



Rutland County Council

Catmose Oakham Rutland LE15 6HP.
Telephone 01572 722577 Facsimile 01572 75307 Oakham

Minutes of the **TWO HUNDRED AND SEVENTY NINTH MEETING** of the **COUNCIL**
held in the Council Chamber, Catmose, Oakham, Rutland, LE15 6HP on Monday, 21st
January, 2019 at 7.00 pm

PRESENT:

Mr I Arnold	Mr G Brown
Mr N Begy	Mr K Bool
Mr E Baines	Ms R Burkitt
Mr B Callaghan	Mr G Conde
Mr W Cross	Mr J Dale
Mr R Foster	Mrs J Fox
Mr R Gale	Mr O Hemsley
Mr J Lammie	Mr A Lowe
Mr A Mann	Mr M Oxley
Mr C Parsons	Mrs L Stephenson
Miss G Waller	Mr A Walters
Mr D Wilby	

OFFICERS PRESENT:

Mrs H Briggs	Chief Executive
Mr S Della Rocca	Strategic Director for Resources
Mr M Andrews	Strategic Director for People
Mr P Horsfield	Deputy Director for Resources – Corporate Governance (Monitoring Officer)
Mrs H Bremner	Head of Communications
Mrs J Morley	Governance Officer
Mr K Silcock	Governance Officer
Mr R Stone	MOD
Ms B Saunders	Regenco
Mr J Ryley	Defence Infrastructure Organisation

---o0o---

The Chairman announced that the agenda for the meeting would be amended to allow maximum time for item 17 to be debated.

---o0o---

511 APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Mr Alderman and Mr Bird.

512 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman announced that the list of his engagements and those of the Vice Chairman had already been circulated.

513 ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE LEADER, MEMBERS OF THE CABINET OR THE HEAD OF PAID SERVICE

There were no announcements from the Leader, Members of the Cabinet or the Head of Paid Service.

514 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Mr Baines declared an interest in item 16 on the agenda as he was now President of the Rutland Record and Local History Society. The Society had put in a submission on 29 May 2018 but as he had not been party to this he felt that it did not prejudice him in any way.

Mr Brown declared an interest in item 10 as he was part of the group that had written the Barrowden and Wakerley Neighbourhood plan.

515 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the 278th meeting of the Rutland County Council District Council held on 17 December 2018 were confirmed by the Council and signed by the Chairman.

516 PETITIONS, DEPUTATIONS AND QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

The Chairman advised those giving deputations that he was happy to receive them in the order they had decided on rather than the order in which their requests to speak had been received, and also that speakers would be allowed to take advice from their supporters when answering Members' questions.

The Chairman informed Members that he would be exercising his discretion and allowing more than the allotted 30 minutes to enable all five deputations and Members' questions to be heard.

Deputation 1

A deputation, as printed below, was received from Mrs Sharon Ashworth, on behalf of concerned residents of Edith Weston.

Good evening Councillors.

My name is Sharon Ashworth and I represent a group of concerned residents from Edith Weston.

We understand and believe that when Rutland County Council embarked on the redevelopment of ST Georges Barracks with the MOD, they were guided by their core strategy policy – C S 6¹ and that they did so with the best of intentions, to protect Rutland.

Let's remind ourselves of a few facts.

- The redevelopment of St Georges Site was instigated by the MOD
- The Mod employ Regenco
- The last local plan consultation was for policy changes to incorporate St Georges Barracks -thus enabling the MOD to achieve their objective.
- On page 21 of tonight's Public report - point 6.3 - From the outset the MOD rejected all potential alternative uses
- The comment on page 12 is another example of MOD pressure - The MOD have made it clear that if you don't support the HIF submission, they will STILL bring the site forward for development.

and yet ..

Well, here's what we find MOST puzzling...

In Nov 2016, after the MOD announced in parliament its "Better Defence Estate" - Sir Michael Fallon was interviewed on Forces Network and he explained the criteria used in selecting 91 sites out of the possible 301

They were;

- Those that are most expensive to run,
- Those that could be grouped together into centres of speciality

but also, and I quote "to get out of some of the more rural locations to areas of larger population where their partners have a better chance of getting work" ²

There is a certain irony here...

