

Morcott Parish Council: White Horse Inn Committee

Notes from a meeting held on 8th June 2017 at Rutland County Council offices, Catmose, Oakham:

Present:

RCC: Nick Hodgett Planning Control Officer
Sharon Baker Planning Policy Team

Burghley Estates: David Pennell Estates Director
Simon Harris Harris McCormack Architects
Mark Flood Insight Town Planning

Morcott Parish Council: Andrew Johnson
Martin Whitfield

1. RCC Policy and response to Pre-Application:

NH initiated the discussion by outlining RCC's current position on the Pre-Application made by Burghley Estates which had previously been notified by letter (sent 24/11/16) to BE:

- a. The proposed development is outside the PLD;
- b. The proposed development is therefore viewed as being in countryside;
- c. The Conservation Officer considers that there is less than substantial harm to the conservation area;
- d. However it is recognised that the village pub provides benefits to the community;
- e. In addition the play area is a benefit;
- f. The starter housing is also a benefit (providing it qualifies as affordable housing, which would be likely);
- g. Accordingly, and particularly because there are policy issues, the pre-application does not meet the requirements to be progressed further at this stage.

2. RCC Local Plan Review progress & implications:

- a. NH confirmed that, depending on any issues arising because of the General Election, the RCC Local Plan Review 2016 would now be issued for consultation during August/September 2017 (*since verbally confirmed as commencing 31st July*) and published in November/December 2017;
- b. It was confirmed during discussion that RCC's Annual Housing Requirement (2011-2036) has recently been confirmed as a total of 159 houses per annum (*revised down from 171 pa – see SHMA Update April 2017*). It was inferred at the meeting that RCC will not have any problems at all in reaching the required total and as a consequence of the number of known planned and windfall developments RCC does not envisage site allocations being made at the villages (including Morcott).

3. NPPF:

MF made several detailed points relating to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) concerning, amongst several other points, the community benefits that the development would bring. The NPPF may have precedence over local policies where local policies are out of date. These points included that the NPPF defines that established facilities are able to be developed in a way that benefits the community and developers are encouraged to plan proactively for community benefits. There was some discussion about the various merits or otherwise about the points being raised. MF wished to understand whether RCC would be willing to consider further the site plan and other considerations. NH indicated that RCC would be prepared to receive further input within the existing pre-application.

4. Conservation area:

There was an extended discussion on the initial report from the conservation officer concerning the pre-application (which could not be located) and an opportunity to follow up

the conservation area appraisal with the conservation officer. The point was made that the area proposed for the development is not countryside and the proposed development would not damage the conservation area. RCC's own conservation area appraisal does not attach any value to the paddock. The paddock was not designated as open space in the Village Plan and it could not be assumed that it would have been if it had been inside the PLD. It was agreed that it would be appropriate for BE to contact the conservation officer concerning current evidence and undertake further work in order to understand and provide further evidence concerning the issues of any impact on the conservation area and how this could be minimised.

5. Particular aspects of the site:

There was a discussion concerning the ability to develop brown field sites particularly with relation to a permitted development in Greetham. RCC took the view that the proposed development in Morcott was not similar to the development permitted in Greetham, however BE did not agree with this view. Re policy on mixed use sites: RCC would need good evidence that a mixed use scheme should go ahead including adequate consultation.

6. Regarding the pub (The White Horse Inn):

RCC would like to see the pub retained but if this is not possible a development of houses on the existing brownfield site could be put forward and considered on its merits. As this site is within the PLD & depending on the development proposed this would be more likely to gain planning approval. In terms of the pub building RCC would like to keep the building but it might be converted to residential housing or even demolished depending on the case put forward. The pub is a non-designated asset.

7. Character of the proposed development:

RCC pointed out that the nature and character of the development proposed is not appropriate in their view as it consists mainly of large executive style homes: the number of houses proposed is too many for the site and they would be more prepared to consider a lower number such as a total of 9 houses. In the review there is more work to do on the number of houses and the character of the development so that it fits more with the character of Morcott.

It was pointed out by SH that a great deal of work had been done to ensure that the proposed houses reflected the varied character of Morcott. It was further pointed out that the total number of houses proposed for the paddock is 9, with a further 4 houses on the land behind the pub. Should it be necessary to submit a modified proposal for the pub site only it would be likely that this would be for at least 6 houses including the pub and stable buildings (or their replacements). RCC reiterated that they would be prepared to consider a proposal which included fewer house and was more in character with the village rather than a large executive development.

RCC made the point that the tree survey needs to be confirmed and that the tree at the front of the pub is protected and must not be harmed.

8. Follow up:

At the conclusion of the meeting it was agreed by RCC that they would accept any further work on the proposed development under the existing pre-application. BE confirmed that they welcomed the ability to undertake further work & submit additional evidence and would be in contact.

Andrew Johnson
28th June 2017

/Ends