

# APPENDIX 5



## Rutland Local Plan 2018-2036 Local Plan Review

---

### Summary of Consultation Responses (2017 – 2018)

The following 5 Appendices set out a summary of the main issues which were raised through consultation on the following stages of the Local Plan:

- Draft Local Plan Consultation 2017 (including comments made about both the proposed allocations and sites which were assessed but not allocated at this stage)
- Additional Sites Consultation 2018
- Focussed consultation regarding St George's Barracks 2018

Each table sets out a summary of the main issues raised, the Officer response to the comment made and, where appropriate, the proposed change to be made to the plan. These proposed changes have been incorporated into the text of the Pre-Submission Draft Plan.

# Appendix 1

## Rutland Local Plan Review

### Consultation on Draft Plan – Comments on Plan Policies and Appendices Schedule of Main Issues Raised, Officer Responses and Proposed Changes

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
<b>Chapter 1 – Introduction</b>		
<p>Historic England request the term ‘heritage assets’ and their settings is used (this comment made at various places throughout the plan but only noted here).</p> <p>The Environment Agency suggest wording regarding meeting the Water Framework Objective requirements.</p>	<p>Agree to make reference to these within the Key Issues and throughout the plan as appropriate.</p>	<p>Update Plan throughout to reference heritage assets and their setting as appropriate.</p> <p>Reference to the Water Quality Framework is made in Policies EN7 (Pollution Control) and H3 (St George’s Garden Community Development Requirements).</p>
<p>A number of parish councils and neighbourhood plan groups suggest that the aims, objectives and policies of neighbourhood plans should have been taken into account in the Local Plan.</p> <p>Local and Neighbourhood Plans should be taken forward in a co-ordinated way to reflect the thinking in the Neighbourhood Planning legislation.</p>	<p>Agree. The policies and objectives of those neighbourhood plans which have been made have been considered as part of the plan making process. However it must be recognised that the Local Plan is the primary development plan document for the County and will establish the strategic policies for the County for the next 20 years. Its preparation may render some policies within neighbourhood plans out of date.</p>	<p>Updated section on Neighbourhood Plans included in Chapter 1: Introduction</p>
<b>Chapter 2 – Spatial Portrait</b>		
7 (70%) agree; 2(20%) disagree; 1 (10%) other		Total Comments: 10
<p>One comment questions whether the plan has a strategy to deal with the impact on local infrastructure, employment and traffic flows of growth (particularly that planned in the south from Corby and the Oxford to Cambridge corridor (O2C).</p>	<p>The Local Plan will be published alongside an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) which considers the impact of growth proposed in the Local Plan on infrastructure, services and utilities. The council is working with utility and other infrastructure/service providers to make sure that the infrastructure implications of the allocated sites are fully assessed and where necessary</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
	<p>mitigation measures are identified and put in place to address development impacts.</p> <p>The council has had on-going dialogue with its neighbouring authorities and key strategic cross boundary issues, including the impact of development proposed in the Local Plan, are being addressed through the Duty to Co-operate.</p>	
<p>A number of comments raise the lack of reference to the potential of development at St George's Barracks and the One Public Estate.</p>	<p>An additional stage of consultation took place in August and September 2018. This focused on the implications for the Local Plan should the St. George's Barracks site be allocated including the spatial distribution of growth across the County and the specific policy changes that would be required, including a policy related to the development of the site. The responses to this consultation and proposed consequential changes to the Local Plan can be found in Appendix 5.</p>	<p>See Appendix 5</p>
<b>Chapter 3 – Vision and objectives</b>		
<p>Agree 11 (73%); disagree 2 (13%); Other 2 (13%) <span style="float: right;">Total comments: 15</span></p>		
<p>A Parish meeting has suggested that in Strategic Objective 4, new housing development in Rutland should be limited to meeting local need within the county as defined by independent local needs survey.</p>	<p>The Rutland Local Plan must make provision for its Local Housing Need (LHN), which is 127 dwellings per annum (dpa). However, the Government is committed to ensuring that more homes are built and the LHN provides the minimum starting point in determining the number of new homes needed in an area. Therefore, to provide flexibility and choice of sites over the plan period, reflect market signals and address issues of affordability it is proposed a buffer of approximately 38 dpa is added to the minimum housing requirement.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>It is suggested that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Strategic Objective 12 (now 13) (Natural and Cultural Environment) is expanded to include the control of pollution (air, light, noise and traffic);</li> <li>2. Strategic Objectives 12 to 15 (now 13 to 16) require new strategic policies;</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Pollution control is covered in the overarching Policies SD1 (Sustainable Development Principles), EN2 (Place Shaping Principles) and EN3 (Delivering Good Design) and specifically Policy EN7 (Pollution Control)</li> </ol>	<p>No change</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
<p>3. Detail is required for Strategic Objective 19 (now 17) about how the plan will implement, measure, monitor and report a net gain in biodiversity.</p>	<p>2. These objectives are related to strategic policies EN9 (Natural Environment) and EN11 (Historic and Cultural Environment)</p> <p>3. Objective 19 concerns securing net biodiversity gains on mineral extraction sites, this is sought through restoration conditions via the planning permission. Policy EN9 (Natural Environment) and the supporting text provides more detail on securing net biodiversity gains in respect of all new development proposals.</p>	
<p>One parish council states that to be vital and viable, smaller villages do need improved public transport (Strategic Objective 9 (now 10)), high quality communication infrastructure (Fibre Broadband and mobile phone coverage), employment (Strategic Objective 7(now 8)), additional low cost housing and an investment in sports and leisure facilities. However they do not feel the plan does this.</p> <p>An interest group has questioned the plans assumption that existing settlements will be adequate to absorb expected growth and has queried what controls are in place for the quarrying which is under the control of SKDC.</p>	<p>The council has sought to identify the most appropriate settlements to accommodate sustainable growth. Policies in the plan seek to ensure existing infrastructure can be expanded to meet the needs of development.</p> <p>RCC is consulted on minerals applications in neighbouring areas.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>One comment thinks that the possibility of a new settlement and the scope offered at St George's Barracks site should also be addressed and that the provision for bypasses around Caldecott and Uppingham should be included due to extra development at Corby using route north.</p>	<p>See response under Chapter 2 (Appendix 5 page 2).</p> <p>There are currently no proposals for bypasses at Caldecott or Uppingham. However, the latest Local Transport Plan (LTP4), which covers the 2019 – 2036 period, commits to re-establishing the case for a Caldecott relief road and seeking funding to undertake a feasibility study. This position is reflected in the updated IDP.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p><b>Policy RLP1 - Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development</b></p>		
<p>Agree 50(69%); disagree 18 (25%); other 4 (5%) Total 72 comments</p>		
<p>Two landowners have commented – one feels that the policy should place greater emphasis on the different dimensions of sustainability, and the other suggests deletion of some of the text in accordance with the plan's vision and objectives always to maintain an up to date development plan.</p>	<p>The policy followed the wording of the Planning Inspectorate's Model policy on sustainable development. However, at recent Local Plan examinations Inspectors have recommended that this "standard" policy is unnecessary as the matters covered are adequately dealt</p>	<p>Delete policy RLP1 and update text to reflect National policy.</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
<p>Individual comments that not enough emphasis is given to environmentally sustainable development and the protection of natural assets; that infinite growth with finite resources is impossible.</p>	<p>with in national policy through the NPPF. It is, therefore, recommended that the policy be deleted and replaced by text referencing national policy.</p>	
<b>Policy RLP 2 - Sustainable development principles (now Policy SD1)</b>		
81 comments in total 51 (62% support policy; 16 (19%) disagree and 14 (17%) had other comments		
<b>Government and agencies</b>		
<p>Environment Agency recommends an additional bullet point to demonstrate that adequate waste water treatment is already available or can be provided in time to serve the development ahead of its occupation.</p> <p>Historic England consider that criteria would be strengthened and more reflective of the NPPF with the inclusion of “and their settings” at the end of the sentence.</p>	<p>Agree additional bullet point be added to the Policy.</p> <p>Agree that ‘and their settings’ be added to criterion I.</p>	<p>Amend policy criteria as appropriate.</p>
<b>Landowners, developers, agents and businesses</b>		
<p>Persimmon Homes East Midlands considers that the policy needs to acknowledge that some previously developed sites may be subject to constraints such as contamination and suggests the addition of wording along the lines of "where practically possible" at the end of this point.</p> <p>William Davis Ltd considers that c) is contrary to the remainder of the Plan in that the proposed sites for new development are almost exclusively greenfield; it appears to be applicable to all development proposals but won't be in the gift of those developing greenfield sites to firstly bring forward previously developed sites.</p>	<p>Agree that criterion c should be amended by addition of ‘wherever practical and possible’</p>	
<b>Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups</b>		
<p>Edith Weston Parish Council suggest criterion d would benefit from more clarity in the definition of “density” and suggest strengthening criterion h to “minimise the adverse impact on and wherever possible enhance the character of the towns, villages, having due regard to neighbourhood plans”.</p>	<p>Agree that reference to Neighbourhood Plans should be added to criteria d and m.</p>	
<b>Public and interest groups</b>		

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
Rutland Branch of CPRE consider this should include the control of pollution in the environment (air, light, noise and traffic).	Agree additional criteria on pollution control should be included.	
Individual comments include that not enough emphasis is given to environmentally sustainable development and protection of natural assets; the Sustainability Appraisal fails to recognise the unsustainable nature of this agenda and the inherent conflict with the objectives set out in RLP2, especially the need to travel.	Policies are included within the plan to promote development in sustainable locations, sustainable forms of construction and design, renewable energy and address the effect of climate change. However, Rutland is a rural area and the need to travel will always be an issue.	No change.
<b>Policy RLP3 - The Spatial Strategy for Development (now Policy SD2)<sup>1</sup></b>		
<b>Government and agencies</b>		
East Northamptonshire Council comments that the “Smaller Service Centres” could be regarded as misleading for the intermediate category of villages; it may be more appropriate to refer to these villages in terms of their wider context i.e. accessibility to local services and facilities; the plan should recognise cross boundary in terms of the connections between villages.	Comments noted. As set out in the Settlement Sustainability Assessment Background Paper Update (November 2019) the settlement hierarchy has been reviewed and it is proposed that the Smaller Service Centre category be combined with the Smaller Villages.	No change in response to comment.
<b>Landowners, developers, agents and businesses</b>		
<p>Andrew Granger &amp; Co consider that greater levels of development should be allocated in and around Local Service Centres to limit over-development of the Main Towns and ensure that local services are retained and if possible enhanced.</p> <p>Pegasus Group for Davidsons Developments consider that the policy should specify the proposed distribution between Oakham and Uppingham and make it clear that some 81% of the growth directed to these larger centres will be at Oakham.</p> <p>Strutt &amp; Parker LLP for Exton Estate supports the principle of local service centres accommodating a significant proportion of Rutland’s residential development needs (30%) but recommend this figure should be set as a guide and not a maximum.</p>	<p>Comments noted. However, with the proposed allocation of St George’s Barracks there will be a consequential reduction in the quantum of development proposed in other settlements through the allocation of sites. As the most sustainable locations, Oakham and Uppingham will continue to accommodate the majority of the residual housing requirement.</p> <p>It is proposed to amend the policy to clarify the scale of development appropriate in each tier of the settlement hierarchy, including removing the split between settlements of the proportion of the total housing requirement.</p> <p>It is clear that the housing requirement figures are a minimum provision over the plan period.</p>	Amend the wording of Policy RLP3 (now Policy SD2) to clarify the scale of development appropriate in the settlement hierarchy tiers.

<sup>1</sup> See also responses to revised Policy RLP3 in Appendix 5

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
Rosconn Group comments that neither this policy nor any other policy provides a clear apportionment of growth, which is essential.		
Barton Willmore for DeMerke Estates comments that Barleythorpe should be considered as adjoining and part of the urban area of Oakham (Main Town) and in this light it is considered to be a substantial location to accommodate growth.	To reflect the relationship of Barleythorpe to Oakham in terms of recent developments and the accessibility for residents to a range of services and facilities it is proposed that Barleythorpe be removed from the list of Smaller Service Centres and instead referenced in the 'Main Town' tier of the hierarchy.	Remove Barleythorpe from the list of Smaller Service Centres and amend 'Main Town' title to read 'Main Town – Oakham (including Barleythorpe)'.
Burghley House Preservation Trust considers that the policy text regarding Small Villages should be amended (wording suggested) in light of their proposed change to RLP6.	The Burghley House Preservation Trust made a similar comment in response to the subsequent 2018 consultation. It is agreed that some development where this is shown to be necessary to support and/or enhance community facilities/local services would be appropriate and a change to the Policy wording to reflect this is proposed.	Amend Policy RLP3 (now Policy SD2) to include reference to development supporting/enhancing community facilities/local services.
<p>DLP (Planning) Ltd for Larkfleet Homes Ltd proposes that the wording in relation to “Land in Rutland” be redrafted as suggested by them.</p> <p>Pegasus Group for Linden Homes Strategic Land propose that the policy be amended to make it clear that any development on the edge of Stamford would be to meet Stamford's housing needs and would be in addition to the identified housing requirements for the County area.</p>	This policy needs to be read in conjunction with Policy RLP13 (now Policy H4 (Cross Boundary Opportunity – Stamford North) and the supporting text, which provides more detail on the development of this site. It is agreed, however, that the Policy wording and/or supporting text should be amended to refer to the matters raised by the respondents.	Amend Policy RLP13 (now Policy H4) to refer to preparation of a masterplan and that development will contribute towards meeting the housing needs of South Kesteven District.
<b>Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups</b>		
Barrowden Parish Council considers there are flaws within the assessment e.g. in the evaluation of doctor's surgeries; that definition of infill is required; disagree that the allocations reflect the spatial strategy; ask that the Local Plan follows the example of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan as it sets a level of growth for every settlement	It is considered that the approach to settlement classification (as set out in the Settlement Sustainability Assessment Background Paper) is reasonable in order to differentiate the roles of the County's rural settlements. The classification is based on the most up to date information on service and facility provision (July 2019) in	Include indicative housing number for Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan area and guidance for other neighbourhood



Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
<p>Clipsham Parish Meeting raises a number of issues including that "sustainable development" requires a measurable definition; that the 70:30 split seems to be prescriptive and arbitrary and should be revisited recognising the needs and offers of the various towns and parishes; that policies for the smaller villages need to be more restrictive and aligned to open countryside policies; that windfall development, infill development and back land development all need to be tightly conditioned in the smaller villages; that development permissions in the small villages should depend upon proven local need within the village verified by a "local needs survey"; that smaller service centres do not have the level of service facilities which justify the viability of conversion of rural buildings in small villages or the countryside.</p> <p>Edith Weston Parish Council is concerned that the policy of limiting development within the smaller service centres to infill on previously developed land and conversion and re-use of existing buildings could cause the smaller service centres to stagnate; that an appropriate level of growth should be set for each settlement, allowing the community to decide on the most appropriate sites in developing their neighbourhood plans.</p> <p>North Luffenham Parish Council suggests that consideration be given to set an appropriate level of growth for each settlement, allowing the community to decide on the most appropriate sites.</p> <p>Uppingham Town Council asks to delete the word "moderate" in relation to "Uppingham should be a focus for growth".</p> <p>Whissendine Parish Council is concerned that Whissendine has been designated as a 'hub village'. Whissendine is losing those services that would make it a 'hub', it has lost one public house, has a reduced bus service, the school has</p>	<p>each village. In any approach it is inevitable that a line has to be drawn somewhere, resulting in the inclusion or exclusion of a village from a particular tier of the classification but the assessment has been carried out in a consistent and robust manner.</p> <p>It is important that the Local Plan demonstrates that the housing requirement for the county will be delivered during the plan period. To date only the Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan Group have indicated a desire to determine their own allocations. Therefore, the Local Plan will allocate suitable and deliverable sites in settlements across the County (excluding Uppingham) consistent with the spatial strategy (now Policy SD2) to ensure that the housing requirement is met.</p> <p>The Local Plan will provide support for Neighbourhood Plans groups that wish to make provision in their Plans for additional housing growth and will include guidance on indicative additional housing numbers.</p> <p>It is proposed to amend the policy to clarify the scale of development appropriate in each tier of the settlement hierarchy, including removing the split between settlements of the proportion of the total housing requirement. This approach provides for a level of new development that is considered commensurate with the role and character of these settlements.</p> <p>The Council has undertaken further analysis on the contribution of windfall sites to the housing supply. This has demonstrated that there is compelling evidence that windfall sites will provide a small but reliable source of housing supply over the plan period. To recognise this, an allowance of 20 dwellings per annum over the period 2022 - 2036 is considered appropriate and will be included in the housing supply figure for the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan.</p>	<p>plan groups who may wish to allocate additional housing sites within text of Housing Chapter</p> <p>Include a windfall allowance of 20 dwellings per annum in the housing land supply figures.</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
<p>a full roll, and the highway system is insufficient to cope. The village is also subject to regular flooding;</p> <p><b>Public and interest groups</b></p> <p>Rutland Branch of CPRE questions where the evidence is justifying the 70/30% split for housing development between towns and villages; The main towns should be described as 'market' towns as there are no 'non-main' towns. 'Sustainable' should be defined with suitable measurement terms and how it can be verified;</p> <p>Several comments that Ketton has been allocated too high a proportion of development; that the strategy should take a higher proportion of windfall sites; that brownfield development sites should be considered before taking more agricultural land; that schools should be given a higher weighting;</p> <p>Individual comments relate to the ranking of villages in the settlement hierarchy including that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Braunston should be a local service centre;</li> <li>o Greetham should not be a local service centre;</li> <li>o Langham should be a local service centre;</li> <li>o Market Overton should be a smaller service centre;</li> <li>o Morcott should become a smaller service centre</li> <li>o Whissendine should retain its status as a smaller service centre;</li> </ul>	<p>The allocation of sites in an individual settlement will be dependent on a number of factors including the availability of suitable sites, whether there are any identified constraints, the impacts of development and whether this can be appropriately mitigated.</p>	
<p><b>Policy RLP4 - Built development in the towns and villages (now Policy SD3 – Development within Planned Limits of Development)</b></p>		
<p><b>Landowners, developers, agents and businesses</b></p>		
<p>CMYK (Planning and Design) Ltd for Abbey Developments Ltd. comments that best use does not necessarily equate to densest use: what constitutes the best use should be determined by each site's individual characteristics and context.</p> <p>Persimmon Homes East Midlands questions how "small scale sustainable development" is defined.</p>	<p>To be more effective and avoid duplication between policies it is proposed that Policy RLP4 be combined with Policy RLP5 to form a single policy (Policy SD3 – Development within Planned Limits of Development).</p> <p>The wording of new Policy SD3 seeks to address the points made by the respondents and clarifies that the scale of development should be appropriate to its location and the size and character of the settlement.</p>	<p>Combine Policies RLP4 and RLP5.</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
<p>Marrons Planning for The Burley Estate Farm questions the lack of definition of “small scale”; that broad phraseology is confusing and the words “small scale” are not needed.</p> <p>Jeakins Weir consider the policy is needlessly prescriptive in its specification of proposals that are ‘small-scale’, the policy lacks conformity with the NPPF as it needlessly restricts many potentially suitable sites; reference to “Planned Limits to Development” should be removed.</p>		
<b>Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups</b>		
<p>Clipsham Parish Meeting comments that proposals for built development in the smaller service centres and small villages should not share the same policy as applies to the towns.</p>	<p>Comments noted. However, the wording of new Policy SD3 ensures that the scale of development is appropriate to its location and the size and character of a settlement.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<b>Public and interest groups</b>		
<p>Rutland Branch of CPRE consider there should be a separate paragraph for small villages as opposed to smaller service centres; that the policy should encourage the use of innovative and local materials and design to complement the site; what part of the environment should not be adversely affected - built or natural; are adverse effects to be defined?</p> <p>Individual responses question how 'adverse affects' and 'detrimental impacts' be measured; that there is no synergy between the local plan and neighbourhood plans; that the draft plan does not stipulate the size of houses to be built; that development should be in proportion the current population; concerns about the scale of development in Ketton.</p>	<p>The wording of new Policy SD3 ensures that the scale of development is appropriate to its location and the size and character of a settlement.</p> <p>The other points raised by the respondents are covered by other policies in the plan particularly those relating to design.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<b>Policy RLP5 - Residential Proposals in Towns and Villages (now Policy SD3 – Development within Planned Limits of Development)</b>		
<b>Landowners, developers, agents and businesses</b>		
<p>CMYK (Planning and Design) Ltd for Abbey Developments Ltd. Potential comment that infill sites do not necessarily constitute small sites within substantially built up frontage.</p>	<p>To be more effective and avoid duplication between policies it is proposed that Policy RLP4 be combined with Policy</p>	<p>Combine policies RLP4 and RLP5.</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
<p>Jeakins Weir consider there is duplication between Policies RLP4 and RLP5 which is confusing and unacceptably restrictive and will preclude development from coming forward that is acceptable in planning terms but may be on the edge of a settlement or on a greenfield site.</p> <p>Marrons Planning for The Burley Estate Farm Partnership consider that the policy is wholly restrictive and relates primarily to small scale residential development rather than residential development as a whole; its application to both towns and villages will severely restrict larger scale development coming forward within the planned limits to development and recommend that a greater amount of flexibility is provided.</p> <p>The Burghley House Preservation Trust suggests amendments to wording regarding land within or adjoining the planned limits to development of settlements.</p>	<p>RLP5 to form a single policy (Policy SD3 – Development within Planned Limits of Development).</p> <p>The wording of new Policy SD3 seeks to address the points made by the respondents.</p>	
<b>Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups</b>		
<p>Clipsham Parish Meeting consider that residential proposals for the smaller service centres and small villages should not be the same as for the towns and different and more restrictive policies should apply; paragraph (d) should be qualified to allow development only if the existing structure is suitable for conversion.</p> <p>Edith Weston Parish Council consider the policy should also be referred to in policies RLP 1 and 2.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The wording of new Policy SD3 ensures that the scale of development is appropriate to its location and the size and character of a settlement.</p> <p>Within the Planned Limits of Development it is considered unnecessary to be overly restrictive on the types of building that may be converted. The consideration of individual proposals is covered by Policy EN3 (Delivering Good Design).</p>	No change.
<b>Public and interest groups</b>		
<p>Rutland Branch of CPRE comments that the brownfield register should be included in the policy.</p>	<p>It is considered to be unnecessary to refer to the Brownfield Register in the Policy.</p>	No change.
<b>Policy RLP6 - Development in the Countryside (now Policy SD4 – Residential Development in the Countryside)</b>		
<b>Landowners, developers, agents and businesses</b>		
<p>Gladman Developments consider that the Council may wish to consider a more flexible policy in relation to development in the Countryside; in the absence of a 5 year housing land</p>	<p>Noted, however the countryside would still not be an appropriate location for development other than that set out in this policy.</p>	No change.

