

Rutland Local Plan

Site Allocations and Policies DPD
Preferred Options Consultation October-November 2012

Summary of main issues raised and how they have been taken into account

Main issues raised	How main issues have been taken in to account
<p>Chapter 2 – The objectives of the Plan</p>	
<p>A number of comments of support for the objectives are made.</p> <p>Two individual responses suggest there should be an objective to work within the capacity of the road network and the highway system and that there should be a reference to returning brownfield land to beneficial use.</p>	<p>Objective 14 has been amended to refer to the re-use of previously developed (brownfield land)</p> <p>The suggested objective to work within the capacity of the road network and the highway system is considered to be a constraint rather than an objective of the plan. However it is proposed to add a new criterion j) under Policy SP15 (Design and Amenity) j) referring to impact on the highway network (see below).</p>
<p>Chapter 3 - Site Allocations</p>	
<p>Policy SP1 – Sites for residential development</p>	
<p><u>Oakham</u></p> <p>Majority agree with Site OAK45. Concerns raised about the loss of a playing field, need for adequate sewerage infrastructure and traffic implications.</p> <p>Alternative sites proposed to the south east of Oakham and on existing employment allocation to the north of the town.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>OAK45 comprises a housing site previously allocated in the 2001 Rutland Local Plan.</p> <p>The concerns that have been raised about traffic, infrastructure and other issues can be dealt in more detail through the planning application process under Policy SP5 and SP15 (design and amenity), in accordance with criterion c) of Policy SP1.</p> <p>The loss of the playing field was considered by the Inspector at the Examination of the 2001 Rutland Local Plan who concluded that the loss would be minimal and would not justify rejection of the site as a housing allocation.</p> <p>The policy states that developments will be phased to ensure co-ordination with infrastructure, particularly waste water treatment and water supply capacity. Information provided by Anglian Water indicates that there is capacity at the waste water treatment works and in the foul sewerage network</p>

Main issues raised	How main issues have been taken in to account
	<p>available to serve the proposed growth.</p> <p>There is no need to identify further sites for residential development in Oakham to meet the requirements of the Core Strategy. Alternative sites were considered through the site appraisal process which concluded that site OAK45 compares favourably with other sites in and around the town.</p> <p>The re-designation of the existing employment allocation for residential purposes is not considered acceptable as there is no need to identify further land for employment development in Oakham and the employment allocation is required to meet employment needs.</p>
<p><u>Uppingham</u></p> <p>A large majority agree with sites UPP04 and 05 but the majority disagree with site UPP21.</p> <p>Suggestions that the allocations should be consistent with the Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan. Sites UPP04 and 05 are supported by the Neighbourhood Plan Task Group along with a number of other alternative sites proposed.</p> <p>Detailed concerns are raised by residents about loss of garage and parking space, green space and play space, effects on wildlife and hedgerows, property values, drainage and infrastructure in relation to site UPP21.</p> <p>Some comments that sites UPP04 and 05 are unsound in the absence of a safeguarding line for the Uppingham Bypass.</p> <p>Promoters of alternative allocations comment that the housing requirement for Uppingham needs to be increased to provide flexibility and a number of alternative</p>	<p>The Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan will consider proposals for residential, employment and other land use allocations in its area and allocate sites where appropriate.</p> <p>Consequently the proposed allocations for residential development in Uppingham are deleted from the plan, allowing these to be considered through the Neighbourhood Planning process.</p> <p>The sites for residential development in Uppingham that were previously identified in the Preferred Options document will be put forward to Uppingham Town Council together with the responses to consultation that have been received for consideration through the Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan.</p>

Main issues raised	How main issues have been taken in to account
<p>sites are proposed in and around the town.</p>	
<p><u>Empingham</u></p> <p>Similar numbers agree and disagree with sites EMP07 and 08</p> <p>Detailed concerns are raised by residents about sites EMP07 and 08 in relation to access, traffic and parking problems; impacts on the conservation area, character of the village and listed buildings; that other sites outside the conservation area are available.</p> <p>English Heritage raises concerns about the need to assess any impact on listed buildings in a conservation area and the need for detailed criteria to guide development.</p> <p>Empingham Parish Council consider the density figure to be maximum and would prefer mixed housing and to increase local employment opportunities.</p>	<p>The concerns raised in the responses have been considered and the numbers of dwellings proposed on residential allocations EMP07 and EMP08 reduced in order to ensure that any potential impacts on the conservation area and listed buildings are minimised.</p> <p>Otherwise the concerns that have been raised including the impact on the listed building and conservation area, traffic, infrastructure and other issues can be dealt in more detail through the planning application process under Policy SP5 and SP15 (design and amenity), in accordance with criterion c) of Policy SP1.</p> <p>Other sites in Empingham were considered through the site appraisal process which concluded that site EMP07 and 08 compare favourably with other sites in and around the village.</p> <p>The density of the development is a guide only and has been deleted from the policy. The detailed design and layout of the proposals would be dealt with through the planning application process.</p> <p>The sites would need to provide for a minimum of 35% affordable housing thereby contributing mixed housing.</p>
<p><u>Ketton</u></p> <p>Similar numbers agree and disagree with sites KET01 and 02 while majority agree with site KET06.</p> <p>Detailed concerns raised by residents about the scale of development proposed being too large for Ketton and issues relating to sites KET01 and 02 including access and traffic and parking problems; impacts on the conservation area, open space and historic buildings, loss of open space and a historic orchard, capacity of the local school on schools, infrastructure constraints.</p>	<p>The concerns raised in the responses have been considered and the numbers of dwellings proposed on residential allocations KET01 and KET02 reduced in order to ensure that any potential impacts on the conservation area and listed buildings are minimised.</p> <p>Otherwise the concerns that have been raised, including the impact on the conservation area, open space, traffic, infrastructure and other issues can be dealt in more detail through the planning application process under Policy SP5 and SP15 (design and amenity), in accordance with criterion c) of Policy SP1.</p> <p>The primary school at Ketton currently has capacity to accommodate additional pupils and this will be sufficient to accommodate the proposed growth, subject to detailed requirements being known.</p>

