

<b>Minutes of Langham Parish Council Meeting</b> <b>Held on Tuesday 26<sup>th</sup> September 2017</b> <b>At Langham Village Hall</b>		
Attendance	Cllr. Ovington – Chairman Cllr. Higgins Cllr. Hosmer Cllr. Manning Cllr. G Palmer Cllr. Wright Helen Duckering – clerk  4 members of the public	
Apologies	Cllr. B Palmer Cllr. Duncan C.Cllr Hemsley	
Item		Actions
1	<b>Parishioners' representations</b>  Representatives from the Munday's Close Working Group made a short presentation outlining proposals for the continued maintenance and improvement of the Munday's Close site. They emphasised the merits of the area; its biodiversity and as an asset to the community. A formal report was presented for consideration with regard to the maintenance of the area. The group were thanked for their continued work and thorough assessment.  <b>The meeting opened at 7.55 pm</b>  A minute's silence was held in remembrance of Cllr. George Kirk who passed away on 7 <sup>th</sup> September.	
2	<b>Declarations of Interest and Dispensations</b>  Cllr. Higgins declared an interest in 21 Ruddle Way, the subject of a planning application.	
3	<b>Minutes of the last meeting held on 25<sup>th</sup> July 2017</b>  The minutes were approved and signed by the Chairman.	
4	<b>Matters arising</b> Actions from the last meeting  Item 9 – Streetlight at Ranksborough Hall. It was proposed that the streetlight at Ranksborough Hall, which was not upgraded by Rutland County Council (RCC) and is not working, be replaced provided that the cost does not exceed £500 and the light then be adopted by RCC.  <b>Proposed Cllr. Hosmer, Seconded Cllr. Manning – All in favour</b>	
		HD

	<p>Streetlight on Church Street – The light, which Western Power reported as having no supply, has still not been mended, making this area dangerous at night. It was agreed that the clerk would contact E-on urgently again for the repair to be actioned, stating the safety issues caused.</p> <p>Streetlights in churchyard – two lights in the churchyard are not working. RCC have not adopted these, and E-on did not maintain. It was agreed that the clerk would contact Peterborough Diocese to request the necessary repairs be made.</p> <p>It was reported that the gate at Mickley Lane does not shut. Cllr. Hosmer agreed to arrange repairs.</p> <p>Extension to burial ground – deferred to next meeting.</p> <p>All other actions completed.</p>	<p>HD</p> <p>HD</p> <p>RH</p>
5	<p><b>Clerks report &amp; Correspondence</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Letter from Langham Baptist Church requesting a grant towards the cost of an additional wall heater. Item 14 below.</li> <li>• Request from a resident that a zebra crossing be installed across A606 near Ranksborough Hall. This request will be included in the actions considered by the Traffic Group. Item 6 below.</li> <li>• Proposals from Munday’s Close working group with a schedule of works for costing. Item 18 below.</li> <li>• Letter of thanks from a resident for the work completed by C.Cllr Hemsley and family to clear overgrown paths.</li> <li>• A bequest of £200 on behalf of a late resident for the upkeep of the village hall. This kind gift has been acknowledged to the resident’s family.</li> <li>• Correspondence regarding the displaying of Remembrance Poppies on lampposts. It was agreed that this a worthwhile cause, however, the Parish Council does not support individual charities and this is a matter for individuals to support if appropriate.</li> <li>• Letter from Rutland Foodbank requesting a donation. As above, it was agreed that a specific donation is not appropriate. The Parish Council fully supports the work of the Foodbank and individuals will make donations. The clerk will respond to the request.</li> <li>• Correspondence from a resident raising concerns about a small wall constructed on Church Street. The matter has been reported to RCC. The planning inspector did not consider it a planning issue. The Highways department are advised that this is a temporary structure, but will maintain contact with the resident to ensure safety.</li> <li>• Acknowledgement from RCC of Parish Council winter planning proposals and confirmation from the Village Hall Committee that salt supplies can be stored at the village hall.</li> <li>• Request from RCC to consider a reduction in the speed limit between Barleythorpe and Oakham from 40 mph to 30mph. This will be considered by the Traffic Group. Item 6 below.</li> </ul>	<p>HD</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Letter from Village Hall Trustees outlining the requirement to replace the heating system. The proposal was acknowledged as favourable and supported in principle. It was suggested that the trustees make a presentation to the Parish Council to explain the proposal fully and present costings. The clerk will contact the trustees to request.</li> </ul>	HD
6	<p><b>Neighbourhood Plan and Traffic Group</b></p> <p>Cllr. Ovington confirmed that the Traffic Group, of 12 members, has held its first meeting. They considering various proposals to improve safety and will work with RCC within its budgeting cycle. It was proposed that a letter be sent to RCC, initially in response to the request to review the Barleythorpe/Oakham speed limit, but also outlining the intentions of the group to address various issues to improve safety. The Traffic Group will meet again in October. Proposed Cllr. Ovington, Seconded Cllr Higgins. All in favour</p>	HD
7	<p><b>Adoption of Annual Schedule of Actions</b></p> <p>The schedule was adopted with the addition of the setting of Parish Council meeting dates in September. Proposed Cllr. Manning, Seconded Cllr. Palmer. All in favour</p>	
8	<p><b>Munday's Close Working Group report</b></p> <p>The report was formally received and accepted in principle. It was commended as an excellent and comprehensive piece of work. It was agreed that the clerk will forward the schedule of work proposed to Mow &amp; Sow and then a meeting between the working group and the contractor will be arranged in order that a costing can be provided for work outside the existing contract.</p>	HD
9	<p><b>Recommendations from review of vegetation</b></p> <p>The review of trees, shrubs and hedges around the village was accepted and the recommendations adopted having identified areas requiring action by homeowners, the Parish Council and RCC respectively. It was acknowledged that there might be additional sites to add at a later date. Proposed Cllr. Higgins, seconded Cllr. Palmer. All in favour</p> <p>It was agreed that Cllr. B Palmer composes a suitable letter to homeowners requesting that work be completed and identifying a suitable timescale.</p>	BP

