



Summary of Consultation Responses

Local Plan Review

Issues and Options

November 2015- January 2016

Summary of consultation responses

Site Allocations and Policies DPD Issues and Options: September-November 2011

Contents

1. Introduction	2
2. Suggested sites for new housing and other development.....	3
3. Neighbourhood Plans	4
4. The spatial portrait, vision and objectives	5
5. The Spatial Strategy	6
6. Site allocations	15
7. Minerals Planning Issues.....	19
8. Waste Planning Issues.....	22
9. Infrastructure	26
10. Other issues	29
11. Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SA/SEA) and Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA)	32

Appendix – List of respondents

Summary of consultation responses

Site Allocations and Policies DPD Issues and Options: September-November 2011

1. Introduction

Purpose of this document

The purpose of this document is to summarise the responses to the Local Plan Review Issues and Options consultation.

The consultation

Consultation on the Issues and Options document took place over a 9-week period from 10 November 2015 to 12 January 2016. The document was subject to extensive consultation and publicity in accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. This included:

- the consultation document and response forms distributed to a wide range of statutory and non-statutory consultees;
- press releases to local newspapers and media;
- a community roadshow at public libraries in Uppingham, Ketton and Ryhall, the Victoria Hall in Oakham, and the Village Hall in Cottesmore;
- an exhibition at Oakham public library and Rutland County Council Offices in Oakham;
- meetings with a range of groups and stakeholders, including the Local Strategic Partnership (Rutland Together) and the Rutland Parish Forum;
- email notifications sent to people who had asked to be updated on progress of the Local Plan;
- all documents made available on the Council's website.

Further details are available on the Council's website:

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

The response received.

A total of 106 written responses to the consultation have been received (including 3 late responses). A list of the respondents to the consultation is shown in the Appendix.

These responses include a number of sites put forward for residential and other development (see Section 2 below). Maps showing the location of these sites can be found in the "Summary of Sites Submitted through the Call for Sites and Issues and Options Consultations September 2015-January 2016" (April 2016) which can be viewed on the council's website.

Format of this document

The summary below indicates the total numbers of comments received against each question and the numbers of responses supporting each option. This is followed by summary of the main comments that have been made in response to each question. Not every comment received is listed.

Summary of consultation responses

Site Allocations and Policies DPD Issues and Options: September-November 2011

2. Suggested sites for new housing and other development

Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- Aitken & Merry put forward a site for residential development at Great Lane, Greetham;
- Ancer Spa on behalf of clients put forward a site for residential and other uses at Uppingham Gate, Uppingham;
- Andrew Granger & Co Ltd on behalf of clients put forward land for residential and associated development at Cold Overton Road, Langham; Main Street, Cottesmore; and Ashwell Road, Oakham;
- Bidwells on behalf of clients put forward land for residential development at Quarry Farm, Stamford (Little Casterton Parish);
- David Shaw Planning on behalf of clients put forward sites for tourism at Barnsdale (Exton Parish);
- Greetham Parochial Church Council puts forward land for waste management at Wood Lane, Greetham;
- Hughes Craven on behalf of clients put forward an extension to Hooby Lane Quarry, Stretton, for minerals extraction;
- Individual landowners put forward sites for residential development and other purposes at Wakerley Road, Barrowden; Morcott Road, Barrowden; Hubbards Lodge Stud, Langham;
- Ivor Crowson Developments (Stamford) Ltd put forward a site for minerals extraction at Stretton Road, Greetham;
- Jeakins Weir put forward land for residential development to the east of Uppingham Road and west of the bypass, Oakham;
- Marrons Planning on behalf of clients puts forward land for residential development at Belmesthorpe Lane, Ryhall; Ranksborough Farm, Langham; and Seaton Road, Glaston;
- Pegasus Group on behalf of clients put forward a site for residential development and open space at Bartles Hollow, Ketton;
- Richardson on behalf of clients puts forward sites for residential development at Glebe Road, North Luffenham;
- Savills on behalf of clients puts forward land for residential development at Stamford Road and Uppingham Road, Oakham;

Parish Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- North Luffenham Parish Council puts forward a site for affordable residential development off Pinfold Lane, North Luffenham.

Maps showing the location of these sites and further information about them can be found in the “Summary of Sites Submitted through the Call for Sites and Issues and Options Consultations (April 2016)” which can be viewed on the council’s website.

Summary of consultation responses

Site Allocations and Policies DPD Issues and Options: September-November 2011

3. Neighbourhood Plans

Question 1:

How should the Local Plan Review play a coordinating role in the preparation of neighbourhood plans?

Option A: Continue the current approach showing an overall figure for the amount of development to be accommodated across the Local Service Centres?

Option B: The Local Plan Review to specify the amount of development to be accommodated in each of the Local Service Centres?

Option C: The Local Plan to specify the amount of development to be accommodated in each of the Local Service Centres where there is a current or proposed neighbourhood plan and an overall figure for the remaining Local Service Centres?

Option D: Another option? (Please specify with reasons)

Option A	11	(28%)
Option B	12	(30%)
Option C	9	(23%)
Option D	7	(17%)

Total comments: 45

Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- A number of responses consider that the Local Plan must plan to deliver the strategic requirements of Rutland including sufficient land to meet assessed housing and employment needs and making land allocations at levels of the settlement hierarchy; It should provide the strategic framework for neighbourhood plans to conform, including the amount of housing, its distribution and allocation of sites;
- One response considers that the risk of leaving allocation of sites to neighbourhood plans will result in unnecessary delays in bringing sites forward and that the Local Plan Review should make specific allocations where there has been limited progress in preparing neighbourhood plans.

Parish Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- Most support for Option C with some support for A and B;
- Langham Neighbourhood Plan Group considers that the remaining number of houses should be divided between Local Service Centres that have no neighbourhood plan or those which do not stipulate how many houses;
- Uppingham Town Council supports the current approach of showing an overall figure across the local service centres in consultation with neighbourhood planning groups.

Public and interest groups

- Most support for Option A with some support for B, C and D;

Summary of consultation responses

Site Allocations and Policies DPD Issues and Options: September-November 2011

- Several comment that neighbourhood plans should be allowed to make decisions at local level to meet local needs;
- Uppingham First considers that it is not for the Local Plan to restrain or coordinate neighbourhood plans but it should build upon and embrace their content, simply specifying an overall minimum for housing countywide.

4. The spatial portrait, vision and objectives

Question 2:

Do you agree with the spatial portrait, objectives and vision as set out in the Council's current development plan documents?

Yes/No

If no, please state specify any changes that you consider necessary, giving reasons for your comments.....

Yes	30	(77%)
No	9	(23%)

Total comments: 57

Government and agencies

- Natural England welcome these and suggest additional wording in respect of soil resources and green infrastructure;

Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- 10 agree and 4 disagree;
- Marrons, Pegasus Group and Savills on behalf of clients generally support the spatial portrait, vision, objectives;
- Bidwells on behalf of clients consider the spatial portrait is must be updated and that the significance of Stamford as a key service centre is not given enough weight. The Council must enter in continuous process of engagement with South Kesteven District Council;
- DLP Planning on behalf of clients suggest that the objectives need to be more smart and specific to enable monitoring and that key decisions should not be deferred to neighbourhood plans; the vision should acknowledge that by 2026 suitable development opportunities across the County will have been identified planned and delivered;
- Strutt and Parker on behalf of clients consider that greater emphasis should be given to housing in local and smaller service centres.

