



Summary of Consultation Responses

Site Allocations and Policies DPD Preferred Options October-November 2012



January 2013

Summary of consultation responses

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

Contents

1.	Introduction	1
2.	Responses to the Objectives of the Plan	2
3.	Responses to Site Allocations	
	• SP1 - Sites for residential development	2
	• SP2 - New employment land allocations	7
	• SP3 - New retail allocations	7
	• SP4 - Site for waste management and disposal	8
4.	Responses to The Location of Development	
	• Planned limits of development	9
	• SP5 – Built development in the towns and villages	9
	• SP6 - Housing in the countryside	10
	• SP7 - Non residential development in the countryside	10
5.	Creating sustainable communities	
	• SP8 - Mobile homes and residential caravans	11
	• Sites for travellers	11
	• SP9 - Affordable housing	11
	• SP10 - Market housing within rural exception sites	12
	• SP11- Use of military bases and prisons for operational or other uses	12
	• SP12 -Town centre area, primary and secondary shopping frontages	13
	• SP13 - Agricultural, horticultural, equestrian and forestry development	13
	• Sustainable transport and accessibility	13
	• SP14 - Telecommunications and high speed broadband	13
6.	Responses to Sustaining our Environment	
	• SP15 - Design and amenity	14
	• SP16 - Advertisements	14
	• SP17 – Outdoor lighting	14
	• SP18 - Wind turbines and low carbon energy developments	14
	• SP19 – Biodiversity and geodiversity conservation	15
	• SP20 – The historic environment	16
	• SP21 - Important Open Spaces and Frontages	17
	• SP22 - Provision of new open space	18
	• SP23 - Landscape character in the countryside	19
	• SP24 - Caravan and camping sites	19
	• SP25 – Lodges, log cabins, chalets and similar forms of self serviced accommodation	19
	• SP26 - Rutland Water recreation areas	19
	• SP27 - Eyebrook reservoir	20
	• SP28 – Waste related development	20

Summary of consultation responses

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

Responses to Appendices	
• Appendix 1 - Agricultural, forestry and other occupational buildings	20
• Appendix 2 - Parking standards	21
• Appendix 3 - Areas of biodiversity and geodiversity importance	21
• Appendix 4 - Designated historic assets in Rutland	22
• Appendix 5 - Open Space Standards	22
• Appendix 6 - Glossary	22
Policies Map	23
Other comments	23

Summary of consultation responses

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

Introduction

Consultation on the Preferred Options document took place over a 6-week period that commenced on 11 October 2012 and ended at 4.45 pm on 22 November 2012.

The document was subject to extensive consultation and publicity in accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. This included:

- Letters sent to a wide range of statutory and non-statutory consultees with copies of the document and a response form;
- Email notifications sent to people who had asked to be updated on progress of the LDF and people on the Council's consultation database;
- A summary leaflet delivered to every household in Rutland;
- Notices placed on parish notice boards and a press release was sent to local newspapers and media;
- An public exhibition held at public libraries in Oakham, Uppingham; Ketton and Ryhall and the Council Offices in Oakham;
- A community roadshow held at Greetham Community Centre, Victoria Hall in Oakham, Empingham Audit Hall, and public libraries in Uppingham, Ketton and Ryhall at which Council officers were available to discuss the plan;
- Meetings held with a range of groups and stakeholders including Parish Councils in the Local Service Centres, the Local Strategic Partnership (Rutland Together) and the Rutland Parish Councils Forum;
- Documents and response forms available for inspection at public libraries in Rutland;
- Documents available on the Council's website with an on-line form for submitting comments to the Council.

Further details are available on the Council's website:

<http://www.rutland.gov.uk/siteallocations>

A total of 166 written responses to the consultation have been received from 162 individual people and organisations.

Format of this document

This document summarises the responses to the Site Allocations and Policies Development Plan Document (DPD) Preferred Options consultation document.

The numbering and headings in this document correspond with those in the Preferred Options consultation document. It does not list every comment but highlights the key responses and issues that have been raised.

Copies of the consultation responses including details of alternative development sites submitted to the Council as part of the consultation process can be viewed on request at the Council Offices in Oakham during normal opening hours.

For enquiries please contact the Planning Policy Section by email at localplan@rutland.gov.uk or telephone 01572 722577.

Summary of consultation responses

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

Chapter 2 – The Objectives of the Plan

The objectives of the Plan		
Agree	Disagree	Other Comments
2	8	-

Government and agencies

- The Environment Agency suggests adding to objective 14 reference to returning land to beneficial use;

Public and interest groups

- One individual response suggests that there should be an objective to work within the capacity of the road network and highway safety.

Chapter 3 – Site allocations

Policy SP1 – Sites for residential development			
Site	Agree	Disagree	Other Comments
Phase 1			
Oakham			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> OAK45 north of Former Parks Nursery School 	11	6	-
Uppingham			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UPP21 north west of 18-40 Branston Road 	12	18	4
Empingham			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EMP07 Main Street, Empingham 	13	13	4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EMP08 Southview Farm, Empingham 	14	16	1
Ketton			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KET01 Adjacent to Chater House, High Street 	13	14	1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KET02 Home Farm, High Street 	12	12	2
Phase 2			
Uppingham			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UPP04 Leicester Road 	22	6	0
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UPP05 North of Leicester Road 	21	6	2
Phase 3			
Greetham			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GRE01 Northbrook Close, Oakham Road 	11	4	3
Ketton			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KET06 adjacent to Empingham Road 	12	8	-
Ryhall			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RYH02 adjacent River Gwash Trout Farm 	15	3	1

Summary of consultation responses

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

Oakham

Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- Hawksmead Ltd comment there is a significant likelihood that land at north Oakham will not yield the 1,096 dwellings ascribed to it and therefore part of the existing employment allocation should be allocated for housing;
- The Society of Merchant Venturers seeks allocation of land to the south east of Oakham for housing (60-80 new homes) and public open space;

Government and agencies

- Sport England questions the loss of the playing field element of site OAK45 and whether a replacement has been identified
- The Environment Agency disagree with site OAK45 the local authority should be satisfied ahead of allocating the site that the necessary improvements to sewage and sewerage infrastructure will be provided without exceeding environmental limits;
- The Homes and Communities Agency welcomes the allocation of site OAK45;

Public and interest groups

- One individual response suggests that allocation of the site should be deferred to assess the traffic situation in next few years.