The figure set for MOD to contribute 55,000 houses is A STRONG SUBLIMINAL message that you will no doubt have heard.

In the Better Defence Estates report ³, Page 11, the table indicates that 39,800 houses have been accounted for in their targets - this leaves 15,200 houses that need to be met by the remaining 56 sites.

SO, the MOD are suggesting that the Smallest, most rural county in England should accommodate 14.6% of the 15,200?

The MOD are our defence experts, but they are NOT Housing or planning experts.

The MOD do not have powers to act above our Government's Housing departments.

Councillors – it is time to put Rutland's interests first.

PLEASE SAY NO to the HIF fund submission.

Instead - say YES to Option 3 - on page 22 of this evening's paper.

A NEW RUTLAND VILLAGE with 350 new homes - something that WE CAN ALL BE PROUD OF - no funding, 30% affordable and adding to the prosperity of Oakham & Uppingham our cherished market towns.

We realise this still leaves unutilised land, but the MOD might like to leave Rutland a country park as a legacy!

In addition, we believe there will be other suitable options that will add to Rutland's leisure and economy and contribute towards the MOD'S objectives.

It just takes time to find these options and the future of OUR County, cannot be rushed.

The Partnership RCC have with the MOD is valuable and can still work – but the MOD need to be realistic about what is Right for Rutland.

We have tried very hard to be factual, concise and fair and all we ask is that you give the HIF submission your - independent thought.

Thank you for your time.

¹ Rutland Core Strategy Development Plan - Policy CS6 Re-use of redundant military bases and prisons- Page 29

² <https://www.forces.net/news/tri-service/more-50-bases-go-mod-estate-sell>

³ A Better Defence Estate- MOD Nov 16

Questions by Members

- Mr Gale asked whether there was support for a Rutland sized village rather than something the size of a small town.
Mrs Ashworth responded that residents supported a development of circa 350 homes as indicated in the deputation.
- Mr G Conde questioned whether the necessary infrastructure for a village of 350 had been considered.
Mrs Ashworth's understanding was that the local school was undersubscribed and that monies from the developers would support additional infrastructure such as drainage.

Deputation 2

A deputation, as printed below, was received from Mr Neil Newton, a member of the St George's Advisory group and Empingham Parish Council.

Thank you, Chairman, Neil Newton, Empingham Parish Council. In our opinion the decision you are asked to endorse tonight is symptomatic of the mindset that has pervaded the St Georges debacle to date, namely that there is only one answer and the evidence and the arguments will be made to fit.

A brief history, the base is to close, the council engages, a memorandum of understanding the MOU fine. What you were not asked, and the residents were not consulted about was whether you wanted to acquiesce in, indeed facilitate, a monstrous new modern housing estate, totally out of keeping with anything in Rutland.

No expert planning or legal advice was taken as to whether the MOU or normal planning powers would better protect the interests of Rutland. I am not talking small council lawyer or planner, this is way above their pay grade, I mean planning counsel instructed on our behalf by one of the major property consultancies. There is enough meat in your own core strategies in the local plan, the sustainability arguments in the Government white paper, The Right Homes in the Right Places, and the precedents of redundant airfields refused planning permissions, to at least ask the question, never done.

You were given no options or alternatives. The MOU is at best a glorified best endeavours clause, no legal standing and leaving all the power with the MoD

More shamefully most of you, and the public, were kept in the dark as to the scale of the development for nearly a year. Your officers took the decision that the MOU and its contents was not a key decision, how the biggest decision to affect Rutland in its current existence was not a key decision is beyond belief.

This is not just arcane process, because it was not a key decision it was never formally reported to cabinet, your call in and scrutiny processes did not apply, the access to information rules were invalidated. The detail could be kept under wraps. By the time the scale of what was being considered was apparent, a lot of tick box consultation and information drip feed meant the initial plan was presented as a deep-rooted fait accompli

That attitude of we know best, is replicated tonight. You are asked to endorse a decision to access funds to accelerate the provision of infrastructure to facilitate 2315 homes. Where did that figure come from, you are told it is the MoD's optimum solution, well bully for them. What is the optimum number for Rutland, you should ask?

Have you had the chance to examine the MoD calculations in any detail?

