

2021/0165

Response to Parish Council Feedback

Please find below an outline of the applicant's response to the Parish Council's request for additional information, as outlined in the Summary of the document '2021/0165 - Barrowden Parish Council - 1127747', uploaded to the RCC website on 8 April 2021.

	Information Requested	Response
1	A comprehensive Business Case (similar to that normally provided by Andrew Coombe from Sanham Planning) which will include the size of flocks and locations of grazing, cost of operation, depreciation/ investment costs for development on site for a 5 year period including sensitivity analysis to demonstrate overall viability.	<p>RCC have commissioned an independent assessment of the proposals by Andrew Coombe. As of the time of writing this is still outstanding. Further application has been submitted in support of this assessment</p> <p>Maps showing the locations of grazing have been provided to RCC and are also included in Appendix 1 to this document.</p>
2	Justification for 24 hour round the year on-site presence.	Again, this is being addressed as part of the independent assessment by Andrew Coombe.
3	Revised plans to relocate the sheep enclosure to reduce impact on BW1 para 2 view J	<p>As per p.5 of the Design and Access Statement changes were made to the placement of the proposed agricultural building following pre-application feedback to mitigate its impact.</p> <p>Banking and planting was shown on drawings submitted in support of application (EA/P/01A, EA/P/03A and EA/P/06A). It is our opinion that the new enclosure will be completely hidden from view once planting matures and prior to that barely visible.</p> <p>Whilst BPC suggested that the enclosure would be clearly visible 50m down the road we were careful to choose the photograph where the barn was most visible in the view provided on p.10 of the Design and Access Statement.</p>

	Information Requested	Response
		<p>The attached sketch (EP/SK/SK02) shows the limited impact that moving the enclosure a further 10m into the field will have on the height of the ridge. The topography of the site is such that even by using the same measures to reduce the levels and sink the foundations of the barn the ridge height would be approx. 0.3m lower than in the currently proposed location. Moving the enclosure a further 10m into the field would also result in wasted space along the boundary with Morcott Road and reduce the space available for grazing in front of the enclosure further down the field.</p> <p>As an alternative arrangement the applicant is suggesting moving the barn 50m away from the Morcott Road boundary into the field, creating a more traditional farmyard arrangement of buildings with the proposed farm house and existing barn. This would reduce the ridge height of the enclosure by approximately 2.5m. The space behind the enclosure would then be free to be used for grazing (as it is currently). This re-location of the sheep enclosure would mitigate any impact on the views as you drove into Barrowden along the Morcott Road.</p>
4	A landscaping plan including tree survey tree retention and protection plan	<p>This request is tied in with the request for further information from RCC Forestry which the applicant has complied with (see Appendix 2).</p> <p>A list of native tree species being planted is included on p.13 of the Design and Access Statement alongside photograph showing an example of planted screening.</p> <p>The extent of planting/landscaping is dependent upon the final location of the sheep enclosure.</p>
5	Ecological Report with a view to ensuring protection of protected species and achieving a net biodiversity net gain, including assessment of impact on wildlife from the development	<p>The assessment of the impact on wildlife and the protection of species from the development was addressed in response to comments from the Ecology consultee (the senior Planning Ecologist for LCC).</p> <p>The applicant commissioned a report which can be viewed in Appendix 3.</p>

	Information Requested	Response
		<p>Policy BW5 states “proposals within the local green infrastructure corridor shall, where feasible, include suitable measures to enhance the landscape, biodiversity and recreational value of the corridor.” The proposals protect the Roadside Verge Nature Reserve (RVNR) shown on Fig. 7. The proposed programme of planting on the site (including screening and orchard) fulfils BW5 requirement to enhance the landscape of the corridor.</p>
6	<p>Revised plans to meet requirement of BW6 para 2</p>	<p>In response to concerns raised by the Parish Council and the Conservation Officer about the proposed use of materials the applicant has amended the design. The dwelling will be built from local rubble stone in accordance with BW6.</p>
7	<p>Report on surface water drainage as per BW7 (should read BW8)</p>	<p>Policy BW7 relates to the local impact of construction. Policy BW8 relates to surface water flooding. Policy BW8 suggests that <i>“proposals will be required to demonstrate that the development will not result in a net increase in surface water run-off and should indicate how any necessary mitigation measures will be satisfactorily integrated into the design and layout of the scheme”</i>.</p> <p>A walkover survey was carried out on site to assess soil conditions. This report can be viewed in Appendix 4.</p> <p>As stated in p. 6 of the Design and Access Statement and shown on drawing EA/P/01A measures will be taken to contain surface water run of within the site using rain water harvesting and soakaways in accordance with current SUDS practice and regulation.</p> <p>The architects have visited site and provided and outline design of these proposals which in their professional opinion are a workable solution. Further detailed design and reports will be carried out as part of the detailed design once the applicant has secured planning permission.</p>
8	<p>Acceptance of AOC on dwelling house</p>	<p>The applicant has no objections to this condition.</p>

Comments from Members of Public

The applicant would like to note that support for these proposals was misrepresented in the written feedback from BPC which stated that:

“This application has been the subject of many letters of support and by noon on 29 March a total of 44 comments had been received on the RCC website, of which 32 were from outside Barrowden Parish and just 12 from within Barrowden. Of those 12 comments, nine were supportive of the development and three raised objections and cited specific material planning considerations.”

In fact on 29 March a total of **59** comments were uploaded to the RCC website. Of these **14** were from residents of Barrowden. **13** comments were supportive and only **1** raised an objection.

In total **69** comments have been uploaded to the RCC website. Four of these raise objections and the remaining **65** support the application.

The applicant would also suggest that the comments in support of the application do in fact refer to specific material planning considerations.

The Barrowden and Wakerley Neighbourhood plan identifies the need to protect and support the rural economy. Item 5.52 states that *“a majority of respondents to the Barrowden and Wakerley 2016 questionnaire indicated that they were in favour of agricultural (81%) ... development”*.

The rural economy is also addressed in Policy CS16 of Rutland’s Core Strategy Development Plan. This policy identifies that traditional rural industries the area have declined but that the uses have a substantial impact on the quality of the landscape in the area. The strategy is to encourage agricultural enterprises where this would be consistent with maintaining and enhancing the environment, and contribute to local distinctiveness. The document states that rural economic development will be focused on the needs of existing rural businesses.

Objective 8 in the Site Allocations and Policies Development Plan also adopted by RCC is to support the rural community by encouraging development opportunities related to the rural economy including farm industries.

Comments from the local agricultural community speaking to the importance of Redhill Charolais to the rural economy and its long term establishment in the area clearly evidence that the farming business is one that RCC have outlined their intention to support in the relevant planning policies. Therefore they are clearly material planning considerations.

In contradiction to all of these policies Vine Farm, the only remaining working farm in Morcott (see p. 7 of the Morcott Village Plan, 2013) has now been sold to Hereward homes, a private developer, following it being granted Class Q planning permission by Rutland County Council.



Buildings that are still in agricultural use by the applicants as part of their established business were dismissed as 'redundant' by RCC.

The loss of these premises in the area leaves Redhill Charollais and the Wild family without a home.

There are no suitable premises of a similar kind in the area for leasing. Evidence to support this was submitted as an Appendix to the original Business Case document.

The granting of the Class Q on the existing farm illustrates that leasing premises (even if they were available) has the problem of being an insecure method of supporting this (or any other) rural business long term, given that tenants are subject

to being asked to leave at relatively short notice when the landowners decide it is in their interest to sell to private developers for profit.

The applicants are asking for support for their proposals, which are modest in scale, so that they can continue their established business which will in turn support the local rural economy.