Uppingham

Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- Bloor Homes argue that the approach to housing allocations is not based on an appropriate assessment having regards to evidence; seek allocation of land south of Uppingham Road for development (100-200 dwellings);
- Larkfleet Homes disagree with the approach to setting out the housing requirement and consider that sites UPP04 and 05 are unsound in the absence of a safeguarding line for an Uppingham Bypass; seek allocation of land at roundabout field, Ayston Road, Uppingham (90 dwellings);
- Lynton Developments considers that allocations should be distributed over a wider variety of sites and be consistent with the Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan; seek allocation of a site for mixed use including residential to the east of Uppingham Gate;
- Marrons on behalf of clients argue that the housing provision to Uppingham should be increased to provide flexibility; seek allocation of sites in Uppingham at Hazel Close (18 dwellings), off Goldcrest (99 dwellings) and south of Leicester Road;
- The Peterborough Diocesan Board of Finance seek allocation of a site to the north west of Uppingham for residential development (about 768 houses);
- Uppingham School objects to the response by the Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan Task Group that land off Leicester Road is suitable for housing;

Government and agencies

- Natural England comment that sites UPP04 and UPP05 are in areas of particularly attractive countryside designated in the Rutland Local Plan and would need to be compatible with the important landscape features and characteristic of this area; development would result in loss of best and most versatile Grade 2 agricultural land;

Parish Councils and Meetings

- Uppingham Town Council and its Neighbourhood Plan Task Group consider that no site should exceed 60 dwellings and recommend sites UPP04 (max 14 dwellings), UPP05 (max 60 dwellings) plus sites east of the Beeches (18

Summary of consultation responses

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

dwellings), south of Leicester Road (60 dwellings) and at Samuel Court (8 dwellings);

Public and interest groups

- The Branston Road Forum disagrees with site UPP21 as it is important open space and the area cannot accommodate more traffic. Supports sites UPP04 and 05 for a smaller number of dwellings plus a number of sites elsewhere around the town;
- The Limes Firs and Spurs Residents Association does not wish to see more than 160 dwellings in the plan period and supports site UPP21 for a smaller number of dwellings, site UPP04 for occupation by over 55s, and UPP05 for 60 dwellings. A further site is proposed at Leicester Road;
- A number of individual responses raise concerns about site UPP21 citing loss of garage and parking space that will cause more congestion and danger on the roads, loss of green space and play space, effects on wildlife and hedgerows, property values, drainage and infrastructure, loss of privacy, increase in crime.

Empingham

Government and agencies

- English Heritage comment that site EMP07 contains a range of grade 2 listed barns and walls within a conservation areas and that the impact on designated assets will need to be carefully assessed. The preferred sites should include development criteria to guide future proposals;

Parish Councils and Meetings

- Empingham Parish Council have no objection to sites EMP07 and 08 provided that the density stated is a maximum figure and in practice far fewer dwellings would be allowed; that due account is taken of the Parish Council's preference for mixed housing and the need to increase employment opportunities in the village;

Public and interest groups

- A number of individual responses raise concerns about sites EMP07 and 08 including excessive density of development; 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 more suitable;
- One individual response objects to the omission of site at Whitwell Road Empingham which is considered to meet the criteria of Policy SP5;

Ketton

Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- G W Ellis and Sons agree with site KET06 but disagree with the boundary of the site shown on the map and with its inclusion in Phase 3 of the plan period; consider that it should replace site KET01 or 02 in phase 1;
- Hanson Cement Ltd. agree with sites KET01 and 02 but disagree with Site KET06 due to its proximity to the area with planning permission for quarrying and potential effect on future operations; propose an extension to site KET02 and an additional site at The Crescent, Ketton (20 homes);
- Larkfleet Homes object to the total number of houses allocated to Ketton which has the potential to have a detrimental impact on highways; that greater provision should be made to other Local Service Centres or Uppingham;

Summary of consultation responses

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

- Linden Homes disagrees with sites KET01 and 02 on the grounds of acceptability and deliverability and propose an alternative site on land west of Timbergate Road (up to 159 dwellings);

Government and agencies

- English Heritage are concerned that the tree coverage fronting site KET01 will need to be protected and that KET02 is within a conservation area and adjacent to listed buildings; that the preferred sites should include development criteria to guide future proposals;
- Natural England comment on site KET01 that it is surprised to see a green colour coding for loss of an important open space and point out that a right of way will need to be retained;

Parish Councils and Meetings

- Ketton Parish Council has no objection to the proposed developments and number of houses provided that none require any additional access on the High Street;

Public and interest groups

- A number of individual responses raise concerns about the scale of development proposed being too large for Ketton and a range of 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;

Greetham

Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- Larkfleet Ltd seek allocation of sites in Greetham at Priestwells Close and Greetham Garden Centre in order to ensure housing requirements to 2026 can be met without slippage;
- Hanover Homes seek allocation of the former Greetham Garden Centre for housing (35 dwellings) and submit detailed proposals;

Parish Councils and Meetings

- Greetham Parish Council comment on site GRE01 that they would like to see a mixed development including bungalows and older persons' houses; that highway concerns about visibility and speed of traffic need to be taken into account and an equipped play area to be placed with the development;

Ryhall

Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- Marrons on behalf of clients agree with site RYH02 but disagree with its allocation in the third phase of the plan and request that it be brought forward in the plan period and submit a concept plan for the site;

Government and agencies

- Natural England comment that site RYH02 is within 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;

Parish Councils and Meetings

- Ryhall Parish Council agree with site RYH02.