Why are Rutlanders being asked to pay for the legacy clean-up costs of the MoD in terms of numbers of houses they neither need nor want?

Why can these legacy costs not be met from the quarry receipt?

Do you know what affordable housing means, not in nebulous national terms, but what are the rental levels assumed, densities, build quality, tenure mix, and thus house prices mean for a bus driver in Rutland. Can he/she afford the so-called affordable housing, or will they be a magnet for commuters. You don't know.

Even the information you are given is heavily caveated, the MoD have made it perfectly clear that they can revisit the numbers any time.

Finally, Chairman this is one of the final hurdles but not the last fence; that will be the planning application. You will not take that application, it will be after the next elections.

But what impact will taking the queens shilling now have on the future council's decision options. If the next council wishes to explore alternatives you have been denied, but the developer says the Council have signed up to 2315 and that is the only way it can be delivered, what leg will the Council stand on?

I am sure there will be bland comfort noises that the planning application will not be sullied, but how can it not be, even if it is only an influence on a future inspector.

The grant conditions will have to be signed up to well before the planning application is decided. Once again where is the expert opinion?

In a few minutes it is impossible to detail all the information gaps, but If you cannot honestly say to yourselves that you have had adequate information, or time, or expert advice to back this decision against all other options, how will you justify to yourselves, or to the thousands of Rutlanders that view this huge modern monstrosity with horror, that you have faithfully discharged your obligations as councillors to protect a unique rural heritage.

Let your successors consider this matter in a way most of you have not been allowed to.

Questions by Members

- Mr Oxley asked Mr Newton where the information was that said the MOD could revisit their figures at any time.

Mr Newton said he did not have the report in front of him to quote from but assured Members that the information was there.

- *Mr Cross congratulated Mr Newton and suggested that he stand for election as a Councillor.
Mr Newton thanked Mr Cross but said he was delighted with the Councillors he already had.*

Deputation 3

A deputation, as printed below, was received from Mr Andrew Johnson, a member of the St George's Advisory Group and Chairman of Morcott Parish Council:

Good Evening – My name is Andrew Johnson. I am Chairman of Morcott Parish Council and a member of the St Georges Advisory Group.

This debate is premature and poorly informed, yet it paves the way for a project which will change the face of Rutland for ever. You will also hear this from others this evening. In addition to the points they will raise I would like to pose a question: Why, as an outgoing council facing a general election very shortly, would you wish to be rushed into voting in favour of the proposal at this time?

I would particularly like to challenge the obvious bias of the information being provided to you which presents a favourable view of the St Georges proposals. As a consequence of the rush to commit to these proposals, you are not being offered the chance to understand and interpret all the salient facts which would provide balance and properly equip you to make the decision this evening. Where is the evidence of proper Governance?

As an example I would like to focus on the housing numbers assumed if the St George's proposals go ahead. Implicitly this evening, you are being asked to agree with the St Georges evolving masterplan and the total of 2315 dwellings contained within it, including at least 1200 houses to be built prior to 2036.

The key issue with the number of houses proposed at St Georges is that the "Objectively Assessed Need" for housing in Rutland over the next plan period is defined as 160 houses per year. The implication of agreeing to go ahead with the HIF application proposed is that no development in the rest of Rutland other than at St Georges will go ahead within the plan period. In the light of the trend in windfall and brown field site development seen since 2006 this is obviously totally unrealistic.

It is therefore implicit in the development proposal, upon which the HIF application is predicated, that the number of houses built will either exceed 160 per year, or otherwise developments in Oakham, Uppingham and other service centres will be sacrificed. Rutland simply does not need the number of houses which require a level of investment in infrastructure which is implied by the HIF application you are being asked to approve.

It is apparent that the MoD are driving Rutland to meet their demands. For example, County Councillors were not trusted to debate the "Memorandum of Understanding" prior to it being signed. What is to say that the MoD will not demand a faster building programme than anticipated? If more than 160 homes are built in any given year Rutland

will still need to build 160 per year in the following years to meet the target. If far more than 160 a year are built in the early years you will then run the risk of not having sufficient supply in future years.