Main issues raised	How main issues have been taken in to account
<p>Ketton Parish Council has no objection to the proposed allocations provided that the sites are not accessed from the High Street.</p> <p>Two additional sites for residential development have been put forward at the Crescent, Stamford Road and off Timbergate Road. The landowner/agent of site KET06 requests that the boundaries of the site be extended and that it be brought forward in the plan period.</p> <p>Hanson Cement is concerned about the impact of Site KET06 on future quarrying operations.</p> <p>English Heritage raises concerns about the tree frontage on site KET01, that KET02 is in a conservation area and the need for detailed criteria to guide development.</p> <p>Two responses claim that the site appraisal process for sites in Ketton is inconsistent, ill judged, inaccurate and biased and detailed amendments are proposed.</p>	<p>The policy states that developments will be phased to ensure co-ordination with infrastructure, particularly waste water treatment and water supply capacity. Information provided by Anglian Water indicates that there is capacity at the waste water treatment works and in the foul sewerage network to serve the proposed growth although it may require localised network capacity to accommodate flows.</p> <p>The previous designation of part of Site KET01 as an Important Open Space has been removed from the plan following the review of important open space and frontages carried out in May 2012 which concluded that this does not merit designation as important open space</p> <p>The phasing in Policy SP1 in Ketton and across the Plan period will allow the Council to co-ordinate the developments with the provision of infrastructure in the village and to manage the continuity of housing supply in one of the most sustainable villages in the County.</p> <p>The site at the Crescent, Stamford Road could be included as a residential allocation given that it is within the planned limits of development and would make use of previously developed land. This would create greater flexibility in housing supply following the reduction in housing numbers on sites KET01 and 02.</p> <p>The proposed extension to site KET06 would not be justified by the existing housing commitments and requirements in Ketton. However the proposed phasing of the site is no longer required due to the reduced capacity on sites KET/01 and KET/02. Consequently the number of houses to be provided on the site in the plan period has been increased accordingly. The site lies outside the Area of Search for future quarrying operations for Ketton quarry in the Minerals Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD and would not impinge on future quarrying operations.</p> <p>The other alternative large site put forward, off Timbergate Road, is a large site on green field land which is outside the planned limits of development. Its allocation would not be justified by the existing housing commitments and requirements in Ketton.</p>

Main issues raised	How main issues have been taken in to account
	<p>More detailed criteria to guide development are not considered necessary as issues such as those raised in relation to sites KET01 and that KET02 will be considered under policies SP19 (Sites of Biodiversity and Geodiversity Importance) and SP20 (The Historic Environment) and other policies of the plan.</p> <p>The site appraisal process has been carried out in accordance with the methodology and is not considered to be inconsistent, inaccurate or biased. The detailed comments that have been made in relation to the appraisal of these two sites will be considered and any changes to the Site Appraisals made as required.</p>
<p><u>Greetham</u></p> <p>Large majority agree with the proposed allocation of site GRE01.</p> <p>Greetham Parish Council would wish to see mixed development with play equipment on site GRE01 but have a number of highway concerns about the development.</p> <p>Two other alternative sites in the village proposed.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>In accordance with Policy SP1, the layout and design, play equipment, traffic, infrastructure and other issues would be would dealt with through the planning application process under Policy SP5 (Built Development in the Towns and Villages) and SP15 (Design and Amenity).</p> <p>Other sites in Greetham were considered through the site appraisal process which concluded that site GRE01 compares favourably with other sites in and around the village.</p> <p>The alternative sites are not justified by the existing housing commitments and requirements in Greetham</p>
<p><u>Ryhall</u></p> <p>A large majority agree with the proposed allocation of site RYH02.</p> <p>The landowner/agent for site RYH02 seeks its allocation earlier in the plan period.</p> <p>Natural England comment that site RYH02 is within an area of Local Landscape Value designated in the Rutland Local Plan and development would need to be compatible with the important landscape features in this area.</p>	<p>Paragraph 3.15 has been amended to explain that the phasing of the site in Policy SP1 will allow the Council to prioritise the release of previously developed land ahead of greenfield sites such as this and to manage the continuity of housing supply across the Plan period .</p> <p>The concerns that have been raised about the impact on the landscape can be dealt in more detail through the planning application process under Policy SP5 and SP15 (design and amenity), in accordance with criterion c) of Policy SP1. Account would also be taken of SP23 (Landscape Character in the Countryside) as this replaces policy designation for areas of Local Landscape Value.</p>

Main issues raised	How main issues have been taken in to account
<p><u>Alternative Allocations</u></p> <p>Alternative allocations are sought in Belton, Braunston, Caldecott, Cottesmore, Edith Weston, Exton, Glaston, Lyddington, Oakham, Tinwell,</p> <p>Promoters of alternative allocations question the basis on which the housing requirement has been calculated, arguing that insufficient land is allocated to meet needs, that there is too much emphasis on windfalls, with the need for a buffer and more flexibility in supply.</p> <p>Cottesmore Parish Council is surprised that Cottesmore is not to be allocated any sites despite having indicated that housing could be considered on land to the west of Rogues Lane, Cottesmore.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>Alternative allocations in Oakham are not justified as there is no need to allocate further land in Oakham to meet the requirements of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Alternative allocations in Cottesmore are not justified as there is no need to allocate further land in the Local Service Centres to meet the requirements of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Alternative allocations in the smaller villages are not justified as it would not be consistent with the locational strategy in the Core Strategy to allocate sites in these villages. Small sites for affordable housing can be considered as rural exception sites under Core Strategy Policy CS11 and Policies SP8 and SP9 of the Site Allocations DPD.</p> <p>The housing requirement is based on the evidence base work (e.g. windfall study) and is considered to provide sufficient flexibility.</p>
<p><u>Other comments</u></p> <p>Other comments relating to the plan's approach to delivering its housing target include the following objections;</p> <p>A phasing policy is inappropriate and inconsistent with the NPPF.</p> <p>Housing figures are carried over from the Core Strategy and based on the East Midlands Regional Plan and are now out of date and not robust or adequate as the basis of the preparation of this plan in accordance with NPPF requirements. To be compliant with NPPF plan period should be extended to 2030.</p>	<p>The phasing policy is to manage delivery over the plan period and allows flexibility in bringing sites forward if necessary to secure a steady supply of the requirement housing. An explanation for the phasing is set out at paragraph 3.15 of the plan but Paragraph 3.17 has been amended to refer to brownfield land being prioritised over green field.</p> <p>The plan seeks to deliver the adopted Core Strategy. The Council is committed to an early review of the local plan with updated housing needs assessments at the earliest opportunity. It is not considered that the Core Strategy housing requirement that underpins the Site Allocations and Policies DPD should be reviewed at this stage</p>
<p>Policy SP2 – New employment land allocations</p>	
<p>A large majority agree with the proposed allocation of site UPP15.</p>	<p>The Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan will consider proposals for residential, employment and other land use allocations in its area and allocate sites where</p>