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
<p>supply the policy would decrease the likelihood that the plan could swiftly respond to a need for additional development.</p> <p>Strutt &amp; Parker LLP for Exton Estate considers that the policy is too prescriptive, it does not meet the requirements of the NPPF in the context of the re-use or adaption of rural buildings - advocates the deletion of sub paragraph B.</p> <p>The Burghley House Preservation Trust considers the approach of restraint is not NPPF-compliant and should be amended to allow for residential (and other) development of land adjoining small villages where this would directly contribute to and/or enhance the social sustainability of the village.</p>	<p>Policy is considered to be appropriate and in accordance with NPPF.</p> <p>Policy is considered appropriate in terms of restricting the types of development permitted in the countryside.</p>	
<b>Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups</b>		
<p>Uppingham Town Council considers that the planned limits of development for Uppingham should not be amended by RCC but should be a matter for the refreshed neighbourhood plan.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<b>Public and interest groups</b>		
<p>Limes, Firs &amp; Spurs Residents Association considers that the planned limits of development for Uppingham should be a matter for the refreshed neighbourhood plan.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<b>Policy RLP7 - Non-residential development in the countryside (now Policy SD5)</b>		
<b>Landowners, developers, agents and businesses</b>		
<p>Strutt &amp; Parker LLP for Cecil Estate Family Trust and the Exton Estate consider that the wording of the policy is too prescriptive; that sub clause E should not be restricted purely to tourism and should be more specific in supporting all rural employment and enterprise opportunities where these conform to other limbs of this policy.</p> <p>DLP (Planning) Limited for Larkfleet Homes Ltd considers that a sufficient degree of flexibility is needed and are concerned that the policy would preclude the provision of</p>	<p>Clause e) includes rural enterprises but could be amended to include “creates local employment opportunities”</p> <p>Noted. However large scale proposals within the open countryside would only be considered appropriate in exceptional circumstances and it is inappropriate to make policy provision for them.</p>	<p>Amend clause e as suggested.</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
larger scale employment development in the County should a specific unmet need arise.		
<b>Policy RLP8 - Re-use of redundant military bases and prisons (now Policy SD6)</b>		
Agree 61 (85%) Disagree 2 (2%) other comment 8 (11%) Total 71		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Historic England considers that the policy should include a specific criteria in respect of heritage assets and their settings.</li> <li>2. Sport England supports the inclusion of active design in relation to this and all development and design policies.</li> <li>3. CS Ellis Group Ltd requests the Council actively engage with the existing tenants of the redundant military bases and prisons before the production of detailed planning policy documents relating to such sites.</li> <li>4. A number of Parish Meeting and Parish Councils have commented on the potential and the significance of the St. George's barracks and suggest it is properly considered, evaluated and included in the plan so that its impact on surrounding areas and infrastructure improvements required can be assessed. Individual comments have also been made that more detail should be provided on St George's Barracks; that opportunities exist for locating employment within the existing buildings in the south west corner of the site and the actual airfield site and opportunities for building more housing; that the plan should contain a policy that any significant new site should be developed in preference to spoiling villages; that St George's Barracks developed as one of the proposed garden villages in conjunction with Cambridge University.</li> <li>5. Rutland Branch of CPRE comments that there are several options for the redevelopment of the St George's Barracks site and further implications of the expansion of Kendrew Barracks and the possibility of these sites supporting significant additional housing should be discussed in the plan.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The policy includes reference to cultural heritage, which would include heritage assets</li> <li>2. Support welcomed.</li> <li>3. RCC and the MOD have engaged with local communities and existing businesses in the proposals for St George's as they have developed.</li> <li>4. An additional stage of consultation took place in August and September 2018. This focused on the implications for the Local Plan should the St. George's Barracks site be allocated including the spatial distribution of growth across the County and the specific policy changes that would be required, including a policy related to the development of the site. The responses to this consultation and proposed consequential changes to the Local Plan can be found in Appendix 5</li> <li>5. There are no proposals at this time for the closure or expansion of the Kendrew Barracks site.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No change to the Local Plan</li> <li>2. No change to Local Plan.</li> <li>3. No change to the Local Plan</li> <li>4. See Appendix 5</li> <li>5. No change to the Local Plan</li> </ol>
<b>Policy RLP9 - Use of military bases and prisons for operational or other purposes (now Policy SD7)</b>		
Agree 46 (85%) Disagree 6 (11%) other 2 (3%) Total 54		

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
No comments of note	Support for the policy approach is welcomed	No change.
<b>Policy RLP10 - Delivering socially inclusive communities (now Policy SC1 – Delivering safe, healthy and inclusive communities)</b>		
Agree 47 (79%); disagree 8 (13%) other 4 (6%) total 59		
<p>Uppingham Town Council generally agrees with the policy but would like to see banks included in the list of key assets where alternative use would not be supported;</p> <p>Limes, Firs &amp; Spurs Residents Association is concerned about the lack of support by RCC for an Uppingham Hopper Bus.</p> <p>One individual comment that social housing and better public transport would be essential.</p>	<p>Agree in part, however, it is not always practical or viable to retain banks within smaller towns. Therefore, suggest the term “banking facilities” is included within the list.</p> <p>Comments noted, however it is not something which would be specifically referred to in the local plan.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p>Add “banking facilities” to second paragraph of policy.</p> <p>No change to Local Plan.</p> <p>No change.</p>
<b>Policy RLP11 - Developer contributions (now Policy SC4 – Developer Contributions)</b>		
Agree 36 (76%) Disagree 7 (14%) other 4 (8%) total 47		
<p>A landowner suggest that the Council prepares an up to date infrastructure delivery plan as soon as possible having regards to cross boundary infrastructure demands.</p> <p>Clipsham Parish Meeting considers that the policy needs to include the requirement of no net loss of biodiversity and a system of developer contribution applied to fund the replacement of that loss of biodiversity on a nearby site.</p> <p>One individual comments that developer contributions should be strongly enforced and not allowed to be deferred or discounted.</p>	<p>An updated Infrastructure Delivery Plan is being prepared and will be published alongside the Pre-submission plan. This will have regard to cross boundary demands.</p> <p>Policy EN9 (Natural Environment) and the supporting text provides more detail on securing net biodiversity gains in respect of all new development proposals.</p> <p>National planning policy requires that Local Plan policies do not make a development unviable and therefore affect its delivery. In some cases a scheme may not be viable and the developer contributions may need to be deferred or discounted.</p>	<p>Reference the IDP in Policy supporting text.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>Update reference to viability in accordance with the new NPPF</p>
<b>Policy RLP12 - Sites for residential development</b>		
Comments on the proposed allocated housing sites, officer response and any changes proposed to the allocations can be found in Appendix 2.		
<b>Additional/amended sites</b>		
The following sites have been put forward for consideration in the Local Plan:	These additional sites were the subject of public consultation in August and September 2018.	See Appendix 2.

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Barleythorpe: Land adjacent to, Barleythorpe Hall, Main Road</li> <li>• Barrowden: 7 Wakerley Road,</li> <li>• Greetham: North Brook Close</li> <li>• Greetham : Stretton Road, Greetham</li> <li>• Langham: Ranksborough Farm, Langham</li> <li>• Manton: St Mary' Road, Manton</li> <li>• Oakham: North of Barleythorpe, Oakham</li> <li>• Oakham: Co-op site, Burley Road</li> <li>• Ryhall: River Gwash Trout Farm, Belmesthorpe Lane</li> <li>• South Luffenham: Wireless Hill employment site</li> <li>• Tinwell: Home Farm</li> <li>• Uppingham: Land off the Beeches, Uppingham</li> <li>• Uppingham: Land off Goldcrest and North of Firs Avenue</li> <li>• Uppingham: Welland Vale</li> </ul>	<p>Comments received on these sites, officer response and any changes proposed can be found in Appendix 2.</p>	
<p><b>Policy RLP13 – Cross Boundary Development Opportunity – Stamford North (now Policy H4)</b></p>		
<p>General comments: Agree 4 (25%), Disagree 6 (37%), Other 6 (37%)  LIT/01 – Little Casterton, Land at Quarry Farm (Stamford North): Agree 12 (40%), Disagree 18 (60%)  LIT/02 – Land at Quarry Farm (Stamford North): Agree 12 (40%), 18 (60%)</p>		
<p><b>Government and agencies</b></p>		
<p>Highways England comment that there is likely to be a cumulative impact on the A1 which will need to be considered through a Transport Assessment.</p> <p>Casterton College supports the proposals and stresses the importance of road safety on Sidney Farm Lane.</p>	<p>Noted. Additional traffic assessment work has been undertaken for the whole site (including that within SKDC) and an agreement has been reached with Highways England as to the A1 junction improvements required for.</p> <p>Road safety issues are acknowledged.</p>	<p>Include reference to junction improvements, the masterplan and the comprehensive approach to the development of the site in policy and supporting text.</p>
<p><b>Landowners, developers, agents and businesses</b></p>		
<p>1. DLP Planning for Larkfleet Homes Ltd supports the proposals but requests that the policy refers to 650 homes and a “Nature Park” rather than a Country Park; that the development should be CIL exempt as the infrastructure</p>	<p>1. The draft masterplan refers to a proposed Country Park. The capacity of the site will be updated. The site will not be exempt from CIL charges, once collected the Council can distribute CIL monies to other infrastructure providers as appropriate.</p>	<p>1. Update capacity of site to 650 dwellings. Clarify that CIL will be</p>



Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
<p>needed is likely to be in Stamford and South Kesteven rather than Rutland.</p> <p>2. Savills for the Burghley House Preservation Trust supports the proposals and submits a draft Stamford North Delivery Statement setting out a proposed means of delivering the scheme in an appropriate and coordinated manner to the benefit of the communities in both council areas.</p> <p>3. The Rosconn Group considers that the policy should be clarified to make clear that the site allocation is being made solely to help meet the housing need of South Kesteven District and not Rutland District and will not contribute to the 5-year land supply for Rutland.</p>	<p>2. Noted, this will be referenced in the supporting text.</p> <p>3. It is agreed that the Policy wording and/or supporting text should be amended to refer to this.</p>	<p>expected from the development.</p> <p>2. Add reference to the Delivery Statement in the supporting text.</p> <p>3. Amend Policy H4 and supporting text to clarify development will contribute towards meeting the housing needs of South Kesteven District.</p>
<b>Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups</b>		
<p>1. Clipsham Parish Meeting considers that the developments require local consultation and agreement and that the Council needs to devise clear policies to strictly control such development within its borders.</p> <p>2. Great Casterton Parish Council comments that the developments may increase traffic through the village and traffic alleviation measures must be considered.</p> <p>3. Langham Parish Council comments that there needs policy clarification of the Rutland housing numbers to be gained and the developments will need careful amelioration.</p> <p>4. Stamford Town Council/Neighbourhood Planning Forum supports the allocation in principle but considers a holistic approach is needed to cover a relief road, an education campus, infrastructure and serviced, green spaces, design policies and guidelines, parking spaces, policies in the neighbourhood plan and an east-west link which should be the subject of a joint study.</p>	<p>1. Consultation has been carried out with local communities via both the SKDC and Rutland Local Plan processes.</p> <p>2. A traffic assessment has been undertaken which has identified the necessary mitigation measures in Rutland and Lincolnshire. This is reflected in the IDP.</p> <p>3. It is agreed that the Policy wording and/or supporting text should be amended to refer to this.</p> <p>4. Agree – a joint masterplan is being prepared which will cover the whole site and include these issues. It should be noted that the Stamford Neighbourhood Plan has not yet been published.</p>	<p>1. No change.</p> <p>2. No change.</p> <p>3. Amend Policy H4 and supporting text to clarify development will contribute towards meeting the housing needs of South Kesteven District.</p> <p>4. No change.</p>
<b>Public and interest groups</b>		
<p>A range of concerns are raised include increased traffic congestion and traffic cutting through Little Casterton to the A1; the need for a bypass of Little Casterton, the lack of infrastructure and local facilities; the impact on local</p>	<p>These issues have been addressed through the ongoing dialogue with the developers and through the development of a masterplan for the site.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
<p>residents, services, public transport, school runs and parking in Stamford; that any houses in within the County boundaries must be included in Rutland's housing totals; that the requirement that "development is expected to include" to is too weak and that the requirements for a country park and a strong mitigation framework need to be strengthened.</p> <p>The Rutland Branch CPRE considers that more detail is needed on the extent of future development and that the proposed new homes are in addition to the SHMA figures.</p>	<p>This should be referenced in the policy</p>	<p>Amend Policy H4 and supporting text to clarify development will contribute towards meeting the housing needs of South Kesteven District.</p>
<p><b>Policy RLP14 - Housing density and mix (now Policy H6 – Meeting all Housing Needs and Policy H5 – Housing Density)</b></p>		
<p>Total comments: 55, 24 of which agree with the policy whilst 21 disagree and 10 make "other" comments</p>		
<p>Those disagreeing with the policy have commented that: the proposed policy mix is based on demographic analysis and assumptions in the SHMA and have not taken account of market demand; so the policy should be expressed in a more flexible way to allow the mix to be on a demand led basis; policy should make it clear that housing mix, like density (as described in the first part of the policy) is expected to vary depending on the location and character of the site, local circumstances and site specific issues including potential issues of viability.</p> <p>Other comments were that: policy is too weak and should require the % mix as mandatory; policy should include a specific requirement that developers offer starter homes and homes suitable for downsizing for our elderly community with more emphasis on meeting local requirements.</p> <p>Policy is in conflict with the Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan, but the mix and density should be a matter for the Neighbourhood Plans to determine.</p>	<p>The NPPF (paragraph 61) requires policies to reflect the housing needs of different groups within the community. It is considered that the policy as currently worded provides the flexibility required to allow local circumstances to be taken into consideration. Reference to the most recent SHMA within the policy allows for updated information to be used to determine housing mix and this can be extended by also adding reference to 'other up to date evidence of housing need'.</p> <p>It is considered that the policy should provide for a degree of flexibility to allow local circumstances to be taken into account. The policy requires new development to provide a wide mix of homes to meet the range of housing needs and demands of the County's residents. This will cater for all types of housing needs, including housing suitable downsizing.</p> <p>The Local Plan will supersede those neighbourhood plans which have been made. Whilst a review of neighbourhood plans would need to be in conformity with the strategic</p>	<p>Update all references to data from the 2019 SHMA.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
<p>The policy should not be too prescriptive, to allow for local needs and environment; and there should also be variable density of housing.</p>	<p>policies of the Local Plan, it is considered that this policy is a local policy and, therefore, neighbourhood plans could set their own density and housing mix policy subject to this being supported by appropriate evidence.</p> <p>The revised Policies H5 and H6 provide flexibility in respect of local site characteristics influencing both the housing mix and density of a development and further flexibility is not considered to be required.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<b>Policy RLP15 - Self-build and custom housebuilding (now Policy H8)</b>		
<p>A majority of responses agree with this policy.</p> <p>A number of respondents from the development industry consider that the policy is not justified by the evidence and raise concerns about its implications for the viability and deliverability of development. Alternative approaches suggested include identifying smaller sites or setting out a criteria-based policy, allowing development on the edge of settlements or infill sites, considering requirements on a case-by-case basis or by negotiation as a part of housing mix.</p> <p>Uppingham Town Council and a local residents' group in Uppingham support the policy but do not agree with the 5% requirement.</p>	<p>The Council is required to give suitable development permission in respect of enough serviced plots to meet the demand for self and custom house building. This policy puts in place the planning policy framework to enable the Council to meet its duty.</p> <p>The Council has established a self and custom build register to provide an indicator of demand for self-build plots within the County. The data from this register will be used along with other sources of information where necessary to consider the need for this type of plot. However, to provide a degree of flexibility it is proposed to add criteria relating to the marketing and disposal of plots.</p> <p>The Council considers that the policy approach set out in Policy H8 will ensure that demand on the register can be met. Whilst the policy makes a specific requirement for plots to be made available on larger housing sites, it is expected that a proportion of the plots required to meet the demand identified by the self-build register will also come forward on small sites and single plots on infill sites.</p> <p>It is proposed to increase the site size threshold on which a percentage of plots should be provided to 50+ dwellings to reflect the practical implications of requiring single/small number of plots on small sites. It is also proposed to lower the percentage requirement to at least 2% of site capacity to reflect current evidence of demand.</p>	<p>Revise site size threshold to 50+ dwellings and plot requirement to at least 2% of the site capacity.</p> <p>Add criteria relating to the marketing and disposal of self-build plots.</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
	It should be noted that the Policy has been subject to viability testing.	
<b>Policy RLP16 - Affordable housing (now Policy H9)</b>		
Agree 38(64%); disagree 12 (20%); other 9 (15%) total 59		
<b>Landowners, developers, agents and businesses</b>		
<p>A developer considers that the extent of exceptional circumstances should be defined to provide clarity and certainty.</p> <p>Two house builders consider the plan needs greater flexibility for different types of affordable housing models and funding mechanisms, it must also take account of viability and scale issues.</p> <p>A landowner and a developer suggests an up to date 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is needed to assess the ability of proposals to accommodate 30% affordable housing.</p>	<p>As the provision of affordable housing off site should only be in exceptional circumstances it is considered unnecessary to try and define in the supporting text what those circumstances might be. However, the policy wording has been revised to reflect the NPPF that off-site provision will only be acceptable where it is robustly justified.</p> <p>The definition of affordable housing will be updated to reflect that set out in the NPPF. There will also be a need to make changes to the policy i.e. site thresholds, to ensure it is consistent with the NPPF (2019).</p> <p>The policy has been subject to viability testing and the Whole Plan Viability Study will be published in support of the Local Plan.</p>	<p>Update definition of affordable housing to reflect NPPF.</p> <p>Update policy to ensure consistency with the NPPF (2019).</p>
<b>Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups</b>		
<p>Oakham Neighbourhood Plan Group suggests use of the word "must" or "will" instead of "should" to take a firmer line.</p> <p>Ketton Parish Council suggests reducing the minimum development size, which would require 30% affordable housing from 11 houses to 6; it should state that commuting lump sums or off site alternatives should not be permitted; would like to see an addition to the policy regarding encouragements/incentivisation of the formation of Housing Associations or Trusts that would allow affordable housing to remain affordable in the long term;</p> <p>North Luffenham Parish Council comments that RCC must ensure that Housing Associations managing shared ownership of affordable homes act in a totally transparent</p>	<p>Agree replace "should" with "will".</p> <p>The site size thresholds are set out in national planning policy. There is a need to revise the thresholds to ensure consistency with the most recent version of the NPPF. The threshold of 10 or more dwellings applies to Oakham and Uppingham and the threshold of six or more dwellings applies to all other settlements in the County which are "designated Rural Area".</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p>In first sentence replace 'should' with 'will'</p> <p>Update site thresholds to ensure consistency with NPPF (2019).</p> <p>No change.</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
<p>way in the on-going allocation process, to ensure that such properties are made available in perpetuity to local people in housing need</p>		
<b>Public and interest groups</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Definition of affordable homes needs to be inclusive of 'starter homes'</li> <li>ii. no detailed study has been carried out to 'identify' the need in individual villages and Oakham and Uppingham</li> <li>iii. Emphasis should be on the RCC /Spire Homes building its own properties for rent.</li> <li>iv. Commuted sums and off-site provision in lieu should not be allowed except in very special circumstances.</li> <li>v. Affordable housing would be better in the towns where the transport links are better, not in rural areas where travel is essential and employment and amenities limited.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The definition of affordable housing will be updated to reflect that set out in the NPPF, which includes starter homes.</li> <li>ii. Individual village housing need surveys are undertaken on request and can be done as part of a neighbourhood plan.</li> <li>iii. Noted, however, this is only one source of affordable housing.</li> <li>iv. The NPPF allows for off-site and commuted sums where robustly justified.</li> <li>v. Comment noted. However, there is also a genuine need for affordable homes in rural communities to meet the needs of local residents who need to live in a rural location for work or family reasons.</li> </ul>	<p>Update definition of affordable housing to reflect NPPF.</p>
<b>Policy RLP17 - Rural Exception Housing (now Policy H10)</b>		
Agree 17 (62%) disagree 9 (33%) other 1 (3%) Total 27		
<p>Strutt &amp; Parker LLP for Cecil Estate Family Trust and Exton Estate considers the wording is too prescriptive and advocates the deletion of sub paragraphs C, D and E;</p> <p>A parish council is concerned that Housing Associations act in a totally transparent way in the on-going allocation process for affordable housing, to ensure that properties are made available in perpetuity to local people in housing need.</p>	<p>These sub paragraphs relate specifically to the circumstances where market housing might be considered acceptable to cross subsidise a rural exception scheme. It is considered appropriate for the policy to include this level of detail as the means of providing clarity and certainty about where such development might be acceptable.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>
<b>Policy RLP18 - Gypsies and travellers (now Policy H11)</b>		
<p>One Parish Council comments that further expansion of sites will not encourage community cohesion and it would be preferable for gypsies and travellers to be subject to the same planning rules as the rest of the population.</p>	<p>The Council must follow national planning policy for Gypsy and Traveller provision.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
<p>Other comments include that the Council considers a site on St George's Barracks; that provision of sites should be solely on a provisional basis; and the adverse effects of traveller sites on security, safety, village life and environmental hygiene.</p>	<p>Specific provision is made as part of the St George's Garden Community Development (as set out in Policy H3).</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p><b>Policy RLP19 - New provision for industrial and office development and related uses (now Policy E1)</b></p>		
<p>Comments on the proposed allocated employment sites, officer response and any changes proposed to the allocations can be found in Appendix 2.</p>		
<p><b>Policy RLP20 - Expansion of existing businesses and protection of existing employment sites (now Policy E2 – Expansion of Existing Businesses and Policy E3 – Protection of Existing Employment Sites)</b></p>		
<p>A large majority agree with this policy.</p> <p>One response seeks identification of the key employment sites identified in the policy on the policies map. One response requests that an additional element be added to the policy to encourage developers to provide employment opportunities around the seven existing sites.</p>	<p>The wording of the policy does offer support for the expansion of existing businesses, subject to certain criteria being met. It is not considered appropriate for the local plan to encourage such development, but rather that it should set out the policy basis under which such proposals will be considered.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p><b>Policy RLP21 - The rural economy (now Policy E4)</b></p>		
<p>A large majority agree with this policy. No specific comments were made.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p><b>Policy RLP22 - Agricultural, horticultural, equestrian and forestry development</b></p>		
<p>A large majority agree with this policy.</p> <p>One response suggests that the provisos in the policy should be in all other development policies.</p>	<p>As the criteria in this policy are covered by other plan policies, it is proposed to delete this policy in order to avoid duplication between policies and make the Plan more effective.</p>	<p>Delete Policy RLP22.</p>
<p><b>Policy RLP23 - Local Visitor Economy (now Policy E5)</b></p>		
<p>All agree with this policy.</p> <p>Two respondents raise the issue of second homes and what restrictions/disincentives may be needed.</p> <p>One respondent suggests that a Park and Ride scheme could help promote local tourism.</p>	<p>The issue of placing restrictions/disincentives on second homes is outside the scope of this policy, which is concerned with supporting proposals that support the local visitor economy. However, there is no strong evidence that second homes are an issue in Rutland for which a specific policy is needed. Any proposals for second homes will be considered on their merits in relation to this policy and other policies of the plan.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
	The need for Park and Ride Schemes will be considered but it is unclear where in Rutland such a scheme would be feasible given the rural nature and the relatively small size of the towns and villages in the area.	
<b>Policy RLP24 - Rutland Water (now Policy E6)</b>		
<p>Historic England requests that heritage assets and their settings should be referenced within this policy.</p> <p>Anglian Water Services Limited considers that the policy does not recognise that development may be needed at the reservoir by the operator and there is no positive policy reference to the need for development associated with Rutland Water. It requests the policy be amended to state that the Local Planning Authority will support proposals which involve the role, function and operation of Rutland Water reservoir, its treatment works and associated network.</p> <p>Empingham Parish Council considers that the plan should include information as to how the Council proposes to ensure effective control of Anglia Water's commercial activities including the economic, environmental and social cost to settlements.</p> <p>Other comments include that the two reservoirs should be rigorously protected equally and that further development for Rutland Water should be significantly protected including all activities both on and off the water.</p>	<p>It is considered unnecessary to specifically refer to heritage assets in this policy, as development impacts on heritage assets would also be subject to the requirements of Policy EN14 (Historic and Cultural Environment).</p> <p>It is agreed that the policy should be amended to refer to development associated with the operational requirements of Anglian Water.</p> <p>It is considered that the Policy as worded provides appropriate criteria against which the issues raised by the respondent could be assessed.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>Add reference to the operational requirements of Anglian Water.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>
<b>Policy RLP25 - Eyebrook Reservoir Area (now Policy E7)</b>		
A large majority agree with this policy.	Noted.	No change.
<b>Policy RLP26 - Caravans, camping, lodges, log cabins, chalets and similar forms of self-serviced holiday accommodation (now Policy E8)</b>		
A large majority agree with this policy.		

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
<p>The Environment Agency comments that caravans, camping, log cabins and chalets are highly vulnerable to flooding and should not be permitted in flood risk areas.</p> <p>One response comments that the policy does not seem to address caravan and camping sites and would wish to see evidence from RCC as to the stance being taken.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Policies SD1 (Sustainable Development Principles) and EN6 (Reducing the Risk of Flooding) set out requirements in relation to development and flood risk.</p> <p>It is agreed that the policy wording should also include reference to caravan and camping sites.</p> <p>The stance taken to allow such sites, subject to various provisos to ensure that the development is acceptable, is in accordance with the sustainable development principles set out in Policy SD1.</p>	<p>In the first paragraph of Policy E8 insert the words 'caravans, camping' before 'lodges, log cabins...'</p>
<b>Policy RLP27 - Town centres and retailing (now Policy E9)</b>		
<p>One comment on behalf of the Cooperative Society requests that the policy be amended to reflect the society's Burley Road site as a key component of Oakham's retail infrastructure and include a third bullet to refer to other retail centres identified on the Inset Maps.</p> <p>Other comments raise concerns that improvements are needed to the West End of the Oakham Town Centre and that co-ordination between the bus and train services would enhance the visitor and resident experience.</p> <p>Uppingham Town Council challenges the downgrading of some of Uppingham's primary shopping area and intends to commission its own independent retail assessment.</p>	<p>The policy seeks to identify the retail hierarchy rather than the location of particular retail developments. As such it would be inappropriate to include reference to the Burley Road site in this policy. It is, however, identified as a site for retail development under Policy E11.</p> <p>Comments noted. Policy SC2 (Securing Sustainable Transport) seeks to secure improvements to and between public transport links.</p> <p>The definition of the Primary Shopping Area and Primary Shopping Frontage was based on advice in the Retail Capacity Assessment (2016), which found that the change of use away from class A1 retail use in an area of High Street West would not be detrimental to the overall vitality and viability of the town centre and that its designation as a secondary shopping frontage was appropriate. However, it should be noted that reflective of the most recent NPPF (2019), secondary shopping frontages will not be designated in the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>
<b>Policy RLP28 - Primary and secondary shopping frontages (now Policy E10 – Primary Shopping Area)</b>		
<p>Uppingham Town Council gives notice that it intends to commission its own independent retail assessment and</p>	<p>Comments noted. However, it would be inappropriate to delay the Local Plan pending the outcome of this assessment.</p>	<p>No change.</p>



Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
<p>requires that RCC await the outcome of this before moving this matter forward.</p> <p>A residents' association comments that the proposal to amend existing primary retail areas in Uppingham to secondary areas flies in the face of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p>Whilst a review of neighbourhood plans would need to be in conformity with the strategic policies of the Local Plan, it is considered that this policy is a local policy and, therefore, neighbourhood plans could set their own retail policies subject to this being supported by appropriate up to date evidence.</p> <p>See comment in response to Policy RLP27.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<b>Policy RLP29 - Site for retail development (now Policy E11)</b>		
R1 - Tim Norton, Long Row		
<p>A number of individual responses were concerned over the site's location in relation to the railway line and the impact additional traffic would have on the operation of the level crossing.</p>	<p>Comments noted. However, it is proposed that this site not be taken forward as an allocation due to issues over its deliverability.</p> <p>It is proposed to allocate an alternative site (Co-op site on Burley Road, Oakham) for non-food retail development.</p>	<p>Delete the Tim Norton, Long Row site and replace with the Co-op site, Burley Road, Oakham.</p>
<b>Policy RLP30 - Securing sustainable transport and accessibility through development (now Policy SC2 – Securing Sustainable Transport)</b>		
<p>A large majority agree with this policy.</p> <p>A number of responses consider that that the policy is lacking in detail as to how on how improved transport choices will be provided Various suggestions are made as to extending the footpath and cycleway network , road improvements, by-passes for villages; and facilities for foot and cycle paths to bus stops in Uppingham. Some raise concerns about the impact of increased closure of the Oakham level crossing, the impact of out of county developments, and that the plan should be used to provide an adequate road network within the county.</p> <p>Network Rail encourage inclusion of a policy statement that no new crossings will be permitted, that proposals which</p>	<p>This purpose of this policy is to indicate the measures that will be required of new development proposals in order to ensure that they provide sustainable transport and accessibility. These will necessarily depend on the nature and location of the development proposals concerned.</p> <p>The wider issue of developing a network of footpaths and cycleways is covered by Policy EN10 (Blue and Green Infrastructure, Sport and Recreation Strategic Policy).</p> <p>Detailed proposals for road, cycleway and footpath improvements and the need for new bypasses are beyond the scope of the Local Plan. These would more appropriately be dealt with in the first instance through the Council's Local Transport Plan.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
<p>increase the use of level crossings will generally be resisted and where development would prejudice the safe use of a level crossing an alternative bridge crossing will be required to be provided at the developers expense, and that any development in the vicinity of level crossings should be reviewed to ensure that any mitigation works would not affect the viability of the allocation;</p> <p>Uppingham Town Council considers the policy is at variance with RLP27 which seeks to restrict the development of shopping amenities in Uppingham</p>	<p>It is not considered appropriate to include a policy statement on railway crossings as requested by Network Rail. The potential impact of development on the safety and operation of level crossings and any appropriate mitigation measures would be addressed through Transport Assessments.</p> <p>The impact of developments on the Oakham level crossing and any measures that are needed to mitigate those impacts are considered under the proposed allocations for Oakham. These impacts have been assessed and appropriate measures are proposed as part of the IDP.</p> <p>It is not clear why the policy is considered to be at variance with Policy RLP27 (Town Centres and Retailing) which deals with different matters.</p>	
<b>Policy RLP31 - Electric Vehicle Charging Points (now Policy EN4 – Sustainable Building and Construction)</b>		
<p>A large majority agree with this policy.</p> <p>Two responses from the development industry consider that the issue of viability needs to be referred to and taken into consideration. One requests that a definition of adequate arrangements should be included in the accompanying text.</p> <p>A range of individual comments are made including that every new residential property must provide adequate arrangements for charging electric vehicles at 7 kW; that there are no technical reasons why communal parking areas could not be provided with charge points; that the word “rapid” is changed to “fast”; that the number of charging points needs to be increased; that the electricity infrastructure is unable to cope with demand now.</p>	<p>Agreed that to provide clarity the text updated to reflect requirements in latest version of the NPPF.</p> <p>It is agreed that communal parking areas should not necessarily be exempt from the provision of charging points and that there may be circumstances where it is not technically feasible or viable for provision to be made i.e. due to the capacity of the electricity network.</p>	<p>Amend the supporting text to Policy EN4 to reflect the NPPF.</p> <p>Amend the Policy text to clarify that communal parking areas are not automatically exempt and that in some developments it may not be technically feasible or viable for provision to be made.</p>
<b>Policy RLP32 - High Speed Broadband (now Policy SC3 - Promoting Fibre to the Premise Broadband)</b>		

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
<p>A large majority agree with this policy.</p> <p>Two developers consider that the policy does not provide sufficient flexibility in that may not always be possible to install and the requirement should be subject viability.</p> <p>A number of parish councils and one individual comment raise concerns that the policy is too weak and should go further in requiring optical fibre to the edge of all houses and developments; and that network providers should be encouraged to provide comprehensive and improved high speed mobile phone coverage.</p>	<p>The Policy has been revised and updated to reflect the latest position on digital technology provision and align with the ambitions set out in the Council's Digital Rutland Strategy 2019 – 2022.</p> <p>The policy is clear that where it is not practical, feasible or viable to deliver FTTP then alternative provision will be considered.</p> <p>The policy does support the development of electronic communication networks, including telecommunications, but the coverage and quality of mobile phone networks is beyond the scope of the local plan.</p>	<p>No change in response to comments.</p>
<b>Policy RLP33 - Delivering Good design (now Policy EN3)</b>		
<p>Two neighbouring local authorities consider it may also be helpful to refer to the role of green infrastructure in delivering ecosystem services.</p> <p>The Environment Agency suggests detailed changes of wording including reference to water efficiency standards, the need for net biodiversity gains, habitat creation areas and tree planting on new developments and reference to Blue Infrastructure.</p> <p>Anglian Water Services Limited comments there should be reference to the inclusion of SuDS as part of new development; and there is no reference to foul drainage and sewerage treatment.</p>	<p>Agree that reference to ecosystems should be made. However, it is considered that this would be most appropriately made in the supporting text to Policy EN10, which specifically covers Green Infrastructure.</p> <p>Reference to meeting water efficiency standards has been included in Policy EN4 (Sustainable Design and Construction) and the other issues raised are covered by other Local Plan policies that deal specifically with these issues e.g. Policy EN9 (Natural Environment).</p> <p>Agree that these matters should be referenced in the Local Plan and a new Policy which will cover these issues is proposed (Policy EN5 – Surface Water Management, water supply, foul drainage and Sustainable Drainage Systems).</p> <p>Policy does not require the landscape to be preserved but for landscaping to help preserve visual amenity.</p>	<p>Add reference in Policy EN10 supporting text to the role of Green Infrastructure in supporting ecosystems.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>Add new Policy EN5.</p> <p>No change.</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
<p>One developer comments that under i) landscaping, preservation is generally not possible and almost all development will cause visual change.</p> <p>Issues raised by Parish/Town Councils and Meetings include that paragraph 7.6 be added to the policy; the importance of masterplanning by SPDs for developments of more than 5 homes; the need for adequate drainage of paved and tarmacked areas; the need for parking to access services in a village; that low density developments are preferred and there should be a maximum height of new dwellings; that the policy requires an independent architectural review on every site of more than 25 dwellings.</p>	<p>The requirements of former paragraph 7.6 are already included by elements of the Policy. Masterplanning is not necessary for small scale development. The new design guide will be relevant to address many of these concerns and it would be appropriate for reference to be made to it in the Policy as well as Neighbourhood Plans.</p>	<p>Add reference in the Policy to the Design Guide and Neighbourhood Plans.</p>
<b>Policy RLP34 - Accessibility Standards (now Policy H7)</b>		
<p>A large majority agree with this policy.</p> <p>Developers have raised concerns about whether there is sufficient evidence or viability testing to support the requirement, that there should be some flexibility in relation to viability or heritage requirements and that there should be a third exception criterion to recognize that the requirement cannot be met for all 4 bed units.</p> <p>One Parish Council requests that the policy be applied to houses required for downsizing in rural villages of 2 and 3 bedroomed homes. One Parish Meeting questions why it not considered appropriate to include national space standards in the policy</p>	<p>The evidence to support the inclusion of this requirement is included in the SHMA Update (2019) and viability has been tested through the Whole Plan Viability Report.</p> <p>The application of this policy is not limited by house size. The application of the national space standards are optional and only where they can be justified by evidence of need. The Council considers that there is not sufficient evidence to support the requirement for internal space standards.</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change.</p>
<b>Policy RLP35 – Advertisements (now Policy EN16)</b>		
<p>A large majority agree with this policy. No specific comments were made.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<b>Policy RLP36 - Outdoor lighting (now Policy EN18)</b>		
<p>A large majority agree with this policy</p> <p>One parish meeting considers that a strategic policy statement is needed for the protection of dark skies and to prevent light pollution.</p>	<p>The policy is intended to retain dark skies and light pollution and reference is made under criterion a) to lighting avoiding pollution of the night sky. The prevention</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
<p>One respondent considers that the policy should be strengthened to avoid pollution of the night sky, and there should be similar provision in respect of other pollution.</p>	<p>of light pollution is also included under Policy EN3 (Delivering Good Design).</p> <p>Pollution control is also covered by Policy EN7.</p>	
<p><b>Policy RLP37 - Energy efficiency and low carbon energy generation (now Policy EN8 – Low Carbon Energy)</b></p>		
<p>Historic England raises concerns that the proposed areas for wind turbine developments are not based on robust evidence and could lead to pressure for developments that are likely to result in harm to Rutland’s heritage assets.</p> <p>Anglian Water Services is concerned that the policy does not cover renewable other than wind and recommends additional wording to state that all new housing developments will be encouraged to be energy efficient. It also suggests that all new non-domestic buildings should be encouraged to meet BREEAM design standards for energy efficiency.</p> <p>Anglian Water and Severn Trent propose that residential developments should be required to meet the optional higher water efficiency standard of 110 litres per occupier per day, as set out in Building Regulation part G2; Severn Trent recommends an approach of installing specifically designed water efficient fittings in all areas of the property rather than focus on the overall consumption of the property.</p> <p>Parish Councils and Meetings raise a number of concerns including that reference should be made to the Wind Turbines SPD and that a sister SPD is needed to cover applications for large solar farms; that an amendment to the map is needed so as not to give the impression that wind</p>	<p>The areas shown as being suitable for wind turbine developments are based on a Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity study which considered the suitability of the landscape to accommodate different heights and groupings of wind turbines.</p> <p>Policy EN8 states that wind turbines will only be permitted if impacts can be satisfactorily addressed. This includes impacts on heritage assets (Policy criterion 1i).</p> <p>Renewables other than wind are addressed in Part 2 of the Policy, which covers solar farms and other low carbon energy generating developments.</p> <p>Energy and water efficiency and meeting BREEAM design standards are now included in Policy EN4 (Sustainable Design and Construction).</p> <p>Reference is already made in the Policy supporting text to the Wind Turbines Supplementary Planning Document (2012). This also states that detailed guidance on other renewable energy developments may be provided through preparation of supplementary planning documents or by</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
<p>turbines can be built in the centre of villages and in private gardens;</p> <p>Other comments that solar farms and low carbon energy generation should not cause loss of biodiversity and should minimise impact on wildlife; that all new developments should be required to include PV Panels.</p>	<p>other means as appropriate. Guidance on large solar farms is included in the SPD.</p> <p>The map designation for wind turbines reflects the evidence included within the Rutland Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Study (Wind Turbines) and the SPD and should not be amended. Policy criteria provide sufficient protection against inappropriate wind turbine development within villages.</p> <p>Policy EN8 states that proposals for low carbon energy will only be permitted if impacts can be satisfactorily addressed. This includes impacts on the natural environment, which would include loss of biodiversity (Policy criterion 2c).</p> <p>A requirement to install PV Panels on all new developments would not be justified. However, through Policy EN4 the Plan does seek to require a high level of energy efficiency in all new developments.</p>	<p>No change</p>
<b>Policy RLP38 - The natural environment (now Policy EN9)</b>		
<p>The Environment Agency suggests additions to the policy to state that all developments should aim for net biodiversity gain; that habitat creation areas should be provided on-site; that blue infrastructure should be referenced alongside green infrastructure; that any loss of which should be resisted; an addition to the possible list of networks.</p> <p>Other issues raised include the suggestion for a biodiversity compensation system to compensate for biodiversity impact of new development; the need to protect species not protected by law and networks involving non-designated land; that more comprehensive policies are needed for the protection of the natural environment and limiting pollution and stronger protection for ancient and veteran trees; habitat creation should include planting of trees and woodland.</p>	<p>It is agreed that reference should also be made to Blue Infrastructure but this would be better made under Policy EN10.</p> <p>It is agreed that the Policy be amended to address the points made by the respondents.</p>	<p>Amend wording of Policy EN10 to address issues raised.</p>
<b>Policy RLP39 - Sites of biodiversity and geodiversity importance (now Policy EN9)</b>		