10	<p><b>Finance</b></p> <p><b>Current position</b> The clerk circulated the current financial summary, Appendix 1,2 &amp; 3 attached, and these were approved.</p> <p><b>Proposed Cllr Higgins</b> <b>Seconded Cllr Hosmer</b> <b>All in favour</b></p> <p><b>Account for payment</b> None</p> <p>It was proposed that the Chairman, Cllr. B Palmer, be made a member of the finance committee.</p> <p><b>Proposed Cllr. Ovington</b> <b>Seconded Cllr. Wright</b> <b>All in favour</b></p>	
11	<p><b>Grants the Baptist Church</b></p> <p>It was proposed that a grant of £500 be made to the Baptist Church towards the cost of installing a second wall heater.</p> <p><b>Proposed Cllr. Manning</b> <b>Seconded Cllr Higgins</b> <b>4 in favour</b></p>	HD
12	<p><b>Renewal of Parish Insurance</b></p> <p>It was proposed that the Parish Insurance policy be renewed via Came and Co at a cost of £1086.14</p> <p><b>Proposed Cllr Hosmer</b> <b>Seconded Cllr. Palmer</b> <b>All in favour</b></p>	HD
13	<p><b>Working Party update</b></p> <p>Cllr. Ovington reported the work that had been done by C.Cllr Hemsley and family and herself to clear some of the overgrown areas around the village. Thanks were extended to C. Cllr Hemsley and family for their work.</p>	