Main issues raised	How main issues have been taken in to account
<p>Detailed concerns that UPP15 would add to existing traffic problems and impact adversely on adjacent residents; that development would have to be in keeping with existing units; that further development of UPP15 is unnecessary as there is already unlet space on the Station Road units; that the existing employment area at Station Road should be moved to UPP15 allowing redevelopment of that site for housing</p> <p>Alternative sites proposed on land north of Oakham Bypass for employment use to be held in reserve in the event that there is a loss of employment land through reallocation of Hawksmead Business Park for housing and the proposed release of land at Ashwell Business Park. An extension of Site UPP15 to the east is proposed for employment-led mixed use including enabling residential development.</p>	<p>appropriate.</p> <p>Consequently the proposed allocation for employment development in Uppingham has been deleted from the plan, allowing this to be considered through the Neighbourhood Planning process.</p> <p>The site for employment development in Uppingham that was previously identified in the Preferred Options document will be put forward to Uppingham Town Council together with the responses to consultation that have been received for consideration through the Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The reallocation of the Hawksmead Business Park for housing and alternative sites proposed on land north of Oakham Bypass for employment use is not justified by the housing and employment requirements in the Rutland and would be contrary to Policy CS13 of the Core Strategy. Further work on reviewing the 2008 Employment Land Assessment is being undertaken to update the evidence base to support the Council's position on the overall availability of employment land. This will further address all the issues raised in response to the Preferred Option plan.</p>
<p>Policy SP3 – New retail allocations</p>	
<p>The majority agree with the proposed allocations.</p> <p>Detailed concerns about site OAK25 in terms of access, traffic problems, highway capacity and junction safety at the railway crossing; that the area should be extended to include adjacent properties and include a multi storey car park; One response raises concerns about site OAK43 in term of access, loss of parking spaces, disruption for residents.</p> <p>Oakham Town Council disagrees with site OAK25 due to concerns</p>	<p>The Site Appraisal process and Council's retail capacity study considered that the retail allocation on these sites OAK25 and OAK43 within and on the edge of Oakham Town Centre would be acceptable in principle. In accordance with Policy SP3 the impact on the residential amenity, parking, traffic, infrastructure and other issues would be dealt with through the planning application process under Policy SP5 and SP15 (Design and Amenity).</p> <p>The allocation of the alternative out of centre sites proposed for retail is not considered appropriate. The land adjacent to Lands' End Way Oakham is safeguarded for employment use under Core Strategy Policy CS13 (Employment and Economic Development) and any retail development on the former Rutland County College site can be considered under Policy SP3 and Core Strategy</p>

Main issues raised	How main issues have been taken in to account
<p>about increased traffic flow from Cold Overton Road onto development</p> <p>Promoters of alternative sites consider that the plan fails to deliver sufficient retail floorspace, disagree with site OAK25 and 43 on a range of issues and seek allocation of land at the former County College site and adjacent to Lands End Way.</p>	<p>Policy CS17 Town Centres and Retailing).</p> <p>In order to ensure the Local Plan is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework in dealing with retail proposals on unallocated sites outside the town centre, Policy SP3 has been amended to indicate that where the Council is considering edge of site and out of centre proposals, preference will be given to accessible sites that are well connected to the town centre in accordance with the sequential test set out in Policy CS17.</p>
<p>Policy SP4 - Sites for waste management and disposal</p>	
<p>A large majority agree with the proposed allocations.</p> <p>Some detailed concerns about sites KET03a and b in terms of its impact on the surrounding area and roads, importation and transportation of waste and how this relates to the existing planning consent.</p> <p>The Environment Agency comments that sites KET03a and 03b and GRE05 are located over principal aquifers and within Source Protection Zone 2 where there is groundwater sensitivity to pollution risks.</p> <p>Some concerns about the potential impact of KET03b and COT09 on nature conservation.</p> <p>One response considers site GRE/05 to be unsuitable for waste due to access problems, visibility from the A1 and potential contamination of the Cacass Spring.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal recommends that reference be made to the geological trail within the SSSI at Ketton Quarry.</p>	<p>The supporting text to Policy SP4 has been amended to provide further guidance on the likely scale of development proposed at Ketton, the numbers of vehicle movements and the restoration of the quarry.</p> <p>It is considered that potential impacts will be able to be avoided or minimised to acceptable levels through application of mitigation measures. Site specific assessments (e.g. transport assessment) are required (as standard process) to accompany any planning application – where appropriate routing agreements will also be established. In addition potential impacts are required to be addressed through both the Core Strategy and development management policies (e.g. Policy SP28 – Waste Related Development) of the Local Plan.</p> <p>Potential impacts relating to water resources are identified through the site appraisals (as stated above) and are required to be addressed through both the Core Strategy and development management policies (e.g. Policy SP28 – Waste Related Development) of the Local Plan. In addition any application will be subject to environmental regulation and permitting requirements.</p> <p>Reference to the geological trail within the SSSI at Ketton Quarry has been included in the text.</p> <p>The site appraisals for Ketton and Cottesmore clearly identify the biodiversity and geodiversity interests (including presence of designated sites such as SSSI - of which the geology trail forms part of) as well as restoration potential. The site appraisals are linked to the Sustainability Appraisal</p>

Main issues raised	How main issues have been taken in to account
	<p>process and have informed both the Sustainability Appraisal and plan-making process. Detailed site surveys, avoidance and / or mitigation measures required to reduce potential impacts to acceptable levels and a restoration scheme (where applicable) would form part of the planning application and be subject to the development assessment process.</p> <p>The site appraisal of site GRE/05 identified good access to the site with only a limited number of additional HGV movements likely to be generated. The site is largely screened by vegetation from the A1. Any potential impacts on water resources would be addressed as described as above.</p>
Chapter 4 – The location of development	
Planned Limits of Development	
<p>No concerns were raised in relation to the planned limits of development criteria and the wording in the document.</p> <p>One request for a loosening of the planned limits of development beyond existing built forms to provide a more local approach in light of the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>Comments were received asking for amendments to the planned limits of development. The majority of these comments were asking for the extension of the limits to allow further development.</p>	<p>The planned limits of development were drawn to reflect the extent of the built up area and to include the proposed allocated sites.</p> <p>The proposed amendments to the planned limits of development have been considered but no further changes are considered necessary.</p>
Policy SP5 Built development in the towns and villages	
<p>A large majority agree with the proposed policy.</p> <p>Some detailed concerns are raised by landowners and developers that the policy is inflexible and will unnecessarily restrict growth and should be amended to be consistent with national policy.</p>	<p>The policy states that sustainable development will “generally” be supported within planned limits to development. Support does not need to be qualified in this way and the word “generally” has been deleted from the first sentence of Policy SP5 in accord with national planning policy.</p> <p>Reference to phasing simply reiterate Policy SP1 (Sites for Residential Development) for phasing of allocated sites. It is not unreasonable to make</p>