By agreeing to the proposal in front of you this evening you are in danger of paving the way for a large settlement which is not required to meet Rutland's housing needs. Be in no doubt that the development the MoD are demanding at St George's is of a scale which will change the face of Rutland for ever.

This development is not "Right For Rutland", instead it is "Right for the MoD" who are the dominant partner in this initiative. Incredibly £15 Million or 50% of the HIF bid is to be used to defray the cost of Remedial work to clear up the mess left by the MoD, including the removal of significant quantities of asbestos. Why would you allow this?

If you vote for the HIF application, you are complicit in allowing the MoD to dominate planning policy and I urge you to reject this application for HIF Funding.

Questions by Members

- Mr Conde asked Mr Johnson what had made him think that if 160 houses per year were built on the St George's site then no further development would be permitted.
Mr Johnson replied that it was exactly this point that he was trying to assert and that in fact the number of homes being built could increase from the original number if there was a faster building programme than anticipated.
- Mr Walters challenged Mr Johnson's assertion that the decision being asked of Council was premature as the HIF funding bid needed to be submitted by 22 March 2019.
Mr Johnson felt the Council should be challenging the decision to submit a bid as if a smaller development was considered and the need defined then perhaps infrastructure funding and therefore the bid would not be needed at all.
Mr Walters' supplementary question asked Mr Johnson whether, if the development went ahead as planned, he would rather the Council had applied for HIF funding or had not.
Mr Johnson replied that he would rather that the Council examined the proposal properly and that the implications of applying for HIF funding at this time were properly understood.
- Mr Lammie asked Mr Johnson how he backed up the assertion that the Council debate was premature.
Mr Johnson voiced his concern that the submission of the HIF bid was premature as it pre-committed the Council and any future Council to an agreement with the MOD.

Deputation 4

A deputation, as printed below, was received from Mr Ed Jarron, a member of St George's Advisory Group and Edith Weston Parish Council.

Ladies and Gentlemen, and in particular Councillors of Rutland County Council.

My name is Edward Jarron and I am speaking on behalf of Edith Weston Parish Council.

The proposers of this development have failed to engage the community properly and have certainly failed to address the very significant number of as yet unpublished objections to the site being developed as proposed. It would thus be totally wrong to suggest that the development has community support.

The development currently being proposed affects all of Rutland, not just our village, and it is my Parish Council's firm view that, as currently drafted, the proposal to build 2,315 houses of the former St George's site is bad for Rutland and a very high risk venture. There will inevitably be unforeseen consequences and there has been a serious lack of proper consideration of other potential uses.

The master plan is clearly predicated upon securing the best deal for the Ministry of Defence, rather than meeting the real needs of the people of Rutland. This has resulted in a proposal for a massive housing estate which is more than likely to become a dormitory town for surrounding cities, rather than an exciting development that will serve Rutland's needs.

The first of these needs is high quality employment. The Master plan treats employment as an afterthought and, recognizing that the area dedicated to employment is seriously inadequate (less than 10% of the total area available) it makes the extraordinary claim that a large proportion of the residents will work from home. Frankly that is not good enough.

Properly researched plans to bring work to the county would have been a much better place to start and an appropriate allocation of land made for that purpose. The fastest growing jobs sectors are in areas such as information technology, biotechnology, and environmental and engineering technology. There are also great and as yet undeveloped opportunities in the tourism industry, yet to the best of our knowledge no efforts appear to have been made to attract companies looking for new space.

Instead, RCC has been so obsessed with cramming the site full of houses to maximize receipts for the MoD that scant attention has been paid to the many other possibilities for the site.

We are not against housing; quite the contrary. The current infrastructure on the base will support at least 350 houses and with the 70 proposed for the Officers' Mess site, we could go ahead immediately with a development of at least 420 houses, without any major infrastructure investment. There are sufficient facilities in local villages in the forms of schools, shops, churches, pubs, and other meeting places to support a development of this size, which would have the warm support of the local community. It would be a good place to start and would provide the Council with a clear indication of future requirements.

So, in summary, you are being asked to endorse a bid for HIF funding based upon a badly conceived and unrealistically sized plan. By supporting this bid, you will in effect you will be tacitly agreeing to a new town in Rutland from the outset.