Parish Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- 6 agree and 1 disagrees;
- Barrowden Parish Council considers that there should be a stronger objective to safeguard the special character of the Welland Valley ensuring that development in the smaller service centres and villages do not alter that character;
- Clipsham Parish Meeting considers that a clear distinction is needed between the Restraint Villages and larger villages that might be appropriate for development.

Public and interest groups

- 14 agree and 4 disagree;

Summary of consultation responses

Site Allocations and Policies DPD Issues and Options: September-November 2011

- The British Horse Society points out the importance of the horse industry to the local economy and its usefulness to health and wellbeing;
- The Melton and Oakham Waterways Society support green wedges and green corridors and suggest the remains of the Oakham Canal can support this and should be protected;
- The Theatres Trust suggest a definition of Community Facilities should be in support of objective 5;
- Uppingham First consider that the objectives should embrace the spirit of local determination and localism with an appropriate supporting statement;
- The Woodland Trust make various suggestions for additional wording in relation to trees and woodland and would like a single strong objective on the natural environment;
- Individual comments that there needs to be a more stronger awareness of the rural nature of Rutland; too much emphasis on Oakham and Uppingham and that development at county borders near Stamford will result in taking their custom out of the county.

5. The Spatial Strategy

Question 3:

Do you agree with the proposed grouping of villages in the settlement hierarchy in terms of the services and facilities available in those villages?

Option A: To include villages in the groups as shown in the proposed settlement hierarchy in Option A?

Option B: To include villages in the groups as shown in the proposed settlement hierarchy in Option B?

Option C: To include particular villages in different groups to those shown in Option A and Option B

If so, please specify the changes to the proposed settlement hierarchy that you consider necessary, giving reasons for this.

Option A	17	(44%)
Option B	8	(21%)
Option C (other options)	13	(34%)

Total comments: 65

Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- 6 support Option A with none supporting Option B and 5 supporting Option B;
- a range of other options put forward; Several support the role of Oakham and Uppingham as the primary focus for new development;
- Bidwells on behalf of clients consider that Stamford should be included in the settlement hierarchy as a strategic growth point/main town;
- DLP Planning on behalf of clients support the identification of Tinwell as a Smaller Service Centre;

Summary of consultation responses

Site Allocations and Policies DPD Issues and Options: September-November 2011

- Lucas Land and Planning on behalf of a client prefer Option B but with Barrowden and Lyddington categorised as Local Service Centres to strengthen villages close to Uppingham.
- Marrons on behalf of clients supports the proposal to upgrade Langham to a Local Service Centre and considers that spreading growth across fewer local service centres will present more opportunities for growth in the more suitable and sustainable smaller service centres;
- Strutt and Parker on behalf of clients support Option A but with Morcott as a local service centre;

Parish Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- 2 support Option A and 3 support Option B;
- Braunston Parish Council is alarmed at the proposal that the village should become a smaller service centre. It considers that the assessment methodology has not been applied consistently and that it should be reworked and reassessed;
- Barrowden Parish Council supports Option B as it spreads development across a larger number of locations but disagrees with the findings of the sustainability of settlements and considers this needs to be reassessed;
- Clipsham Parish Meeting raises a number of detailed concerns about the Sustainability of Settlements Assessment;
- Langham Parish Council considers that Langham should be a Smaller Service Centre and Market Overton a Local Service Centre; Barleythorpe has limited facilities but these are increasing and a review will be needed shortly;
- Tinwell Parish meeting would prefer its village to be an Accessible Village with Limited Facilities rather than a Smaller Service Centre;
- Uppingham Town Council considers that Barrowden should be a local service centre and Caldecott an Accessible Village with Limited Facilities.

Public and interest groups

- 9 support Option A and 5 support Options B and C;
- Environmental Theme Group considers the assessment of settlements needs to be re-calibrated to reflect a more realistic determination of sustainability; it considers Oakham to be the most sustainable location where most development should be focussed. Does not consider that Preston is a suitable village for development and should remain as a Small Village;
- Uppingham First considers that the local plan should stop trying to limit development with outdated and arbitrary criteria and support the two market towns in local determination of their economic and development needs.
- 12 responses object to the classification of Braunston as a Smaller Service Centre claiming that the scoring process is wrong and should be reassessed; One response supports its designation; One response considers that the Sustainability Assessment of Settlements does not reflect an accurate account of Barrowden and submits an alternative appraisal; One response supplies a copy of the Borough of Pendle's list of sustainable characteristics and asks that the system be reconsidered involving the whole community.

Summary of consultation responses

Site Allocations and Policies DPD Issues and Options: September-November 2011

Question 4:

How much new housing should the Local Plan Review provide for over the next 21 years 2015-2036:

Option A: Provide for the level of growth indicated in the SHMA (average of 173 dwellings per year)?

Option B: Provide for a higher level of growth than identified in the SHMA Update? (Please specify with reasons)

Option C: Provide for a lower level of growth than identified in the SHMA Update? (Please specify with reasons)

If so, please specify the changes to the proposed settlement hierarchy that you consider necessary, giving reasons for this.

Option A	35	(81%)
Option B	5	(11%)
Option C (other options)	3	(6%)

Total comments: 50

Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- 13 support Option A and 2 support Option B;
- Bidwells on behalf of clients considers that the figure should account for the accumulated backlog by including the 20% buffer as part of its 5 year land supply;
- DLP Planning on behalf of clients considers that the figure should be increased to 185 dwellings per annum to provide a balance between demographic change and economic growth and that consideration should be given to meeting needs from elsewhere in the HMA;
- Marrons on behalf of clients considers that the evidence base needs to be reviewed regularly and kept up to date in respect of demographic projections;
- Pegasus Group on behalf of clients considers that 173 dwellings is the minimum requirement and must be reviewed in the light of new population projections in Spring 2016;
- The Home Builders Federation comment that the Council should not plan for less than 173 dwellings per annum and that the widest possible range of sites will be needed.

Parish Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- 10 support Option A with one supporting Option C;
- Barrowden Parish Council wishes to see less reliance on windfall sites and more specific allocations;
- Langham Parish Council and Langham Neighbourhood Plan Group consider that Option A best aligns to their neighbourhood plan;
- Clipsham Parish Meeting considers that the SHMA is a flawed process leading to unsustainable levels of growth.

Public and interest groups

- 11 support Option A, 3 support Options B and 2 support Option C;

Summary of consultation responses

Site Allocations and Policies DPD Issues and Options: September-November 2011

- Individual responses suggest:
 - an increase closer to 25% on 150 dwellings equating to 187 per annum;
 - more housing than suggested will be needed because of people wanting to live on their own/living longer/wanting to downsize;
 - more starter homes needed not executive 5 bed homes;
 - large amounts of housing built at Oakham recently mean the town needs to draw its breath otherwise the character of the town could be destroyed.

Question 5:

Do you consider that any additional sites for employment, retail or other types of development should be allocated in the Local Plan Review?

Yes/No

If yes, please state what additional sites will be required giving reasons.