Main issues raised	How main issues have been taken in to account
<p>Other comments from statutory agencies that the policy should be strengthened to reflect backland and tandem development, design and layout, and to address the ecological value and potential risks of developing previously developed land.</p> <p>A community interest group is concerned that policy should seek to prevent loss of community and cultural facilities.</p>	<p>provision for the cumulative impact of development having a detrimental impact.</p> <p>The policy is considered to be appropriate in terms of assessing proposals for backland and tandem development when read in conjunction with policies SP15 (Design and Amenity) and SP20 (The Historic Environment). Policy SP19 (Biodiversity and Geodiversity Conservation) provides adequate protection in relation to bio-diversity which includes previously developed land and is consistent with principles in Core Strategy Policy CS1 (Sustainable Development Principles). Concerns about potential risks from former uses would be considered in requirement to ensure development would not adversely affect the local environment or local amenity.</p> <p>Core Strategy Policy CS7 (Delivering Socially Inclusive Communities) provides protection to safeguard community facilities.</p>
<p>Policy SP6 - Housing in the countryside</p>	
<p>A large majority agree with the proposed policy.</p> <p>Two responses raise concerns that the policy and the distance requirements for reuse or adaptation of rural buildings for residential use and dwelling extensions or replacement dwellings are restrictive on farming enterprise and contrary to national policy.</p> <p>English Heritage considers that the policy does not give consideration to historic environment issues or wider impacts of local character and distinctiveness.</p> <p>The National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups considers that the policy would prevent proper provision for traveller sites.</p>	<p>Policy SP6 b) has been amended to indicate that affordable sites may also include small numbers of market homes where exceptionally permitted by Policy SP9 (Market housing within rural exception sites).</p> <p>The policy does not repeat National Planning Policy Framework policy but paragraph 4.18 covers paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework including bullet point 4 re “the exceptional quality or innovative nature of the design or dwelling”. The text reference at paragraph 4.18 however is wrong and has been corrected.</p> <p>The advice given in paragraph 4.31 on the maximum distances from settlements for rural buildings being adapted for residential use and the advice given in paragraph 4.35 on the acceptable size of dwelling extensions or replacement dwellings in the countryside are for guidance only and not prescribed in Policy SP6 (Housing in the Countryside).</p> <p>All development covered by policy SP6 will need to be assessed against the requirements of Policy SP15 (Design and Amenity) and SP20 (The Historic</p>

Main issues raised	How main issues have been taken in to account
	<p>Environment).</p> <p>The Preferred Option plan provides no supplementary planning policy to that set out in the Core Strategy at Policy CS12 (Gypsies and Travellers). This is due to the findings of a Gypsy and Traveller Needs Assessment undertaken by ORS and published in May 2012. The advice from the study is considered robust and is as summarised at paragraphs 5.3 to 5.9 of the Preferred Options document.</p>
Policy SP7 – Non-residential development in the countryside	
<p>A large majority agree with the proposed policy.</p> <p>Some concerns that the policy is restrictive on farming enterprise and businesses in the countryside that need to expand and is contrary to national policy.</p> <p>English Heritage considers that the policy should refer to the historic environment when setting out environmental constraints.</p>	<p>The Policy states that sustainable non-residential development will “generally” be supported in the countryside. Support does not need to be qualified in this way and the word “generally” has been deleted from the first sentence which would accord with national planning policy.</p> <p>Policy provides presumption in favour of small scale sustainable development for existing rural business through alterations, extensions or other ancillary development and for new employment growth subject to the growth being “rural tourism, leisure or related rural enterprise that supports the local economy and communities”. It is considered that this is a supportive policy to the needs of existing businesses or employment sites in the countryside and the need to support farming enterprise in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework</p> <p>All development covered by policy SP7 will need to be assessed favourably against the requirements of Policy SP15 (Design and Amenity) and SP20 (Historic Environment).</p>
Chapter 5 – Creating sustainable communities	
Policy SP8 – Mobile homes and residential caravans	
<p>A large majority agree with the proposed policy.</p> <p>Langham Parish Council only support the policy if it applies to all sections of the community.</p>	<p>No change. The policy is not an additional requirement in consideration of sites for Gypsies and Travellers as adequate policy guidance is provided by Core Strategy Policy CS12 (Gypsies and Travellers). Paragraph 5.2 and 5.7 have been amended to clarify that the policy guidance at Policy</p>

Main issues raised	How main issues have been taken in to account
<p>The National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups considers that the policy would prevent proper provision for traveller sites.</p>	<p>SP8 is not an additional requirement in consideration of sites for Gypsies and Travellers as adequate policy guidance is provided by Core Strategy policy CS12.</p>
<p>Sites for Travellers</p>	
<p>The National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups considers that this section is not consistent with the Core Strategy and would prevent proper provision for traveller sites.</p>	<p>The Preferred Option plan provides no supplementary planning policy to that set out in the Core Strategy at Policy CS12 (Gypsies and Travellers) This is due to the findings of a Gypsy and Traveller Needs Assessment undertaken by ORS and published in May 2012. The advice from the study is considered robust and is as summarised at paragraphs 5.3 to 5.9 of the Preferred Options document.</p> <p>However, Paragraph 5.7 has been amended to clarify that the policy guidance on Mobile homes and residential caravans (Policy SP8) is not an additional requirement in consideration of sites for gypsies and travellers as adequate guidance is provided by Core Strategy Policy CS12.</p>
<p>Policy SP9 – Affordable housing</p>	
<p>A large majority agree with the proposed policy.</p> <p>Some detailed concerns are raised by landowners and developers and about criteria b), c) and d) and whether the policy incorporates flexibility as required by the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>Some concerns from Parish Councils that the last paragraph should be strengthened or that the requirements for smaller developments should be abolished.</p>	<p>Policy SP9 has been amended by amending and merging c) and d) to clarify that affordable housing must be broadly equivalent in standard and siting to typical open market properties of the same floorspace/number of bedrooms/general type, unless it conforms to the Homes and Communities Agency's design standards.</p> <p>An additional paragraph has been included paragraph following 5.17, setting out the Council's reasoning for ensuring that all affordable housing is fit for purpose for a given floorspace/number of bedrooms/general type.</p> <p>It is considered that Policy SP9 takes a realistic approach to viability and strikes the correct balance in permitting sustainable development in line in accordance with policies of the core Strategy and national policy guidance.</p>
<p>Policy SP10 – Market housing within rural exceptions sites</p>	
<p>A large majority agree with the proposed policy.</p>	<p>Policy SP10 (h) has been amended to clarify that the requirements to clarify that the requirements relating to combined gross internal floor area of the</p>