It follows that we most strongly urge you to reject this proposal and to charge the Executive to go back to the drawing board and produce a plan that will put Rutland's needs at its centre and gain the support of its people, which the current plan so clearly fails to do.

No questions were asked of Mr Jarron.

Deputation 5

A deputation, as printed below, was received from Mr Paul Cummings, a member of the St George's Advisory Group and Chairman of North Luffenham Parish Council.

Good Evening – My name is Paul Cummings, the Chairman of North Luffenham Parish Council.

This debate is premature. Whilst tonight you are considering the Housing Infrastructure bid, there has been no proper debate or opportunity for the Council to challenge the proposals on the table for the development in the form of the Masterplan, which the HIF bid underwrites. At the moment, it seems to the residents of Rutland that this project is being railroaded through, with no real opportunity for their elected representatives on the Council to have a proper debate on the detail of the proposals, or indeed any alternative proposals such as Woolfox. The HIF bid and Masterplan are inexorably linked, however the 'Project Fear' analysis in the Business Case that without HIF funding the Council would withdraw from the project and the partnership and the MoD would insist upon building thousands more homes on the site, is absolute nonsense. Beyond a few stylised drawings have you really any idea of what you are now committing millions of pounds to? What will this huge housing estate really look like? Certainly not the promised typical Rutland village. I would remind you that the MoD are in the driving seat of this project yet have no responsibility for its sustainability. Once the last soldier and last dog leaves the Barracks, the MoD only want to meet their financial and house building targets.

As you have heard, in terms of sustainability, the Masterplan still lacks any imagination or credibility in respect of job creation. The scale of this development far exceeds the RCC's own accepted demand for both jobs and housing and, it is simply in the wrong place to meet these needs. Nothing in the plan proposes to build on Rutland's critical £124m/annum leisure and tourism industries that support over 1,700 jobs. In terms of environmental sustainability, we see nothing to suggest that the development will result in the requisite net gain in biodiversity.

Affordable homes for local people are a vital part of the County's future. But what will attract the new residents of the 665 affordable homes to live nowhere near any centre of services or currently established employment, and next to a huge quarry. Solely in terms of affordable homes - this community will be the size of Edith Weston, Lyndon, Manton, Preston, Ridlington and Wing, combined. There simply is not a need for this number of affordable homes to service the County's needs – the number is driven by the requirement to build a total 2,315 homes, 30% of which must be affordable. There is no clarification about what actually is affordable to a bus driver, nurse or shop worker.

This is not 'Nimbyism' it is simply our contention that the current proposal is not "an appropriate solution to the redevelopment of the site. It is not sustainable nor environmentally sound nor does it incorporate innovative and imaginative ideas that might attract high tech business to the site; all of which we support." An essential element of any HIF bid and indeed a Garden Town community is that it does have the support of the local communities and in this case, it is clear that it does not. I urge you to reject this application for HIF Funding. You, the County Council, not the Executive or the Cabinet are in charge of the direction the Barracks development takes, – we urge you to take control and to seek an early and full debate on the Masterplan, before committing to spending £30 million pounds of public money. This is too important for the future of Rutland to be "nodded through".

Questions from Members

- Following Mr Cummings' assertion about affordable homes, Mr Walters asked him whether he knew and could supply the numbers of people on the waiting list for social housing in Rutland and the number of people at risk of homelessness in Rutland.
Mr Cummings believed the figure on the waiting list was 300 and yes there were some people at risk of homelessness but unless the affordable homes were really affordable then it was not going to help the situation.
- Mr Brown asked whether Mr Cummings was aware that the decision being asked of Council was only, at this stage, whether to submit the bid for funding. If the bid was successful, the conditions would be brought back before Council for another decision.
Mr Cummings responded that he was aware that it was only a bid but warned that there was a real danger that if the Council received such a substantial sum of money the wrong decision would be made and it helped a case that he was not entirely sure had been proven.
- Mr Foster asked Mr Cummings how the Woolfax development would be preferable to St George's.
Mr Cummings was not an expert but felt that Woolfax needed to be taken into consideration as otherwise the Council were making the situation fit only one solution. In response to Mr Foster's supplementary question on whether it was in fact nimbyism, Mr Cummings replied that his personal view was that both sites needed development but it was the scale and how it was managed that needed debate. Woolfax sat in Empingham parish and their Parish Council believed that the Woolfax development was a much more sustainable proposal.
- Mr Conde asked whether Mr Cummings was aware of the egress of many young people who were leaving the County because they could not afford to buy homes.
In response, Mr Cummings stated that the National Audit statistics showed that in the last 20 years Rutland has become much more affordable.