Yes	18	(66%)
No	9	(33%)

Total comments: 31

Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- ANCER SPA on behalf of clients consider additional sites for retail and community facilities will be needed in Uppingham;
- Astill Planning on behalf of clients puts forward sites for employment at Wireless Hill North Luffenham and for retail at Welland Vale Uppingham;
- DLP Planning on behalf of clients puts forward Greetham Quarry for new employment premises;
- Lucas Land and Planning on behalf of a client considers that a flexible approach will be needed towards Uppingham School staffing, estate and employment needs.

Parish Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- Barrowden Parish Council considers that specific actions will be needed to encourage home working in rural areas and appropriate infrastructure including superfast broadband;
- Langham Parish Council and Langham Neighbourhood Plan Group suggest Rutland County Council offices should move to Oakham Enterprise Park;
- Uppingham Town Council state that any additional sites should be taken account of through their neighbourhood plan;

Public and interest groups

- A range of additional facilities are suggested including
 - cinema;
 - sports;
 - more frequent railway services;
 - light industry;
 - more parking for retail;
 - more employment in Oakham;
 - enterprise in rural areas.

Summary of consultation responses

Site Allocations and Policies DPD Issues and Options: September-November 2011

- Uppingham First consider that the Local Plan should limit itself to overall targets and empower neighbourhood plans to determine specific sites as in Uppingham.

Question 6:

How should the future mix of new housing in Rutland be planned?

Option A1: Specify in detail the mix of dwellings types, sizes and tenures (including specialist provision) across Rutland and specify a requirement for affordable housing;

Option B1: Specify in broad terms the mix of dwellings types, sizes and tenures (including specialist provision) across Rutland with and to specify a requirement for affordable housing;

Option C1: Do not specify of the mix of dwellings types, sizes and tenures allowing the market to decide, but to specify a requirement for affordable housing.

Another option? (If so, please specify)

Option A1	10	(29%)
Option B1	14	(41%)
Option C1 (other options)	10	(29%)

- Total comments: 47

Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- 3 support Option B1 and 10 support Option B1;
- Bidwells, Savills, Pegasus Group on behalf of client and Jeakins Weir raise the need for flexibility and that the approach will need to be reviewed in the light of recent changes to government policy and definition of affordable housing;
- DLP Planning on behalf of clients consider that the Council should avoid any prescriptive policy on housing mix and should set a percentage target for affordable housing but recognising viability concerns;
- DLP Planning on behalf of clients considers that the Council should avoid over-prescription on housing mix, setting a percentage target for affordable housing but recognising viability concerns;
- Marrons on behalf of clients consider that seeking to exercise control over purchasing decisions is not possible in the private sector and flexibility will be needed to ensure that local demand is met;
- The Home Builders Federation comments that any policy should not micro-manage development and it must acknowledge that there are a number of ways to meet different needs. References to Building for Life and Lifetime Homes need to be updated and a whole plan viability assessment needed.
- The Planning Bureau consider that, unless properly planned for, there is likely to be a serious shortfall in specialist accommodation for the elderly population and suggest policies that encourage specialist housing for elderly people to “Lifetime Homes” standards that can be readily adapted to meet their needs.

Parish Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

Summary of consultation responses

Site Allocations and Policies DPD Issues and Options: September-November 2011

- 2 support Option A1 and 3 support Option B1;
- Barrowden Parish Council raises the issue of the high demand for older residents wishing to downsize and the lack of quality smaller homes for them to purchase;
- Langham Neighbourhood Plan Group consider that it would be appropriate to set a broad target but to be more prescriptive would prevent villages, especially, to sustain their unique character;
- Langham Parish Council consider it important to include starter homes and homes for single people and flats or apartments are not particularly suitable for the elderly, especially single people;
- Uppingham Town Council considers that the local plan should not specify the mix but specify a requirement for affordable housing and defer to the neighbourhood plan.

Public and interest groups

- 8 support Option A1 and 7 support Option B1;
- Uppingham First considers that localism has provided the means for towns such as Uppingham to determine their own needs which should be encouraged in the local plan;
- Individual responses raise the need for bungalows and properties suitable for older people wishing to downsize and that these bungalows should be accessible for wheelchairs and showers rather than baths.

Question 7:

Do you agree that the distribution of growth between the towns and villages in Rutland should:

Option A: Maintain the current apportionment of new development between the towns and villages?

Option B: Provide for a higher proportion of growth at Oakham?

Option C: Provide for a higher proportion of growth at Uppingham?

Option D: Provide for higher level of growth at the Local Service Centres?

Another Option?

Option A	10 (28%)
Option B	7 (19%)
Option C	4 (11%)
Option D	9 (25%)
Another Option	6 (17%)

- Total comments: 48

Government and Agencies

- Highways England considers that the cumulative impacts of growth in Oakham should be subject to a transport assessment.
- Historic England is concerned that there is no reference to heritage assets within the options;

Summary of consultation responses

Site Allocations and Policies DPD Issues and Options: September-November 2011

Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- ANCER SPA Ltd on behalf of clients considers increasing the proportion of growth at Uppingham will facilitate the development of additional facilities and services that the town needs;
- Bidwells on behalf of clients suggest growth on the edge of Stamford should be presented as an option in the Local Plan Review because it is a suitable location for development;
- DLP Planning Ltd on behalf of clients consider providing a higher level of growth in the rural areas with a minimum of 40% growth to the rural villages;
- DLP Planning Ltd on behalf of clients considers the main towns should remain the focus of residential development. No less than 60% of residential development being focussed on Oakham and Uppingham;
- DLP Planning Ltd on behalf of clients consider the proportion of residential development directed to Local Service Centres should increase and consideration be given to strategic opportunities in and around such centres, including Greetham Quarry;
- Lucas Land and Planning on behalf of clients suggest including a higher level of growth in the Smaller Service Centres as well as the Local Service Centres. The concern is too much development could threaten the attractive fabric of Uppingham and swamp both the infrastructure and small town centre;
- Marrons on behalf of clients consider it crucial that a reasonable level of new development is provided across the Local Service Centres;
- Marrons on behalf of clients consider Oakham is the most sustainable settlement within the County and has the ability to provide the necessary infrastructure to accommodate significant amounts of new development;
- One response considers separate 'hamlets' away from Local Service Centres can provide like-minded communities and good neighbour relations;
- Pegasus Group on behalf of clients suggest that a 65%/25% split between the main towns and the Local Service Centres should be considered;
- Robson Planning Consultancy on behalf of clients suggest to meet current government NPPF consultation proposals for more sustainable development on brownfield land and small sites adjacent to settlement boundaries;
- Savills on behalf of clients consider Oakham is the most sustainable settlement in the County therefore should provide for a high proportion of growth;
- The Home Builders Federation Ltd considers the apportionment of the housing requirement to the towns and villages and future directions of growth should give due consideration to meeting the housing needs of rural areas especially as Rutland is one of the least affordable areas in the country.