Public and interest groups

- Belmesthorpe Neighbourhood Watch accept that RYH02 is the most suitable site but careful consideration will need to be given to where it will be accessed from;

Summary of consultation responses

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

- Individual comments that it is not suitable to build on low land near the river and would be better to build elsewhere on higher land and elsewhere in the village; that the best site is south of Beech Drive and Meadow Lane, Ryhall.

Other comments

Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- Andrew Granger & Co consider that insufficient land has been allocated to meet housing need with a heavy reliance on windfall sites. Seek allocation of residential sites at Braunston, Belton, Edith Weston and Oakham.
- Barrett/David Wilson Homes consider that insufficient land has been identified to meet additional needs and seek allocation of land at Edith Weston (141 dwellings);
- Carter Jonas on behalf of clients put forward sites for future development at Cottesmore, Edith Weston and Glaston;
- Drummond Robson on behalf of Mr Sharman comment that the policy should allow greater discretion in determining growth through windfalls and acknowledge the special nature of Great Casterton and Caldecott and their proximity to major towns; seeks allocation of exception site for housing on the edge of Caldecott;
- Hanover Developments object to windfall sites being taken into account and object to phasing of sites which can act as a restriction to future growth with no justification or explanation;
- Hereward Homes consider that the housing numbers are out of date and must be reassessed; seek allocation of sites for housing site at Holme Farm Yard, Tinwell and Home Farm, Exton;
- Linden Homes object to reliance on a windfall allowance and consider that the plan period should be extended to 2030; that the housing distribution to the Local Service Centres should be rebalanced in line with the Core Strategy;
- Larkfleet Homes consider the housing numbers are out of date and need to be reassessed; object to any phasing of housing delivery which it considers as being contrary to government expectations;
- Staniforth Architects on behalf of client propose a site at Main Street Lyddington as a rural exception site allocation;
- The Society of Merchant Venturers consider that the housing provision needs to increase to allow a buffer and greater flexibility;
- Wardle Evans on behalf of client seek allocation of land to the west of Rogues Lane, Cottesmore which it considers would offer opportunities for wider community benefits;

Government and agencies

- Anglian Water provides a red-amber-green assessment of the proposed site allocations;

Parish Councils and Meetings

- 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;
- Morcott Parish Council support the general approach to meeting housing needs but request that the evidence relating to existing commitments and windfall developments be put in the public arena;
- Tinwell Parish Meeting seek allocation of the field behind builders yard at Holme Farm Tinwell for affordable housing and 2-3 bedroom houses;

Summary of consultation responses

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

Public and interest groups

- One individual comment that the plan makes little mention of the expansion of necessary amenities for the additional 3,000 homes needed.

Policy SP2 – New employment land allocations

Site	Agree	Disagree	Other Comments
Uppingham			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UPP15 Land adjacent to Uppingham Gate (1ha) 	21	4	-

Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- Hawksmead Ltd seek allocation of land north of Oakham Bypass for employment use to be held in reserve in the event that there is a net loss of employment land through reallocation of Hawksmead Business Park for housing;
- Lynton Developments seek extension of Site UPP15 to the east for employment-led mixed use including enabling residential development; do not welcome widening of uses within the site to include waste related development;

Public and interest groups

- Individual comments that development of 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;
- The Limes Firs and Spurs Residents Association supports UPP15 and considers it would be appropriate to move the existing industrial area at Station Road to the site.

Policy SP3 – New retail allocations

Site	Agree	Disagree	Other Comments
Oakham			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OAK25 Tim Norton, Long Row 	12	7	1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OAK43 Rear White Lion, Melton Road 	11	2	-

Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- Hawksmead Ltd disagree with site OAK25 on the grounds of availability, planning history, highways/traffic, environmental and amenity issues; that allocation of the site would be contrary to national retail policy; seek allocation of land adjacent to Lands' End Way Oakham;
- Sainsbury's Supermarkets and Tresham College disagree with site OAK25 as being unsuitable in terms of scale, highway grounds and availability; consider that the plan fails to allocate sufficient land to deliver the amount of retail floorspace identified in the Core Strategy and Retail Capacity Assessment and that further land must be allocated; seek allocation of the former Rutland County College site for retail development;

Summary of consultation responses

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

Government and agencies

- The Environment Agency disagree with sites OAK25 and 43 as the local authority should be satisfied ahead of allocating the sites that the necessary improvements to sewage and sewerage infrastructure will be provided without exceeding environmental limits;

Parish Councils and Meetings

- Oakham Town Council disagrees with site OAK25 due to concerns about increased traffic flow from Cold Overton Road onto development;

Public and interest groups

- A number of individual responses raise 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.