14	<p><b>Planning</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning updates since the last meeting were circulated. Appendix 4 attached</li> <li>• It was confirmed that a response had been made to the Local Plan Consultation.</li> <li>• Further to the Review of Electoral Ward Boundaries, it was proposed that a letter be sent opposing the proposed increase in Councillor numbers from 26 to 28. <b>Proposed Cllr. Palmer, Seconded Cllr Higgins. All in favour</b></li> </ul>	HD
15	<p><b>Playing field inspection</b>  October – Cllr. G Palmer  November – Cllr. Ovington</p> <p>It was noted that some pigeon deterrent spikes require replacing on the swing. Clerk to arrange.</p>	HD
16	<p><b>AOB</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cllr. Wright advised that as Cllr. Kirk had for many years arranged for a remembrance wreath to be placed on the war memorial, she was researching how to obtain a wreath and the cost for future years. It was agreed that the Chairman should be asked to undertake the laying of the wreath on behalf of the Parish Council.</li> <li>• The desire to make a suitable and appropriate memorial to Cllr. Kirk was discussed. It was agreed that councillors would consider this individually and make any suggestions via the clerk by November 13<sup>th</sup>.</li> <li>• It was agreed that the Parish Council would make a donation from the Chairman's fund of £50 to the RAF benevolent fund in lieu of flowers at Cllr. Kirk's funeral.</li> </ul>	BP  ALL  HD
17	<p><b>Date and time of the next meeting</b></p> <p><b>28<sup>th</sup> November 2017 7.30pm</b></p>	
18	<p><b>Meeting closed at 9.50pm</b></p>	

<b>Summary of Action Points</b>			
No.	Description of Action	Responsible	Due Date
1	Clerk to ascertain cost of replacing Ranksborough streetlight, chase repair of Church Street streetlight and contact Diocese regarding churchyard lights.	HD	ASAP
2	Repair to Mickley Lane gate to be arranged	RH	ASAP
3	Clerk to write to Rutland Foodbank confirming decision	HD	ASAP
4	Clerk to contact Village Hall Trustees to request a presentation of heating proposals.	HD	ASAP
5	Clerk to write to RCC Highways confirming response to speed limit reduction and Traffic Group intentions	HD	ASAP
6	Clerk to forward MCWG proposals to contractor and arrange meeting.	HD	ASAP
7	Chairman to compose letter to homeowners requesting action with trees etc.	BP	ASAP
8	Clerk to make grant to Langham Baptist Church	HD	ASAP
9	Clerk to renew Parish Insurance policy	HD	ASAP
10	Clerk to sending letter of objection to Electoral Boundary Review	HD	ASAP
11	Clerk to order replacement pigeon spikes for play area	HD	ASAP
12	Proposals for a memorial to Cllr. Kirk to be sent to clerk for circulation.	ALL	13 <sup>th</sup> Nov
13	Clerk to arrange donation to RAF Benevolent Fund	HD	2 <sup>nd</sup> Oct

Langham Parish Council  
 Finances April 2017- March 2018  
 The financial year is divided into six two-month periods.

		CURRENT PERIOD: 3	
INCOME		2017-18	Year to date:
	Precept:	22,000.00	20,000.00 22,000.00
	Grass Cutting:	2,000.00	2,000.00 1,358.00
	Street Lights:	2,400.00	2,400.00 1,853.38
	Burial Ground:	1,000.00	1,000.00 2,014.00
	Sundries:	600.00	300.00 200.00
	Interest:		
	VAT:		2,082.57
	TOTAL:	28,000.00	26,000.00 29,507.95
<b>EXPENSES:</b>			
	Clerk's Salary:	6,000.00	3,000.00 2,479.13
	Clerk's Expenses:	500.00	250.00 302.62
	Street Lights - electricity:	1,600.00	800.00 482.13
	Street Lights - capital:	2,000.00	1,000.00
	Grounds & Open Space:	6,500.00	3,250.00 3,435.00
	Insurance:	1,050.00	525.00 1,086.14
	Cllr expenses:	300.00	150.00 35.00
	Grants:	1,750.00	875.00 500.00
	Audit:	300.00	150.00 200.00
	Subscriptions:	500.00	250.00 332.36
	Hall rental:	200.00	100.00
	Chairman's Fund:	100.00	50.00 100.00
	Contingency:	500.00	250.00
	Waste Collection:	900.00	450.00
	Village Hall:	1,500.00	750.00
	Neighbourhood Plan Expenses	300.00	150.00
	Burial ground:	1,100.00	550.00 484.73
	VAT:		136.43
	Play area		
	TOTAL:	25,100.00	12,550.00 9,573.54
<b>OVERALL SURPLUS/DEFICIT:</b>		2,900.00	13,450.00 19,934.41
	Current a/c: at 1 Apr 2017:	20,583.70	
	Adjustments:		
	2017/18 opening balance:	20,583.70	20,583.70
	Income to date:	29,307.95	
	Expenditure to date:	7,937.40	
	Surplus/deficit to date:		21,370.55
	Bank balance at period end:		41,954.25