Main issues raised	How main issues have been taken in to account
<p>A number of concerns are raised by landowners and developers that the policy is inflexible and over prescriptive, with no justification for criteria g) and j) and that d), h), i), j) and l) should be deleted.</p> <p>The Homes and Communities Agency welcomes the policy exception for affordable housing while other comments consider that affordable housing sites should only be within the planned limits of development.</p>	<p>market homes this does not have to be rented housing within the definition of the HCA's specific 'affordable rented' scheme, provided it meets the National Planning Policy Framework definition of 'affordable housing' and is rented.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.32 has been amended to clarify justification of (l).</p> <p>Criterion (g) is justified by paragraph 5.22. This is based on Core Strategy paragraphs 2.18 for Local Service Centres and 2.19 for Smaller Service Centres. Flexibility has been shown by allowing 5 dwellings in restraint villages following core Strategy Policy CS11 (Affordable Housing),. Criterion (j) is justified by paragraphs 5.23 and 5.24.</p> <p>Criterion (d) ensures that schemes are justified and that market homes are used only to the extent necessary to cross-subsidise affordable homes. See paragraphs 5.23 and 5.24 for justification, the latter also referencing the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>Criteria (h) and (i) are justified by paragraphs 5.23 to 5.27. (i) is also in line with Policy CS11 regarding tenure mix and the Strategic Housing Market Assessment.</p> <p>With criterion (l), market housing is permitted on sites outside the Planned Limits of Development on an "exceptions" basis and the importance of the affordable housing on an "enabling" basis must be sufficient to justify this. Justification is provided in paragraph 5.32.</p> <p>The principle of development outside the Planned Limits of Development is in Core Strategy Policy CS11 and in National Planning Policy Framework - sufficient constraint is already applied.</p>
Chapter 6 – Building our economy and infrastructure	
Policy SP11 – Use of military bases and prisons for operational or other purposes	
A large majority agree with the proposed policy.	Policy SP11 has been amended by including reference to the need for water and waste water infrastructure and contamination issues

Main issues raised	How main issues have been taken in to account
<p>Two responses request that the policy be extended to include small scale development sites to the south of Kendrew Barracks and former Woolfox Airfield with potential for development.</p> <p>Other comments from statutory agencies that the policy should include consideration of water and waste water infrastructure, and to address the ecological value and potential risks of developing previously developed land.</p>	<p>Policy SP11 is intended to apply to areas that are used primarily as military bases or prisons. The small scale housing sites to the south of Kendrew Barracks and the former Woolfox Airfield do not form part of these areas.</p> <p>Ecological value is covered by criterion d) which refers to the need to protect the natural heritage and Policy SP19 biodiversity and geodiversity conservation.</p>
<p>Policy SP12 - Town centre area, primary and secondary shopping frontages</p>	
<p>All responses but one agree with the proposed policy.</p> <p>Sainsbury's Supermarkets, Tresham College and individual comments that the Tesco store should not be included in the town centre boundary and the secondary shopping frontages should be extended.</p> <p>Detailed concerns are raised by residents about Tesco site being included in the town centre in relation to traffic and residential amenity.</p> <p>English Heritage consider the policy should make reference to designated heritage assets in assessing proposals affecting shop fronts and security.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>The town centre boundary and the secondary shopping frontages are supported by the Council's retail capacity study (2010) and Oakham and Uppingham town centre boundaries study (2012).</p> <p>The impact on residential amenity and traffic has been dealt with through the planning application for the Tesco extension granted in 2010.</p> <p>Proposals affecting shop fronts and security and potentially impacting on designated heritage assets are covered by Policy CS22, SP20 and the Council's Shop front SPD (2002). This will be covered in any subsequent updated shop front guidance</p>
<p>Policy SP13 - Agricultural, horticultural, equestrian and forestry development</p>	
<p>A large majority agree with the proposed policy.</p> <p>An amendment is suggested to item g) that development should not impact on biodiversity,</p>	<p>Policy SP13 has been amended by inserting new criteria h) to read "it will have no adverse impact on biodiversity, habitats and species."</p>

Main issues raised	How main issues have been taken in to account
habitats and species.	
Policy SP14 - Telecommunications and high speed broadband	
All responses agree with the proposed policy. No issues raised.	No change.
Chapter 7 – Sustaining our environment	
Policy SP15 – Design and amenity	
<p>All responses but one agree with the proposed policy.</p> <p>One response requests that reference to “loss of outlook” in clause c) be deleted and e), j) and k) be redrafted to remove subjective judgements and to take a more positive approach to development management.</p> <p>Other comments request the policy refers to loss of amenity within 400m of a sewage treatment works and additional guidance relating to incorporating biodiversity within and around developments.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal of the Preferred Options document has shown the need to incorporate changes to the policy to refer to safe access by vehicles and to include a criterion relating to impact on the highway network.</p> <p>The Equality Impact Assessment has shown a need for access for mobility scooters to rear gardens of residential premises.</p>	<p>Policy SP15 has been amended by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deleting reference to the “loss of outlook” in c) and provision of bus shelters and or a bus service in e). • Amending k) to clarify the requirements for provision of open space • Including reference to “vehicles” and external access for mobility in criterion l); • Inserting new criterion m) referring to impact on the highway network; <p>Criterion j) is retained as it relates to the visual amenity aspect of trees and hedgerows whereas Policy SP19 relates to the biodiversity issues.</p> <p>It is not considered necessary to include specific reference loss of amenity within 400m of a sewage treatment works as criterion c) protects amenity.</p> <p>It is not considered necessary to include additional guidance relating to incorporating biodiversity in new developments as this is covered elsewhere in Policy SP19 (Biodiversity and geodiversity conservation) and Core Strategy Policy CS21 (The Natural Environment).</p> <p>Standards of provision of new open space are set out in Policy SP22 (Provision of New open space).</p>
Policy SP16 - Advertisements	