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
<p>One parish meeting considers that all developments whether protected or not require a measured impact assessment of the development. The Rutland Branch of the CPRE considers that c) should apply to all sites regardless of importance. The Woodland Trust requests that the policy should be amended to give stronger protection to ancient and veteran trees and reference to habitat creation to include planting of trees and woodland.</p>	<p>As there is some duplication between this Policy and Policy RLP38 it is proposed to combine the two policies.</p> <p>It is agreed that additional references to habitat creation and tree planting could be included in the new Policy.</p>	<p>Combine policies RLP38 and 39 into EN9.</p> <p>Add reference to habitat creation and tree planting.</p>
<b>Policy RLP40 - The historic and cultural environment (now Policy EN15)</b>		
<p>Historic England commented that the policy should be amended to be strategic in order to ensure soundness in accordance with the NPPF. It suggests that non-designated heritage assets and archaeology should be addressed within the supporting text; that “Historic assets” should be revised to read “heritage assets” and the last sentence could be reworded to read “where this does not harm their significance”.</p> <p>Other issues raised include the lack of reference or protection for public rights of way; the former Oakham to Melton canal and the site of the Battlefield of Losecoat Field; that clear guidance is needed to resist inappropriate development and that master planning and supplementary guidance is needed on historic/conservation areas.</p>	<p>It is agreed that the Policy should be more strategic in nature and to differentiate it from Policy RLP41 (now Policy EN15).</p> <p>These are very specific localised issues which would not be included in the Local Plan.</p>	<p>Amend Policy to address issues raised by Historic England.</p> <p>No change.</p>
<b>Policy RLP41 - Protecting heritage assets (now Policy EN16)</b>		
<p>Historic England commented that the policy should be amended to be strategic to ensure soundness in accordance with the NPPF. It questions whether a local list will be produced; and whether a specific shopfronts policy could be included;</p> <p>Parish Councils commented that reference to desk-top analysis should be removed and that the policy should include any development which is likely to have an impact on heritage assets, whether in conservation areas or not.</p>	<p>Given that Policy RLP40 (now Policy EN15) has been revised to be more strategic, it is considered the level of detail provided by this Policy to be appropriate.</p> <p>A specific shopfront policy is considered unnecessary as matters this is covered by other policies in the plan i.e. those related to design.</p> <p>Desk top analysis is consistent with the requirements of national policy.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
<p>Other issues raised include how the policies are to be enforced, the lack of clear guidance to resist inappropriate development and that master planning and supplementary guidance on historic/conservation areas are needed;</p>	<p>The policies of the Local Plan as a whole provide guidance on appropriate development. The other issues raised are not matters that would be included in the Local Plan.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p><b>Policy RLP42 - Green infrastructure, sport and recreation (now Policy EN10 – Blue and Green Infrastructure, Sport and Recreation Strategic Policy)</b></p>		
<p>The Environment Agency commented that all reference to Green Infrastructure should be altered to Blue and Green Infrastructure.</p> <p>Neighbouring authorities in Northamptonshire consider that it may be helpful to refer to the role of green infrastructure in delivering ecosystem services and that corridors of relevance to Rutland and North Northamptonshire could be identified and referenced in the Plan.</p> <p>Other comments include the lack of mention of bridleways, the needs of the horse-riding community and the former Oakham to Melton canal; that trees and woods could be incorporated as part of GI in new development.</p>	<p>Agree.</p> <p>It is agreed that reference to ecosystem services should be made.</p> <p>Reference is already made to public rights of way but it is agreed that bridleways could also be referenced.</p>	<p>Amend policy to also reference Blue Infrastructure.</p> <p>Add reference in supporting text to the role of Green Infrastructure in supporting ecosystems.</p> <p>Add reference to bridleways.</p>
<p><b>Policy RLP43 - Important open space and frontages (now Policy EN12)</b></p>		
<p>Barrowden Parish Council seeks for important open spaces in its village to be re-evaluated.</p> <p>One comment from a landowner disagrees with the designation of an area of important open space at Brooke Road, Oakham which it considers as being wholly inappropriate and unjustified.</p>	<p>This has been addressed through the preparation of the Barrowden and Wakerley Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>A new policy is proposed to provide a policy framework for the identification and designation of Local Green Spaces in Neighbourhood Plans.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p>Add new Local Green Space strategic policy.</p>
<p><b>Policy RLP44 - Provision of new open space (now Policy EN13)</b></p>		
<p>Sport England does not support the use of standards for outdoor sports and playing fields and sports halls and indoor sports facilities and is concerned that the playing pitch element of the Sport and Recreation Strategy has not</p>	<p>It is agreed to delete the standards for sports/recreational facilities from the Policy.</p>	<p>Delete reference to sports/recreational facilities standards.</p>



Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
<p>apparently been reviewed and that CIL will not deliver funding towards off-site sports provision.</p> <p>Other issues raised include whether the proposed standards for Sports Hall/Indoor Provision are per 1,000 population, whether existing facilities are sufficient and therefore what new open space is actually required and that trees and woods could be incorporated as part of GI in new development.</p>		
<b>Policy RLP45 - Landscape Character Impact (now Policy EN1)</b>		
<p>Two comments request that the last paragraph of the policy be strengthened to require that a landscape impact assessment be undertaken and comply with the agreed measures.</p>	<p>This paragraph has been deleted as the issues covered are dealt with by Policy MIN4 – Development Criteria for Mineral Extraction.</p>	<p>No change in response to comment.</p>
<b>Policy RLP46 - Spatial strategy for minerals development (now Policy MIN1)</b>		
<p>There was a high degree of support overall (76%) for Policy RLP46.</p> <p>Of the respondents who disagreed with the policy, an individual comment was made that local impact had not been considered or existing local concerns addressed.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The policy intent is to provide guidance regarding where, in the future, such development would be preferred. Local impacts and potentially adverse impacts that may arise from any site specific proposals will be assessed through the planning application process and against the requirements of Policy MIN4.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<b>Policy RLP 47 - Mineral provision (now Policy MIN2)</b>		
<p>The majority of respondents agreed (71%) with Policy RLP47.</p> <p>Of the respondents who disagreed with the policy, an individual comment was made that local impact had not been considered or existing local concerns addressed.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The policy intent is to provide guidance regarding the quantum of minerals to be provided to support sustainable growth over the plan period. Local impacts and potentially adverse impacts that may arise from any site specific proposals will be assessed through the planning application process and against the requirements of Policy MIN4.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<b>Policy RLP48 - Safeguarding Rutland's Mineral Resources (now Policy MIN3)</b>		

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
<p>There was a high degree of support overall (83%) for Policy RLP48.</p> <p>Of the respondents who disagreed with the policy, an individual comment was made that local impact had not been considered or existing local concerns addressed.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The identification of MSAs does not create a presumption that mineral resources will be worked. Where non-mineral development is proposed within an MSA and prior extraction is proposed (and determined as practicable) the environmental feasibility and potentially adverse impacts, including local impacts, will be taken into account as appropriate.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<b>Policy RLP49 - Development criteria for mineral extraction (now Policy MIN4)</b>		
<p>The majority of respondents agreed (68%) with the proposed development criteria for mineral extraction set out through Policy RLP49 including parish/town councils, agents, landowner, developers and the public.</p> <p>Historic England considers that the policy would be strengthened by the addition of the words “heritage assets and their settings”.</p> <p>Of the respondents who disagreed with the policy, one parish council suggested specific reference to adverse impacts of additional HGV traffic in the development criteria for minerals extraction, and one organisation suggested that specific mention of the adverse impacts of HGV traffic in connection with mineral extraction should be made including dust generation and quarry slurry.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the plan is to be read as a whole and so suggestions for inclusion of text regarding historic environment, HGV traffic, dust and quarry slurry are not considered necessary as these matters are covered under separate policy(ies) covering such matters and/or are captured under point 8 of the policy “environmentally acceptable and avoids and/or minimises potentially adverse impacts (including cumulative impacts) to acceptable levels”.</p> <p>Specifically regarding the comment of Historic England, the NPPF (Section 17 – Facilitating the Sustainable Use of Minerals) uses the term “historic environment”.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<b>Policy RLP50 - Site-specific allocations for the extraction of crushed rock (now Policy MIN5)</b>		
M4a Greetham Quarry North West extension		
<p>Half of respondents agreed with Policy RLP50 including parish/town councils, agents, landowner, developers and the public.</p> <p>DLP Planning on behalf of the client promoting the adjacent site for mixed used development (RLP19 GRE/01) commented that they support the site M4a.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
<p>Of the half of the respondents who disagreed with Policy RLP50 a number of responses (15) were made by the public and a local business highlighting concerns about the site including: the closeness of the site to Greetham village, visual, noise and environmental impacts of quarrying, HGV traffic movements through the village, health risks associated with dust production and the effects of blasting on properties.</p> <p>It was highlighted that there is currently a degree of separation between Greetham Quarry and houses in the village but that the extension to the quarry would be nearer to housing and the community centre. A request was made for traffic and transport modelling at the pre-application stage.</p> <p>An individual comment was made that the proposed developments RLP12 GRE/01(A) and RLP19 GRE/01 would be incompatible with the adjacent site M4a due to likelihood of noise, dust, access and traffic issues.</p>	<p>Factors such as potentially adverse impacts on the natural and historic environment, environmental nuisance and general amenity have been given due consideration as per the site assessment methodology.</p> <p>As above, proximity to sensitive receptors is addressed in the site assessment. Where the proposed development has increased transport/traffic implications a Transport Assessment is required to accompany the planning application. Such detailed modelling is not considered proportionate to the plan-making process.</p> <p>Site-specific investigations would be required to support any planning application with suitable avoidance and/or mitigation measures proposed to avoid, reduce and manage potentially adverse impacts. Potential adverse impacts, including land use compatibility, noise, dust, access and traffic issues are addressed in the site assessment.</p>	
<b>Policy RLP51 - Site-specific allocations for the extraction of building stone (now MIN6)</b>		
M5a Hooby Lane Quarry extension		
<p>The majority of respondents (74%) support Policy RLP51 including agents, landowners, parish/town councils, developers and the public.</p> <p>Of the respondents who disagreed with the policy, an individual comment was made that local impact had not been considered or existing local concerns addressed.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Factors such as potentially adverse impacts on the surrounding area and general amenity have been given due consideration as per the site assessment methodology.</p>	No change.
<b>Policy RLP52 - Safeguarding of minerals development (now Policy MIN7)</b>		
There was a high degree of support overall (78%) for Policy RLP528.	Noted.	No change.

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
Of the respondents who disagreed with the policy, an individual comment was made that local impact had not been considered or existing local concerns addressed.	It is not clear how this response applies to this specific policy as the policy intent is to safeguard development and reduce potential for land use conflict and adverse impacts.	
<b>Policy RLP53 - Borrow Pits (now Policy MIN8)</b>		
<p>There was a high degree of support overall (76%) for Policy RLP53.</p> <p>Of the respondents who disagreed with the policy, an individual comment was made that local impact had not been considered or existing local concerns addressed.</p> <p>Another respondent felt that the policies do not go far enough to support Borrow Pits.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Should any proposals for development of a borrow pit come forward due regard will be given to potential adverse impacts through the planning application process in line with the plans policies.</p> <p>The policy enables borrow pits where considered suitable and is considered to provide adequate support, no detail has been given on how the policy could further support borrow pits.</p>	No change.
<b>Policy RLP54 - Development criteria for other forms of minerals development (now MIN9)</b>		
<p>The majority of respondents (73%) agreed with the policy including agents, landowners, parish councils and the public.</p> <p>Concern was raised that there was not sufficient evidence provided to allow such a wide ranging policy (which was stated by a respondent to lack detail) to be adopted without such evidence being first provided.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>It should be noted that the plan is to be read as a whole and so this policy should be taken in view of other policies in the plan regarding natural environment, amenity, transport, heritage assets, etc. Local circumstances have not indicated a need for a more detailed policy addressing other forms of minerals development (e.g. rail links to quarries, etc.) and so this more general policy which supports development yet seeks to ensure that potential adverse impacts are avoided and/or minimised to acceptable levels is considered adequate.</p>	No change.
<b>Policy RLP55 - Waste management and disposal (now Policy WST1)</b>		
The majority of respondents (81%) support Policy RLP55 including parish/town councils, agents, landowner, developers and the public.	Noted.	

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
<p>The suggestion was made that a third civic amenity site near Oakham be brought forward at an early date and included as a specific site in the local plan.</p> <p>One organisation commented that there is no mention of increased sewage disposal capacity to cover the proposed housing developments and questioned whether Rutland's Management Plan justifies the figures quoted.</p>	<p>A decision has not yet been made regarding future civic amenity site provision.</p> <p>Proposals for increased sewage and waste water treatment capacity would be expected to comply with Policy RLP55 regarding the spatial strategy, further clarification could be provided through Policy RLP56 (now Policy WST2). The waste needs assessment sets out the justification for figures stated in Policy RLP55.</p>	<p>Add new bullet point to Policy WST2 to read: 'g) specific to proposals for extensions to existing sewage treatment works (STWs) or new STWs, the increased capacity is required to support sustainable development, operations do not have unacceptable impacts and the scale of development reflects the role of the location with respect to the settlement hierarchy'</p>
<b>Policy RLP56 - Waste-related development (now Policy WST2)</b>		
<p>The majority of respondents (91%) support Policy RLP56 including parish/town councils, agents, landowner, developers and the public.</p> <p>Historic England suggested that it would be helpful to replace the words "historic environment" with "heritage assets and their settings" to ensure compliance with the NPPF.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The use of the term historic environment is consistent with the NPPF (Section 17 – Facilitating the Sustainable Use of Minerals).</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<b>Policy RLP57 - Sites for waste management and disposal (now Policy WST3)</b>		
<p>Overall, the majority of respondents support the sites identified through Policy RLP57, with support for individual sites of 87% (W1), 62% (W2) and 75% (W3).</p>		
W1 - Cottesmore, Burley Road		
No specific comments received.	Noted.	No change.
W2 - Greetham, Wood Lane		

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
<p>A range of concerns were raised by individual responses including that environmental health and traffic increase would be unmanageable and unacceptable; visual landscape and environmental impacts; requests for traffic and transport modelling, and that the neighbourhood plan should be heeded.</p>	<p>Factors such as potentially adverse impacts on the surrounding area and general amenity have been given due consideration as per the site assessment methodology. Any proposal coming forward on the site would be assessed through the planning application process and would be required to demonstrate that adverse impacts could be avoided and/or minimised to acceptable levels.</p> <p>It should be noted that this site is carried over from the adopted statutory plan (Site Allocation and Policies DPD Policy SP4 ref W2) adopted October 2013.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>W3 - Ketton, Ketco Avenue</p> <p>Ketton Parish Council is concerned that the site appears to go through/include an SSSI and that the proposed area for the deposition of inert waste should be reduced to exclude the SSSI; questions the implications in terms of the original planning permissions granted for the restoration and landscaping of the excavated quarry that did not include any waste disposal and how waste will be brought to the quarry; suggests by rail only, to minimise the impact on the roads through the village; questions what measures would be put in place to minimise dust and noise disturbance in the village, given that the proposed Empingham Road housing development will be adjacent to the quarry.</p> <p>A range of concerns were raised including that inert waste disposal could substantially increase HGV traffic on the A6121 which must be minimised and rail delivery required/enforced; that waste disposal was not permitted as part of the original planning application, only restoration; that the boundary of the SSSI needs amending; that local impact have not been considered and existing local concerns not addressed.</p>	<p>It should be noted that this site is carried over from the adopted statutory plan (Site Allocation and Policies DPD Policy SP4 ref W3).</p> <p>The presence of, and need to protect, the SSSI is acknowledged in paragraph 9.95 and the site assessment.</p> <p>The waste disposal referred to is connected to restoration of the sites – the plan text will be amended to reflect that this may also include recovery operations.</p> <p>Factors such as potentially adverse impacts on the surrounding area and general amenity have been given due consideration as per the site assessment methodology. Any proposal coming forward on the site would be assessed through the planning application process and would be required to demonstrate that adverse impacts could be avoided and/or minimised to acceptable levels, in addition transport impacts would be assessed through a TA accompanying the planning application.</p>	<p>In paragraphs 9.84 and 9.95 and Policies WST1 and WST3 delete “disposal of inert waste” / “inert disposal”, and amend to read “deposit of inert waste to land” / “inert disposal/recovery” as appropriate.</p>
<p><b>Policy RLP58 - Restoration and aftercare (now MIN10)</b></p>		
<p>The majority of respondents (92%) support policy RLP56 including parish/town councils, agents, landowner, developers and the public.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
Comments received raised concerns regarding compatibility of RLP58 and the Greetham Quarry proposed land allocation for mixed development shown in RLP12 (item 13).	The Policy allows for consideration of local needs and economic development, as such this policy and proposed land allocation are not considered contradictory.	
<b>Implementation and monitoring framework</b>		
One interest group suggested that there should be a policy setting out actions to be taken to readdress shortfalls in compliance with policies.	<p>The implementation and monitoring chapter has been expanded to set out the actions the Council will take in the event that annual monitoring indicates that housing delivery or other aspects of the Plans policies are not being met.</p> <p>It should also be recognised that there is now a requirement to undertake a review of Local Plans at least once every five years to determine whether a Plan requires to be updated.</p>	No change.
<b>Appendix 1 – List of strategic policies</b>		
A number of respondents considered that too many of the Plan’s policies had been identified as strategic.	Comments noted. Those policies that are considered to be strategic have been reviewed and as a consequence there are fewer policies identified as being strategic.	Appendix to be updated
<b>Appendix 2 – List of replaced local plan policies</b>		
Majority of respondents agree with this appendix.	Noted.	No change.
<b>Appendix 3 – Local plan evidence base studies</b>		
<p>Majority disagree with this appendix.</p> <p>One Parish Meeting considers that several of the studies are too out of date to be relevant and that studies are needed in relation to local infrastructure and transport plans, waste management, St George’s Barracks and the impacts of major developments in surrounding counties.</p> <p>Rutland Branch of CPRE also considers that the Strategic Transport Assessment and the Parking Sufficiency Studies for Oakham and Uppingham dated 2010 are out of date and points out there is no Infrastructure Study of development in surrounding counties.</p> <p>The Oakham Neighbourhood Plan Group considers that the Oakham and Barleythorpe Neighbourhood Plan Big Survey should form part of the Local Plan evidence base.</p>	<p>Some of the studies listed were carried out for the previous version of the local plan but are still considered to be relevant and are listed in the Local Plan for completeness.</p> <p>An IDP has been developed and will be published as supporting evidence alongside the Regulation 19 Local Plan. More evidence based work will be carried out to support the plan’s preparation in relation to the St Georges Barracks and land in Rutland on the edge of Stamford. These will be form part of the evidence base and will be listed in the Appendix as appropriate.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan Big Survey was carried out for the purposes of the Oakham Neighbourhood Plan and does not form part of the evidence base for the local plan.</p>	Appendix has been removed as all relevant and up-to-date evidence will be published on the website as part of the Local Plan review process