Parish Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- Barrowden Parish Council considers that specific allocations should be made to all categories and it should not be left to windfall sites to meet the target numbers. Development in Smaller Service Centres (SSCs) and villages is not sustainable; Propose that the Local Service Centres have a higher proportion of housing development and the SSCs and villages are reduced to 5% of the total need;
- Cottesmore Parish Council and Clipsham Parish meeting support Option B;
- Ketton and Morcott Parish Council's support Option A;
- Langham Neighbourhood Plan Group consider Option A would be acceptable on the condition that Option B is accepted in Question 3;

Summary of consultation responses

Site Allocations and Policies DPD Issues and Options: September-November 2011

- Langham Parish Council support Option C as it would help retain the rural character of Rutland Villages and increase the viability of both Oakham and Uppingham. Consider development on the edge of Stamford would be sustainable with good transport links;
- Oakham Town Council supports Option D;
- Uppingham Town Council considers that the plan should provide for a higher level of growth at Local Service Centres, Smaller Service Centres and Villages with limited services.

Public and interest groups

- CPRE Rutland branch and two members of the public support Option D as there are now sufficient local service centres identified to allow more sustainable growth in them and would enhance their role and increase the chance of improved public transport accessibility etc. Another option – include the Smaller Service Centres as well;
- Environmental Theme Group supports Option B as it provides for a higher growth at Oakham for the reason that this is the most sustainable location;
- Melton and Oakham Waterways Society are supportive of any development in the vicinity of Oakham Enterprise Park to the north of Oakham, where such development could be used to support the restoration of the Oakham Canal;
- Uppingham First does not support further development in the area of Oakham Enterprise Park and considers the plan should support further opportunities on existing employment sites in Uppingham;
- Four individual comments support Option A; Two support Option B and one considers if we are to develop vibrant and prosperous market towns then Oakham as the County town needs to grow. It also has land in most directions to sustain this. It will also serve to limit housing growth in the Local Service Centres.

Question 8:

Do you agree that the distribution of new development between Oakham and Uppingham should?

Option A: Maintain the current apportionment of new development between Oakham and Uppingham

Option B: Provide for higher level growth at Uppingham

Option C: Provide for higher level growth at Uppingham.

Another option? Yes/No

If yes, please specify giving reasons for this option.

Option A	12	(33%)
Option B	9	(25%)
Option C	11	(31%)
Another Option	4	(11%)

- Total comments: 41 (7 respondents did not choose an option)

Summary of consultation responses

Site Allocations and Policies DPD Issues and Options: September-November 2011

Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- 2 support Option A; 2 support Option B; 4 support Option 4; and 3 support Another Option;
- Ancer Spa on behalf of clients suggests that without additional growth, it will not be possible for the public transport infrastructure of Uppingham to improve or for additional facilities to be 'attracted' to the town. It is also essential in order to assist Uppingham in gaining the much needed public transport and funding improvements to local services and facilities. Based upon the total population of the two towns alone it would be reasonable for the split to be at least 30% of growth being directed toward Uppingham. The allocation for Uppingham (based upon 30/70 split between Uppingham and Oakham) should therefore be 330 units, rather than 20;
- Andrew Granger and Co Ltd on behalf of clients consider that a higher level of growth should be provided in the Local Service Centres;
- DLP Planning Ltd on behalf of clients considers that Oakham should logically continue to take the largest share of residential development in the urban settlements. However, given the need to support Uppingham, and the level of development already focused on Oakham, DLP can also see a case for an increase in the proportion of development to be focused on Uppingham to approximately 30%;
- Jeakins Weir suggests that to allocate 80% of the main town's proposed growth towards Oakham, with the remaining 20% directed towards Uppingham is a strategy that doesn't adequately reflect Oakham's significantly stronger sustainability credentials;
- Lucas Land and Planning on behalf of client preferred an option maintaining the current apportionment between Oakham and Uppingham – to be agreed with the Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan;
- Marrons on behalf of clients state that Uppingham is constrained by limited public transport services and has fewer facilities when compared to Oakham. Oakham has the benefit of excellent public transport links and contains a wide range of higher order services and facilities which can support significant amounts of new development. This approach also ensures that the local service centres such as Ryhall can accommodate the smaller scale development over the plan period, depending on their levels of sustainability;
- Robson Planning consultancy on behalf of clients suggests providing more housing associated with service centres rather than concentrating development at the two towns since the Council's emphasis on these two settlements is less sustainable on its own and will increase isolation of the smaller communities;
- Savills on behalf of clients suggests a higher proportion of growth should be allocated to Oakham.

Parish Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- 2 support option A; 1 supports option B; 4 support option C; and 4 support Another Option;
- Barrowden Parish Council consider that a higher level of growth should be allocated for Uppingham; growth should not be concentrated in Oakham;
- Langham Neighbourhood Plan Group recommends a weighting towards Oakham as the current 80:20 ratio is slightly too high;

Public and interest groups

Summary of consultation responses

Site Allocations and Policies DPD Issues and Options: September-November 2011

- 7 support Option A; 5 support Option B; 3 support Option C; and 1 supports another option;
- Uppingham First consider the level of economic growth should be a matter of local determination at town level, subject to the SHMA Housing target;
- individual responses suggest:
 - more housing for other villages including starter homes, affordable housing and older persons smaller homes;
 - 50% to both Oakham and Uppingham, highlighting that Uppingham also requires growth;
 - Uppingham has better access to major roads such as the A47 and A1 and Oakham is currently overdeveloped.

6. Site allocations

Question 9

Which are the most suitable directions for growth in and around Oakham (please select as many as apply)?

Option 1: Previously developed land and buildings within the built-up area of the town.

Option 2: South-east of Oakham (between the bypass and the railway)

Option 3: South of Oakham (between the railway and Brooke Road)

Option 4: South of Oakham (between Brooke Road and Cold Overton Road)

Option 5: West of Oakham (between Cold Overton Road and Barleythorpe Road)

Option 6: North of Oakham (between Melton Road and the railway, outside the bypass)

Option 7: North east of Oakham (between the railway and Burley Road, outside the bypass)

Option 8: East of Oakham (between Burley Road and Stamford Road, outside the bypass)

Another option?

Option 1	14	(18%)
Option 2	11	(14%)
Option 3	13	(17%)
Option 4	4	(5%)
Option 5	10	(13%)
Option 6	9	(12%)
Option 7	6	(8%)
Option 8	4	(5%)
Another Option	4	(5%)

Summary of consultation responses

Site Allocations and Policies DPD Issues and Options: September-November 2011

Total comments: 75

Summary of consultation responses

Site Allocations and Policies DPD Issues and Options: September-November 2011

Government and Agencies

- Environment Agency indicated that Options 7 and 8 extend toward flood zones 2 and 3. It is unclear if the sites themselves would be at flood risk; Options 2 and 4 may fall within flood zones 2 and 3 after the Welland flood model update;
- Historic England is concerned about the lack of reference to historic assets. Substantial further work is required in relation to heritage assets in order to determine the suitability of any proposed sites or directions for growth.

Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- Andrew Granger and Co Ltd on behalf of clients support Options 6 and 7;
- Anglian Water Services Ltd state that consideration should be given to the implications of locating development within these areas for the existing foul sewerage network and to what extent new or improved infrastructure will be required and also to the impact of additional flows on Oakham Water Recycling Centre and how foul flows will be conveyed to this site;
- Burley Estate support Options 7 and 8;
- Jeakins Weir support land to the east of Uppingham Road and west of the bypass (Option 2);
- Marrons on behalf of clients support Option 3;
- Savills on behalf of clients and Jeakins Weir support Option 2 and consider it to be the most appropriate location for new growth around Oakham (detailed justification given);

Parish Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- The highest level of support for Option 1 (5 responses) on previously developed land within the built up area of Oakham followed by Option 3 (4 responses) to the south of Oakham between the railway and Brooke Road;
- Clipsham Parish Meeting support Option 1, 3, 5 and 6;
- Langham Neighbourhood Plan Group support Options 1, 2, 3, 4 and 8;
- Langham Parish Council support Options 1, 2, 3 and 4;
- Morcott Parish Council support Options 1, 5, 6 and 7;
- Oakham Town Council support Options 1, 3 and 5;
- Uppingham Town Council consider it is the role of Oakham Town Council to determine through their Neighbourhood Plan.

Public and interest groups

- The highest level of support is for Option 1 (9 responses) for developing on previously developed land and within the built up area followed by Option 2 (8 responses) land to the southeast of Oakham;
- Melton and Oakham Waterways Society consider that the remains of the Oakham Canal to the north of Oakham should be particularly protected from future development and any development in this area should be to contribute to the restoration of the canal and public access to it;
- The Environmental Theme Group prefers Option 1 if it is done carefully. Options 3, 5, 7 and 8 could be developed subject to more detailed assessment and new crossings over the railway may be required although option 8 is close to existing sewage works. Option 6 could be sustainable for employment/industrial use and suitable acoustic buffer zone away from existing residential area that allows business to freely operate. Option 2 would require careful consideration given to the impact on the important green wedge to preserve this distinct feature and

Summary of consultation responses

Site Allocations and Policies DPD Issues and Options: September-November 2011

Option 4 is considered unsuitable due to high visual impact and existing woodland;

- Uppingham First consider this is a matter for the Oakham Neighbourhood Plan and Oakham Town Council;
- Individual responses include:
 - development should not go outside the bypass, particularly not the land between the railway and the Ashwell Road;
 - unless the level crossing problems are resolved, development has to be on the town centre side of the railway;
 - care should be taken to prevent each area effectively joining the next, which will compromise village identities.

Question 10

Should future growth at Uppingham continue to be focussed on allocated sites to the north and west of the town?

Yes

No

Another option?

Yes	19 (83%)
No	3 (13%)
Another Option	1 (4%)

Government and Agencies

- The Environment Agency point out that areas to the north and west of Uppingham lie within flood zone 1;
- Historic England considers that substantial further work is required in relation to heritage assets in order to determine the suitability of any proposed sites or directions of growth.

Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- Anglian Water Services Ltd set out that consideration should be given to the implications of locating development within these areas for the existing foul sewerage network and to what extent new or improved infrastructure will be required;
- Ancer Spa Ltd on behalf of clients consider the site at Uppingham Gate is ideally located for further growth;
- Lucas Land and Planning on behalf of clients considers there is already potential for increased densities of development to be provided on the sites allocated in the Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan and it is for the Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan to ascertain the need for future residential allocations and the possible timing of future allocations.

Parish Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- Langham, Barrowden and Morcott Parish Councils, Clipsham Parish Meeting and Langham Neighbourhood Plan Group support future growth focussed to the north and west of Uppingham;

Summary of consultation responses

Site Allocations and Policies DPD Issues and Options: September-November 2011

- Uppingham Town Council and Langham Neighbourhood Plan Group consider this should be determined by the Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan.

Public and interest groups

- Environmental Theme Group considers there could be sustainable development in this area subject to more detailed assessment;
- Individual comments suggest:
 - an option between the Leicester Road and Stockerston Road or a third option i.e. west-south-west;
 - no development takes place north of the A47 in Uppingham. In the longer terms would be possible to develop between London Road and Gypsy Lane, south of the middle playing field. Another possibility could be infill between the A47 and the road leading to North Street East. Any development would mean more traffic.
- Uppingham First proposes that while the Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan concentrates on the north and west of the town for housing development, the emerging draft Town Centre and Business Zones Plan explore the potential growth on brown field sites in the town centre and specifically a new development zone incorporating retail, parking and starter homes. The new local plan should not seek to restrict such a development which is in line with current government thinking.

7. Minerals Planning Issues

Question 11:

Do you agree with the proposed approach to providing for a steady and adequate supply of minerals by:

- identifying a provision rate for limestone of 0.19 Mtpa based on the average aggregate sales for the most recent ten year rolling period (2004 – 2013);
- maintaining a sufficient stock of permitted reserves for limestone and clay in order to supply the Cement Works at Ketton at the existing output of 1.4 Mt of cement production per annum
- not identifying a provision rate for other forms of mineral extraction and aggregate production?

Option A) Identify the provision to be made for minerals as proposed above.
Option B) Identify the provision to be made for minerals through another method.

If so please specify the changes to the proposed approach that you consider necessary, giving reasons for this.

Option A	17	(89%)
Option B	2	(11%)

- Total comments: 20

Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- 1 supports Option A and 1 support Option B;

Summary of consultation responses

Site Allocations and Policies DPD Issues and Options: September-November 2011

- The Minerals Product Association support Option B as it cannot agree to the statements made on aggregate demand or endorse the intended local provision until the deficiencies in the Local Aggregate Assessment have been addressed. The plan should contain a policy commitment to maintain a stock of permitted reserves to support the actual and proposed investment for plant and equipment, of at least 15 years for cement primary (chalk and limestone) and secondary (clay and shale) materials to maintain an existing plant;
- Clipsham Quarry Company and Bullimore Sand and Gravel Ltd support Option A but consider this may not be sufficient to cover the plan period up to 2036 and recommend an early review. It would also be helpful if the Plan made clear that planning for a year-on-year supply of 0.19mt of limestone is effectively a minimum level of supply to be achieved.

Parish Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- 6 support Option A;

Public and interest groups

- 10 support Option A and 1 support Option B;

Question 12:

Do you agree with the proposed approach that would see the current spatial strategy and locational elements taken forward into the Local Plan Review (including the designated areas for future minerals extraction and area of search); the development criteria being combined into fewer policies and refining these to also address minerals specific planning requirements (where appropriate); and continuing with the approach of not including site-specific allocations.

Option A) Include the spatial strategy and locational elements as proposed above.

Option B) Alter the currently adopted spatial strategy and locational elements to be taken forward into the emerging plan.

If so please specify the changes to the proposed approach that you consider necessary, giving reasons for this.

Option A	18	(86%)
Option B	3	(14%)

- • Total comments: 23

Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- 1 supports Option A and 2 support Option B;
- The Minerals Product Association (MPA) support Option B as they believe that it is inappropriate to continue to make demonstration of need a requirement for permission of mineral. The Local Plan should not oppose new sites merely because they are new. There is no need to review policy on building stone but submit that it is not in line with national policy and guidance. MPA consider that limitation to small scale operations is counter-productive and unjustified. They urge the Council to review the policies affecting building stone (MCS 3 and 6)

Summary of consultation responses

Site Allocations and Policies DPD Issues and Options: September-November 2011

and remove the requirement for them to be small scale and limited to local markets or heritage end uses.

