

# Appendix B



Rutland  
County Council

## RCC Response to Pre-Submission Draft Barrowden & Wakerley Neighbourhood Plan (May 2018)

---

### A. General

- 1.1 The draft Barrowden & Wakerley Neighbourhood Plan (BWNP) appears generally supportive of the current planning policy framework in Rutland set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, Core Strategy Development Plan Development (DPD) (July 2011) and the Site Allocations and Policies DPD (October 2014).

### B. Key issues that need to be addressed in the plan include recognising:

- 2.1 Policies or parts thereof that include the word 'should' are aspirational. Where we can actually enforce it, use 'shall'.
- 2.2 Wording of affordable housing policy focuses too much on one specific possible site.
- 2.3 Local Green Space policy in plan needs more clarity in terms of 'exceptional circumstances'.
- 2.4 In terms of the provision of new community facilities policy in the plan more definition of word 'exceptionally' is needed.

### C. Comments from Rutland County Council Service Leads

The consultation draft plan has been circulated to all relevant service leads within the Council and the responses received are considered below referring to the sections in Neighbourhood Plan order:

#### ***Housing Strategy and Enabling Officer Response:***

##### **Policy BW11 – Affordable Housing**

- Affordable Housing seems to single out a specific location for affordable housing development if needed. If the Parish Council is clear about need and deliverability then it could consider including the site as an allocation. As this doesn't seem to be the case, then the site should only at most be mentioned as a community

aspiration in the supporting text and not be included in Policy BW11. Policies CS11 and SP10 of the Local Plan already cover rural exception sites, so Policy BW11 may not be needed.

***Planning Policy Response:***

**6.0 Monitoring and Review**

- Local Planning Authorities are not required to monitor Neighbourhood Plans. It is the responsibility of the Parish Council to monitor the Neighbourhood Plan.

***Public Rights of Way Response:***

**Policy BW3 – Local Green Space in Barrowden Village**

- Welcomes the additional protection (from inappropriate development) to the area around footpath E299 provided by Policy BW3.

**Policy BW5 – Local Green Infrastructure Corridor**

- An extra layer of protection against development that might detract character of the area. Proposals that could improve or enhance access to Wakerley Wood would be particularly beneficial.

**Appendix 2 – Community Aspirations (3. Protect and enhance footpaths)**

- Fully support the community aspiration to “Protect and enhance footpaths”, but suggest that maybe this is changed to “Protect and enhance public rights of way” so as to include the bridleway in Barrowden.
- The references to actions in the first Rights of Way Improvement Plan are now a little out of date. The second plan is sitting in draft and will be released when it has been considered by Members. A rights of way network hierarchy has been developed, and will be the basis for prioritisation of inspection and maintenance. The highest priority paths are routes promoted by RCC and those in and around larger settlements and Local Service Centres (defined by the settlement hierarchy in the Local Plan).
- The Welland Valley (Market Harborough to Peterborough) cycle route previously considered by Sustrans would be an amazing addition to the network of walking and cycling routes in the area but would require a huge capital investment.

### ***Economic Development Response:***

#### **Portrait of the Area**

- 3.16 – In terms of local employment, there is no mention of new flexible business centres such as Oakham Enterprise Park, The King Centre Oakham (Oakham), and Seaton Offices (Seaton). We also have a couple of tenants commuting daily from Barrowden.
- 3.18 – Post 16 education is also available at Uppingham (UCC)?

#### **5. The Neighbourhood Plan Policies – Promoting the Rural Economy**

- Section 5 makes no reference to Seaton business centre: <http://www.rutlandoffices.com/>
- 5.51 – 2016 tourism figures increase visitor numbers to over 1.8m with an annual upward trend of around 3%.

#### **Appendix 2 – Community Aspirations (9. Maintain the Provision of the Surgery)**

- Need to consider proximity to St Georges and possibility of new ‘super surgery’ & other services likely to impact viability of smaller local facilities in Barrowden.

### ***Conservation Officer Response:***

#### **5. The Neighbourhood Plan Policies – Protecting and Enhancing Our Environment**

- Whilst designated heritage assets have been identified it would be helpful to identify those buildings that are unlisted but still make a positive contribution to the character of the village. It would also be useful to note any records in the HER in the appendix. This would link in well with Policy BW6 (4).

### ***Development Control Response:***

#### **Portrait of the Area**

The word ‘is’ is missing from Para 3.3, line 2.

#### **Policy BW3 – Local Green Space in Barrowden Village**

- Questions what are ‘exceptional circumstances’? Indicates we had this problem with the Cottesmore Neighbourhood Plan. If we are faced with an application to develop it, what will tip the balance in its favour?

#### **Policy BW7 – The local impact of construction**

- A permission can’t require considerate construction. RCC don’t use construction times very much as the Government frowns on it. Noise is controlled by other

legislation. Part 2 of this policy could only call for a condition in exceptional circumstances.

#### **Policy BW8 – Surface water flooding**

- Sustainable Urban Drainage (SUDS) is only a requirement for major development?

#### **Policy BW10 – Dwelling size and type**

- The need or shortfall for housing types needs to be defined.

#### **Policy BW11 – Affordable housing**

- Questions what would happen if another affordable housing site comes forward. Is the Parish/community veto final? If there was a demand it may be difficult to refuse? Also indicates that there was a new Government announcement about exception sites recently.

#### **Policy BW12 – Working from home**

- If there is no material impact on neighbours, planning permission may not be required. This policy could say that “Proposals for home working, where a material change of use occurs.”? Removal of permitted development rights would need to be clearly demonstrated as specifically necessary.

#### **Policy BW13 – Bed and breakfast accommodation**

- Planning permission may not be required for B&B unless it is a material change of use – low key use would not be.

#### **Policy BW15 – The provision of new community facilities**

- Indicates problems encountered with new village hall in South Luffenham as the only land they had was the playing field outside the PLD. They got around policy by saying it was a recreational facility as well as village hall. Definition of word ‘exceptionally’ needed.

#### **Policy BW16 – Fibre broadband**

- Should the word ‘technology’ be there end of line 2? Not sure how much power RCC have to insist on this requirement in a planning permission?

## **D Next stages:**

### **SEA/HRA Screening**

The SEA/HRA Screening Report undertaken by RCC for the BWNP is subject to consultation responses received from the statutory bodies on whether a full SEA/HRA report will be necessary.

The Neighbourhood Plan when formally submitted to the Council will need to be accompanied by:

- Robust evidence to support and justify the planning policies within the document.
- A Basic Conditions Statement setting out how the plan meets legal requirements.
- SEA/HRA Screening Report/Environment Report.
- A Consultation Statement setting out:
  - Who were consulted,
  - How they were consulted,
  - Summarises the main issues and concerns raised and
  - How they were considered and where relevant addressed in the BWNP.