Main issues raised	How main issues have been taken in to account
<p>All responses but one agree with the proposed policy.</p> <p>English Heritage considers that the policy should be strengthened by setting out criteria under the listed buildings and conservation areas part of the policy which could include reference to materials, colour and illumination.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>It is not considered necessary to include additional reference to materials, colour, illumination etc as these are covered by the reference in the policy to “the appearance or character of the street scene” in the Policy and by other legislation and guidance relating to listed buildings and conservation areas.</p>
Policy SP17 - Outdoor lighting	
<p>All responses but one agree with the proposed policy.</p> <p>Comments that there should be a requirement for external lighting to be switched on only when reasonably necessary and that reference be made to the impact of light pollution on local amenity, dark landscapes and nature conservation as stated in the National Planning Policy Framework.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>It is not considered appropriate to include a requirement for outdoor lighting only to be switched on when necessary.</p> <p>There is no need to repeat national policy guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework in Local Plan.</p>
Policy SP18 - Wind turbines and low carbon energy developments	
<p>A large majority agree with the proposed policy.</p> <p>Several comments that the policy should be more positive and supportive of wind energy and other renewables and amendments requested to clauses of a), f), j), and m) of part 1 of the policy and a) and l) of part 2 of the policy.</p> <p>One comment that more details be given of the timeframe and standards that will be require in restoring land to its original condition.</p>	<p>Policy SP18 part 2 a) has been amended by referring to impact on residential amenity rather than disturbance to neighbouring occupiers during construction.</p> <p>The Policy takes a positive approach to wind energy and other renewables by supporting such developments where the impacts of such developments can be addressed satisfactorily.</p> <p>Criteria a), f), j), and m) in part 1 of the Policy refer to the topics on which further guidance is provided in the Wind Turbine Developments Supplementary Planning Document (November 2012) and are retained.</p> <p>Criterion l) in part 2 of the policy relating to mitigation is intended to ensure that adequate mitigation measures are taken as part of any development and should be retained.</p>

Main issues raised	How main issues have been taken in to account
	<p>The timeframe and standards for restoring land are detailed matters that would be dealt with as through the planning application process in accordance with Criteria n) of Part 1 of the Policy and m) of part 2 of the Policy. It would not be appropriate to provide more details in the policy.</p>
<p>Policy SP19: Biodiversity and geodiversity conservation</p>	
<p>A large majority agree with the proposed policy.</p> <p>Natural England and others consider that the policy should also refer to the protection and enhancement of ecological networks as required by the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>Natural England support the policy but would also like to see “net gain” where compensatory habitat is created rather than equal or greater size.</p> <p>The Woodland Trust consider the section on ancient woodland and veteran trees is weakened by its wording and request reference to enhancement or expansion of existing habitats.</p> <p>The Leicestershire and Rutland Wildlife Trust requests a number of additions to the Policy including references to working with Local Nature Partnerships and the National Planning Policy Framework and that a Phase 1 Habitat survey of the whole county is required.</p> <p>Other comments that the section on trees and hedgerows duplicates the requirements of Policy SP15 (Design and Amenity) or that dead trees should also be given protection.</p>	<p>Policy SP19 c) has been amended to clarify that that compensatory habitat or equal or greater value is provided rather referring to size than size.</p> <p>It is not considered reasonable to require that there should in all cases be a net gain.</p> <p>The plan identifies and maps components of local ecological networks as required by the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>The maintenance and enhancement of ecological networks is covered in Core Strategy Policy CS21 (The Natural Environment) and Paragraph 7.24 refers to further work being required to identify ecological networks.</p> <p>The wording relating to irreplaceable habitats is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework. Core Strategy Policy CS21 provides for sites, features or species of ecological interest to be maintained or enhanced.</p> <p>References to working with local partnerships are already included in paragraph 7.24. It is not necessary to repeat the National Planning Policy Framework in the policy. A Phase 1 Habitat Survey of the whole of Rutland is not considered to be justified.</p> <p>The section on trees and hedgerows is not considered to duplicate Policy SP15 (Design and Amenity) as it relates to the protection of trees and hedgerows for biodiversity reasons whereas the requirements of Policy SP15 relate to visual amenity issues. It is not considered appropriate to provide specific protection for dead trees.</p>

Main issues raised	How main issues have been taken in to account
Policy SP20: The Historic Environment	
<p>A large majority agree with the proposed policy.</p> <p>English Heritage welcomes the inclusion of the policy but considers it over-long and repeats the National Planning Policy Framework in many places and suggests rationalising the policy and some changes to wording.</p> <p>Some concerns that more flexibility should be given to rural business in Conservation Areas, that the policy goes beyond the provisions of legislation and does not conform with the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>Some requests for additional historic sites to be included in the policy and that it is made clear in the document that it covers all historic assets including Listed Buildings and entries in the Historic Environment Record.</p> <p>Some Parish Councils comment that the policy should be strictly enforced and that sympathetic development to improve the thermal efficiency of historic listed buildings should be encouraged.</p> <p>One response requests that the document makes clear that historic assets include Listed Buildings and the entries in the historic environment record.</p>	<p>Policy SP20 has been amending requirements relating to development affecting heritage assets and removing requirements relating to designated heritage assets which are covered by national planning policy.</p> <p>The supporting text has been amended to clarify that the National Planning Policy Framework sets out the criteria to apply to designated and non-designated sites and clarifies the features that comprise the designated and non-designated assets.</p> <p>The text in paragraph 7.28 has been amended to make clear that other features including open space, parkland and the Historic Environment Record also make up the heritage assets.</p> <p>It is not accepted that there should be more flexibility to rural businesses in Conservation Areas as this could result in development taking place which would have an adverse effect on the Conservation Area.</p> <p>The requests to include additional historic sites have been submitted to the Leicestershire and Rutland Environmental Records Centre to consider for inclusion in the Historic Environment Record for Rutland.</p> <p>The thermal efficiency of historic listed buildings is an issue that is outside the scope of this plan.</p>
Policy SP21: Important open spaces and frontages	
<p>A large majority agree with this policy and the designations.</p> <p>Concerns were raised at the removal of the important open</p>	<p>No change has been made to Policy SP21 but the Policies Map has been amended as follows:</p> <p>1) The open space in Uppingham for the primary school playing field has been amended to not include any of the site previously identified as site</p>