Government and agencies

- Northamptonshire County Council agrees with the proposal for minerals appointment and that locally important stone be included in MSAs.

Parish Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- 7 support Option A.

Public and interest groups

- 10 support Option A and 1 support Option B.

Question 13:

Do you consider that any additional sites for minerals extraction and aggregate production need to be allocated to ensure a steady and adequate supply of aggregates?

Yes

No

If yes please state what additional sites will be required giving reasons and site-specific information.

Yes	17	(89%)
No	2	(11%)

- Total comments: 18

Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- 1 agrees;
- Clipsham Quarry Company/Bullimore Sand and Gravel Ltd consider that it is necessary for the Council to allocate additional areas for mineral extraction/ aggregate production during the Plan period (to 2036) to ensure a steady and adequate supply of minerals. An extension(s) to Clipsham Quarry will be necessary during the 20-year Plan period to sustain supplies of both limestone aggregate and high quality building stone at the required provision levels;
- DLP Planning Ltd indicates that further land is available for limestone extraction at Greetham Quarry, if new allocations are needed to meet future targets;
- Minerals Product Association consider that the justification for providing no additional sites has yet to be demonstrated in a Local Aggregate Assessment that addresses the shortcomings we have identified.

Parish Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- 5 disagree;
- Barrowden Parish Council disagree unless there is clear evidence of longer term demand.

Public and interest groups

- 9 disagree.

Summary of consultation responses

Site Allocations and Policies DPD Issues and Options: September-November 2011

Question 14:

Do you agree with the proposed approach to be taken to safeguarding of mineral resources and related development that would see the Minerals Safeguarding Area (MSA) and planning requirements refined to address local circumstances (including identification of building stone resources) and align with national policy and guidance?

Option A) Continue with the current approach to the MSA.

Option B) The current MSA and planning requirements for development proposals within the MSA should be refined as proposed above.

Option C) Alter the current approach to the MSA using a different method.

If so please specify the changes to the proposed approach that you consider necessary, giving reasons for this.

Option A	6	(32%)
Option B	12	(63%)
Option C	1	(5%)

- Total comments: 21

Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- 1 support Option B and 1 support Option C;
- The Minerals Product Association considers it is important for the review to make sure the safeguarding approach is fully consistent with national policy and guidance.

Government and agencies

- Northamptonshire County Council agrees with the proposal for minerals appointment and that locally important stone be included in MSAs.

Parish Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- 3 support Option A and 4 support Option B.

Public and interest groups

- 3 support Option A and 7 support Option B.

8. Waste Planning Issues

Question 15:

Do you agree with the proposed approach to identifying waste arisings and indicative waste management and disposal capacity requirements detailed in the Local Waste Management Needs Assessment 2015?

Option A) Identify the indicative capacity requirements for waste management and disposal as proposed.

Option B) Identify the indicative capacity requirements for waste management and disposal through another method.

Summary of consultation responses

Site Allocations and Policies DPD Issues and Options: September-November 2011

If so please specify the changes to the proposed approach that you consider necessary, giving reasons for this.

Option A	17	(89%)
Option B	2	(11%)

- Total comments: 20

Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- 1 support Option A.

Government and agencies

- Environment Agency suggests the Council develop a formal review mechanism and contingency procedures to address any potential disruption to the provision of waste management to Rutland that may arise from planning issues outside Rutland's control.

Parish Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- 6 support Option A and 1 support Option B;
- Langham Neighbourhood Plan Group support Option A as long as great care and consideration is taken with siting of these.

Public and interest groups

- 9 support Option A and 1 support Option B;
- Individual responses include any option should maximise the recycling or if possible the prevention of waste and current facilities for household waste on two sites with limited opening hours is limited.

Question 16:

Do you agree that a new policy addressing LLW management and disposal outlining local planning requirements should be prepared for inclusion in the Local Plan?

Yes
No

Yes	20	(91%)
No	2	(9%)

- Total comments: 24

Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- 1 agrees.

Government and agencies

- Environment Agency welcome the recognition within this Plan of the fact that waste planning authorities are now required to take account of low level radioactive waste (LLW) in line with national policy and guidance. Given the size of the council area, and the relatively insignificant amount of low level radioactive

Summary of consultation responses

Site Allocations and Policies DPD Issues and Options: September-November 2011

waste generated locally, it may be sensible in this instance to not develop a radioactive waste policy. However, it would be happy to support the council's judgment either way on this.

Parish Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- 7 agree.
- Barrowden Parish Council that it is better to have a clear policy than be silent on this matter;
- Langham Neighbourhood Plan Group outlines that the policy needs to state that having such a site should not become a disposal site for other counties.

Public and interest groups

- 12 agree and 2 disagree;
- One individual response states that the Council should avoid the King's Cliffe situation.

Question 17:

Do you agree with the proposed approach to be taken to the spatial strategy and locational elements of the Local Plan regarding waste management and disposal which would see the current spatial strategy taken forward into the emerging Local Plan; the development criteria refined to reflect national policy and guidance where necessary; and continuing with the approach of not including site-specific allocations for large scale advanced treatment facilities, new landfill site(s), hazardous waste management facilities or inert disposal not associated with restoration of quarries.

Option A) Include the spatial strategy and locational elements as proposed above. Option B) Alter the currently adopted spatial strategy and locational elements to be taken forward into the emerging plan.

If so please specify the changes to the proposed approach that you consider necessary, giving reasons for this.

Option A	19	(100%)
Option B	0	(0%)

- • Total comments: 20

Government and agencies

- Northamptonshire County Council supports the continuation of development of a sustainable waste management network and recognises the need for cross boundary movements.

Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- Clipsham Quarry Company/Bullimore Sand and Gravel Ltd support Option A and indicate that disposal capacity at Woolfox Quarry is unlikely to be available from approximately the middle of the Plan period. There is potential benefit in allowing for some importation of these inert materials to assist reclamation of Clipsham Quarry during the Plan period.

Summary of consultation responses

Site Allocations and Policies DPD Issues and Options: September-November 2011

Parish Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- 5 support Option A.

Public and interest groups

- 12 support Option A.

Question 18:

Do you consider that any additional sites for waste management use (in particular small scale facilities such as materials recycling facility, composting, anaerobic digestion, inert recycling/processing or other suitable processes) will be required to facilitate delivery of the indicative waste management capacity requirements over the plan period?

Option A) Yes, additional sites will be required. If yes please state what additional sites will be required giving reasons and site-specific information (including land owner contact details).

Option B) No, the existing allocations and enabling policies are sufficient to allow sites to come forward over the plan period.

Option A	6	(32%)
Option B	13	(68%)

- • Total comments: 20

Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- 1 supports Option A;
- One private landowner supports Option A indicating that a flexible approach is appropriate and new sites when required, should be completed before they are required.

Parish Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- 2 support Option A and 5 support Option B;
- Barrowden Parish Council support Option A stating additional Civic Amenity (CA) recycling sites are required around Oakham as the population grows, since driving towards Cottesmore or Morcott CAs cannot be considered sustainable;
- Langham Neighbourhood Plan Group support Option B indicating that no additional sites need to be added in light of the reduced estimate of requirement;
- Morcott Parish Council support Option A indicating that another Civic Amenity will be required as the North Luffenham CA site is inappropriately situated.