Policy SP4 - Sites for waste management and disposal			
Site	Agree	Disagree	Other Comments
Advanced treatment facility			
• KET/03a: Ketton, Ketco Avenue	13	1	1
Inert disposal			
• KET/03b: Ketton, Ketco Avenue	13	2	3
Small scale preliminary treatment facilities			
• COT/09 – Cottesmore, Burley Road	11	-	3
• GRE/05 - Greetham, Wood Lane	12	1	2

Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- Greetham Valley Golf disagrees site GRE05 due to the road access being unsuitable for more HGVs, it would not be a good advert for Rutland to have waste stored on the side of the A1 and the potential for contaminated water getting into Cacass Spring;

Government and agencies

- 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; not in favour of proliferation of multiple private sewage discharges in relation to sites COT09 and GRE05;
- The Leicestershire and Rutland Environmental Records Centre request that KET03b makes reference to biodiversity and restoration to calcareous grassland in the policy; recommend rejection or deferral of site COT09 until habit survey and species information obtained;
- Natural England consider it surprising that the sustainability appraisal of the inert disposal element of KET03b does not make reference to the potential impacts on the SSSI and associated geological trail from the quarry restoration;

Parish Councils and Meetings

- Collyweston Parish Council disagrees with KET03b as it is unsure what this means and what impact it will have on the surrounding area and roads;
- Greetham Parish Council comment that the highways department should be aware of the traffic implications to GRE05 near to the A1;

Summary of consultation responses

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

- Normanton Parish Meeting disagrees with site KET03a as transporting the pellets to the plant rather than the refuse would be a better solution and with KET03b as the approved restoration scheme does not allow importation of waste and transportation of large quantities of waste to the site should not be encouraged;

Public and interest groups

- Individual comments that map in relation to KET03b is misleading and contradicts the planning consent for the quarry extension; that road layout of site COT09 should not spoil avenue of Oak trees on approach to Cottesmore.

Chapter 4 – The location of development

Planned Limits of Development (Paragraphs 4.1-4.7 and Policies Map)		
Agree	Disagree	Other Comments
1	4	10

Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- Barratt/David Wilson Homes consider there is a requirement to reconsider the planned limits of development to include land between Chiltern Drive and Severn Crescent Edith Weston;
- Commercial Land Ltd seek a loosening of PLD beyond existing built forms to allow all sites to be considered equally in terms of potential suitability;
- Hereward Homes object to the change to the PLD at Tinwell which should also include land at Holme Close;
- Uppingham School requests a change to the PLD to include houses and school buildings on Red Hill/London Road, Uppingham
- Wardle Evans on behalf of Mr Hollis request a change to the PLD at land to the west of Rogues Lane Cottesmore;

Public and interest groups

- Individual comments request changes to the PLD in Glaston.

Policy SP5: Built development in the towns and villages		
Agree	Disagree	Other Comments
16	8	8

Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- Barratt/David Wilson Homes and Andrew Granger and Co on behalf of clients consider there is insufficient flexibility in the policy which will constrain development;
- Larkfleet Homes Ltd consider that the policy should be rephrased to reflect the presumption in favour of development, there is no justification for testing cumulative effect of development and reference to phasing should be removed;
- Commercial Land Ltd consider the policy should be revised to allow growth of settlements beyond their current limits;
- Sainsbury's Supermarkets and Tresham College request the policy be amended to provide clarity consistent with national planning guidance;

Government and agencies

Summary of consultation responses

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

- English Heritage consider the policy could be strengthened in relation to backland or tandem development and requirements relating to design and layout
- Natural England comment that previously develop sites have the potential for ecological value which needs to be recognised;
- The Environment Agency suggests an amendment to ensure that potential risks from former uses are assessed and cleaned up as necessary;

Public and interest groups

- The Theatres Trust suggest an amendment that existing community and cultural facilities will be protected and enhanced by resisting their loss or change of use unless replacement facilities are provided
- One individual comment that the premise that any development in Restraint Villages is unsustainable may result in stagnation of these settlements.

Policy SP6 - Housing in the countryside		
Agree	Disagree	Other Comments
17	7	1

Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- Andrew Grainger on behalf of clients consider that the policy does not reflect national policy and is onerous and restrictive on farming enterprise;
- The NFU disagree with the distances quoted in paragraph 4.31 as they are too strict and one size fits all and with size limits quoted in paragraph 4.35 as there will be justification for larger buildings;

Government and agencies

- English Heritage is concerned that the policy on replacement dwellings does not give consideration to historic environment issues or wider impacts of local character and distinctiveness;
- Natural England are pleased to see the text recommended by the Habitats Regulations incorporated into the policy;

Public and interest groups

- The National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups disagree with the policy as it would prevent proper provision for traveller sites.

Policy SP7 – Non-residential development in the countryside		
Agree	Disagree	Other Comments
17	3	3

Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- Andrew Grainger on behalf of clients consider that the policy does not reflect national policy and is onerous and restrictive on farming enterprise;
- Linecross Ltd consider it essential that growing businesses in the countryside have the opportunity to expand beyond their established site;
- Palmers of Oakham consider that policies should be less restrictive on existing employment sites provided they do not cause significant harm;

Government and agencies

- English Heritage consider that the policy should be amended to refer to historic environment character when setting out environmental constraints;
- Natural England are pleased to see the text recommended by the Habitats Regulations incorporated into the policy;

Parish Councils and Meetings

Summary of consultation responses

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

- Langham Parish Council comment that 15 sports pitches between Barleythorpe and Langham cannot be seen as “essential” to a county the size of Rutland;
Public and interest groups
- One comment that alternative uses for buildings in the countryside should be expedited when it would mean an improvement in appearances.

Chapter 5 – Creating sustainable communities

Policy SP8 – Mobile homes and residential caravans		
Agree	Disagree	Other Comments
11	2	2

Parish Councils and Meetings

- Langham Parish Council disagree with the policy as it is only acceptable if it applies to all sectors of the community; gypsy families in Burley Road and Oakham Road continue to receive preferential treatment;
- North Luffenham Parish Council consider that mobile homes and caravans are detrimental to our environment;

Public and interest groups

- The National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups disagree with the policy as it would prevent proper provision for traveller sites.