Balance as per Bank Statement 15th August 2017			<b>£41,245.97</b>
	Cheque Number		Unpresented Presented
Expenditure			
17-Jul	H Duckering - clerks salary & expenses	IB12/17	857.83
17-Jul	LRALC	IB10/17	35.00
18-Jul	E-ON	IB11/17	578.56
28-Jul	Grant Thornton	IB13/17	240.00
07-Aug	Mow & Sow	IB14/17	880.00
			<u>2591.39</u>
Receipts			
15-Aug- 17	Plot reservation - Hardwick		250.00
			<u>250.00</u>
Balance as per account plus unpresented credits			<b>£41,245.97</b>
Less unpresented cheques			
Balance as per calc.			<u><b>£41,245.97</b></u>

Balance as per Bank Statement 15th September 2017		£41,954.25	
	Cheque Number	Unpresented	Presented
Expenditure			
16-Aug	H Duckering - clerks salary & expenses	IB15/17	609.72
05-Sep	Mow & Sow	IB14/17	880.00
			<u>1489.72</u>
Receipts			
22-Aug-17	Plot reservation - Holroyd		280.00
06-Sep-17	Plot reservation - Martyn		100.00
12-Sep-17	RCC - grass cutting		1,358.00
			<u>1738.00</u>
Balance as per account plus unpresented credits		£41,954.25	
Less unpresented cheques			
Balance as per calc.		<u>£41,954.25</u>	

**2017/0680/CAT**

**48 Well Street**

**Fell 1 No. Norway spruce**

This application concerns a mature Norway spruce, which appears already to be the subject of a Tree Preservation Order, as shown from the information given in Q8 of the application. It is one of two handsome mature trees to the front bank of 48 Well Street, dominating the Conservation street scene and locality. The Norway spruce is stated as in good health by the applicant and confirmed as such by the tree surgeon, and is therefore, by definition, a significant tree. The application is to fell the tree. There is no tangible evidence presented of interference with, or damage to, power lines and appears to have been maintained to avoid interference. The application states no structural damage to drains or drives. The attached tree surgeons letter makes mention of a flooring problem, which could have occurred for many different reasons. There is no relevant technical engineering report relating to the house floor, and therefore no evidence that it is significant or even tree related. This is a significant tree, probably the subject of a Tree Preservation Order, now under an application to fell, without any appropriate technical evidence as to why such a critical application is being made.

**Recommend Refusal and recommend reinstatement of TPO**

**2017/0677/FUL 39 Church Street**

**Boundary alterations**

There is no objection to the removal of the side wall to the garden of the above property or the provision of a parking area within the confines of the existing garden area. However, the removal of part of the front wall by 1.5m will give rise to some problems. As this will facilitate vehicular access to the existing garden area, the parking area to the front of this will have to be kept clear resulting in the loss of one parking space. The adjacent village hall is well used and the loss of a parking space will particularly affect those users who are disabled and/or elderly. The removal of a shorter length of wall, perhaps 0.5m or 0.75m, may be acceptable and would give the applicant a little more room in which to access the parking area without reducing the number of available parking spaces. A resolution to this application must be achieved without the loss of a parking space in this restricted location. The answer to question 8 of the application would indicate that this loss has not been recognised by the applicant.

**Recommend Refusal**

## **2017/0685/AGP Clonmel Farm, Cold Overton Road**

### **Proposed agricultural building for storage of agricultural machinery and livestock feeds.**

Planning consent for fruit growing at the above premises already exists. There is a small poly tunnel with protective netting, which may indicate some production of fruit, although not on a large scale. On the site there were several vehicles consisting of a caravan, at least one Bass Solar Energy vehicle and what appears to be the rear portion of an agricultural vehicle.