Public and interest groups

- 3 support Option A and 8 support Option B;
- Individual responses include more CA tips are needed and recycling of clothing.

Summary of consultation responses

Site Allocations and Policies DPD Issues and Options: September-November 2011

9. Infrastructure

Question 19:

Is there any additional infrastructure that will be required to support the new development in Rutland that will be required in the period to 2036?

Yes
No

If yes, please specify with reasons.

Yes	33	(92%)
No	3	(8%)

- Total comments: 38 respondents (2 respondents submitted comments only)

Government and Agencies

- The Environment Agency referred to water quality matters, stating that flow monitoring records for treated effluent (for 2014) from the Oakham Waste Water Recycling facility indicates there is limited licensed headroom to accommodate further growth of that community. It is imperative that Anglian Water Services are consulted to discuss infrastructure provision.

Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- Ancer Spa on behalf of clients stated that land for community uses and retail will also be required within the main towns of the County;
- One private landowner considers that a new, much larger facility is needed to replace the Oakham Medical Practice;
- Lucas Land on behalf of clients state that cycle paths need to be considered at the outset in the development process. Further development should be accompanied by sustainable infrastructure from all points of view: healthcare, policing, parking etc;
- Robson Planning Consultancy on behalf of clients considered that if appropriate sites are chosen, the infrastructure will require less or no additional infrastructure.

Parish Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- Oakham and Uppingham Town Councils consider that there should be a general increase in all services and infrastructure, proportionate to the amount of development to 2036;
- Ketton and Cottesmore Parish Councils highlighted a need for more local services to help minimise the need for travel. Ketton went on to state that it is important to retain as many shops and post offices as possible, outside the main towns.
- With regard to highways infrastructure and transport:
 - Cottesmore Parish Council identifies a need for a considerable increase in both the numbers and frequencies of buses to alter the dependence on cars. Barrowden Parish Council identifies the need for more appropriate bus services to meet employment requirements; and Uppingham Town Council and Langham Parish Council highlight the need for an improved internal and external bus services.

Summary of consultation responses

Site Allocations and Policies DPD Issues and Options: September-November 2011

- Langham Neighbourhood Plan group considers that medical provision in and around Oakham is poor and needs to be more accessible, bigger and with additional parking. There is not enough provision for school places for existing residents particularly in and around Oakham. There is a need for additional parking and level crossing improvement in Oakham; improvements are needed to the pavement/cyclepath between Oakham and Barleythorpe with a safe means of crossing needed;
- Langham Parish Council considers there is a need for additional parking places in Oakham, Uppingham and Oakham station;
- Oakham Town Council identifies a need for a Western Distributor Road;
- Several parishes consider there to be a need for bypasses. Morcott Parish Council considers the need for bypasses generally around the towns and villages, whilst Langham Neighbourhood Plan Group considers that a Langham Bypass is becoming critically important. Uppingham Town Council considers there is a need for an Uppingham Bypass and Barrowden Parish Council considers that additional development in the town would cause a need for a north-south bypass;
- Tinwell Parish Meeting would like to see a new road for Ketton works to the A606. This would reduce the HGV traffic through Ketton and Tinwell via the A6121;
- Uppingham Town Council considers a need for improved access to Station Road cycle paths as well as improved footpaths and a coach park;
- Uppingham Town Council wishes to see improved access to Station Road, cycle paths, improved footpaths, a coach park, car parks (improved disabled, child/parent and a long stay car park on the perimeter).
- A number of parishes consider school and health provision:
 - Barrowden Parish Council considers there to be a need for better provision of GP Services and consideration should be given to providing schooling close to new developments;
 - Ketton Parish Council proposes the relocation of the primary school to another site, preferably off the Empingham Road, if the site off Timbergate Road is developed;
 - Langham Parish Council considered the need for additional medical facilities and more school places.
- Barrowden Parish Council suggests improvements to sewage services and Clipsham Parish Meeting considers a need for new urban drainage systems;
- Langham Neighbourhood Council considers there a need for improved broadband provision, particularly in the villages; whilst Barrowden Council suggests the replacement of copper telephone cables.
- Clipsham Parish Council suggests a need for Green Open Spaces whilst Langham Parish Council requests larger play areas and open spaces within larger housing developments.

Public and interest groups

- Additional facilities suggested include:
 - a maternity unit reintroduced at Oakham hospital;
 - a new or larger doctor's practice in Oakham;
 - a swimming pool and children's swimming pool;
 - better policing and social care;
 - better public transport, including more frequent train and bus services;

Summary of consultation responses

Site Allocations and Policies DPD Issues and Options: September-November 2011

- broadband provision/extension/improvement; RCC needs to ensure that BT Openreach has a clear strategy for providing the superfast broadband for everyone;
- car parks;
- cycle routes on Uppingham Road/Braunston Road in Oakham;
- green spaces;
- hospital and healthcare service;
- improved primary and secondary schools including a new primary school at Oakham north;
- improved sewage and water infrastructure
- improvements to emergency services;
- leisure venues including a new arts centre/cinema
- more and better shops;
- more sheltered accommodation and housing for the elderly;
- open spaces and cycle routes;
- smaller/affordable houses in villages with smaller houses for older residents looking to downsize; more exception sites for social and affordable housing in villages;
- traffic calming measures in villages.
- Uppingham First suggest:
 - a new entrance to the Station Road Industrial Estate and the compulsory purchase and upgrade of its highway to bring it into public ownership;
 - delivery of the Uppingham Mast Project detailed in the Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan;
 - extension of “fibre to the premise” broadband to all parts of Uppingham;
 - a new cycle path from the A47 to the town centre;
 - a new shared space initiative linking High Street West to High Street East, incorporating the surface of the Market place, giving priority to pedestrians;
 - restoration of heritage paving in Uppingham Town Centre;
 - Various highway/footpath/roundabout improvements;
 - A new long stay car park as proposed in the draft Uppingham Town Centre and Business Zones Plan;
 - A community owned solar power farm.
- Environmental Theme Group considers a need for the provision of:
 - electric points for vehicles and new technologies and carbon reduction and micro-generation in new technologies;
 - multifunctional green spaces;
 - older drainage systems need to be assessed and upgraded before new development is permitted.
- CPRE Rutland Branch considers adequate provision should be made for:
 - a long term plan for the railway crossings;
 - education;
 - emergency services;
 - medical services;
 - open spaces.
 - public transport and parking in the town centres.