Sites for travellers (paragraphs 5.3-5.9)

Public and interest groups

- The National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups disagree with this section as it would prevent proper provision for traveller sites; express doubts about the robustness of the 2012 review.

Policy SP9 - Affordable housing		
Agree	Disagree	Other Comments
16	3	3

Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- Andrew Grainger on behalf of clients consider that the policy does not reflect the prospect of flexibility outlined in national policy;
- Drummond Robson on behalf of Mr Sharman consider that insufficient account is taken of the need to provide viable schemes of adequate quality for their particular environment;
- Larkfleet Homes request that criteria b) and d) be amended and c) deleted;

Government and agencies

- The Homes and Communities Agency welcome the reference to HCA design standards;

Parish Councils and Meetings

- Collyweston Parish Council suggests strengthening the last paragraph to state that the Council “will” refuse development proposals that seek to underdevelop or split sites to reduce the affordable housing contribution;
- Empingham Parish Council asks whether the Council will arrange follow up studies of on integration of affordable housing in communities;

Summary of consultation responses

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

- Langham Parish Council suggests abolishing the affordable housing contribution for small developments, possibly of under 6 houses;
- Morcott Parish Council are concerned about the exception that affordable housing is granted from normal policies of restraint and request that the policy be amended to be consistent with the definition of minor development.

Policy SP10 - Market housing within rural exception sites		
Agree	Disagree	Other Comments
11	3	4

Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- Andrew Grainger on behalf of clients consider that more flexibility is needed in respect of overly prescribed requirements;
- Commercial Land Ltd request the policy be rewritten to remove the restrictions on size of development and assess each application individually;
- Drummond Robson on behalf of Mr Sharman consider that insufficient account is taken of the need to provide viable schemes of adequate quality for their particular environment with no justification for requirements in g) and j);
- Larkfleet Homes considers the policy presents an over prescriptive approach and requests deletion of d), h), i), j) and l);

Government and agencies

- The Homes and Communities Agency welcome the policy exception allowing a small amount of affordable housing in the countryside where essential to allow the delivery of affordable units;

Parish Councils and Meetings

- Langham Parish Council consider that all affordable housing should be within the planned limits of development to prevent creep into open countryside.

Public and interest groups

- One comment that exception sites cannot be permitted outside the planned limits of development where a conservation area exists.

Chapter 6 – Building our economy and infrastructure

Policy SP11 – Use of military bases and prisons for operational or other purposes		
Agree	Disagree	Other Comments
15	3	2

Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- Abbey Developments request that the policy be amended to give favourable consideration to small scale development; that the area to which the policy applies be extended to include housing development site to the south of Kendrew Barracks which would allow small undeveloped plots to be brought forward for use;
- Andrew Grainger on behalf of clients requests that the policy be extended to include former military bases such as Woolfox Airfield with potential for development;

Government and agencies

- Anglian Water request an additional bullet requiring the consideration of water and waste water infrastructure;

Summary of consultation responses

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

- Defence Infrastructure Organisation welcomes the policy and the exclusion of Kendrick and St Georges Barracks from policies on development in the countryside;
- Natural England comments that previously developed sites have the potential for ecological value which needs to be recognised;
- The Environment Agency comments that potential risks from former uses need to be assessed and that soil and groundwater are cleaned up where necessary;

Public and interest groups

- One comment that the MOD should have to make sustainable development and reuse buildings instead of demolish and build.

Policy SP12 - Town centre area, primary and secondary shopping frontages		
Agree	Disagree	Other Comments
11	1	3

Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- Sainsbury's Supermarkets and Tresham College consider that the Tesco store should not be included in the town centre boundary and the secondary shopping frontages should be extended to include a number of retail and business units;

Government and agencies

- English Heritage consider that it would be useful to make reference in the policy to designated heritage assets in assessing proposals affecting shop fronts and security;

Public and interest groups

- Individual comments that the residual of the Tesco site should not be included in the town centre designation due to concerns about traffic and impact on adjacent residential properties; that there should be traffic calming and 20 mph speed limits on Oakham High Street and traffic calming on Barleythorpe Road and through Barleythorpe.

Policy SP13 - Agricultural, horticultural, equestrian and forestry development		
Agree	Disagree	Other Comments
14	1	-

Public and interest groups

- The Leicestershire and Rutland Wildlife Trust requests an amendment to item g) that development should not impact on biodiversity, habitats and species;

Sustainable transport and accessibility (paragraphs 6.18-6.20)

Parish Councils and Meetings

- Morcott Parish Council considers that the policy fails to address concerns about traffic conditions and access.

Public and interest groups

- One individual comment that there is no mention of the need for bridleways or pavements in various locations (eg Langham to Ashwell).

Summary of consultation responses

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

Policy SP14 - Telecommunications and high speed broadband		
Agree	Disagree	Other Comments
17	-	1

No issues raised.

Chapter 7 – Sustaining our environment

Policy SP15 – Design and amenity		
Agree	Disagree	Other Comments
17	1	3

Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- Larkfleet Homes disagree with the policy and request that 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;

Government and agencies

- Anglian Water recommend a policy requiring consultation and assessment of the the risk of loss of amenity to development proposed within 400m of a sewage treatment works;
- Environment Agency request reference be made to its “Climate Ready” document
- English Heritage welcome the policy and proposed wording;
- Natural England would also like to see additional guidance on the incorporation of biodiversity within and around developments;

Parish Councils and Meetings

- Morcott Parish Council is encouraged by the increased emphasis on the wider landscape and views into and out of conservation areas.

Policy SP16 - Advertisements		
Agree	Disagree	Other Comments
11	1	1

Government and agencies

- 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.

