. It all looks very suburban and does not, in my view, look like 'Greetham'- it could be anywhere.
16. The cycle path starts just after North Brook Close and children do use it to cycle to school. A single exit should also be suitable for the new garden centre site. The multiple exits from the new site are of the worst kind of suburbanisation.
17. I therefore formally object to the proposed design of the frontage properties and their access arrangements directly onto the road. The individual accesses to these properties should be internalised within the site to allow the cycle path to continue to operate unimpeded.

## **Planning Assessment**

18. The main issues are design, layout and landscaping. Highway safety can only be considered in relation to the design of this detailed layout as the principle of an access to serve this development has been established.

19. As set out above, the layout is dictated by the Masterplan on the original application, as imposed by the Inspector. The applicant has been advised to submit a fresh Full application so that the layout could better reflect the Greetham style but they have thus far declined to do so and have contractual obligation to obtain a Reserved Matters approval. On that basis the layout is acceptable and has to be approved.
20. In terms of design, dwellings are generally considered to be of an acceptable design. Some minor queries have been raised with the developer but they have declined to make changes to designs. Whilst improvements could be made they are within the site so are not considered to be sufficient to warrant refusal.
21. The comments regarding the design of the Affordable Units is acknowledged but they are of brick construction with a roof material to be approved. They have a simple cottagey feel and are not considered to be inappropriate. The fact they are different from the larger detached houses does not necessarily identify them as affordable. Affordable providers do not like to 'pepperpot' their units across a development and this Authority has previously accepted clusters of up to 15 affordable units
22. The developer has provided alternative details for landscaping and boundary treatment, especially on the western side where the present conifer trees will be removed leaving a native hedge, supplemented by further hedge and tree planting. Fencing had been proposed along that side but has now been removed.
23. The 3 plots facing the main road had been given individual driveways. This had been suggested by a Design Review Panel elsewhere as being a way of calming traffic and reflecting similar arrangements along the road. This did not however accord with the outline permission that approved the existing single point of access. The 3 frontage plots have therefore been altered to be served off a private drive inside the site. Indications are that a full application might be made to give these direct access at a later stage.
24. The scheme is otherwise considered to be in accordance with the outline permission and should thereby be approved.