Summary of consultation responses

Site Allocations and Policies DPD Issues and Options: September-November 2011

10. Other issues

Question 20	
Are there any other issues that will need to be addressed in the Local Plan Review?	
Yes	18 (75%)
No	6 (25%)
If yes, please specify with reasons	

- Total comments: 36

Government and agencies

- Defence Infrastructure Organisation notes that there is no reference to the use of MOD sites. The MOD would like to see a policy similar to Policy SP11;
- East Northamptonshire Council considers it would be more appropriate to prepare a separate Minerals and Waste Plan as the issues differ fundamentally from other strategic planning matters; It considers that effective enhancement of green infrastructure corridors in North Northamptonshire would require extensive collaborative working between key partners. Further work may be required to enhance the ecological quality of the River Welland. For the new local plan, the importance of the Welland Valley as a green infrastructure corridor should be noted; the plan should acknowledge cross boundary relationships together with other similar networks elsewhere;
- Environment Agency suggests amending policies in respect of waste, land contamination, water quality, minimising the use of resources, and flood risk. A process of updating river modelling is under way which could result in changes to flood zones in Rutland;
- Highways England welcomes paragraph 5.39 as a means of ensuring that development is being allocated in a suitable manner and that impacts on the transport infrastructure being considered;
- Historic England is concerned about the lack of reference to historic assets and recommends that heritage policy should be strategic;
- Leicestershire County Council highlights the continued risk to the provision of subsidised bus services as reductions in government funding increase the pressure on local authority budgets;
- Melton Borough Council suggests continuing to work together in the future.
- Natural England welcomes the commitment in paragraph 1.9 to take into account the environmental as well as the economic, social sustainability of the plan.

Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- Andrew Grainger and Co raise the issue of its client's land which is being promoted for residential development in the Langham Neighbourhood Plan;
- Bidwells stress the duty to cooperate and the need for continual dialogue with South Kesteven District Council;
- Clipsham Quarry Company/Bullimores Sand and Gravel Ltd have concerns about the identification of Bidwell Lane as a Local Wildlife Site and the designation of local wildlife sites in general;

Summary of consultation responses

Site Allocations and Policies DPD Issues and Options: September-November 2011

- Lucas Land on behalf of client comment:
 - that spatial policies will need to reflect the role of the Uppingham and Oakham Schools as employers;
 - Para 1.6 be amended that Neighbourhood Plans should be in general conformity with strategic policies, not absolute;
 - Para 1.15, 3.3 to be amended to read “in general conformity with the plan”
 - Para 3.4 should be amended to read “should conform generally with its policies and provide...”;
 - Para 3.6 to be re-worded;
 - A sensible approach to new development initiatives outside the planned development limits will prevail.
- Marrons on behalf of clients stated that it will be necessary for other elements of the Plan to be updated to reflect changes in government policy and local infrastructure requirements, particularly Policy CS19 and CS20 of the Core Strategy which refer to Building for Life, Lifetime Homes Standards and the Code for Sustainable Homes. A viability assessment of the whole Local Plan Review will be required taking account of affordable housing requirements and the cumulative policy impacts on development. The implications of the CIL charging schedule would also need to be taken into account.
- Severn Trent Water will provide more specific comments and modelling of the network when detailed developments and site specific locations are confirmed but for most sites it not foresee any particular issues;
- Wardle Evans requests confirmation that the preferred allocations in the Langham Neighbourhood Plan are being taken forward and included in this plan;

Parish Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- Barrowden Parish Council wishes to make representation to Rutland County Council about potential changes to the Planned Limits of Development;
- Clipsham Parish Meeting considers that clear restoration targets should be established for limestone quarries to enhance biodiversity and disused quarries should never be permitted for housing development; the Planned Limits of Development are a vital and essential planning control and recommend strictest adherence to present planned limits of development; Foul and surface drainage needs to be assessed and managed;
- Langham Neighbourhood Plan group considers there is a need to ensure all RCC projects are not only well planned and reported but also well delivered e.g. waste;
- Langham Parish Council considers it important that all RCC policies are well planned and reported but also well delivered, e.g. waste is not always recycled as intended;
- Stretton Parish Council considers that the existing Development Plan Documents are fully adequate without change for the future extended period.
- Tinwell Parish Meeting considers the Local Plan Review is well written. It would welcome the submission of the site for development at the Old Barn, Casterton Lane, Tinwell but would object strongly to the field west of the A1 at Tinwell being developed in any way.
- Uppingham Town Council is keen to work on the local plan on a collaborative basis but emphasises that communities with a neighbourhood plan have much greater say than in the past. It considers section 3.4 to be misleading and should read that “any neighbourhood plans already under preparation should generally conform with its policies”.

Summary of consultation responses

Site Allocations and Policies DPD Issues and Options: September-November 2011

Public and Interest Groups

- British Horse Society considers there are gaps in the rights of way network, especially connectivity of bridleways;
- CPRE Rutland Branch considers there to be a future requirement for additional energy production in Rutland with priority given to schemes with low visual and environmental impact. Consideration should be given to Local Plans produced by districts adjoining Rutland;
- Leicestershire and Rutland Bridleways Association highlights the need to preserve, and where possible, extend the network of off-road rights of way for walkers, cyclists, horse riders and those with restricted mobility;
- Melton and Oakham Waterways Society would like to see Oakham Canal specifically recognised for protection and conservation. Future development in the vicinity of the canal should be conditional upon contribution to conservation and/or restoration opportunities;
- Environmental Theme Group considers the plan should enhance biodiversity explicitly linked to the local Bio Diversity Action Plan (BAP); restoration of limestone quarries in accordance with LPAB habitats is needed with clear restoration targets; a clear planning mechanism is needed to ensure new green spaces are designed to increase sustainability of the development through enhancing biodiversity, SUDS and attractive areas for leisure;.
- Theatres Trust supports the retention of Policy CS7 as it includes safeguards for cultural facilities and recommends a policy which contains criteria for encouraging the provision of new facilities to serve the growing population.
- Uppingham First comments that:
 - full embracement of the Localism Bill is required with the Local Plan with a bottom-up approach built on local opinion; Uppingham First advised:
 - RCC should discover community/Uppingham Town Council views before allocating sites in Uppingham. (para. 1.14);
 - The Localism Act requires that Neighbourhood Plans are in “general” conformity with the Local Plan. (para 1.2);
 - A reason for reviewing the Local Plan should be the advent of Localism (para 1.6);
 - It is difficult to understand why there should be a minimum size of site as a site is either viable or it is not (para 2.10);
 - The word ‘consideration’ should have read decision (para. 2.5)
 - Neighbourhood Plans should be able to include new areas of policy not yet in a local plan (para 3.9);
- Individual responses include the following:
 - affordable homes needed for young people;
 - being proactive over national energy demand;
 - better public transport to allow people to travel to work and shop;
 - document is not fit for purpose, too complex and using planning jargon;
 - drain maintenance;
 - extension of Planned Limits of Development requested at Morcott on the south side of the A47;
 - glossary would be useful;
 - increasing number of old people, including smaller houses in villages;
 - local shops and businesses and Oakham High Street needed to be safeguarded;

Summary of consultation responses

Site Allocations and Policies DPD Issues and Options: September-November 2011

- more housing in Stamford would place the historic town under pressure from traffic and will take the prosperity of Rutland in to Lincolnshire (para 5.37)
- Oakham Enterprise Park not providing what is needed;
- planned limits of development need to be reviewed;
- recycling of black plastic needed when the contract for recycling is retendered;
- upkeep of footpaths/cycle routes needed.

11. Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SA/SEA) and Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA)

Government and Agencies

- Natural England welcomes the SA/SEA and HRA;
- Historic England is concerned that the SA/SEA does not effectively consider heritage assets as it does not provide any detailed analysis of the historic environment impacts for each option under objective 10.

Parish Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- Clipsham Parish Meeting makes a number of detailed comments in relation to the SA/SEA and Baseline Scoping Report.