Policy SP17 - Outdoor lighting		
Agree	Disagree	Other Comments
13	1	-

Parish Councils and Meetings

- Barrowden Parish Council considers that there should be a requirement for external lighting to be switched on only when reasonably necessary to meet its purpose and a system provided in the design to ensure this is met;

Public and interest groups

- The Leicestershire and Rutland Wildlife Trust request reference be added to paragraph 125 of the NPPF regarding the impact of light pollution on local amenity, dark landscapes and nature conservation.

Summary of consultation responses

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

Policy SP18 - Wind turbines and low carbon energy developments		
Agree	Disagree	Other Comments
13	5	2

Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- The NFU considers that the policy is not supportive enough of wind and other renewables and there must be a massive step change;
- Hawksmead Ltd disagree with clauses a) disturbance to neighbouring occupiers and l) proximity to the renewable energy source in part 2 of the Policy relating to other low carbon energy generating developments and request that it be redrafted on a positive footing;
- Renewable UK consider that the DPD needs to be more positive about wind energy and recommend changes to Policy SP18 due to concerns about the requirements relating to a) landscape f) separation distances j) grid connection and m) mitigation;

Government and agencies

- English Heritage welcome reference to the historic and cultural environment
- Natural England support the policy;

Parish Councils and Meetings

- Barrowden Parish Council consider that the title should be changed to “Wind turbines and low carbon energy generation developments”.
- Langham Parish Council comment that consideration should be given to the opinions and concerns of local people and decommissioning should be agreed to the “when” and what standards will be expected in returning to original condition;

Public and interest groups

- Individual comments raise concerns that wind turbines are inefficient eyesores, that wind turbines should be placed on former airfields; that the MOD should use turbines to be energy efficient; that there should be 2 mile exclusion zone around Rutland Water;

Policy SP19: Biodiversity and geodiversity conservation		
Agree	Disagree	Other Comments
12	6	2

Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- Hanson Cement Ltd questions the boundary of the SSSI at Ketton Quarry and asks for it to be checked against Natural England’s records and amended.
- Larkfleet Homes Ltd state that the section relating to trees and hedges duplicates the considerations in policy SP15 and provides a suggested amendment to the clause in relation to trees and hedgerows;

Government and agencies

- Leicestershire and Rutland Environmental Records Centre recommend that this policy is amended to include reference to ecological networks as required by the National Planning Policy Framework.
- Natural England are supportive of the policy but would like to see additional wording in the policy in relation to the protection and enhancement of wider ecological networks and also would like to see a net gain where a compensatory habitat is created rather than ‘equal or greater size’.

Summary of consultation responses

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

-
- Environment Agency state that new developments should not pose an unacceptable risk of pollution to groundwater and asks that the use of sustainable drainage systems is encouraged;

Parish Councils and Meetings

- Morcott Parish Council supports the policy but regret that no sites of biodiversity or geodiversity importance around Morcott are included;
- Barrowden Parish Council request that the last paragraph on trees and hedgerows is deleted.

Public and interest groups

- Leicestershire and Rutland Wildlife Trust believe that Policy SP19 is fairly comprehensive but further reference to the NPPF would enhance the policy. The Trust also highlight that an up to date Phase 1 Habitat survey of the whole county is required.
- Oakham Home and Gardens Allotment Society request that six allotment sites are added as areas of biodiversity and geodiversity importance;
- The Woodland Trust welcome the wording of the policy in regards to ancient woodland or veteran trees but state that the wording 'unless the need for the benefits of the development..' significantly weaken the degree of protection afforded by the policy. The Trust also requests that reference is made to the enhancement or expansion of existing habitats.

Policy SP20: The Historic Environment		
Agree	Disagree	Other Comments
13	4	1

Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- DLP Planning Ltd on behalf of Mr Hempstead state that this policy goes significantly beyond the provision of the Listed Buildings Conservation Areas Act and is not in conformity with Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
- Palmers of Oakham Ltd request that the policy should allow some flexibility for the development of rural businesses in the conservation area dependant on their value to the local economy.

Government and agencies

- English Heritage welcomes the inclusion of this policy but states that it is overlong and repeats the National Planning Policy Framework in many places and suggests changes to the policy wording.

Parish Councils and Meetings

- Pickworth Parish Meeting raise concerns that two of the most important historical sites in Rutland are not mentioned: The Limekiln, edge of Pickworth and Battle of Losecoat Field.
- Barrowden Parish Council comments that historic and listed buildings may not have good thermal efficiency and suggests that it should be possible to improve the situation sympathetically to the original building and asks that such development should be encouraged under this policy.
- Langham Parish Council asks that this policy is strictly enforced as at present inappropriate changes to buildings within the Conservation Area, such as PVCu windows, are being permitted.

Public and interest groups

Summary of consultation responses

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

- Rutland Local Historic and Record Society ask that the document makes clear that historic assets are not limited to Scheduled Monuments and Registered Parks and Gardens but also include Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas, Historic Rights of Way and green lanes and the many entries in the Historic Environment Record managed for Rutland by Leicestershire County Council.
- One individual response noted the omission of text regarding non-native species of trees in a rural conservation area.