517 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

There were no questions from members of the Council.

518 REFERRAL OF COMMITTEE DECISIONS TO THE COUNCIL

No committee decisions had been referred.

519 CALL-IN OF DECISIONS FROM CABINET MEETINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM 15 DECEMBER 2018 TO 18 JANUARY 2019 (INCLUSIVE)

No call-ins were received.

520 REPORT FROM THE CABINET

Report No. 23/2019 from the Cabinet was received, the purpose of which was to consider the recommendations and note the key decisions of the Cabinet since the

publication of the agenda for the previous ordinary meeting of the Council on 17 December 2018.

RESOLVED

1. Council **NOTED** the key decisions made by Cabinet since the publication of the agenda for the previous ordinary meeting of the Council on 17 December 2018, as detailed in Appendix A of report No.23/2019.

521 REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL

There were no reports from Committees of the Council.

522 REPORTS FROM SCRUTINY COMMISSION / SCRUTINY PANELS

There were no reports from the Scrutiny Commission/Scrutiny Panels. Mr Conde, Chair of the Scrutiny Commission, informed Members that the Scrutiny Commission annual report would be ready for the March round of scrutiny panel meetings. The commission was awaiting the Government report and recommendations on the way forward for scrutiny.

523 JOINT ARRANGEMENTS AND EXTERNAL ORGANISATIONS

- i. Mr Bool - Combined Fire Authority
Mr Bool informed Members that he would be attending three forthcoming meetings and he would report fully on them at the next Council meeting.

524 NOTICES OF MOTION

No notices of motion had been submitted.

525 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC AND PRESS

The Chairman announced that although there were exempt appendices to item 16, the St George's Barracks Report, it was his intention that the meeting should remain in public session unless detailed debate requiring disclosure of the exempt information was required. He requested that should Members at any point wish to discuss the exempt information that they should indicate that to him and he would then ask Council to vote on whether the meeting should move into private session.

RESOLVED

1. Council resolved to remain in public session

526 ST GEORGES BARRACKS EVOLVING MASTER PLAN AND HOUSING INFRASTRUCTURE BUSINESS CASE

---o0o---

The Chairman announced his intention to allow Mr Hemsley 15 minutes to present the report after which any Councillors wishing to respond would be allowed five minutes each. Points of order could also be asked for and would not be included in the allocated time. If at 9.30pm the Council was still in debate then in accordance with Procedure Rule 58, the Chairman would ask that the time for the meeting be extended by 30 minutes.

---o0o---

Report No.18/2019 was received from the Chief Executive, the purpose of which was for Council to consider the recommendations approved by Cabinet (Report 234/18) relating to the evolving Masterplan for the St George's site and the associated Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF) Business Case.

Mr Hemsley introduced the report and moved the recommendations. Mr Brown seconded the recommendations and reserved his position to speak later in the debate.

During debate the following points were raised:

- Mrs Stephenson, commented that Rutland was undergoing a huge period of change and that Rutland would evolve was certain but that how it did that, was not. The timing of the paper was unfortunate but necessary as investing in infrastructure from the outset was logical and necessary. Missing out on the HIF bid would leave the Council vulnerable to being in debt for a long time.
- Mr Conde felt that there had been a good level of public engagement and therefore Ketton Parish Council had decided to keep an open mind as they appreciated that this was a long term phased project, rather than about the number of homes in the next five years, and that the vote was about initial infrastructure funding rather than the final plan.
- The comments of Mrs Stephenson and Mr Conde were endorsed by Mr Begy who warned of the dangers of the Council stagnating unless it kept its options open and did not close doors at this early stage.
- Mr Oxley reminded Councillors that in the past developers' promises on the number of affordable homes had failed to materialise. Having an opportunity to be involved from the very start of the project was important because of the scale and number of homes being proposed and would ensure that the correct infrastructure was put in place. It would also enable the Council to influence the design so that it complemented existing Rutland villages.
- Mr Wilby commented that the St George's project had been subject to a great level of scrutiny and would continue to be so. The project offered the chance to get in early to organise transport and build a properly equipped school.
- Mrs Burkitt felt that the decision Councillors were being asked to make was not an easy one. If they did not vote for the HIF bid submission then there was a danger that unchecked developers' schemes would lose Rutland's identity but equally she recognised residents' concerns that Rutland communities had evolved over a long time and that the proposed development threatened this.
- Mr Lammie was the only member who was under the age of 35 and who did not own his own home. The HIF bid and the St George's project would offer an opportunity for many younger people who grew up in Rutland to return home.