The application is for a 6 metre high, very large metal building, close to Cold Overton Road, on an agricultural site. It would be obtrusive, with little sensitivity to its location and could have been sited further away from the road on this small field. The reasons for requiring such a large agricultural building are not fully explained. What sort of rare breeds are to be reared? Cattle, sheep, pigs, or perhaps poultry? Surely any agricultural machinery required for this would not be particularly large. The size of the field would limit the number of animals that could be accommodated and it is difficult to see why such a large storage area would be required to store feed. Question 4 answer states that the building would not be used for livestock. Storage of feed, on this level of volume within a large shed would indicate a substantial number of animals, for which there is no information.

As well as an address in Oakham, Bass Solar Energy is also listed on a Google search as Bass-Solar-Energy, Langham, Clonmel Farm, Cold Overton Road. On the bass-solar-energy.co.uk website, as well as solar panels, milk churns etc., feed is also listed. With this information, and the fact that a Bass Solar Energy vehicle has often been seen at the field, the situation needs to be clarified. Has planning consent to store vehicles and a caravan on this site been granted? It appears that there may perhaps be some merging of fruit growing and the solar panel business at Clonmel Farm. In addition, local residents are concerned with some developments that have taken place.

The rearing of rare breeds on this site is acceptable, but the proposal for such a large agricultural building cannot be justified on existing information. A smaller building may be acceptable.

### **Recommend Refusal**

## **2017/0721/FUL 1 Depot Cottage, Ashwell road**

**Removal of one pre-cast concrete garage and be replaced with a brick built one, having a deeper footprint and door opening to allow 4x4 vehicle access. An adjacent garage to be widened and be of the same height to enable a low- pitched roof to flow across two garages and continue across the front of the house and over the existing defective flat roof.**

The revised plan, which includes a pitched roof over two garages and part of the dwelling, will ensure

a more coherent appearance. However, the roof is to be constructed of black/grey DPE rubber. It would be preferable if this roof were tiled in a similar way to the main roof of the house in order to reflect the character of the location in materials and form. (LNP D3a iii) and match the existing house. It may be deduced from the plans that the pitch if the roof will be masked from the front elevation, but a more appropriate and renewable roof material would be preferable.

**Recommend Approval subject to above concern being addressed.**

**2017/0742/CAT 33 Well Street**

**(T4) – 1 no. Ash – crown raise to 4m and prune back off house to give 2m clearance.**

The above Ash is situated, along with other trees, close to the brook which runs through the village adjacent to the above property. It appears to be in good health but some branches have grown close to the wall of 31 Well Street. The proposed tree works are acceptable and, as the Ash is not in danger, a Tree Preservation Order is not considered appropriate.

**Recommend Approval**

**2017/0727/CAT 31 Well Street**

**(T1) 1 no. Hazel tree – coppice to ~ 0.9m. (T2) & (T3) – 2 no. Holly trees – coppice to ~ 0.9m.**

**(G1) – 4 no. Sycamore suckers (stems) – fell.**

(T1) Hazel, (T2) & (T3) Holly trees – The proposed tree works are recognized treatments for both species and are therefore acceptable.

**Recommend Approval**

(G1) 4 no. Sycamore suckers (stems) – fell – These stems do not contribute to the street scene or the Conservation Area. They are not worthy of protection by means of a Tree Protection Order.

**Recommend Approval**

**Reserved matters for the construction of Continuing Care Retirement Community & Care Home, comprising of 54 No. Assisted Living Units and a 60 Bed Care Home.**

Pre application advice has been sought over a time, with a continued dialogue concerning the site and application for its use by two different sets of buildings, both of a specialist nature. The updated review of the earlier Design and Access statement was well presented and helpful.

**Access:** The accessibility to and within the site for vehicles, cycles and pedestrians is generally satisfactory. However, there are only two disabled spaces, both in one area of the complex, which makes it very difficult for disabled drivers to access other areas and to park elsewhere within the site. It is recommended that more disabled parking spaces be provided in other areas of the complex in addition to existing spaces, in order to ensure that all relatives/friends, including those with physical impairment, will be able to visit residents. In addition to this, the overall provision of parking is wholly insufficient. 'Care Home Isolation' is a real manifestation of what happens to people after admission to residential units, with relatives living elsewhere, and their friends likely to be of a similar age to themselves. A barrier to continued visiting occurs if there is difficulty with transport in any form. Family visitors will largely depend on their car for transport, and in the latter case of older friends, disability transport and mobility scooters. Six visitor spaces and two disability spaces for a 60-bedded unit is totally unacceptable. The logistics for high pressure visiting times, such as weekends, would not work for anyone. Alternative earmarked car parking facilities need to be found within this reasonably large site of 2.86 acres.