Main issues raised	How main issues have been taken in to account
<p>space at Branston Road, Uppingham and land at Charter House, Ketton.</p> <p>Differences were identified between the conservation area map for Ashwell and the site allocations map for Ashwell.</p> <p>Some responses noted that the policy was not in agreement with national policy and had procedural objections.</p> <p>A number of detailed suggestions are made for the removal or addition of Important Open Spaces/Frontages.</p>	<p>UPP21.</p> <p>2) The open space in Seaton identified as SEA04 in the Important Open Space and Frontages Review 2012 has been extended to include the south eastern corner.</p> <p>3) The open space in Seaton identified as SEA07 in the Important Open Space and Frontages Review 2012 has been included as an Important Open Space.</p> <p>4) An additional area of open space has been included in Greetham adjacent to the Important Open Space to the west of the Church.</p> <p>The inclusion or removal of other Important Open Spaces and Frontages was justified by the Open Space and Frontages review was undertaken in June 2012.</p> <p>The Conservation Area appraisal shows important elements of the village in greater detail than that of the policies map. This detail is not available for each village and is therefore not included within the site allocations policies map.</p>
Policy SP22: Provision of new open space	
<p>A large majority agree with this policy and the designations.</p> <p>Natural England requests that this policy is expanded to include the other elements which are covered by Core Strategy Policy CS23 including green infrastructure;</p> <p>Two Parish Councils comment that areas for children to play in should be provided on smaller developments of over 25 units and the policy be extended to cover the deficit of facilities for children and young people in smaller villages.</p> <p>The Woodland Trust request the policy refers to woodland creation and standards.</p>	<p>Policy SP22 and the supporting text has been revised to clarify the requirements of the policy in relation to residential and commercial development and to indicate that contributions sought will be in line with Core Strategy Policies and other policies and guidance.</p> <p>It is not considered appropriate to include any additional provision for woodland or green infrastructure in this policy as the review of Open Space, Sport, Recreation Facilities and Green Infrastructure in Rutland (2009) stated that no definitive provision should be made for natural and semi-natural green spaces (which includes woodland) and green infrastructure.</p>
Policy SP23: Landscape	

Main issues raised	How main issues have been taken in to account
<p>character in the countryside</p> <p>A large majority agree with this policy and the designations.</p> <p>The National Farmers Union is concerned that the policy is worded to try and prevent as much new development as possible.</p> <p>English Heritage considers the policy unsound as it does not refer to the Historic Landscape Character Assessment which has been undertaken for the county.</p> <p>The National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups states that this policy is not consistent with the Core Strategy and prevents proper provision for traveller sites.</p>	<p>Policy SP23 has been amended to include reference to Policy SP19 (Biodiversity and geodiversity conservation).</p> <p>Paragraph 7.55 has been amended to include reference to the Leicestershire, Leicester and Rutland Historic Landscape Characterisation Project (2011).</p> <p>The policy seeks to make use of the Council's Landscape Character Assessment work to guide the assessment of potential impacts on the landscape of development in all areas of countryside rather than simply applying "a stricter test" in the areas that were designated Areas of Particularly Attractive Countryside or areas of Special Landscape Value where the concept of a stricter test was poorly articulated and therefore difficult to apply.</p> <p>There is no basis for excluding any form of development proposal in the countryside from the requirement to comply with this policy.</p>
<p>Policy SP24: Caravan and camping sites</p>	
<p>All responses but one agree with the proposed policy.</p> <p>One comment questions the evidence to support the statement that there continues to be considerable demand for camping and caravanning in Rutland, particularly in locations well related to Rutland Water.</p> <p>One comment that no camping or caravan sites should be by Rutland Water as it would destroy the whole area.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>Paragraph 7.57 has been amended to clarify that the source of information on demand for camping and caravanning facilities in Rutland.</p> <p>Policy SP24 does not apply to the Rutland Water policy area.</p>
<p>Policy SP25: Lodges, log cabins, chalets and similar forms of self-serviced holiday accommodation</p>	
<p>All responses but one agree with the proposed policy.</p> <p>One comment that the lodges, cabins, chalets, etc should not be</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>Policy SP25 does not apply to the Rutland Water policy area.</p>

Main issues raised	How main issues have been taken in to account
around Rutland Water	
Policy SP26: Rutland Water Recreation Areas	
<p>A large majority agree with the proposed policy.</p> <p>The National Farmers Union questions whether agricultural and farm diversification developments will be allowed within the Rutland Water Area</p> <p>One Parish Council considers that any additional development should be resisted as this would help destroy what tourists and local people come to appreciate</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>Policies SP6 and SP7 dealing with agricultural and farm diversification developments are to be read in conjunction with Policy SP26 within the five small areas defined as Recreation Areas within the Rutland Water Area. The presumption in favour of agricultural and farm diversification developments will apply but subject to the limitations applied in Policy SP26 in terms of use.</p> <p>In those parts of the Rutland Water Area outside of the five defined Recreation Areas, Policies SP6 and SP7 are to be read in conjunction with Core Strategy Policy CS24. Again, the presumption in favour of agricultural and farm diversification developments will apply but subject to the limitations applied in Policy CS24 in terms of use.</p>
Policy SP27: Eyebrook Reservoir Area	
<p>All responses but one agree with the proposed policy.</p> <p>Comments that as the reservoir is within two local authority areas there should co-operation between them if development takes place and a footpath/cycle track around the reservoir should included as part of the integrated cycle tourism plans by Leicestershire and Rutland.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal has recommended inclusion of additional wording in the policy relating to the SSSI and RIGS status of Eyebrook Reservoir.</p>	<p>Policy SP27 has been amended to state that development must not be detrimental to the special nature conservation interests of Eyebrook Reservoir (including the conservation objectives for the Site of Special Scientific Interest and Regionally Important Geological Site.</p> <p>The supporting text has been amended to refer to the need to co-ordinate policy and site management across two local authorities under duty to co-operate.</p>
Policy SP28: Waste-related development	
<p>All responses agree with the proposed policy.</p> <p>The Environment Agency requests that an additional criterion is added to the policy to</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>The need to protect the natural environment and resources as well as the identification of potentially adverse impacts (including the avoidance and/or minimisation of such impacts through mitigation</p>

Main issues raised	How main issues have been taken in to account
<p>ensure waste related development does not pose risk to controlled waters including groundwater.</p>	<p>measures) is addressed through Core Strategy policies and development management policies in the Local Plan. In addition water resources are further addressed through national policy and guidance. The existing policy coverage is adequate; as such the suggested wording is not required as it would only reiterate existing policy and that set out through the policy hierarchy.</p>
<p>Appendix 1 – Agricultural, forestry and other occupational dwellings</p>	
<p>All responses agree with the proposed Appendix</p> <p>One comment that the policy does not fully reflect National Planning Policy Framework and is onerous and unduly restrictive on farming enterprise</p> <p>One comment that the policy seeks to reintroduce outmoded policy wiped out by the National Planning Policy Framework and that all references should be removed to any semi-automatic passing onto an external adviser and to an applicant having to pay to repeat what his competent agent will already have submitted.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>The purpose of Appendix 1 is to clarify how the National Planning Policy Framework is to be applied locally using a tried and tested approach that has served its purpose in ensuring that inappropriate development is avoided involving new agricultural, forestry and other occupational dwellings. The intention of the National Planning Policy Framework is not to wipe out any means to ensure that sustainable development of this type is delivered in the countryside.</p> <p>The requirement for the applicant to pay for an independent technical appraisal to ensure the information provided is robust is appropriate. It should not be at the expense of the local community via the Council.</p>
<p>Appendix 2 – Parking Standards</p>	
<p>A large majority agree with the proposed policy.</p> <p>One comment that the implications on design and layout of housing schemes will result in the minimum density requirements of the Core Strategy being impossible to achieve, that there is no definition of rooms and there are differing needs for different areas and there it is not clear whether the requirements' relate to net retail space or gross unit floorspace.</p>	<p>Appendix 2 has been amended to include definition of "rooms" and an explanation of gross floorspace.</p> <p>There is no evidence to suggest that the preferred parking standards would result in the minimum density requirements of the Core Strategy not being met.</p> <p>Local needs are taken into account in the proposed standards which are in line with government guidance. Exceptions to the standards may be permissible in certain circumstances (paragraphs 1.5-1.7).</p> <p>The definition of rooms was taking from the 2001</p>