- Mr Baines recognised that all Councillors acted in the best interests of Rutland but he felt there was a democratic deficit and flaws in the process. The views of his electorate were that the development was too large and the plans were not based on sound information.

Mr Baines therefore proposed an amendment which read as follows:

Council recognises and supports the need to develop the St George's Barracks site. It therefore resolves that the Project Board explores all options or proposals which reflect Rutland's values. It also asks that without delay, representatives of the villages in the Normanton and Martinthorpe wards are co-opted to the Project Board.

The amendment was seconded by Mr Cross who reserved permission to speak later in the debate.

---o0o---

The Chairman adjourned the meeting at 9.03pm to consult with the Monitoring Officer following requests from Members to clarify the amendment and its implications for the HIF bid.

---o0o---

The Chairman reconvened the meeting at 9.08pm.

---o0o---

- The Monitoring Officer outlined to Councillors that the amendment was an alternative to recommendation 2 of the report and that the implication therefore was that the HIF bid would not be submitted at this stage.
- Mr Baines defended his amendment stating that the project was referred to as an evolving plan and that it was unfortunate that Councillors had not heard what was happening to the officers mess site and its potential use for job creation as it would be better to have jobs first and then houses. Additionally there may be alternative funding to the HIF monies at a later stage.
- Mrs Stephenson could not support the amendment as she felt that the HIF bid must be submitted. If the terms of the bid were not right the newly elected Council could amend them as it saw fit to do so at a later date.
- Mr Cross told Councillors that the amendment was an opportunity to revisit the proposal and listen to the view of residents and their passion for the County, rather than just accepting the government foisting the project on Rutland.

---o0o---

The Chairman proposed that the meeting be extended by 30 minutes in accordance with Procedure Rule 58 and this was seconded by Mr Gale.

---o0o---

Mr Walters understood the passion and goodwill of Mr Baines but felt that the amendment wasted time and achieved nothing but more debate on the original motion. Mr Walters moved that the amendment now be put and this was seconded by Mr Begy.

Council voted on the motion to put the amendment to the vote.

RESOLVED

1. Council voted in favour of the motion to put the amendment to the vote.

The Chairman invited Mr Baines to speak before the vote was taken on the amendment.

Mr Baines asked Councillors to think very carefully about their vote and to consider abstaining if they were unsure. The level of interest in the proposal had not been seen in Rutland since the debate on whether Rutland lost its County status and the amendment reflected the views of many residents who were uneasy about the scale of the development.

---o0o---

Mr Gale requested a recorded vote on the amendment and this was supported by four other Members in accordance with procedure rule 11.

---o0o---

RESOLVED

1. Upon being put to the vote, the **AMENDMENT** was **DEFEATED**.

The voting was as follow:

FOR THE MOTION: (8)

Baines, Burkitt, Cross, Dale, Gale, Mann, Parsons, Waller

AGAINST THE MOTION: (14)

Arnold, Begy, Brown, Callaghan, Conde, Foster, Fox, Hemsley, Lammie, Lowe, Oxley, Stephenson, Walters, Wilby

ABSTAINING FROM THE MOTION: (1)