With reference to appendix 5 of the draft Rutland Local Plan - Parking Standards, here it is stipulated that parking standards should be set by the number of rooms in a dwelling. These rooms include kitchen, living, bedroom and utility rooms, but exclude bathrooms, halls and storage rooms. The minimum requirement for a home with 2 rooms is 1 allocated parking space, for a dwelling with 3 rooms it is 2 allocated parking spaces. The disparity between this formula and the number of parking spaces planned for this application is huge, and should be reconsidered and amended accordingly.

**Recommend Refusal**

**Appearance:** The appearance of the Assisted Living Units is acceptable. The gables will add interest and the mansard roof will reduce the perceived height. The gabled bays, some decorative brickwork and balconies will help break up large sections of brickwork of the Care Home. Buff bricks and slate tiles will give a hint of the local vernacular. There are however, too many houses being crowded into too small a space, giving the overall appearance the look of an army camp. Fewer, better laid out, would be preferable.

**Recommend Approval.**

**Landscaping:** There is a limited amount of amenity land provided for these two buildings. It is recommended that the available spaces are designed by a suitably qualified landscape gardener and planted in a way that will enhance the lives of all residents. Consideration should be given to small, texture etc. Plenty of seating is always required for older and/or infirm residents. As some trees are to

be felled, an approved tree-planting scheme should be approved by the Local Planning Authority. The retention of some existing trees and hedges is to be commended. The planting of some semi mature trees within the carpark would help to reduce the impact of vehicles on the adjacent area.

**Recommend Approval subject to above concerns being addressed.**

**Layout:** The way in which the buildings are orientated towards each other and to buildings outside of the development is acceptable. The way in which parking spaces within the development are provided is not acceptable. The parking provision is not adequate for 54 assisted living units which may house 80 or even 100 persons and a care home with 60 rooms, some of which may house two persons. For visitors to the care home there are just 7 spaces plus only 2 disabled spaces on site. There are only 11 bays for staff or deliveries and 7 cycle spaces. It is good to encourage staff to walk or cycle to work but the reality is often so different. Working parents often have to take children to different schools or nurseries and travelling by car is the only realistic option due to time constraints. Please see comments above – Access; it is recommended that the provision for parking is reviewed.

From the presented plans, the formal gardens to the rear of the Care Home look elegant, but would appear to lack shelter and would be little used by residents who would be more likely to need a more sheltered and safe location nearer the main buildings. The area designated ‘private garden’ to the front of the building is again not sheltered and is close to the road. It is accepted that this garden layout would be a pleasant view from the main buildings, but these gardens would not be suitable for personal use by the residents. The social need for appropriate parking arrangements for visitors and family members should take priority over pleasant formal gardens to view from the Home. Smaller sheltered gardens or courtyard gardens, safely nearer the Home, would be more appropriate for personal use of the residents some of whom may have dementia. **Recommend Refusal**

**Scale:** Although the Assisted Living Units form a large building, the scale is reduced by the breaking down of the elevation by the use of different materials. The Care Home has some full height glazed elements to vertically break up the front elevation. The roofline is broken up by bays, a raked section of roof and parapet gable ends, making the building appear less like a solid block. Both buildings are of considerable size, but design details have been incorporated to reduce the impact of these larger scale buildings. **Recommend Approval**

#### **2017/0758/CAT 21 Ruddle Way**

**T1 small Pear tree at front of property to be very lightly thinned out (by approx. 10%) and crown raised to 2.4m all round and lightly tipped back off road.**

The above tree is in a prominent position but has outgrown its allotted space. The proposed works are acceptable and will ensure that the tree is not a hindrance to those using the road or adjacent pavement. As the tree is not in danger, a Tree Preservation Order is not required.

**Recommend Approval**

### **2017/0797/CAT 11 Ruddle Way**

#### **Remove 1 No. Silver birch tree**

The above tree has been planted in a confined space, which is unsuitable for any tree. It is not worthy of protection by means of a Tree Preservation Order.