Main issues raised	How main issues have been taken in to account
<p>Oakham Town Council request that disabled parking provision is increased in existing car parks and states that the overall parking in Oakham needs to be improved.</p> <p>Langham Parish Council concerned that the minimum standards are too low especially for domestic premises; standards for disabled parking are not adequate and new developments such as schools, surgeries should be considered with the provision of public transport and cycle routes being addressed</p>	<p>census and is defined in the Parking Standards Review 2012. The standards relate to gross floorspace for non-residential development unless otherwise stated.</p> <p>The levels of public car parking in Oakham and elsewhere are beyond the scope of this document. These issues can be addressed through the Council's Local Transport Plan.</p>
<p>Appendix 3 – Areas of biodiversity and geodiversity importance</p>	
<p>All responses but one agree with the proposed appendix.</p> <p>A number of responses support or request amendments to the sites identified in the appendix.</p> <p>Two comments support the designation of land at Quarry Farm Little Casterton as a Candidate Local Wildlife Site while the landowner questions the blanket designation of the land and its implications for future growth of Stamford.</p>	<p>Appendix 3 has been amended to correct the naming of sites at Tinwell and boundary of the Candidate Local Wildlife Site at Geeston Quarry Ketton.</p> <p>The Candidate Local Wildlife Site at Quarry Farm Stamford has been designated due to its potential wildlife interest. This area is not being considered as an area for future development in this plan or by South Kesteven District Council as part of their Site Allocations and Policies DPD.</p>
<p>Appendix 4 – Designated historic assets in Rutland</p>	
<p>A large majority agree with the proposed appendix.</p> <p>English Heritage concerned that the appendix does not show all types of designated heritage assets including listed buildings and the grading of registered parks and gardens is not given; suggest the title is changed to 'Heritage Assets' rather than</p>	<p>Appendix 4 has been amended as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the title to read "Designated Heritage Assets"; • to show the grading of registered parks and gardens; • to include statement at the beginning of the appendix to indicate that designated historic assets also include listed buildings which are not shown in the appendix; <p>Due to the large number of listed buildings and the list is subject to change it is not considered feasible</p>

Main issues raised	How main issues have been taken in to account
<p>“Historic Assets”.</p> <p>The Rutland Local History and Record Society asks for the document to make clear that historic assets are not limited to Scheduled Monuments and Registered Parks and Gardens and that battlefields are also included on the national heritage list.</p> <p>A number of suggestions for additional features or detailed changes to the list are made.</p>	<p>to show listed buildings on the proposals map. This information is readily available on the Council's or English Heritage's website or on request from the Council.</p> <p>The additional features that have been suggested and the detailed changes to the list will be forwarded to the Leicestershire and Rutland Environmental Records Centre for consideration for inclusion in the Historic Environment Record for Rutland.</p> <p>There are no registered battlefields in Rutland.</p>
<p>Appendix 5 – Open space standards</p>	
<p>A large majority agree with the proposed appendix.</p> <p>One comment that open space standards would be more use if there was greater detail and clarity on needs and provision.</p>	<p>Appendix 5 has been amended to remove unnecessary repetition of guidance contained in the review of Open Space, Sport, Recreation Facilities and Green Infrastructure in Rutland (2009) and to give further explanation of the types of open space provision and the minimum size requirements.</p>
<p>Appendix 6 – Glossary</p>	
<p>A large majority agree with the proposed appendix.</p> <p>A number of suggestions that definitions of affordable rent, Local Wildlife Sites, SSSIs, RIGS and A1 or other A Class Retail uses be included.</p> <p>The Environment Agency suggests inclusion of reference to the Climate Ready tool.</p>	<p>The Glossary has been amended to include definitions of these terms.</p> <p>The Climate Ready tool is not referred to in the document and it is not considered necessary to refer to it in the Glossary.</p>
<p>Policies Map</p>	
<p>Comments relating to the Policies Map that are shown under the topic areas above are not listed separately here.</p> <p>Two comments that the plan fails to identify or protect the future alignment of a bypass for Uppingham and that it would be useful to have larger inset maps</p>	<p>There is no agreed scheme or route for an Uppingham Bypass that could be shown on the Policies Map.</p>

Main issues raised	How main issues have been taken in to account
for the main settlements.	
Other comments	
<p>Other issues raised include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the wording of all policies be reviewed and adopt a positive approach eliminating subjective assessments and removing reference to cumulative effects; • the DPD needs to be more positive about wind energy • a strong position is needed detailing the expectations of surface water management; • lack of policies relating to contamination and pollution control, water resources and flood risk that are not covered by the Core Strategy; • that major hazard installations and MAHPs and consultation zones should be shown on a map; • lack of reference to the Water Framework Directive; • an extension of the consultation process and a public meeting in Ketton is requested; • no discussion or recognition of boundary issues or integration with adjoining areas. 	<p>The policies do take a positive approach to development and avoid subjective assessments. Cumulative effects of development are a valid planning concern as outlined in the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>The Site Allocations and Policies DPD and the Core Strategy do take a positive approach to wind energy by supporting such developments where the impacts of such developments can be addressed satisfactorily.</p> <p>Issues of contamination, pollution, water resources and flood risk are dealt with elsewhere in the Plan and in the Core Strategy. These deal with the need to protect water resources and it is not considered necessary to specifically refer to the Water Framework Directive.</p> <p>The consultation process is considered to be adequate with a range of measures including a 6 week consultation period, a leaflet delivered to every household in Rutland, a public exhibition and roadshow (including an exhibition and roadshow in Ketton), information on the Council's website and in local media.</p> <p>All neighbouring authorities have been consulted and their comments taken into account in preparing the document.</p>