Policy SP21: Important open spaces and frontages		
Agree	Disagree	Other Comments
19	8	15

Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- DLP Planning on behalf of Mr Barrie Hempstead objects to the designation of an Important Open Space at land Spring Back Way, Uppingham stating that the site does not satisfy the identified criteria and is not justified by national advice, in some cases duplicating an additional level of constraint;
- Francis Jackson Estates Ltd asks for the modification to the defined Important Frontage at Roses Timber Yard, North Luffenham to reduce it in size by 10 metres on Pinfold Lane;
- King West on behalf of Rockingham Castle Estate objects to the proposed extension of the Important Open Space immediately to the west of the Farmhouse and buildings at Meadow Farm, Caldecott, stating that it fails to register other statutory legislation which governs listed buildings and their curtilages.
- Marrons on behalf of Burley Estate Farm Partnership objects to the allocation of Brook Road Allotments, Oakham and state the process of designation is not sound or evidence based;
- National Farmers Union states that a large number of sites have been identified and asks if landowners have been made aware and if the increase in sites is justified;
- Wardle Evans Ltd on behalf of Mr Hollis object to part of an Important Open Space to the north east of Cottesmore due to limited public access and views into the site;

Government and agencies

- English Heritage supports the retention of Oakham Castle as an Important Open Space and the policy as a whole, specifically the criteria which safeguards historic environment attributes;
- Natural England supports this policy.

Parish Councils and Meetings

- Ashwell Parish Council identify that several important open spaces and stone walls are missed from the maps when compared to the Conservation Area Appraisals Map for Ashwell;
- Clipsham Parish Council wish for the site immediately to the west of Clipsham Church to be designated as an Important Open Space and not an Important Frontage, but support the designation of other Important Open Spaces/Frontages in the village;
- Cottesmore, Barrowden, Market Overton, Manton and Tinwell Parish Councils support this policy and the designations.

Summary of consultation responses

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

- Greetham Parish Council request that the open space adjacent to the Important Open Space to the west of the church is also included as an Important Open Space and also requests that the land to the north of Oak House is designated an Important Open Space;
- Langham Parish Council request that the playing fields, allotments and wildlife area in Langham is included as an Important Open Space;
- Morcott Parish Council supports the designation of the Important Open Spaces and Frontage in Morcott and wish to seek these as a Local Green Space. The Parish Council also discuss the importance of Back Lane to the village as an Important Open Space;
- Ryhall Parish Council suggests an additional clause to be added into the criteria in relation to historic status of sites, i.e. Local Landscape Value;
- Seaton Parish Council requests that the Important Open Space to the east of Baines Lane is reinstated from the 2001 Local Plan and an Important Open Space to the north of Seaton Road is extended and the Important Frontage on Main Street is changed to an Important Open Space to include the land to the rear of the wall;

Public and interest groups

- Several individual responses suggest additional sites to be designated as an Important Open Space, including land off Stamford Road, Oakham; land between Catmose Park Road and the bypass, Oakham; land to the east of Baines Way, and the car park to the eastern edge of Seaton;
- One individual response objects to the extension of the Important Open Space designation to the west of Hamblewood, Lyndon Road, Hambleton;
- One individual asks for the extension of one of the Important Open Spaces to the north west of Seaton.

Policy SP22: Provision of new open space		
Agree	Disagree	Other Comments
14	3	1

Government and agencies

- English Heritage welcomes this policy;
- Natural England requests that this policy is expanded to include the other elements which are covered by Core Strategy Policy CS23 including green infrastructure; do not support the findings of the sustainability appraisal with regard to this policy and make recommendations with regard to its lack of detail on green infrastructure;

Parish Councils and Meetings

- Langham Parish Council consider that an area in which children can play should be provided on smaller developments, perhaps over 25 units;
- Morcott Parish Council comment that the policy does not discuss smaller communities, such as Morcott, where the deficit in amenity and open space and provision for children and young people will not be addressed through planning gain. It is requested that the policy to be extended to cover this;

Public and interest groups

- Leicestershire and Rutland Wildlife Trust refer the council to the "Planning for a healthy environment – good practice guidance for green infrastructure and biodiversity".

Summary of consultation responses

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

- The Woodland Trust request that this policy encourages woodland creation wherever possible and refers the council to the access to woodland standards which have been developed by the Trust;

Policy SP23: Landscape character in the countryside		
Agree	Disagree	Other Comments
15	3	2

Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- The National Farmers Union would like to see this policy used to enhance proposed development but it seems to be worded to try and prevent as much new development as possible;

Government and agencies

- Natural England support this policy;
- English Heritage consider the policy unsound as it does not make reference to the Historic Landscape Character Assessment which has been undertaken for the county;

Parish Councils and Meetings

- Ryhall Parish Council requests that through historical designations be added to the last paragraph;
- Morcott Parish Council has not had the opportunity to comment the relationship of Areas of Particularly Attractive Countryside and Areas of Local Landscape Values against the Local Landscape Character Assessment as it was not able to source the information;

Public and interest groups

- The National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups consider that the policy is not consistent with the Core Strategy and prevents proper provision for traveller sites.

Policy SP24: Caravan and camping sites		
Agree	Disagree	Other Comments
10	1	0

Parish Councils and Meetings

- Manton Parish Council 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;

Public and interest groups

- One individual response requests that no camping or caravan sites should be by Rutland Water as it would destroy the whole area.

Policy SP25: Lodges, log cabins, chalets and similar forms of self-serviced holiday accommodation		
Agree	Disagree	Other Comments
10	1	0

Public and interest groups

- One individual response requests that the lodges, cabins, chalets, etc should not be around Rutland Water.

Summary of consultation responses

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

Policy SP26: Rutland Water Recreation Areas		
Agree	Disagree	Other Comments
12	3	0

Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- The National Farmers Union questions if agricultural and farm diversification developments will be allowed within the Rutland Water Area;

Government and agencies

- Natural England supports this policy and the inclusion of criterion c) relating to nature conservation interests and objectives;

Parish Councils and Meetings

- Langham Parish Council states that any additional development should be resisted as this would help destroy what tourists and local people come to appreciate.

