

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL & LICENSING COMMITTEE

27TH OCTOBER 2015

FINAL ADDENDUM REPORT CONTENTS

REPORT NO: 195/2015

Planning applications to be determined by the Development Control & Licensing Committee

Item no.	Application no.	Applicant	Parish
1	2015/0589/FUL	MR WILLIAM WASS	WING

Letter/Further information from applicant

For the avoidance of doubt, and confusion, the report on the applications mentions the “non-implementation” of the extant consent – 2015/0271/FUL: This is in fact incorrect.

The consent includes no “conditions precedent”, it makes no requirements to inform or notify the planning department of “commencement of any development” – as in reality, there are no physical works required to use the two buildings as separate dwellings. There is no requirement to notify building control to enable the two buildings to be used – the garages now have permission, but have not yet been built – pending the outcome of the current application.

The procedure that was followed to officially “change the use” was a paper exercise you specifically advised our client adopted in order to facilitate the granting of the latest application. At no point was my client advised that the requirement would have included the demolition of one property. There will be NO increase in the number of dwellings on the site nor will there be an increase in the overall number of bedrooms on the site.

The two buildings are physically separate units, they both have kitchens, bedrooms, bathrooms etc and are waiting to be let out – pending the outcome of the decision on the above. (An application that was submitted soon after the consent was granted, with a view to gain consent and implement straight away – all as discussed with you prior). Both buildings are (as required by policy) “capable of occupation with minor renovation” and are in “the ownership of the applicant”. The consent has been implemented.

On a separate issue raised in your report, in Policy SP6(5), you state that in order to be a “replacement dwelling” the existing dwelling must be completely removed. Please can you clarify this, as I cannot find any requirement to physically remove the “existing dwelling” in NPPF – PPG 9. It merely states.....

- the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces;

Plot 2 – to be replaced, is a detached 5 bedroom house: the proposed dwelling is also a 5 bedroom detached house – of similar floor area.

NPPF – para 55 referred to support the recommendation states.....

- To promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. **For example, where there are groups of smaller settlements,** development in one village may support services in a village nearby.

There are 4 separate dwellings currently in the vicinity of the application site.

Whilst now superseded, the old PPS (Policy CTY 3 – replacement Dwellings) specifically noted:

- 5.14 The replacement of existing dwellings is important to the renewal and upgrading of the rural housing stock. All permissions for a replacement dwelling granted under this policy will be subject to a condition requiring demolition of the existing dwelling **or restricting its future use if it is to be retained as part of the overall development scheme.**

This certainly appears to confirm that the second dwelling CAN physically be retained, and its loss is by virtue of its proposed incorporation as Plot 1. I would ask that this is clarified at your “pre committee” meeting on Monday, as this could well be the basis for the advice the applicant was given prior to making the last application. It will certainly need to be discussed before any informed decision can be made by Members’.

In terms of mass and bulk – the development occupies a smaller footprint than the existing redundant agricultural buildings, the “sprawl” of the buildings will reduce back from the “open countryside”, the public views of the rear of the property can only be seen from over ½ a mile away, and the development CANNOT be seen from the village of Wing.

3	2015/0705/FUL	MRS CAROLYN WELCH	SOUTH LUFFENHAM
---	---------------	-------------------	-----------------

Letter/Further information from Applicant

The applicant was asked to provide information regarding any proposals for organised team sports to use the new pavilion/playing field. The response was as follows:

There are not any **worked up** proposals at the moment: Again it is a ‘chicken and egg’ situation – where do you start regeneration? There would, in any case, be a great deal of wasted work if we are **not** able to support the use of the Recreation Ground with the reality of the building, which is needed for the social life of the village and indoor recreational activities as well as to re-introduce some sports. The current village hall is in decline and, I suspect, will soon have to be closed.

The plans envisage a **multifunctional** building, serving not one but two main purposes.

Further Consultee Response

Sport England was reconsulted on the additional car and coach parking provided on a revised plan. The following is its response:

I would refer to our response by email date 5th October in which we were able to advise that the proposal was in accordance with Exception E2 of our policy, the revised proposals do not allow this exception to be maintained as the proposal to increase the car parking involves the loss of playing field area.

It is understood however that the PPS will identify the site as being surplus to formal sports requirements, but it appears clear that the Parish council/village residents wish to reintroduce sport/other activities to the site. The proposed car parking results in a sizable loss of the retained usable area. In addition the level of car parking proposed for a village hall appears excessive(over 90 car parking spaces), would it be possible to swap the basketball court for the car park area minimising the impact of the usable area ?

Ultimately, if your authority is satisfied that the site is surplus because the site is properly identified as such in the PPS Sport England would not wish to object to the current proposal as revised, however at this stage the position still remains that the proposal results in the loss of playing field area.

Sport England submits a holding objection with regard to the proposal as revised until such time as the above issues are addressed.

Additional Reason for Refusal

The proposal includes a significant amount of parking space which will result in the loss of playing field space, contrary to the policies of Sport England, Para 74 of the NPPF and Policy CS23 of the Rutland Core Strategy (2011).

4	2015/0787/FUL	MRS JANET COLLIS	EMPINGHAM
----------	----------------------	-------------------------	------------------

This application was withdrawn on 23 October 2015.