

# **BELTON IN RUTLAND PARISH COUNCIL**

Parish Clerk

Jan Clayton Warren, Apple Lodge, Littleworth Lane, Belton in Rutland, Rutland. LE15 9JZ  
Tel: 01572 717623 E Mail: [beltonparishcouncil@gmail.com](mailto:beltonparishcouncil@gmail.com)

**EGM of BELTON IN RUTLAND PARISH COUNCIL on Tuesday 27th  
December to conduct the following business.  
Start time 7.30 pm at Belton in Rutland Village Hall**

## **MINUTES**

**Present: Cllr Hugh Neil  
Cllr Brian Shuttleworth  
Cllr David Boyd  
Cllr Jane Cronin  
Cllr Gail Williams**

**1. To elect a Chairman**

Cllr Hugh Neill proposed by Cllr Cronin and seconded by Cllr Shuttleworth. Agreed by all

**2. To receive the Chairman's declaration of Office**

Duly received

**3. Declarations of disclosable pecuniary**

None

**4. Public Session:**

None

**5. Further 2016/0797/FUL Cat 2 application for land adjacent to 1 Littleworth Lane**

The meeting expressed its surprise at the speed with which building plans for projects already built in the village without the benefit of planning permission, are changed within days of having been considered by the Parish Council, often at EGM's which are called at short notice in order to comply with rules which they must follow leaving the builders at an unfair advantage. The meeting requested the former response just five days before another change in application be included.

We reiterate the comments of our response to the original retrospective application in late November within which you were advised that the online plans were not correct in relation to the hard copy plans provided by you and what had actually been built: We are asked to consider a variation of condition 2 (variation of entrance porch). The appearance of the 'porch' is that of a previous application which was withdrawn.

Had that application not been withdrawn by the present applicant, The Belton in Rutland Parish Council would have objected to it.

We find the design unacceptable for the village, and as it stands it is not acceptable.

According to policy SP5 it does have a detrimental impact. We have no problem with the design of the house. We object to the porch due to materials used, the proportion is too large for the building, it adds nothing to the beauty of the stone. The drawing showing the Proposed Elevation provided in hard copy and shown on the internet does not accurately reflect what has been built and does not show the actual size of what has been built, so is misleading.

The property has to be viewed at night to appreciate just how inappropriate the materials used are in our village. Photographs will be taken from the street scene for the benefit of the Committee should that be requested.

Site Allocations and Policies Development Plan Document Adopted October 2014:

5:12 The curtilage of some dwellings can sometimes be of a suitable size and disposition to allow sub-division to provide plots for additional dwellings. Similarly, land to the rear of existing curtilages can sometimes be satisfactorily used for new housing, known as back land or tandem development. It is of critical importance that such development does not have an adverse impact, either individually or cumulatively upon the character of the village or neighbourhood. To achieve this, and in order to ensure the amenities of the area and neighbouring properties are not unacceptably affected by such development.

SP5

- a) It is appropriate in scale and design to its location and to the size and character of the settlement
- b) It would not adversely affect the environment or local amenity
- c) It would individually or cumulative with other proposals have a detrimental impact upon the form, character, appearance and setting of the settlement or neighbourhood and its surroundings

The response to this was for the builder to make a corrected application which you provided as on-line plans and a follow up hard copy just before the Christmas break. At an EGM of the Parish Council on Tuesday 27<sup>th</sup> December it was noted the plans still fail to reflect what has actually been built. The Councillors are surprised this should continue to be the case and trust it is not simply a ruse on the part of the builder to keep submitting reworked plans until such time as the build, which is appalling out of place in an Article 4 Conservation village, is accepted.

In response to the latest application:

Again, the drawings supplied do not accurately show what has been built.

The cross beams shown in the drawings for the 'porch' is suggested as narrow. Their dimensions are difficult to find. They appear to be certainly more substantial than the drawings suggest.

We are constantly reminded by RCC, the most recent instance being 16 Main Street, that modern plastic windows are unacceptable in the Article 4 conservation village because of the substantial width this is a broad steel coated structure which does not in any way conform to what is deemed to be acceptable for the village which is the smaller dimensions of wooden windows. How, as a Parish Council, are we to enforce the additional expense of installing wooden windows when aluminium coated steel of the dimensions used are found to be

acceptable to RCC in the very same Article 4 village? We accept the standard response that each application is considered in its merits but can find no merit in this application whatsoever. The atrium style 'porch' casts considerable light pollution into the Littleworth Lane part of the village. RCC took on a considerable fight with the owners of Belton House for erecting standard lamps on its drive IN 2004 and after a struggle of five years was eventually successful in having them removed. The light produced by this large glass structure, which we are told meets with the approval of the planning department, is considerably more than that found to be a source of light pollution on Belton House drive. How are the Parish Council supposed to enforce any future instance of light pollution when this house as built can be easily seen from half way up Littleworth Lane, at the very point where Belton House were forced to remove their lamps? Again while we accept each application is considered in its merits, in this instance there is no merit whatsoever.

Planning advise that the extensive garage block they have agreed to will solve the problem. We would like to state the problem is the acceptance by planning of the so called porch without which there is no problem. In order to correct the record, the extensive garage block is over development on a small plot and does nothing to mask the light pollution in addition to which it is being built of SUFFOLK style blackened clap board. How this is suitable for an article 4 village in RUTLAND is beyond our comprehension.

Had these plans been available prior to the house or its garage block being built they would not have been acceptable and it is our belief this has been a deliberate ploy to obtain permission by default to a structure that should never have been allowed.

THE MEETING CLOSED AT 8.20