Policy SP27: Eyebrook Reservoir		
Agree	Disagree	Other Comments
11	1	0

Parish Councils and Meetings

- Langham Parish Council note that Eyebrook Reservoir is within two Local Authority areas and requests that there is co-operation between the two authorities if development takes place;

Public and interest groups

- One individual response requests that a footpath/cycle track around the reservoir is included as part of the integrated cycle tourism plans by Leicestershire and Rutland.

Policy SP28: Waste-related development		
Agree	Disagree	Other Comments
12	0	1

Government and agencies

- The Environment Agency suggests an additional criterion is added to the policy to ensure waste related development does not pose risk to controlled waters including groundwater.

Appendices

Appendix 1 – Agricultural, forestry and other occupational dwellings		
Agree	Disagree	Other Comments
11	1	1

Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- Andrew Grainger and Co on behalf of clients note that the policy does not fully reflect the requirement of paragraphs 28 and 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework and that the policy is onerous and unduly restrictive on farming enterprise;

Summary of consultation responses

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

- Palmers of Oakham Ltd consider that the policy seeks to reintroduce outmoded policy wiped out by the NPPF 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.

Appendix 2 – Parking Standards		
Agree	Disagree	Other Comments
7	2	2

Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- Larkfleet Homes Ltd state that there will be a significant implication on the design and layout of a housing scheme and on the type of housing likely to be provided making the minimum density requirement set out in the Core Strategy impossible to achieve; concerned that there is no definition of 'rooms' and the standards fail to distinguish between the differing needs of different areas; that it is not clear whether the requirements relate to net retail space or gross unit floorspace;

Parish Councils and Meetings

- 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;
- Langham Parish Council state 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;

Public and interest groups

- One individual response states that there is a gross under provision of car parking spaces which should be free where possible.

Appendix 3 – Areas of biodiversity and geodiversity importance		
Agree	Disagree	Other Comments
13	0	2

Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- Diploma PLC states that the approach taken to apply a Local Wildlife Site to the land at Quarry Farm, Little Casterton is not sufficiently explained and does not consider the implications of how it may impact the potential growth of Stamford;

Parish Councils and Meetings

- Clipsham Parish Council supports the designation of Clipsham Quarry and areas of woodland to the east and west of Bidwell Lane as a Regionally Important Geological Site;
- Tinwell Parish Council provides corrections they wish to be made to the naming of several Local Wildlife Sites;

Public and interest groups

- One individual response supports the designation of Ketton disused quarry, Ketton hedge and Geeston Quarry as wildlife sites.
- One individual response supports the designation of Geeston Quarry Ketton as a Local Wildlife Site but questions the boundary.

Appendix 4 – Designated historic assets in Rutland

Summary of consultation responses

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

Agree	Disagree	Other Comments
8	4	2

Government and agencies

- English Heritage raise concerns 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 ‘Historic Assets’;

Parish Councils and Meetings

- Clipsham Parish Council requests that Clipsham Yew Tree Avenue is included in designated historic assets of Rutland and ask that all listed buildings of Rutland are included;
- Langham Parish Council has requested that the village cross, which has recently been listed, is included within the historic assets list;
- Pickworth Parish Meeting raise concerns that two of the most important historical sites in Rutland are not mentioned: The Limekiln, edge of Pickworth and Battle of Losecoat Field;
- Tinwell Parish Council provided additional information on Tinwell sites of archaeological interest;

Public and interest groups

- The Rutland Local History and Record Society notes some differences in the appendix and asks for the document to make clear that historic assets are not limited to Scheduled Monuments and Registered Parks and Gardens but also include Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas, Historic Rights of Way and green lanes and the many entries in the Historic Environment Record managed for Rutland by Leicestershire County Council.

Appendix 5 – Open space standards

Agree	Disagree	Other Comments
10	2	1

Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- Uppingham School states that open space standards would be more use if there was greater detail and clarity on needs and provision;

Public and interest groups

- The Leicestershire and Rutland Wildlife Trust refer the council to ‘Planning for a healthy environment – good practice guidance’.

Appendix 6 - Glossary

Agree	Disagree	Other Comments
8	2	0

Government and agencies

- The Homes and Communities Agency request that the definition of affordable housing could include a specific reference to affordable rent.

Public and interest groups

- The Leicestershire and Rutland Wildlife Trust request that the definitions of Local Wildlife Sites (LWS), SSSIs, RIGS, etc are included.
- One individual response requests the definitions of A1 or other A uses in relation to retail are included.

Summary of consultation responses

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

Policies Map

Comments relating to the Policies Map that are shown under the topic areas above are not listed separately here.

Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- Larkfleet Homes Ltd consider it wholly inadequate that the Plan and Proposals Map inset fails to identify or protect the future alignment of a bypass for Uppingham;
- Uppingham School consider it would be useful to have larger inset plans for the main settlements.

Other comments

Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- Larkfleet Homes Ltd asks that the wording of all policies be reviewed and adopt a positive approach eliminating subjective assessments and removing reference to cumulative effects;
- Renewable UK consider the DPD needs to be more positive about wind energy

Government and agencies

- Anglian Water recommends a strong position is set out detailing the expectations of surface water management;
- Natural England comment that there are no policies relating to contamination and pollution control, water resources and flood risk that are not covered by the Core Strategy;
- The Health and Safety Executive has no comments but recommends that major hazard installations and MAHPs and consultation zones should be shown on a map;
- The Environment Agency comment on the lack of reference to the Water Framework Directive;

Public and interest groups

- A number of comments praise and support the document; individual comments raise concerns about the consultation process and would like to see an extension of the consultation process and a public meeting in Ketton; that there is no discussion or recognition of boundary issues or integration with adjoining areas.