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
	However the Neighbourhood Plan group has pointed out where the views expressed in the survey are relevant to the local plan and these have been considered.	
<b>Appendix 4 – Agricultural, forestry and other occupational dwellings</b>		
No specific comments received.	The appendix will be updated to reflect current national planning guidance as set out in the NPPF (2019).	Update Appendix.
<b>Appendix 5 – Parking standards</b>		
<p>Comments from developers include that the number of communal car parking spaces required is excessive and unjustified and could be misconstrued to read that the requirement is for both shared communal spaces and allocated spaces; that the use of number of habitable rooms over number of bedrooms in determining parking space numbers should also be altered to ensure clarity and transparency.</p> <p>Comments from Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups include that the minimum number of parking spaces be increased with five and six rooms requiring 3 spaces and seven rooms and above requiring 4 spaces; that no off-road parking be allowed arising from new developments in villages with narrow roads and no footways; that the standards for residential parking are not practical; that minimum standards for disabled parking should be increased;</p> <p>Other comments raise concerns about parking on the roads on all new development sites built within Oakham in the last 4 years and that the current parking provisions are not adequate; that parking standards in Whissendine are appalling.</p>	<p>Comments noted, however, no changes are proposed.</p> <p>The parking standards are set by the number of rooms in a dwelling and a definition of ‘room’ is included in the appendix.</p>	No changes.
<b>Appendix 6 – Areas of biodiversity and geodiversity importance</b>		
<p>One Parish Council proposes two new ‘Areas of Local Importance’ in its village.</p> <p>Comment that the verges and landscape are omitted from the Appendix 6.</p>	Noted, however, the process for identify Areas of Local Importance is separate to that of preparing the Local Plan.	This appendix has been deleted.



Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
	Noted, all designated sites have been updated on the policies map	
<b>Appendix 7 – Designated heritage assets in Rutland</b>		
No specific comments received.	n/a	n/a
<b>Appendix 8 – Open space standards</b>		
No specific comments received.	n/a	n/a
<b>Appendix 9 – Permitted sites for minerals extraction and recycled aggregates</b>		
<p>The majority of respondents (61%) agreed with Appendix 9 including a developer, parish council and the public. Of those who disagreed, a comment was made that local impact had not been considered or existing local concerns addressed.</p> <p>One response considers that more clarity is required in respect of the impact of blasting on nearby properties at Greetham Quarry and the blighting effect on the use of Great Lane by walkers, dog walkers, horse and bicycle riders.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Potentially adverse impacts are addressed through the site assessments, site-specific studies would be required as part of the development assessment process when the proposal comes forward. At this stage such detailed assessments are not proportionate.</p>	No change.
<b>Appendix 10 – Waste management needs</b>		
<p>The majority of respondents (81%) agreed with Appendix 10, including a developer, parish council and the public.</p> <p>Of the three respondents that disagreed, a comment was made that local impact has not been considered or local concerns addressed.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>It is not clear how this comment relates to the waste needs assessment.</p>	No change.
<b>Appendix 11 – Glossary</b>		
No specific comments received.	Glossary will be updated as appropriate	Glossary to be updated as appropriate

## Rutland Local Plan Review

### Consultation on Draft Local Plan – Comments on Proposed Allocated Housing Sites Schedule of Main Issues Raised, Officer Responses and Proposed Changes

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
<p><b>Cottesmore</b></p>		
<p><u>COT13 – Land north of Mill Lane</u></p> <p>The site promoters support the allocation of the site considering it to be well related to the built up area of the village. However, they suggest the capacity of the site could be increased to closer to 110 dwellings.</p> <p>Historic England refers to the fact the site is adjacent the Conservation Area. Leicester and Rutland Environmental Records Centre (ERC) refer to evidence of ridge and furrow on the site.</p> <p>The Parish Council are concerned that the site has not been included in any previous sites documents and that the site is larger than that needed to accommodate 60 dwellings. Also concerned that site would extend village form, distant from services and facilities, access is opposite the school, history of flooding on the site and impact of development on drainage capacity.</p> <p>Other issues raised include: scale of development not referred to in Neighbourhood Plan, beyond permitted development line, no local employment necessitating need for residents to travel for employment, good quality agricultural land, lack of or capacity of local infrastructure including school, traffic congestion on Mill Lane, site is greenfield and brownfield sites should be used first, impact on wildlife, development of other sites in Parish would negate need for development of this site.</p>	<p>Following a reassessment of all sites the Council has identified sufficient deliverable and developable housing sites to meet the housing requirement and, as such, does not consider the allocation of this site, which does not compare as favourably to other sites assessed, is needed.</p>	<p>The site not be included in the Regulation 19 Local Plan as a housing allocation.</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
<b>Edith Weston</b>		
<p><u>EDI02(A) – The Yews, Well Cross</u></p> <p>Historic England object to the loss of an important open space within the Conservation Area and harm to other heritage assets.</p> <p>Leicester and Rutland ERC have indicated any planning application would need to be supported by a survey and that mitigation would possibly be needed.</p>	<p>Following a reassessment of all sites the Council has identified sufficient deliverable and developable housing sites to meet the housing requirement and, as such, does not consider the allocation of this site, which does not compare as favourably to other sites assessed, is needed.</p>	<p>The site not be included in the Regulation 19 Local Plan as a housing allocation.</p>
<b>Empingham</b>		
<p><u>EMP01(A) – West of 17 Whitwell Road</u></p> <p>The Parish Council query whether appropriate employment opportunities are included.</p>	<p>This is a small site that would represent a sustainable extension to the village with no adverse impact.</p> <p>Employment provision is made through the proposed allocation of St George’s Barracks.</p>	<p>No change – the site be allocated for housing in the Regulation 19 Local Plan.</p>
<b>Greetham</b>		
<p><u>GRE01(A) – Part of Greetham Quarry, Stretton Road (mixed use)</u></p> <p>Leicester and Rutland ERC have highlighted the site may be of geological value and a Phase 1 habitat survey would be required.</p>	<p>Following a reassessment of all sites the Council has identified sufficient deliverable and developable housing sites to meet the housing requirement and, as such, does</p>	<p>The site not be included in the Regulation 19 Local Plan as a housing allocation.</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
<p>Site also provides rare opportunity to create priority BAP habitat (limestone grassland).</p> <p>The site promoters indicate a Phase 1 habitat survey has been undertaken and no reptiles, badgers or bats were found to be present. They consider the site to be attractive and deliverable for a range of employment uses including B8 use class as part of mixed use development together with complementary non-B class uses supporting principal uses. Undevelopable area should be used to enhance ecological value of site. Range of alternative means of access to minimise any adverse impacts on village.</p> <p>Greetham Parish Council are concerned over the loss of recreational/open space land in accordance with restoration plan following mineral extraction and query whether land is available as believe there are circumstances where ownership reverts to person who owned land before mineral extracted. Also concerned that development would be affected by dust and noise from quarry blasting, flooding, size of development, lack of infrastructure and services/facilities (school and medical centre) in village, limited bus service.</p> <p>Other issues raised include: narrow roads through village, capacity of sewerage system, amount of development already taken place in village, impact on local community, Neighbourhood Plan does not support this type of development and limited local facilities.</p>	<p>not consider the allocation of this site, which does not compare as favourably to other sites assessed, is needed.</p>	
<p><u>GRE02 – Land south of Oakham Road</u></p> <p>Greetham Parish Council raise issue that as the development is within Cottesmore Parish, CIL and precept monies raised will go to Cottesmore and residents will be represented by Cottesmore PC rather than Greetham PC. Also concerned over size of development.</p> <p>Cottesmore Parish Council consider that as site is within Parish the number of dwellings should be counted towards the Cottesmore figure.</p> <p>Other issues raised include: contradicts Neighbourhood Plan policies, narrow roads through village, capacity of sewerage</p>	<p>Following a reassessment of all sites the Council has identified sufficient deliverable and developable housing sites to meet the housing requirement and, as such, does not consider the allocation of this site, which does not compare as favourably to other sites assessed, is needed.</p>	<p>The site not be included in the Regulation 19 Local Plan as a housing allocation.</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
<p>system, amount of development already taken place in village, visual and environmental impacts, increase in flood risk and lack of infrastructure capacity.</p>		
<b>Ketton</b>		
<p><u>KET02 – Land adjacent Empingham Road</u></p> <p>Ketton Parish Council raise the issue of poor visibility onto Empingham Road and suggest access should be through Wootton Close instead.</p> <p>Other issues raised include: scale of development is excessive, proportionally site allocations in Ketton are higher than other Local Service Centres, capacity of local infrastructure and services/facilities, increase in traffic through the village and impact of this on air quality.</p>	<p>Following a reassessment of all the sites the Council has identified sufficient deliverable and developable housing sites to meet the housing requirement and, as such, does not consider the allocation of this site, which does not compare as favourably to other sites assessed, is needed.</p>	<p>The site not be included in the Regulation 19 Local Plan as a housing allocation.</p>
<p><u>KET03 (A) – Land west of Timbergate Road</u></p> <p>The promoters of the site consider the site to be suitable and deliverable. Technical work undertaken and site not subject to any overriding constraints.</p> <p>Ketton Parish Council suggest children’s open space should be designated for new school site. Raise consider impact of traffic on High Street/Empingham Road needs to be assessed and managed.</p> <p>Other issues raised include: capacity of local infrastructure and services/facilities, scale of development is excessive and proportionally site allocations in Ketton are higher than other Local Service Centres</p>	<p>Following a reassessment of all sites the Council has identified sufficient deliverable and developable housing sites to meet the housing requirement and, as such, does not consider the allocation of this site, which does not compare as favourably to other sites assessed, is needed.</p>	<p>The site not be included in the Regulation 19 Local Plan as a housing allocation.</p>
<b>Market Overton</b>		
<p><u>MAR04 – Main Street</u></p> <p>Issues raised include: site is outside Planned Limits of Development, need for number of dwellings proposed not proved, lack of or limited capacity in infrastructure and services/facilities in village, traffic impact on local roads particularly Bowling Green</p>	<p>It is considered that the comments made have not raised any new matters that would indicate the site should not be taken forward into the Regulation 19 Local Plan as a proposed allocation.</p>	<p>That a reduced site be allocated for housing in the Regulation 19 Local Plan.</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
<p>Lane, any housing should be spread over several sites and impact on heritage assets (Conservation Area).</p>	<p>As set out in the evidence base, many sites have been considered through the site selection process. Sites proposed for allocation are considered to offer the greatest sustainability benefits and considerations such as the scale of development, access, and impacts on highways, landscape, ecology, heritage assets and flooding have been taken into account during the site assessment process.</p> <p>Potential adverse impacts of development of the site have been considered through the site assessment process. Where potential adverse impacts have been identified, it is considered that these are not insurmountable and could potentially be mitigated. Further assessment of these issues will be undertaken as part of the planning application process if required at this stage.</p> <p>However, having reassessed the site it is considered that the site area be reduced and only the southern part of the site should be allocated.</p>	
<b>Oakham</b>		
<p><u>OAK04 – Land at Brooke Road</u></p> <p>The Environment Agency have commented on the lack of capacity at the waste water treatment works and impact on water quality compliance with Water Framework Directive. Need to clarify how this will be addressed as may impact on timing and phasing of development.</p> <p>The site promoters support the allocation of the site but consider that 139 dwellings should be the minimum capacity of the site. Suggest density of 30-35 dwellings would be appropriate, which would increase site yield to between 150-175 dwellings. Technical evidence to support allocation undertaken demonstrates that whilst level crossing disrupts flow of traffic, local road network operates within capacity and additional traffic will not detrimentally impact journey times. Additional land adjacent site available and larger allocation would provide potential for increased infrastructure to address local needs.</p>	<p>Following a reassessment of all the sites the Council has identified sufficient deliverable and developable housing sites to meet the housing requirement and, as such, does not consider the allocation of this site, which does not compare as favourably to other sites assessed, is needed.</p>	<p>The site not be included in the Regulation 19 Local Plan as a housing allocation.</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
<p>The promoter of an alternative site (BAE02) considers that it should be reassessed and allocated for development.</p> <p>Other issues raised include: additional traffic exacerbating the issues surrounding the Brooke Road rail crossing, improvements to operation of crossing should be undertaken before further development considered, lack of capacity in local infrastructure and services/facilities, access to site should be from Uppingham Road, increased traffic generally on local road network, limited employment opportunities and loss of agricultural land.</p>		
<p><u>OAK05 – Land off Uppingham Road</u></p> <p>The promoter of an alternative site (BAE02) considers that it should be reassessed and allocated for development.</p> <p>Other issues raised include: illogical extension to settlement placing pressure on surrounding land as location for future development, significant distance from services/facilities, impact on rural character of approach to town and lack of capacity in services/facilities.</p>	<p>It is considered that the comments made have not raised any new matters that would indicate the site should not be taken forward into the Regulation 19 Local Plan as a proposed allocation.</p> <p>As set out in the evidence base, many sites have been considered through the site selection process. Sites proposed for allocation are considered to offer the greatest sustainability benefits and considerations such as the scale of development, access, and impacts on highways, landscape, ecology, heritage assets and flooding have been taken into account during the site assessment process.</p> <p>Potential adverse impacts of development of the site have been considered through the site assessment process. Where potential adverse impacts have been identified, it is considered that these are not insurmountable and could potentially be mitigated. Further assessment of these issues will be undertaken as part of the planning application process if required at this stage.</p>	<p>No change – the site be allocated for housing in the Regulation 19 Local Plan.</p>
<p><u>OAK08(A) – Land at Stamford Road and Uppingham Road</u></p> <p>Historic England have commented on the potential for harm as this a key approach to the conservation area and the impact on other heritage assets.</p>	<p>Following a reassessment of all sites the Council has identified sufficient deliverable and developable housing sites to meet the housing requirement and, as such, does</p>	<p>The site not be included in the Regulation 19 Local Plan as a housing allocation.</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
<p>The promoter of the site supports the allocation as it is immediately available and there are no constraints to development. Suggests that the remaining part of the land holding should also be considered for allocation, has capacity for up to 200 dwellings. Consider the site to be visually well contained, not subject to any statutory designations and development would have limited impact on conservation area.</p> <p>The promoter of an alternative site (BAE02) considers that it should be reassessed and allocated for development.</p> <p>Other issues objecting to the site include: impact on rural character of approach to the town, lack of capacity in services/facilities, impact of additional traffic on local road network and impact on heritage assets.</p>	<p>not consider the allocation of this site, which does not compare as favourably to other sites assessed, is needed.</p>	
<p><u>OAK13 – Land off Burley Road</u></p> <p>Historic England indicate that a high level assessment would be required to consider the impact of development on the Burley Park Registered Park and Garden and other heritage assets.</p> <p>The promoter of an alternative site (BAE02) considers that it should be reassessed and allocated for development.</p> <p>The promoter of an alternative site considers that development here will place significant pressure on the surrounding land to be released for development.</p> <p>Other issues objecting to the site include: other preferable and suitable sites available for development, breaching the bypass sets precedent for future development, flooding, greenfield site and brownfield sites should be given preference, impact on wildlife, of development on existing property and question if there will be safe access into Oakham.</p>	<p>It is considered that the comments made have not raised any new matters that would indicate the site should not be taken forward into the Regulation 19 Local Plan as a proposed allocation.</p> <p>As set out in the evidence base, many sites have been considered through the site selection process. Sites proposed for allocation are considered to offer the greatest sustainability benefits and considerations such as the scale of development, access, and impacts on highways, landscape, ecology, heritage assets and flooding have been taken into account during the site assessment process.</p> <p>Potential adverse impacts of development of the site have been considered through the site assessment process. Where potential adverse impacts have been identified, it is considered that these are not insurmountable and could potentially be mitigated. Further assessment of these issues will be undertaken as part of the planning application process if required at this stage.</p>	<p>That a reduced site be allocated for housing in the Regulation 19 Local Plan.</p>



Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
	<p>However, having reassessed the site it is considered that the site area be reduced and only the north-western part of the site should be allocated.</p>	
<b>Ryhall</b>		
<p><u>RYH04 – River Gwash Trout Farm, Belmsthorpe Road</u></p> <p>The Environment Agency have commented on the lack of capacity at the waste water treatment works and impact on water quality compliance with Water Framework Directive. Need to clarify how this will be addressed as may impact on timing and phasing of development.</p> <p>Ryhall Parish Council consider that housing provided should be starter homes or 2/3 bedroom so that it is available to young people and those on lower incomes/</p> <p>Other issues raised include: flooding, narrow width of road between Belmsthorpe and Ryhall, loss of agricultural land, size of development would not allow for suitable buffer along river, impact on view from Tollesthorpe Road across A6121 towards Belmsthorpe and site was once a rubbish pit.</p>	<p>As set out in the evidence base, many sites have been considered through the site selection process. Sites proposed for allocation are considered to offer the greatest sustainability benefits and considerations such as the scale of development, access, and impacts on highways landscape, ecology, heritage assets and flooding have been taken into account during the site assessment process.</p> <p>Potential adverse impacts of development of the site have been considered through the site assessment process. Where potential adverse impacts have been identified, it is considered that these are not insurmountable and could potentially be mitigated. Further assessment of these issues will be undertaken as part of the planning application process if required at this stage.</p>	<p>No change – allocate site for housing in Regulation 19 Local Plan, in combination with site RYH08.</p>
<p><u>RYH06(A) – Between Meadow Land and Belmsthorpe Road</u></p> <p>Historic England comment that the site is of potential archaeological interest.</p> <p>Ryhall Parish Council comment that the site has previously been declared an Area of Local Landscape Value. Other concerns are loss of agricultural land, site forms part of rural aspect along A6121 acting as gateway to village, site within the flood plain, increased traffic generation, ignores two previous Inspector decisions and there are other more suitable sites.</p> <p>Other issues raised include: lack of infrastructure, poor site access, scale of development is out of proportion with village, public footpath crosses the site, impact on wildlife.</p>	<p>The Council has identified sufficient deliverable and developable housing sites to meet the housing requirement and, as such, does not consider the allocation of this site, which does not compare as favourably to other sites assessed, is needed.</p>	<p>The site not be included in the Regulation 19 Local Plan as a housing allocation.</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
<p>One respondent suggested that a developing a smaller part of the site (northern part) might be acceptable.</p>		
<b>Uppingham</b>		
<p><u>UPP04 – South of Leicester Road</u></p> <p>Historic England have indicated that there is the potential for harm to the Castle Hill Scheduled Monument.</p> <p>The site promoters support the proposed allocation of the site as contributing to meeting the housing requirement for the extended plan period. The site is in a sustainable location, within walking/cycling distance of services and facilities and on a bus route.</p> <p>Uppingham Town Council supports the allocation.</p>	<p>As Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan Group have indicated the intention to make allocations through a review of the Neighbourhood Plan, the Local Plan will not be making any allocations in Uppingham.</p>	<p>The site not be included in the Regulation 19 Local Plan as a Housing allocation.</p>
<p><u>UPP05(A) – Land off Ayster Road</u></p> <p>Uppingham Town Council does not support the allocation of this site without it being demonstrated that safe access to the site can be achieved and there is no adverse impact on the local employment site opposite. Also townscape impacts on northern entrance to town and outside of permitted area of development to the north.</p> <p>Other issues raised include: ignores the Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan, access to site is dangerous, lead to ribbon development along the A47, increased traffic congestion</p>	<p>As Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan Group have indicated the intention to make allocations through a review of the Neighbourhood Plan, the Local Plan will not be making any allocations in Uppingham.</p>	<p>The site not be included in the Regulation 19 Local Plan as a Housing allocation.</p>
<p><u>UPP06(A) – Land off Leicester Road</u></p> <p>Historic England have commented that the site is within an area of ridge and furrow.</p> <p>Leicester and Rutland ERC comment that the site has potential for species rich grassland and protected species are present on</p>	<p>As Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan Group have indicated the intention to make allocations through a review of the Neighbourhood Plan, the Local Plan will not be making any allocations in Uppingham.</p>	<p>The site not be included in the Regulation 19 Local Plan as a Housing allocation.</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
<p>site or in close proximity. Phase 1 habitat survey should be undertaken.</p> <p>Uppingham Town Council supports the allocation.</p> <p>Issues raised objecting to the site include: impact on heritage assets and rural character of settlement setting.</p>		
<p><u>UPP08 – Land north of Leicester Road</u></p> <p>Uppingham Town Council supports the allocation.</p> <p>Issues raised objecting to the site include: loss of open space, need to reduce site in south east corner to protect likely line of Uppingham bypass and impact on rural character of settlement setting.</p>	<p>As Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan Group have indicated the intention to make allocations through a review of the Neighbourhood Plan, the Local Plan will not be making any allocations in Uppingham.</p>	<p>The site not be included in the Regulation 19 Local Plan as a Housing allocation.</p>
<p><u>UPP11 – Land south off Leicester Road</u></p> <p>Uppingham Town Council supports the allocation.</p> <p>Issues objecting to site include: loss of open space.</p>	<p>As Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan Group have indicated the intention to make allocations through a review of the Neighbourhood Plan, the Local Plan will not be making any allocations in Uppingham.</p>	<p>The site not be included in the Regulation 19 Local Plan as a housing allocation.</p>
<p><b>Whissendine</b></p>		
<p><u>WHI06 – Land off Melton Road</u></p> <p>The promoters of the site support the allocation and indicate that additional land is available.</p> <p>Whissendine Parish Council are concerned over the potential loss of an area of historic interest and request that an archaeological survey be undertaken.</p> <p>The provision of affordable housing as part of the development is supported by a number of the respondents.</p> <p>Main issues raised objecting to the site include: impact of traffic on Main Street, adverse impact on the setting of the Grade II windmill, impact on operation of the windmill, scale of</p>	<p>It is considered that the comments made have not raised any new matters that would indicate the site should not be taken forward into the Regulation 19 Local Plan as a proposed allocation.</p> <p>As set out in the evidence base, many sites have been considered through the site selection process. Sites proposed for allocation are considered to offer the greatest sustainability benefits and considerations such as the scale of development, access, and impacts on highways landscape, ecology, heritage assets and flooding have been taken into account during the site assessment process.</p>	<p>That a reduced site be allocated for housing in the Regulation 19 Local Plan.</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
<p>development is excessive for the village, lack of capacity in infrastructure including drainage system, no capacity in school, no local employment opportunities, roads are narrow and not suitable for additional traffic, flood risk, greenfield site and loss of agricultural land.</p>	<p>Potential adverse impacts of development of the site have been considered through the site assessment process. Where potential adverse impacts have been identified, it is considered that these are not insurmountable and could potentially be mitigated.</p> <p>Development has the potential to impact on the significance on the listed building. However, it is considered the impact on the significance of the listed building could be mitigated through reducing the site area and through sensitive development design and layout. Matters relating to how a site may be developed will be reflected in the site guidelines included in the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan.</p>	
<p><u>WHI09(A) – South Lodge Farm</u></p> <p>Whissendine Parish Council are concerned over the potential loss of an area of historic interest and request that an archaeological survey be undertaken.</p> <p>Leicester and Rutland ERC have indicated that there is the potential for badgers on the site and species rich grassland. They suggest that a habitat survey is undertaken before the site is allocated.</p> <p>The provision of affordable housing as part of the development is supported by a number of the respondents.</p> <p>Main issues raised objecting to the site include: few local employment opportunities, scale of development is excessive for the village, roads are narrow and not suitable for additional traffic, limited public transport, lack of capacity in services/facilities, impact on landscape/rural character, ridge and furrow on site, lack of infrastructure capacity and no capacity in school.</p>	<p>It is considered that the comments made have not raised any new matters that would indicate the site should not be taken forward into the Regulation 19 Local Plan as a proposed allocation.</p> <p>As set out in the evidence base, many sites have been considered through the site selection process. Sites proposed for allocation are considered to offer the greatest sustainability benefits and considerations such as the scale of development, access, and impacts on highways landscape, ecology, heritage assets and flooding have been taken into account during the site assessment process.</p> <p>Potential adverse impacts of development of the site have been considered through the site assessment process. Where potential adverse impacts have been identified, it is considered that these are not insurmountable and could potentially be mitigated. Further assessment of these issues will be undertaken as part of the planning application process if required at this stage.</p>	<p>No change – the site be allocated for housing in the Regulation 19 Local Plan.</p>

## Rutland Local Plan Review

### Consultation on Draft Local Plan – Comments on Unallocated Housing Sites Schedule of Main Issues Raised, Officer Responses and Proposed Changes

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
<b>Barleythorpe</b>		
<p><u>BAE/02- Land off Barleythorpe Road</u></p> <p>The promoter of an alternative site (BAE02) considers that it should be reassessed and allocated for development. Site is available and deliverable. It would be a logical extension to settlement as well related to the existing built form of development. Conclusions of site assessment on landscape sensitivity are flawed as not based on site specific assessment. Overall assessment concludes that site performs as well as, if not better, than other sites proposed for allocation.</p>	<p>Following a reassessment of all sites the Council has identified sufficient deliverable and developable housing sites to meet the housing requirement and, as such, does not consider the allocation of this site, which does not compare as favourably to other sites assessed, is needed.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<b>Barrowden</b>		
<p><u>BAR/01 – Land at Back Road</u></p> <p>Site could provide housing to meet need expressed by Parish Council for 2 and 3 bedroom houses.</p>	<p>Barrowden is identified in the Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy as a Smaller Service Centre. It is not proposed to make any allocations in Smaller Service Centres.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<b>Cottesmore</b>		
<p><u>COT/01 – Land off Main Street</u></p> <p>Appropriate site for small scale housing (8 dwellings). No issues with access.</p>	<p>The site is in a sustainable location well related to the settlement. The site access and approach road are unsuitable to accommodate a significant increase in vehicle movement. As a consequence the capacity of the site has been reduced to 8 dwellings.</p>	<p>The site be allocated for housing (no more than 8 dwellings) in the Regulation 19 Local Plan.</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
<p><u>COT/03 and COT/04 – Land west of Rogues Lane</u></p> <p>Landowner willing to offer land for wider community benefit as part of wider development proposals. Would include open space, parking areas, public footpath links, speed reduction measures. Location of site COT04 would reduce risk of flooding.</p>	<p>The site is considered suitable for allocation for a limited amount of development.</p> <p>Following a reassessment of all sites the Council has identified sufficient deliverable and developable housing sites to meet the housing requirement and, as such, does not consider the allocation of this site, which does not compare as favourably to other sites assessed, is needed.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<b>Empingham</b>		
<p><u>EMP/04 – Land off Exton Road</u></p> <p>Omission of site goes against evidence that underpins the plan.</p>	<p>The site has been assessed as unsuitable for allocation due to the adverse impacts on heritage assets (it wholly or predominately contains a Scheduled Monument).</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<b>Ketton</b>		
<p><u>KET01 – Park Farm, Luffenham Road</u></p> <p>Parish Council support reappraisal of site for mixed use.</p>	<p>Following a reassessment of all sites the Council has identified sufficient deliverable and developable housing sites to meet the housing requirement and, as such, does not consider the allocation of this site, which does not compare as favourably to other sites assessed, is needed.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p><u>KET/06 – Chater House, High Street</u></p> <p>The site promoters consider the value of the site to providing local housing in this sustainable settlement has not been recognised and site should be retained as a housing allocation. Question the designation as open space in site assessment.</p> <p>Comments regarding development of the site include: retention of adjacent permissive footpath, site includes traditional orchard which should be included in the Area of Important Open Space</p>	<p>The site is in a sustainable location within the Planned Limits of Development. Development has the potential to impact on the significance of various heritage assets in the area. However, it is considered the impact on the significance of heritage assets could be mitigated through reducing the capacity of the site and through sensitive development design and layout. Matters relating to how a site may be developed will be reflected</p>	<p>The site be allocated for housing in the Regulation 19 Local Plan.</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
	in the site guidelines included in the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan.	
<p><u>KET/08 – Home Farm</u></p> <p>The site promoters consider the value of the site to providing local housing in this sustainable settlement has not be recognised and site should be retained as a housing allocation.</p> <p>Ketton Parish Council considers the site to better suited to development of small business/office units and for heritage aspects of former working farm conserved.</p>	<p>The site is in a sustainable location within the Planned Limits of Development. Development has the potential to impact on the significance of various heritage assets in the area. However, it is considered the impact on the significance of heritage assets could be mitigated through reducing the capacity of the site and through sensitive development design and layout. Matters relating to how a site may be developed will be reflected in the site guidelines included in the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan.</p>	<p>The site be allocated for housing in the Regulation 19 Local Plan.</p>
<b>Langham</b>		
<p><u>LAN/01 and LAN/03 – Land north of Cold Overton Road and Land at Ranksborough Farm</u></p> <p>Larger housing allocation is capable of accommodating additional 45/50 dwellings above proposed 100 dwellings. Adjacent urban edge, brownfield site, accessed via established access address previous concerns access arrangements to the farm could restrict the development potential of site. Development would remove number of uncontrolled industrial/business uses, along with the caravans, which are predominantly vacant/under-utilised, significantly enhance the immediate and wider setting. Development would be more suitable option than development of more environmentally and visually sensitive greenfield site elsewhere in the village.</p>	<p>Following a reassessment of all sites the Council has identified sufficient deliverable and developable housing sites to meet the housing requirement and, as such, does not consider the allocation of these sites, which do not compare as favourably to other sites assessed, is needed.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<b>Oakham</b>		
<p><u>OAK/02 – East of Uppingham Road</u></p> <p>The site promoters consider that the site is extremely well related to existing services and facilities in town centre. Development would incorporate a broad public open space corridor along the</p>	<p>Following a reassessment of all sites the Council has identified sufficient deliverable and developable housing sites to meet the housing requirement and, as such, does</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
<p>site's western boundary with Uppingham Road, screening majority of the proposed housing in views from Uppingham Road and maintaining the "important wooded edge of Oakham". OAK/02 (with OAK/04 and OAK/08(A)) would be logical extension in terms of the impact on countryside given surrounding uses and bypass to the south. Development would have limited impact on significance of heritage assets and in Flood Zone 1 with minimal downstream flood risk.</p>	<p>not consider the allocation of this site, which does not compare as favourably to other sites assessed, is needed.</p>	
<p><u>OAK/07 – South of Brooke Road</u></p> <p>The site promoters consider that there are no significant 'in principle' landscape constraints and future development could be sensitively designed. Council has over emphasised the landscape impacts of the site and given less weight to biodiversity and other planning matters. This site represents opportunity to avoid harm to biodiversity compared to proposed allocation of OAK/13. Consider that site has greater capacity for change to residential development than considered in Council's evidence.</p>	<p>Following a reassessment of all sites the Council has identified sufficient deliverable and developable housing sites to meet the housing requirement and, as such, does not consider the allocation of this site, which does not compare as favourably to other sites assessed, is needed.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p><u>OAK/16</u></p> <p>Development of site offers opportunity to enhance urban edge of town with removal of overhead lines and creation of softer green edge. Less prominent with scope to mitigate.</p>	<p>Following a reassessment of all sites the Council has identified that this site is deliverable and developable to meet the housing requirement and, as such considers that the site should be allocated. Matters relating to how a site may be developed will be reflected in the site guidelines included in the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan.</p>	<p>The site be allocated for housing in the Regulation 19 Local Plan.</p>
<b>Uppingham</b>		
<p><u>UPP/03 – 7 Stockerson Road</u></p> <p>Only very small part of site is steeply sloping (adjacent to stream), which could be excluded from developable area. Trees and hedgerows on perimeter of site provide screening and would not be affected by development, site access already exists. Green corridor</p>	<p>Comments noted. As Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan Group have indicated the intention to make allocations through a review of the Neighbourhood Plan, the Local Plan will not be making any allocations in Uppingham.</p>	<p>No change.</p>



Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
<p>into countryside largely destroyed by the erection of three storey Uppingham School Science Block.</p> <p>.</p>		
Whissendine		
<p><u>WHI/02 – Ashwell Road</u></p> <p>Site is of sufficient size to provide 60-75 houses and provide extensive play areas, etc.</p>	<p>Following a reassessment of all the sites the Council has identified sufficient deliverable and developable housing sites to meet the housing requirement and, as such, does not consider the allocation of this site, which does not compare as favourably to other sites assessed, is needed.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

## Rutland Local Plan Review

### Consultation on Additional Sites 2018 Schedule of Main Issues Raised, Officer Responses and Proposed Changes

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
<b>Barleythorpe</b>		
<p><u>BAE03 – Land adjacent to Barleythorpe Hall, Main Road</u></p> <p>The promoter of the site submits evidence to support the allocation and considers that it is suitable, available, deliverable and developable.</p> <p>The promoter of an alternative site considers that land to the south of the town would be a more suitable option.</p> <p>Concerns are raised about the site size and location on the edge of the village, the loss of separation with Oakham and the need for the design of dwellings to respect the character of the village and the area.</p>	<p>Following a reassessment of all sites the Council has identified sufficient deliverable and developable housing sites to meet the housing requirement and, as such, does not consider the allocation of this site, which does not compare as favourably to other sites assessed, is needed.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p><u>BAE04 – Land off Main Street Barleythorpe</u></p> <p>The promoter of the site supports its allocation which it states has previously had a residential consent granted.</p> <p>The promoter of an alternative site questions its deliverability due to its restricted access and that it is adjacent to a Grade II listed building.</p> <p>Concerns are raised about access to the site and that any development needs to be suitably designed and sensitive to the village environment.</p>	<p>This is a small site in a sustainable location. The site had planning permission for 8 dwellings (which has now lapsed) and, therefore, the issues raised regarding access and impact on heritage assets has previously been assessed and considered capable of being effectively mitigated.</p> <p>The site is considered suitable for allocation.</p>	<p>The site be allocated for housing in the Regulation 19 Local Plan.</p>
<b>Barrowden</b>		
<p><u>BAR03 – Morcott Road</u></p> <p>Historic England refers to its location within the Conservation Area.</p>		<p>No change.</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
<p>One comment in support of the site suggests it could be enlarged into neighbouring land towards Luffenham Road.</p>	<p>Barrowden is identified in the Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy as a Smaller Village. It is not proposed to make any allocations in Smaller Village.</p>	
<b>Edith Weston</b>		
<p><u>EDI03 – Officer’s Mess, Manton Road</u></p> <p>Historic England refers to the proximity of the Conservation Area, the Grade II Listed building to the north west and other heritage assets.</p> <p>Parish Councils raise concerns that the site is part of the St George’s barracks development and should not be treated separately.</p> <p>Other concerns are raised about the site’s prominent position at the entrance to the village, its scale and potential impacts in terms of traffic, loss of green space and biodiversity and the need for development to be of high environmental standards and reflect local circumstances.</p>	<p>As the location of the site is such that it could come forward independently of the wider Barracks site its allocation is considered appropriate.</p> <p>No concerns have been raised by the Highway Authority in respect of traffic generation and other matters raised are considered to be capable of mitigation through sensitive development design and layout and the provision of a landscape buffer. Matters relating to how a site may be developed will be reflected in the site guidelines included in the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan. Further assessment of these will be undertaken as part of the planning application process if required at that stage.</p> <p>The site is considered suitable for allocation.</p>	<p>The site be allocated for housing in the Regulation 19 Local Plan.</p>
<b>Greetham</b>		
<p><u>GRE08 – North Brook Close</u></p> <p>Historic England comments that this an area of potential archaeological interest.</p> <p>Greetham Parish Council considers that a significant part of the land is unusable for housing due to concerns about its proximity to the Brook, flooding and pollution of the river; topography, trees, effects on wildlife, local residents being overlooked; boundary disputes and rights of way.</p> <p>Other concerns raised include the additional pressure on the sewage network and roads.</p>	<p>The Highway Authority have commented that the location of the proposed site access (opposite an existing access serving residential properties and the Cottessmore Road junction) would be detrimental to highway safety as there would be too much traffic movement at the junction of the estate. As such, the site is not considered suitable for allocation.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
<p><u>GRE09 – Stretton Road</u></p> <p>Historic England comments that this an area of potential archaeological interest and adjoins a Conservation Area.</p> <p>Greetham Parish Council considers that the site is far larger than is appropriate for the village; the entrance to the site is on a bend which was the scene of a fatal accident in recent years; it is at the entrance to the village and may detract from the rural character of the village.</p> <p>Other concerns raised by the public include increased traffic; harm to wildlife, overshadowing of properties; and would push south the line of the Greetham bypass and increase its costs</p>	<p>Following a reassessment of all sites the Council has identified sufficient deliverable and developable housing sites to meet the housing requirement and, as such, does not consider the allocation of this site, which does not compare as favourably to other sites assessed, is needed.</p> <p>There are no proposals currently for a bypass and no protected line in any relevant adopted document.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p><b>Langham</b></p>		
<p><u>LAN08 – Ranksborough Farm</u></p> <p>Historic England comments that as the site is partly within the Conservation Area.</p> <p>The promoter of the site submits a representation that concludes it is suitable and deliverable and that there are no issues or concerns to suggest that it is not suitable for development.</p> <p>The promoter of an alternative site objects because it was not put forward for consideration through the neighbourhood planning process and it would require a large number of dwellings to be delivered to be considered efficient and viable for development.</p> <p>Langham Parish Council considers that the site is not acceptable as it lies outside the Planned Limits of Development; most of the site is part of a caravan park; mobile homes occupy some of this site; that access is too dangerous; and the community is over 50s with no children.</p> <p>Other concerns raised by the public include its size and impact on the look of the village, the quality of life for residents, and that consideration is given for the route for the Langham Bypass.</p>	<p>The fact that a site was not put forward as part of the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan or the fact it lies outside the village's Planned Limits of Development does not preclude it from being promoted or considered through the Local Plan site assessment process.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the Council has identified sufficient deliverable and developable housing sites to meet the housing requirement and, as such, does not consider the allocation of this site, which does not compare as favourably to other sites assessed, is needed.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
<b>Manton</b>		
<p><u>MAN03 – St Mary's Road</u></p> <p>Historic England comments that the site is an area of potential archaeological interest with Martinsthorpe deserted medieval village scheduled monument to the west.</p> <p>The promoter of the site considers that the site is suitable, available and deliverable for residential development and that it has 'self-build' potential.</p> <p>Concerns raised include its impact on tourism on cycle route and the generation of traffic.</p>	<p>Manton is identified in the Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy as a Smaller Village. It is not proposed to make any allocations in Smaller Village.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<b>Oakham</b>		
<p><u>OAK18 – Co-op site</u></p> <p>Historic England comments that the site is an area of potential archaeological interest and that the height of any proposed buildings should be limited due its proximity to Burley on the Hill Registered Park and Garden.</p> <p>The promoter of an alternative site comments that this is a small-scale site that would not be appropriate as a site allocation and should be considered as a planning application.</p> <p>Langham Parish Council considers the site is not acceptable as it is surrounded by car parking and garage industrial units; it is potentially polluting and not suitable for housing for children and families.</p> <p>Other concerns raised include traffic congestion and pollution; proximity to the supermarket car park and that it is not viable given its location and size.</p>	<p>This is a small site that has been promoted for retail development. The site is located within the car park of an existing retail area and is therefore suitable for small scale retail development.</p> <p>This site is suitable as a retail site if there is demand and no other sequentially preferable sites are available</p>	<p>The site be allocated for housing in the Regulation 19 Local Plan.</p>
<p><u>OAK19 (Site assessment reference SHELAA/OAK/13a and OAK/13c)</u></p>	<p>Site has been reassessed and is considered to be deliverable and developable and therefore proposed for</p>	