#### **Recommend Approval**

### **2017/0672/FUL 48 Ruddle Way**

#### **Single storey rear extension**

48 Ruddle Way is the end property of a row of three houses which backs on to a belt of trees originally planted to provide screening of the former brewery extensions in about the 1980s. The extension will provide enlarged living accommodation to a modest house. There will be some loss of amenity land and some impact on the adjoining property, but this will be minimal and would be acceptable. All materials should match existing.

#### **Recommend Approval**

### **2017/0818/CAT Partridge House, 1 Well Street**

#### **1 No. Silver Birch (T1) – Fell. 1 No. Sycamore (T2) – Fell.**

Both trees are in a prominent position and contribute to the general street scene. The Silver Birch was probably planted after the house was built. However, there is not enough room for the tree to spread and grow to its full potential. Damage to the house and boundary wall is not yet apparent but this is a possibility in the future, as highlighted in the photographs provided. The loss of this tree is regrettable but, in the circumstances, acceptable.

The Sycamore may predate the building of houses on this site. Again, there is not yet any visible damage but this may occur in the future. The loss of this tree would have a detrimental effect in this part of Well Street but due to possible damage that may be caused, the proposed felling is acceptable.

#### **Recommend Approval**

**The erection of a new housing development comprising 161 new dwellings, including 56 affordable homes, with associated open space, landscaping, infrastructure and drainage.**

It is proposed that the above houses should be built on land that has been set aside for employment use. It appears that efforts to attract potential companies have not been successful and Larkfleet Homes and associates now wish to develop the land for housing. If approved, this particular development would help make up the shortfall on the number of dwellings originally planned for the wider Barleythorpe (Oakham North) site. The above land is adjacent to this site.

The developers are of the opinion that further housing would be a suitable alternative use for the site. However, the loss of this employment land would not be acceptable. Whilst there may not be interest in the site at present, this situation will probably change. There are many start up businesses at Oakham Enterprise Park and as these businesses grow it is likely that some will look for larger premises. Others may delay the decision to locate to the above land until the details of the Brexit settlement are apparent, The loss of this land for employment would reduce the sustainability of the adjacent Barleythorpe (Oakham North) development.

The Rutland Local Plan Review does allocate some land north of the bypass, and west of Ashwell Road, for mixed use, but this plan has not yet been adopted. It is assumed that there is a need for additional employment land for this land to be put forward. Oakham continues to expand and the impact of this growth is reflected in this plan.

The above proposal is for a development of 1,2,3,4 and 5 bedroom dwellings. There are aspects of this application, which are commendable, such as the retention of some trees, varied designs, the inclusion of some small open spaces, and improved parking provision for residents. Each dwelling will have a minimum of 2 parking spaces apart from some affordable homes, which have only one space. All houses, including affordable homes, should have at least two spaces. The lack of adequate parking provision leads to many safety issues. It would appear that 1,2,3,4 and 5 bedroom properties on the new development south of the bypass have been difficult to sell, there have been several revised plans where the size, distribution and number of houses have been varied because the houses were not selling. Building more houses that may not sell seems inappropriate.

There is also insufficient medical and education provision for the houses already built by Larkfleet Homes. Adding more homes will add additional strain to the already overstretched facilities. It would be desirable to see this land used for a new medical centre or perhaps a school.

The above land would be suitable for housing but it is important to protect the future supply of employment land, particularly for the period of the Rutland Local Plan, 2016 - 2036. The future is always uncertain but it can be assumed that there will be an increased need for employment

opportunities within Oakham and the wider Rutland area during that time. It is difficult to prove that the above land will no longer be required in the coming years and therefore the opportunity for employment use should be retained. This appears to be a case of the landowners and Rutland County Council not making a robust enough effort to market the site for industry or employment use rather than a desire to provide low cost housing. Larkfleet Homes bought a lot of land when there was an expectation that houses would sell, and at high prices. Since the economic downturn, they have struggled to make their money back and it would appear that this suggested change of use of the land to housing would help repay their original outlay. This is not a good enough reason to change the use of this land and employment land should be protected.

**Recommend Refusal**