Bool

Debate returned to the **ORIGINAL MOTION**

- Ms Waller addressed the Council not just as the Ward Member for Normanton in which the St George's site was situated but also as someone who was charged to represent the interests of all Rutlanders. Not putting the bid forward would not prevent the Council working with the MOD but the Master Plan would mean that all development until 2036 would be at the new site unless more than the required 160 new houses a year was built, thus affecting the modest and sustained development seen in our other towns and villages. It also gave the green light to future town developments on other brownfield sites.
- Ms Waller argued that approving the HIF bid was, barring a dramatic change of grant conditions, the same as agreeing the project as the Government had outlined the grant conditions and RCC had invested significant time and money putting the grant together. The Council would lose a great deal of credibility if the grant was not accepted. Ms Waller wished to see the site developed but developed in a manner in keeping with the scale and style of Rutland.
- The Chairman, Mr Bool, addressed the Council in his capacity as Ward Member for Normanton. Mr Bool echoed previous comments that voting in favour of the motion

would effectively commit the Council to a development the size of a third market town. The Council had a strong local plan and did not require a development of the size proposed. The creation of a village of circa 400 homes could be done over the next 3-5 years and could be supported by existing infrastructure whereas the HIF guidance invited ambitious plans. Mr Bool feared that the new development would become a dormitory town and unlike Uppingham and Oakham, without the public schools that pumped £600m funds into the local economy and provided leisure and sporting facilities, and the churches that added so much to the community. The fear that if the vote was not approved the MOD would walk away from their memorandum of understanding (MOU) was unfounded as a Government body would be prepared to continue co-operation to achieve a positive outcome. Mr Bool urged Councillors, as custodians of the County, to carefully consider their vote.

- Mr Brown, in closing the debate and having listened to the deputations earlier, made the following points
 - On the issue of affordability mentioned by Mr Cummings, OS Statistics looked at averages and in Rutland we are not talking about averages but the people who cannot afford these houses.
 - There was not going to be another version of the bid and this had been stated quite clearly by Homes England and the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government. The HIF bid was already over committed and was very competitive.
 - The masterplan was not being approved despite comments by Cllr Waller. The building of 2,215 homes would be a decision in the future.
 - Jobs had been created in the Council. In the last twelve months 80 jobs had been created at the Kings Centre and there was a demand for a lot more.
 - There had been numerous opportunities for Councillors to engage in the process with a number of briefing sessions and presentation at scrutiny and other Council meetings.
 - The viability of the Woolfox proposition has been discussed but to date, detailed reports on minerals, traffic and environment etc. had not been forthcoming, nor financial viability models. It had taken two years to get to this point alone with St George's.
 - The proposal of a smaller development of 350 homes including those at the officers' mess would still require demolition costs in excess of £15 million and just did not work financially, especially when it had to be policy compliant on 30% affordable homes.

The Chairman invoked his powers as Chairman to bring the meeting to a close and went to the vote.

---o0o---

Mr Gale requested a recorded vote on the motion and this was supported by four other Members in accordance with procedure rule 11.

---o0o---

RESOLVED

1. To **NOTE** the St. George's Evolving masterplan attached at Appendix 3 to the report.

2. To **APPROVE** the recommendation from Cabinet to submit a business case for Forward Funding under the Housing Infrastructure programme based on the evolving masterplan.

FOR THE MOTION: (12)

Arnold, Begy, Brown, Callaghan, Conde, Foster, Hemsley, Lammie, Oxley, Stephenson, Walters, Wilby

AGAINST THE MOTION: (11)

Baines, Bool, Burkitt, Cross, Dale, Fox, Gale, Lowe, Mann, Parsons, Waller

ABSTAINING FROM THE MOTION: (0)

527 REVIEW OF POLLING DISTRICTS AND POLLING PLACES

Report No.1/2019 from the Chief Executive was received, the purpose of which was to seek Council approval of the recommendations of the Returning officer outlined in the report and to conclude the review of polling districts and polling places.

The Leader, Mr Hemsley introduced the report and moved the recommendation. Mr Foster seconded the recommendation.

Mr Gale hoped that it was a long time before another review was conducted but was particularly happy that the parish of Barleythorpe now had its own ward.

RESOLVED

1. To **APPROVE** the changes of polling districts and places recommended by the Returning Officer and to conclude the review of polling districts and polling places.

528 ANY URGENT BUSINESS

No matters of urgent business were received.

---o0o---

The Chairman declared the meeting closed at 9.55pm

---o0o---