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
<p>Historic England comments that the site is an area of potential archaeological interest and that the height of any proposed buildings should be limited due its proximity to Burley on the Hill Registered Park and Garden.</p> <p>Langham Parish Council Langham consider that the site is not acceptable as it lies outside the Planned limits of Development.</p> <p>An Action Group opposing development to the south west of the town welcomes this as a more suitable site.</p> <p>Other concerns raised include that it is good quality agricultural land that would encroach on greenbelt land and impact on Burley Estate and woods.</p>	<p>allocation in the Regulation 19 Local Plan. Matters relating to how a site may be developed will be reflected in the site guidelines included in the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan.</p>	<p>The site be allocated for housing in the Regulation 19 Local Plan.</p>
Ryhall		
<p><u>RYH08 &amp; RYH09 – River Gwash Trout Farm, Belmsthorpe Road</u></p> <p>Historic England comments that these are in an area of potential archaeological interest within Ryhall Conservation Area and highly graded assets to the west.</p> <p>Ryhall Parish Council has reservations about any sites, which because of their size, compromise the green space and produce an excess of traffic on a country lane.</p>	<p>The sites adjoin site RYH/04, which was included in the Consultation Draft Local Plan as a proposed allocation.</p> <p>No objections have been raised by the Highway Authority in respect of the suitability of access roads to the site or traffic generation. The potential for heritage assets with archaeological interest is not necessarily a constraint to development and can be managed through appropriate investigation at pre or post planning application stage. The other issues raised are considered to be capable of mitigation through sensitive development design and layout. Matters relating to how a site may be developed will be reflected in the site guidelines included in the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan. Further assessment of these will be undertaken as part of the planning application process if required at that stage.</p> <p>Both site are considered suitable for allocation.</p>	<p>Sites RYH08 and site RYH09 be allocated for housing in the Regulation 19 Local Plan</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
<b>South Luffenham</b>		
<p><u>SOU04 – Wireless Hill</u></p> <p>The promoter of the site considers that it is suitable and deliverable for employment development, being located within the existing boundary of the Wireless Hill industrial estate, with potential to deliver substantial benefits for local economic growth and productivity and making use of brownfield land.</p> <p>Barrowden and North Luffenham Parish Councils support the site as providing an opportunity to expand existing brownfield site which would create employment opportunities. Similar support for the site is raised in other comments.</p>	<p>South Luffenham is identified in the Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy as a Smaller Village. It is not proposed to make any allocations in Smaller Villages.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<b>Tinwell</b>		
<p><u>TIN04 – Land of Mill Lane</u></p> <p>Historic England comments that the site is within the Conservation Area with heritage assets to the south, including highly graded assets.</p> <p>Concerns raised include that it is on a greenfield site outside the existing conservation area and village envelope and that Tinwell's classification as a Small Service Centre with very few services or amenities would not support such a large development.</p>	<p>Tinwell is identified in the Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy as a Smaller Village. It is not proposed to make any allocations in Smaller Villages.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<b>Uppingham</b>		
<p><u>UPP11 – Land off Goldcrest Road and north of Firs Avenue</u></p> <p>The promoter of the site comments that it is available and that it will seek planning permission and market the site. The promoter of an alternative site at Ayston Road in Uppingham considers that it could be reliant in its site for access which is a sequentially preferable site.</p> <p>Uppingham Town Council considers that the correct mechanism for site allocations is via the Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan which can consider strategic objectives for these sites.</p>	<p>Comments noted. As Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan Group have indicated the intention to make allocations through a review of the Neighbourhood Plan, the Local Plan will not be making any allocations in Uppingham.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
<p>Other concerns raised include that it is an extension into open countryside and outside of the planned limits of development, with access and traffic issues.</p> <p><u>UPP12 – Land off The Beeches</u></p> <p>Uppingham Town Council considers that the correct mechanism for site allocations is via the Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan which can consider strategic objectives for these sites.</p> <p>Other concerns raised include that it is an extension into open countryside and outside the planned limit of development; topography, access, highway infrastructure, noise and traffic.</p>		
Whissendine		
<p><u>WHI11 – Pickwell Lane</u></p> <p>Historic England comments that the site would not be an area of concern if it could be levelled to the south to match the existing rear gardens to properties on Melton Road.</p> <p>Concerns raised congestion on the roads and road safety, parking, shortage of school places, flooding, surface water and drainage issues, lack of a doctor's surgery, public transport and employment opportunities.</p>	<p>Following a reassessment of all sites the Council has identified sufficient deliverable and developable housing sites to meet the housing requirement and, as such, does not consider the allocation of this site, which does not compare as favourably to other sites assessed and identified as allocations, is needed.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p><u>WHI12 – Land off Pickwell Road</u></p> <p>Historic England objects to the site because of impacts upon the Grade II* 'The Windmill', particularly in views from the south from Pickwell Lane, and asks whether this site could be removed or reduced further.</p> <p>Whissendine Parish Council Site submits a detailed assessment of the site.</p> <p>Concerns raised include the size and location of the site and its impact on landscape and character of the village, flooding, surface water drainage and sewerage problems; traffic, congestion and car</p>	<p>The Council has identified sufficient deliverable and developable housing sites to meet the housing requirement and, as such, does not consider the allocation of this site, which does not compare as favourably to other sites assessed, is needed.</p>	<p>No change.</p>



Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
<p>parking; heritage issues; lack of schools, public transport, employment, local amenities and medical facilities, loss of public open space, biodiversity and wildlife habitat; privacy and quality of life and effects on the campsite and businesses on Pickwell Lane.</p>		
Other Site		
<p><u>Woolfox Depot</u></p> <p>A proposal is submitted for approximately 1,000 acres of land at Woolfox adjoining the A1 as a site for a new Garden Town Community comprising circa 7,000 homes, jobs and economic growth and the opportunity to provide in due course excess of 10,000 homes.</p>	<p>The Council have reviewed the options for the location of a new settlement. For the reasons set out in the Assessment of Strategic Development Sites, it is considered that this site does not compare as favourably to St George's Barracks and the Council remains satisfied that St George's Barracks is a sustainable location for a new settlement.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

## Rutland Local Plan Review

### Specific consultation on implications of potential development of St George's Barracks 2018 Schedule of Main Issues Raised, Officer Responses and Proposed Changes

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
<b>Section 1 – Implications for the Spatial Portrait, Vision and Objectives</b>		
<b>Q1. Can you suggest any amendments to the Vision?</b>		
<p>The main issues raised are that the vision should not be altered to include specific reference to St George's as it is inappropriate and unsuitable for Rutland and there are concerns that the plan is being made to fit the proposal rather than the other way round. There are concerns that the proposal does not meet the latest definition of brownfield land and does not itself meet the amendments to the vision concerning providing locally accessible employment and making use of brownfield land. Issues relating to the deliverability of the site were also raised.</p> <p>Some specific changes to the wording are suggested and suggestions made for more issues to be covered in the vision including: supporting development on underutilised land, the impact on road usage and traffic, respecting and enhancing the landscape, public transport, leisure, self-build and custom homes, the enhancement of green infrastructure and gain in biodiversity and the contribution of Rutland villages to the life of the county.</p>	<p>Development at St George's is a key element of the overall preferred Local Plan growth strategy and, therefore, it is appropriate that this is recognised in the vision.</p> <p>The option of exploring the potential for a new settlement is supported by the NPPF (2019) (paragraph 72), which states <i>'The supply of large numbers of new homes can often be best achieved through planning for larger scale development, such as new settlements .... provided they are well located and designed, and supported by the necessary infrastructure and facilities.'</i></p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal (SA)<sup>2</sup> sets out how the growth options, including a new settlement at St George's (for varying scales of development), were identified together with an assessment of the likely effects when considered against other reasonable alternatives. The SA demonstrated that for all options there were likely to be significant effects and whilst the SA identified a new settlement at St George's as having some negative effects, it scored positively in many other areas.</p> <p>The allocation of St George's is soundly based on a range of technical evidence that underpins the Local Plan, and which has been used to assess alternative sites on a consistent basis, supplemented by a number of site specific studies. Collectively, the technical evidence demonstrates that there are no overriding constraints to development and any impacts of development can be effectively mitigated.</p>	<p>No changes.</p>

<sup>2</sup> Interim SA Report, August 2019

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
	<p>Detailed reports have been completed that demonstrate development of St George's is viable and deliverable. As set out in the housing trajectory, it is expected that the new settlement will deliver 1,000 dwellings within the plan period with first delivery in 2026/27. The trajectory has made a reasonable assessment of the likely lead in time to allow for the closure of the barracks, preparation of an outline planning application and agreeing a S106 agreement, reserved matters, discharge of pre-commencement conditions, marketing of site and putting in place the necessary infrastructure to support the first phases of development.</p> <p>The NPPF (2019) definition is clear that brownfield or previously developed land (PDL) includes not only buildings but also their curtilage, although it should not be assumed that the whole of the curtilage should be developed. The NPPF is also clear that local authorities should seek to maximise the use of PDL. The importance the Government places on maximising the potential of PDL for new development has been highlighted recently in statements made by the Minister of State for Housing. St George's, therefore, clearly falls within the NPPF definition of PDL. It should also be noted that the St George's masterplan indicates that most of the new development will be on areas currently occupied by buildings and structures associated with the barracks use of the site.</p> <p>The proposals for the St George's site include the provision of 14 hectares of employment land as well as the opportunity for residents to work at home.</p> <p>In respect of the specific wording changes sought it is considered that taken as a whole the Plan already seeks to address the issues raised through the proposed policies applicable to St George's Barracks and other Local Plan polices, for example those related to landscape, housing mix and the natural environment. No amendments to the vision are proposed.</p>	

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
<b>Q2. Can you suggest any amendments to Objectives 1 and 12?</b>		
<p>The main issues raised are that reference to St Georges should be removed from the objectives as it is not brownfield land as defined in national planning policy and would conflict with objective 12 and other objectives.</p> <p>There are a number of changes suggested to objective 1 including removal of specific reference to St Georges and replacement with more general wording relating to the reuse of brownfield or ex-MOD sites; that national policy on brownfield development favours infill sites and it is not a “brownfield first” policy; and that decisions should be delegated to neighbourhood plans.</p> <p>Changes to objective 12 suggested include making clear that brownfield sites in existing urban areas will be favoured and large greenfield sites will not be treated as previously developed land; that the biodiversity value of the site should be protected and that development should be to high environmental standards and reflect local circumstances.</p>	<p>As set out in the response to Q1, St George’s falls within the NPPF definition of brownfield land.</p> <p>As it will deliver a significant element of the Plan’s growth strategy it is appropriate that the objectives reference the development of the new settlement. However, as it is proposed that reference be made in Objective 1 to the re-use of brownfield sites and for there to be a specific objective for St. George’s it is agreed that it is unnecessary to also include a reference to St George’s in Objective 1.</p> <p>There is nothing in the NPPF (2019) that suggests that brownfield development should be limited primarily to infill sites. It does, however, highlight (paragraph 117) having a clear strategy on accommodating development needs through making as much use as possible of brownfield land and bringing forward suitable land held in public ownership (paragraph 119). The allocation of St George’s, therefore, is consistent with national policy.</p> <p>Where an emerging Neighbourhood Plan proposes to allocate land to meet the development needs for the Neighbourhood Plan area then this is reflected in the Local Plan. To date only Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan group have indicated the intention to make allocations as part of a review of the Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan. However, it should be noted that the NPPF is clear that those producing neighbourhood plans should support strategic development needs set out in Local Plans and Neighbourhood Plans should not be used to undermine strategic policies (paragraph 29).</p> <p>As the wording of Objective 13 (Natural and cultural environment) makes clear that the diversity of the County’s wildlife and habitats would be safeguarded and enhanced, it is considered that an amendment to refer specifically to biodiversity is not necessary. Any development would also need to meet the requirements of Policy EN9 (The natural environment), which seeks to minimise the impacts of development on biodiversity and wildlife.</p>	<p>In Objective 1 delete: ‘including the creation of a new sustainable community at St George’s’</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
	<p>The suggested changes regarding environmental standards and reflecting local circumstances are considered to be unnecessary as these matters are already covered by Objectives 15 (High quality design and local distinctiveness) and Objective 16 (Resources, waste and climate change).</p>	
<b>Q3. Can you suggest any amendments to proposed Objective 2a?</b>		
<p>The main issues raised are that St George's should be deleted from the objective as it is not a brownfield site and there is no evidence that it is appropriate or sustainable or that alternative uses have been considered. Some consider that it should not be specific about a particular site and that it should give more emphasis on providing employment opportunities, health and education, infrastructure, the removal of minerals before construction starts.</p> <p>Suggestions for changes to the objective include that the development should be restricted in size to the existing footprint or 500 dwellings; that specific infrastructure to support the development should be specified; that services should be available to residents at the point they move in; that there is little mention of starter homes or social housing; that "high quality homes" should be defined; that development of the site should complete the removal of minerals before construction commences.</p>	<p>As set out in the response to Q1, St George's falls within the NPPF definition of brownfield land. The available technical evidence demonstrates that there are no overriding constraints to development and any impacts of development can be effectively mitigated.</p> <p>Alternative uses have not been considered through the Local Plan process as the site is being promoted by the landowner for a residential led mixed use development. As such there is no indication that it would be available for any alternative use.</p> <p>The NPPF makes clear that local authorities should seek to make the best use of brownfield sites to accommodate identified development needs. The developable area and capacity of the site has been tested through the completion of a range of technical evidence. As such there is no justification for limiting re-development of this major brownfield site as suggested by respondents.</p> <p>Proposals for development will be assessed against the policies of the Local Plan as a whole and the wording of Objective 2a needs to be considered in this context. In particular Policy H3 (St George's Garden Community Development Requirements) sets out in more detail how development of the site will be expected to come forward and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) Schedule, which sets out what infrastructure will be required to support the development.</p>	No changes.
<b>Q4. Can you suggest any amendments to the statement about Delivering Sustainable Growth to 2036?</b>		
<p>The main issues raised are that the additional sentence is unnecessary and that St Georges should not be included until evidence is provided that it is needed and is sustainable.</p>	See responses to Q1 and Q3.	No changes.

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
<p>Concerns are raised about the suitability of the site, the scale of development, its deliverability and impact on the environment and existing communities.</p> <p>Some consider that sustainable growth should be defined, that it should state that garden village principles will be followed and design recognizes the character of Rutland, the development should be for 500 houses; that there should be a further bullet point “to enable villages to grow and thrive through encouraging proposals that support or enhance local services”.</p>	<p>It is appropriate that as the new settlement is a key element of the Local Plan growth strategy, this was reflected in the ‘Delivering Sustainable Growth’ statement.</p> <p>With regard to the comment regarding villages, this is already covered by Objective 4 (Diverse and thriving villages) and repetition of the point is considered unnecessary.</p>	
<b>Section 2 – Implications for the Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy</b>		
<b>Q5. Can you suggest any amendments to the Settlement Hierarchy?</b>		
<p>The main issues raised are that St George’s should not be included in the settlement hierarchy as the need for the development is not justified and concerns that including it will impact on the growth of Oakham and Uppingham and the villages and divert resources away from the two towns; that it conflicts with Policy RLP3 that makes Oakham the key focus for new development; that the figure for numbers of dwellings should tally with those given elsewhere in the document.</p> <p>Barleythorpe, Langham and Greetham Parish Councils question the status of their villages in the settlement hierarchy and request that they be reclassified; Uppingham Town Council would prefer Oakham and Uppingham to be referred to as Market Towns.</p> <p>Some question usage of the term “new settlement” or “garden village” to describe St George’s some consider that it should be described as a medium sized town, a smaller town or a small town in the making, a village or a local service centre.</p>	<p>As set out in the response to Q1 it is considered that the allocation of St George’s is justified.</p> <p>The provision of a new settlement does not detract from the position of Oakham and Uppingham in the settlement hierarchy or that an appropriate level of resources will be directed towards them over the plan period to accommodate the level of growth planned, either through existing commitments, new allocations in the Local Plan or proposals in the town’s Neighbourhood Plans.</p> <p>The Council’s approach to the classification of settlements in the hierarchy is based on the availability of community facilities, key public services and retail, leisure and business opportunities as set out in the Sustainability of Settlements Background Paper. The Council’s updated facilities research (July 2019) concluded that Greetham and Langham had the range of services and facilities to be classified as Local Service Centres.</p> <p>To reflect the relationship of Barleythorpe to Oakham in terms of recent developments and the accessibility for residents to a range of services and facilities it is proposed that Barleythorpe be removed from the list of Smaller Service Centres and instead referenced in the ‘Main Town’ tier of the hierarchy.</p>	<p>Remove Barleythorpe from the list of Smaller Service Centres and amend ‘Main Town’ title to read ‘Main Town – Oakham (including Barleythorpe)’</p> <p>Delete the new settlement category and make reference to the new settlement performing a LSC role.</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
	<p>The comments of Uppingham Town Council are noted. However, as the supporting text refers to market towns it is considered unnecessary to amend the wording as suggested.</p> <p>It is intended that the new settlement will ultimately fulfil the role of a Local Service Centre. As such it would be appropriate for this to be referenced rather than for the new settlement to be included as a separate stand-alone category. A change to reflect this is proposed.</p>	
<b>Q6. Can you suggest any amendments to Policy RLP3?</b>		
<p>The main issues raised are that Saint Georges should not be included in the policy because of lack of justification and need for the proposal and concerns about its scale and impact on the environment, communities and traffic; that use of bold text in the policy is misleading as it is inconsistent with the approach used in other parts of the document; that the inclusion of St George's in clause 3 is in conflict with following clause that limits development in the countryside.</p> <p>Some specific amendments to the policy are suggested, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. clause 1 it is misleading to state that Oakham will be the key focus for new development and that it has "excellent" range of services and facilities;</li> <li>2. clause 3 the figure for the number of new houses should be 1,200 consistent with the rest of the document;</li> <li>3. clause 4 that development in Rutland on the edge of Stamford should similarly be described as brownfield and count towards Rutland's needs;</li> <li>4. clause 5 local service centres should have allocations;</li> <li>5. clause 7 should be more positively worded so that development that had been subject to community consultation and would support or enhance local services would also be permitted;</li> <li>6. clause 8 need to define "development will be strictly limited" with finite limits.</li> </ol>	<p>As set out in the response to Q1 it is considered that the allocation of St George's is justified.</p> <p>The comments regarding the use of bold text are noted and it is recognised that different approaches to highlighting the proposed changes were used in the consultation document. However, it was made clear (in paragraph 3.8 of the consultation document) the intention was to replace Policy RLP3 with that set out in the consultation document and it was the revised Policy RLP3 as a whole on which comments were being sought. The emphasis in the Policy was intended to highlight those key elements of the spatial strategy.</p> <p>In response to the comments concerning specific amendments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. As drafted the policy wording reflects that Oakham is the most sustainable location for development and, as the County's main town with a range of higher order services and facilities, will notwithstanding the proposal for the delivery of significant development through the new settlement remain the focus for new development opportunities including new employment, leisure and retail development over the plan period.</li> <li>2. This reflected the total number of dwellings to come forward as part of the new settlement not just those expected to be delivered during the plan period. Since the consultation further technical work has been undertaken which has refined the understanding of the developable area of the site and resultant capacity: this will be reflected in the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan.</li> </ol>	<p>Update references throughout the Plan to the expected number of dwellings to be delivered from the new settlement.</p> <p>Revise Policy RLP 3 (now Policy SD2) to include reference to the settlements identified in the settlement hierarchy, restructure the Policy and include reference to development supporting/enhancing community facilities/local services.</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
	<p>3. The site at Quarry Farm is mixed brownfield/greenfield when considered against the NPPF definition of brownfield land. Development of the site will only be acceptable as part of a comprehensive urban extension to the north of Stamford and it has been formally agreed between Rutland County Council and South Kesteven District Council, through a Statement of Common Ground, that the housing that results will contribute towards the housing needs of South Kesteven district.</p> <p>4. The policy wording is clear that allocations will be made in Local Service Centres. However, the allocation of sites will be dependent on a number of factors including whether there are any identified constraints and the availability of suitable sites. Not all Local Service Centres will necessarily, therefore, receive an allocation.</p> <p>5. It is agreed that some development where this was shown to be necessary to support and/or enhance community facilities/local services would be appropriate and a change to the Policy wording to reflect this is proposed.</p> <p>6. The reasoned justification explains what is meant and no amendment is considered necessary.</p> <p>Because of the cross over between this Policy and the settlement hierarchy it is considered that it would be beneficial for the two to be combined with the hierarchy settlements referenced in the Policy rather than just the supporting text and for the Policy to be restructured.</p> <p>In practice as there has been little difference in how the Smaller Service Centres and Small Villages have been treated it is considered that for the purposes of applying the Policy it would be more effective to combine the two settlement categories.</p>	
<b>Section 3 – Implications for Housing Requirements across Rutland</b>		
<b>Q7. Do you support the proposed changes to the distribution of housing development set out in Table 1?</b>		
<p>A high proportion of respondents (95%) do not support the proposed changes.</p> <p>The responses to the opinion poll submitted to the council show the highest levels of agreement for “Leave as we are”</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>No changes.</p>



Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
with increasing levels of disagreement for higher amounts of development of 500 homes or more.		
<b>Q8. Can you suggest any amendments to the distribution of housing development?</b>		
<p>The main issues raised are St George's should be deleted from the plan because the scale of the development is too large, it is unsustainable and disproportionate to focus so much growth in one location; that development should be spread across the county with an allowance for development on small sites and windfalls; that housing figures for St George's are inconsistently shown in the plan.</p> <p>Some detailed changes to the Table 1 are suggested including that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the distribution in the earlier consultation draft plan should be restored;</li> <li>2. it should be made clear that the figures are minima;</li> <li>3. the figures for development on land north of Stamford should be included;</li> <li>4. the figures for Uppingham should be increased;</li> <li>5. there should be a minimum 20% flexibility allowance.</li> </ol>	<p>As set out in the response to Q1 it is considered that the allocation of St George's, making use of a previously developed site, is justified.</p> <p>The Local Plan also makes provision for growth in the two towns and in a number of villages across the County either through allocations or by enabling other development of an appropriate scale. The Council has undertaken further analysis on the contribution of windfall sites to the housing supply. This has demonstrated that there is compelling evidence that windfall sites will provide a small but reliable source of housing supply over the plan period. To recognise this, an allowance of 20 dwellings per annum over the period 2022 - 2036 is considered appropriate and will be included in the housing supply figure for the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan.</p> <p>It is expected that development of St George's will deliver approximately 1,000 dwellings during the plan period with the remaining dwellings being built out beyond this. As, at the time of the consultation, the technical work to understand the appropriate developable area/capacity of the site was ongoing, the consultation document indicated that when fully developed the new settlement could provide between 1,500 and 3,000 dwellings. It was appropriate, therefore, to reference both figures in the consultation document. Whilst the difference between the two figures was set out in the proposed St George's policy, it is recognised that the purpose of the two figures could have been more clearly explained in the consultation document itself.</p> <p>In response to the comments concerning specific amendments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The comments have been made primarily because of respondents concern regarding the allocation of St George's and/or the resultant impact on the opportunity for development in other locations across the County. It is considered that the proposed spatial distribution as set out in the consultation document remains appropriate allowing for growth in the two towns and in a number of</li> </ol>	<p>Include a windfall allowance of 20 dwellings per annum in the housing land supply figures.</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
	<p>villages across the County either through existing commitments, new allocations or by enabling other development of an appropriate scale to come forward.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. It is clear that the housing requirement figures are a minimum provision over the plan period, demonstrating the Council's approach to meeting the needs of the County in full, as well as providing flexibility.</li> <li>3. It has been formally agreed between Rutland County Council and South Kesteven District Council, through an agreed Statement of Common Ground, that the housing that results from Stamford North will contribute towards the housing needs of South Kesteven district.</li> <li>4. The Local Plan will provide a housing need figure for each Neighbourhood Plan area, including Uppingham. The Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan group have indicated the intention to make allocations through a review of the Neighbourhood Plan to meet the identified requirement but it will also be open to the Neighbourhood Plan to provide for additional growth proposals.</li> <li>5. It is agreed that a degree of flexibility is appropriate and in terms of the number/type of sites proposed for allocation the Local Plan will provide a degree of flexibility so that in the event sites do not come forward when anticipated or deliver the yield expected, the housing requirement will be met. The Regulation 19 Local Plan housing supply provides for a buffer of around 25%. The Council consider this to be an appropriate and robust buffer consistent with the NPPF's desire to significantly boost housing supply and for the Local Plan to provide flexibility.</li> </ol>	
<b>Q9. Do you support the proposed changes to the housing requirements set out in Table 2?</b>		
A high proportion of respondents (95%) do not support the proposed changes.	Noted.	
<b>Q10. Please tell us your views about these changes</b>		
The main concerns raised are that more housing is being proposed than is needed and that this ignores the latest government advice on calculating housing needs that would result in 130 houses per annum; that the figures do not include an allowance for windfall developments or planning applications approved since July 2017 and development at	National planning practice guidance makes clear that the standard method for assessing local housing need provides the minimum starting point in determining the number of new homes needed in an area but that there may be circumstances where it is appropriate to consider whether actual housing need is higher than the standard method	No changes

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
<p>Quarry Farm; that it would be over-reliant on one large site and would deprive Oakham and Uppingham and other settlements of natural growth.</p> <p>Some question the deliverability of the St George's site and the research on which it is based and that that the plan would be too reliant on a single large site; that the table should include allocations to the "Other villages", there should be an increased allocation to Uppingham, that it should include reserve sites, that all the new development should be built at St George's or that development should be limited to 400 or 500 dwellings.</p>	<p>indicates. It goes on to state that use of the standard method is not mandatory and where a higher need figure is identified, which adequately reflects current and future demographic trends and market signals then the approach can be considered sound as it will have exceeded the minimum starting point.</p> <p>The SHMA update (2019) found that the 2017 SHMA need figure remained broadly sound. The Council consider this to reflect a more accurate and relevant assessment of local housing need, responding to market signals and demographic trends identified in the SHMA and, as such, represents a sound basis for the Local Plan housing requirement figure.</p> <p>As set out in the response under Q8, a windfall allowance will be included in the housing supply figure for the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan. In calculating the residual housing requirement figure account is taken of completions and commitments: these figures will be updated in the Regulation 19 version of the Local Plan to reflect the latest position.</p> <p>The proposed spatial distribution of the housing requirement allows for growth in the two towns and in a number of villages across the County either through existing commitments, new allocations or by enabling other development of an appropriate scale to come forward. A planned review of the Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan also provides the opportunity for additional housing provision to be made. The Local Plan also provides a degree of flexibility so that in the event sites do not come forward when anticipated or deliver the yield expected, the housing requirement will be met.</p>	
<b>Section 4 – Implications for minerals and waste issues</b>		
<b>Q11. Please use this space to tell us your views about these proposed changes</b>		
<p>The main issues raised are that more evidence is needed of the extent and nature of minerals reserves on the site and the potential impacts of quarrying, including those on the attractiveness of the area and on the existing communities and residents of the proposed new housing, such as traffic, noise and dust and concerns about damage to designated wildlife sites and that there is no additional capacity for sewage disposal.</p>	<p>A detailed mineral assessment has been undertaken which assists understanding of the nature of the mineral resource present, the area of land that should be safeguarded from development for future mineral working and the extent of a suitable buffer between future mineral working and new residential development. This will be reflected in the masterplan and the Local Plan policy for St George's. Northamptonshire County Council (as agents for the Minerals</p>	<p>No changes.</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
<p>Some comment on the need for buffer zones and restoration of quarry workings; that development should not take place until quarrying has been completed and that phasing and careful management will be needed to minimise adverse impacts; that the golf course should be retained as a public park before extraction of minerals takes place and there should be covenants to ensure that the area is reinstated as a country park and nature reserve.</p>	<p>Planning Authority) have confirmed that there are no objections in principle to the minerals assessment and the Council will continue to liaise with them on the wording of relevant Local Plan policies and the implications for development phasing.</p> <p>It should be noted that any proposal for the working of the mineral resource will be considered against the minerals development management policies concerning the impact/mitigation of environmental impacts and future mineral workings would need to take into account any impact on residential properties, heritage assets and ecology. Restoration following extraction would be secured by condition and/or legal agreement.</p> <p>It is recognised that new development will place pressure on existing infrastructure and may need new or improved infrastructure to support it. The Council has worked with infrastructure providers (including utility companies) to make sure the infrastructure implications of development are fully assessed and where necessary options for resolving identified issues are explored: this is reflected in the IDP. As set out in the IDP there is capacity for a first phase of development before sewage network upgrades would be required.</p>	

**Section 5 – Proposed new policy for St George’s**

**Q12. Can you suggest any amendments to the proposed new policy for St George’s**

<p>Large numbers of comments disagree with including a specific policy for St George’s in the Plan as it implies the development is a foregone conclusion and the plan is being built around it. There is concern at use of the phrase “Planning permission will be granted...” when no application has been made or granted. There are also concerns that it goes against the existing Core Strategy, the vision and other policies of the plan; that there is a lack of definition as to what is meant by a “garden village” and it goes against TCPA guidance for garden villages.</p> <p>There are concerns about the scale and potential impact of the proposal and the lack of infrastructure to support such a development. There is some support for development limited</p>	<p>The potential for the re-development of St George’s was identified in the 2017 Consultation Draft Local Plan but at that time there was insufficient information available for it to be included as a specific allocation in the Local Plan. However, a number of responses to the Consultation Draft Local Plan suggested that the potential development opportunity this site presented should be reflected in more detail in the Local Plan. As more information regarding the potential development of this site became available it was entirely appropriate for the Council to consider the implications of this for the emerging Local Plan and, in the event the site was allocated in the Local Plan, for a specific Local Plan policy to be developed, as this would be necessary to ensure that</p>	<p>Revise the Policy for St George’s Garden Community. See policies H2 and H3</p>
--	---	---

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
<p>to 500 dwellings, while others suggest 50, 1,100, 1,200 dwellings or a village or small community of a similar size to those already existing in Rutland. The findings of the opinion poll show most support for building on the barracks sites with a high level of disagreement with building on the grass airfield.</p> <p>Suggestions are made for the infrastructure and facilities that will be need to be made available, such as GP surgery and healthcare facilities, roads and footpaths , broadband, transport, housing (mixed housing, including affordable and/or social housing and for first time buyers), social services, shops, surgeries, schools parks and that these must be in place.</p> <p>A range of concerns is expressed that the development is not viable or needed, with no evaluation of alternatives and that the policy lacks targets and front loads expenditure which will make the whole development unviable. A range of alternative uses for the site are suggested.</p> <p>Highways England would expect the site to be subject to a Transport Assessment and cumulative impacts of development growth to be considered as part of the development management process</p> <p>Large numbers of concerns are raised about the impact of the proposal and quarrying in terms of visual impact, pollution, noise and dust and traffic on new housing, neighbouring villages, wildlife and habitats. Suggested that no development should occur before the extraction of the adjacent minerals and the reconditioning/landscaping of the site.</p> <p>Natural England welcomes various aspects of the policy and makes a number of detailed suggestions for improving the policy including the concept of biodiversity net gain and access to the countryside and walking opportunities.</p> <p>A range of detailed suggestions for additional wording to include in the policy are suggested including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. all enabling works, such as road improvements, should be completed before any construction commences and</li> </ol>	<p>development of this major development site came forward in an appropriate and sustainable manner.</p> <p>The comments regarding current planning policies are noted but it has to be recognised that planning policies change over time to reflect changed national planning policy and to ensure future development needs are met.</p> <p>A number of respondents suggested the TCPA guidance on garden villages was not being followed in that the support of the community should be sought. The TCPA's 'Garden City Principles' refers to community engagement and provides advice on practical measures on undertaking community engagement. The Council have sought to engage the local community through the Local Plan consultation and the separate consultation on the emerging masterplan. Policy H2 (St George's Garden Community Development and Delivery Principles) clearly sets out the need for a continuing programme of community engagement during the masterplan process. However, the TCPA principles do not indicate that the absence of local community support should preclude a garden community proposal from progressing.</p> <p>The NPPF makes clear that local authorities should seek to make the best use of brownfield sites to accommodate identified development needs. The developable area and capacity of the site has been tested through the completion of a range of technical evidence. As such there is no justification for limiting re-development of this major brownfield site as suggested by respondents.</p> <p>It is recognised that new development will place pressure on existing infrastructure and may need new or improved infrastructure to support it. The Council has worked with infrastructure providers (including utility companies) to make sure the infrastructure implications of development are fully assessed and where necessary options for resolving identified issues are explored: this is reflected in the IDP.</p> <p>It would not be realistic to delay development pending the extraction of the mineral resource as this may be some years in the future.</p>	

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
<p>all construction traffic should be restricted from passing through local villages; more details are needed about how transport links and roads to the new development will be improved; access to the site should be from a main trunk road and not through village roads;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. the policy should be amended to read “The finalised and agreed masterplan must demonstrate how it will deliver a sustainable community and surrounding area based on the following principles.”</li> <li>3. need to define “future proof” in clause 8;</li> <li>4. it should include a requirement for preparation of a design/development brief to be subject to the Council's approval and incorporated in a S106 Agreement;</li> <li>5. it should state that a S106 Agreement will be required and list its principal Heads of Terms; these should include the requirement that once a phase is started it should be completed in full rather than key elements conveniently forgotten/not provided at a later date;</li> <li>6. it should state that the Council should retain the right to approve the delivery mechanism;</li> <li>7. it should state that employment needs to be of a character befitting this rural location and the local road network so no or only minor ancillary warehousing (B8);</li> <li>8. it should spell out that some homes should be designed specifically to facilitate people working from home e.g. with offices above garages or work pods cluster; it should specifically mention of the quantity of such housing to be required -this should be well above the quantity that would normally be sought - say 50%; houses should be in stone, not brick; existing accommodation should be adapted for new housing, not demolished and replaced;</li> <li>9. that any housing has sufficient off road parking spaces per dwelling; at least 2 spaces and 1 garage per house, suitable to accommodate a 21st century car, SUV or similar.it must ensure a comprehensive and consistent form of high quality, well designed development is delivered with all the required social and physical infrastructure provided this happens;</li> <li>10. that any development over 25 units should be subject to an independent design review;</li> <li>11. a contingency plan should be established in case housing numbers on this proposed site are not delivered;</li> </ol>	<p>It should be noted that any proposal for the working of the mineral resource will be considered against the minerals development management policies concerning the impact/mitigation of environmental impacts and future mineral workings would need to take into account any impact on residential properties, heritage assets and ecology.</p> <p>Matters relating to noise/dust etc. would be considered and subject to any necessary and appropriate conditions as part of a minerals planning application.</p> <p>It is considered that the Policy would be more effective if the overarching development principles to be addressed by the masterplan were separated from the detailed site development issues. The policy for St George’s has, therefore, been revised and is included in the Regulation 19 Local Plan. The revised policy wording has also sought to address a number of the suggested policy changes made by respondents, as set out below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The timing of infrastructure delivery will be agreed with the relevant infrastructure provider but there may be instances where infrastructure requirements will only become necessary on completion of a certain amount of development. Construction traffic routes is a matter that could be dealt with through the submission of a construction traffic management plan at the planning application stage and enforced by condition. A Transport Assessment has been undertaken which has assessed the likely traffic impacts associated with development of this site and identified the mitigation required, which is reflected in the IDP.</li> <li>2. Policy H3 seeks to ensure that the masterplan and resultant development consider the impacts on and links to the surrounding area. The Sustainability Appraisal has also considered the likely effects of development.</li> <li>3. Whilst the policy supporting text could provide more detail on that is meant by 'future proof' it is agreed that the policy wording should provide greater clarity.</li> <li>4. The masterplan will provide design principles and any development proposal will need to demonstrate how it responds to these. As such the preparation of a separate design/development brief is considered unnecessary.</li> </ol>	

Main issues raised	Officer Response	Proposed Change
<p>12. more clarification and information needed on community governance of the new location; a community owned eco-friendly power generation scheme should be considered for this site to benefit the whole community;</p> <p>13. in item 11 delete “as far as possible”;</p> <p>14. planning permission should only be granted when all the elements of the masterplan have been agreed including the provision of employment;</p> <p>15. lack of mention of matters such as measures for sustainability, the encouragement of biodiversity into buildings and sustainable drainage, water treatment etc. Items 1-11 fail to take account of any integration of climate change in the design and development;</p> <p>16. ‘Garden Village Principles’ need to be specified, there is no clarity as to what they are;</p> <p>17. ‘green gap’ between the site and adjacent villages needs to increase in order to provide suitable separation.</p>	<p>5. This would be covered by Policy SC4 (Developer contributions) to which all development proposals will be subject.</p> <p>6. It is agreed that the Policy/supporting text could provide more clarity on the mechanism through which the new settlement will be delivered.</p> <p>7. The final quantum/mix of B uses on the site will be determined through the finalisation of the masterplan, which will be informed by an assessment of the particular employment needs of the locality.</p> <p>8. Policy H2 states that provision should be made for home working opportunities. The existing accommodation has reached the end of its economic life and/or is not suited to conversion to residential use.</p> <p>9. Parking requirements will be in accordance with the Council’s approved parking standards.</p> <p>10. As set out in the supporting text to Policy EN1 the Council would encourage major development proposals to be subject to an independent design review.</p> <p>11. The Local Plan will provide a degree of flexibility so that in the event sites do not come forward when anticipated or deliver the yield expected the housing requirement will be met.</p> <p>12. The draft Policy requires an energy strategy which could include consideration of a community based scheme</p> <p>13. It is agreed that this could be more positively worded and this is reflected in the revised policy wording.</p> <p>14. The revised policy makes clear that a planning application(s) will not be considered until the masterplan has been agreed by the Council.</p> <p>15. It is agreed that these matters should be reflected more clearly in the policy wording and this has been addressed in a revised policy wording.</p> <p>16. It is agreed that further information provided could be provided in the supporting text on garden communities. The revised policy wording has also sought to provide clarity on the principles as they apply to the re-development of the St George’s site.</p> <p>17. The extent of the ‘green gap’ is a matter to be determined through the design process as part of the masterplan development.</p>	