

Planning application no 2023/0802/RES

Application for Reserved Matters (site layout, scale, appearance, and landscaping) of Outline Planning Approval 2019/0524/OUT - for 163 no. dwellings with associated internal road layout, car parking, drainage, and landscaping. Discharge of Conditions 4 (Updated Tree Survey), 10 (Programme of Archaeological Works) and 12 (Land Contamination) of 2019/0524/OUT. At Land North Of Leicester Road Uppingham Rutland.

Resume -

The original planning application included a landscape strategy drawing no 1077 002A which included a number of open green spaces around the site including a green area in the north west corner of the site which incorporated two burial mounds. It should be noted that at this time no suds balancing pond was shown.

For this original application UTC objected to the application saying '*The Town Council notes that the location falls within the Neighbourhood Plan area. The outline plan, as submitted, does not reflect the Neighbourhood Plan, nor the recommendations from the design consultancy meetings in respect of: 1) Larger homes on frontage to blend in with other properties on Leicester Rd. 2) Houses to be built around 'village green' spaces.*' A later submission by UTC stated '*Uppingham Town Council supports the use of land for housing in accordance with the existing Neighbourhood Plan. We are delighted and support the proposal for the roundabout. We do not wish to see the layout and design as a reserved matter, unless a condition is included that the layout and design are as in the existing Neighbourhood Plan. Uppingham Town Council would also wish to see access from this site into the allotments. The overall number of units proposed for the top end of the site we consider to be too dense and we would wish to reduce this density and to have the opportunity to discuss this more fully.*'

Planning permission for the construction of up to 163 dwellings was given by RCC but with conditions which included site layout, scale, appearance, and landscaping.

Since the application was submitted UTC has had two visits from the applicant's planning representative who on each occasion presented revised site layout drawings which did not include the green spaces around the site but included a larger green area in the north west corner of the site which incorporated one burial mound and a suds balancing pond at the northern end of the site. On both occasions UTC informed the planning representative that the revised layouts were unacceptable and did not accord with our comments which had been submitted in response to the application and asked for the plans to be revised to incorporate the requirements of the NP.

Latest application 2023/0802/RES -

The applicant initially submitted a planning layout drawing no 1226-23-100 REV A but we could see little change from those drawings which the applicant's planning representative had previously presented to us. UTC therefore submitted an objection saying '*That UTC object to the scheme on the grounds that we do not believe that it meets the requirements of the NP in particular relating the need for clusters. UTC requires a further independent architectural review of the proposed application in order to assist in finding an appropriate scheme.*'

Following this the Clerk took the following action:-

- Following our last meeting I duly emailed the lead officer seeing if we could trigger an architectural review based on Policy 8 of the Neighbourhood Plan which states that '*The Town Council reserves the right to require an individual design review on any development of 25 houses or more or any single building of more than 3000 sqm. Such reviews should be carried out by an appropriately qualified independent body and conducted within the design review guidelines established by RIBA or CABA. The Plan acknowledges existing policy guidance in the*

National Planning Policy Framework(NPPF) and the current and emerging policies of Rutland County Council.'

- He agreed that this does qualify and replied: *'The principle of development access has been agreed at the outline stage, so the reversed matters relates to site layout, scale, appearance, and landscaping. Within those parameters Policy 8 can trigger a request for a design review.'*
- I have chased again to see if this has been actioned. His reply stated: *'I've informed the agent – as they would pay for the review they have to agree to it, so we can't arrange it till they've agreed.'*
- We heard on the 28th September 2023 that a design review is to take place and we have been asked to take part.

The applicant has now made a further submission which includes a revised planning layout drawing no 1226-23-100 REV B unfortunately again we can see little difference in satisfying the requirements of the NP.

Furthermore the information now submitted has made us aware of other items which we should consider commenting upon:-

As commented on above the layout includes a large green area at the top north west corner of the site with a suds balancing pond next to it running along the northern end of the site. Within the green area is situated a LEAP (Local Equipped Area for Play) which is defined in standards elsewhere as being *'for children who are beginning to go out and play independently close to where they live.'*

Within the Play Area Design Guidance it says that for developments of 99+ dwellings *'The needs of children to the age of 14 should be catered for by the inclusion of a range of equipment suitable for the varying age groups..... in addition a kickabout area should be included.'* In addition to this the guide also says *'Play areas should be in open, accessible and welcoming locations and not in remote corners or other locations where there is inadequate supervision from nearby dwellings.'* In terms of the amount of space to be provided the guide says *'requirement of 200 sq metres per 10 dwellings (or 20 sq metres per dwelling) equates to the NPFA standard of 0.8 Ha per 1000 population.'* In summary the provision of a LEAP is inadequate, the site can only reasonably be viewed from the front of 4 properties and does therefore not appear to meet the guide, whether or not the amount of space is adequate or not depends on how the Saxon Burial Ground is to be treated; included there is adequate space, excluded there is not. Further the Planning Committee also considers that consideration should be given to the play areas close location to the suds balancing pond and the dangers that may present.

One of the consultees at RCC is Housing Strategy and they have commented *'There are 20 affordable homes in Eastern cluster and 29 affordable homes in Western cluster. This lack of integration remains unacceptable for the reasons given in my consultee response of 7 August 2023. Cluster sizes should be reduced to 15 and spread across the site. This is a requirement of the section 106 agreement's Affordable Housing Scheme.'* From the information available there does not appear to be a recommendation for the size of clusters other than for developments of 30 - 200 dwellings they should have a maximum of 15. Our view in Planning Committee is that we should support the Housing Strategy comments but suggest the clusters should be smaller than this and 8 seemed to us to be an equitable number.