

Rutland Local Plan

Rutland Local Plan – Issues and Options November 2015 – January 2016

Schedule of Main Issues Raised, Officer Responses and how these have been taken into account in the Consultative Draft Local Plan, July 2017

Main issues raised	Officer Response	How have these comments been taken into account in the Consultative Draft
Sites for new housing and other development		
<p>A total of 128 sites were submitted to the Council through the “Call for Sites” Consultation and a further 9 new sites were submitted through the Issues and Options consultation.</p> <p>A summary of the sites that have been submitted to the Council is shown in the “Summary of sites submitted through the Call for Sites and Issues and Options Consultations September 2015-January 2016 (May 2016).</p>	<p>All the sites have been assessed by the Council in accordance with the published Methodology for Assessing Potential Sites.</p> <p>The findings of the assessment are published in the Site Appraisals and I identify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the sites that it is intended to allocate in the Local Plan and the reasons for their selection. • sites that have not been selected for inclusion in the Local Plan and the reasons for their exclusion. <p>Sites are identified to provide sufficient to meet the objectively assessed need identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment. These sites are set out in the policies of the plan and identified on the policies map.</p>	<p>Following completion of site appraisals and review of Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment, provisional allocations are set out in the Consultative Draft Local Plan.</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	How have these comments been taken into account in the Consultative Draft
	<p>As a starting point for determining allocations, the Council has continued to maintain the existing spatial strategy of new allocations to meet the housing requirement being split 70% in Oakham and Uppingham and 30% in villages, together with the spatial distribution between the two towns being 80% in Oakham and 20% in Uppingham. This has been reviewed and where necessary adjusted once site appraisals have been completed.</p>	
<p>Neighbourhood Plans (Q1)</p>		
<p>No clear preferences although marginally more support (30%) for the Local Plan to specify the amount of development to be accommodated across the Local Service Centres (Option B).</p> <p>Concerns were raised by those promoting development that the local plan should provide the strategic framework for neighbourhood plans to conform to and make allocations of land to meet assessed housing and employment needs.</p> <p>Parish Councils generally supported the approach that specifies the amount of land in each Local Service Centre where there is a neighbourhood plan and an overall figure</p>	<p>The response indicates marginally more support for an approach in which the local plan would specify the amount of development to be accommodated in each of the Local Service Centres.</p> <p>However a number of concerns have also been raised, particularly by those promoting development, that the Local Plan must plan to deliver the strategic housing requirements, by allocating specific sites for development. The NPPF indicates that Local Plans should plan positively for the</p>	<p>The Consultative Draft Local Plan provisionally allocates sites to meet the overall objectively assessed need for the County following the site appraisal process. The outcome of the provisional site allocations sets out the numbers of dwellings to be accommodated in each of the two towns and local service centres.</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	How have these comments been taken into account in the Consultative Draft
<p>for the remaining Local Service Centres.</p> <p>Amongst the public and interest groups, the highest level of support is for continuing the current approach that sets out the amount of development to be accommodated across the local service centres.</p>	<p>development that is needed, indicating broad areas for strategic development and allocating sites to promote development.</p> <p>Therefore it is recommended that the Local Plan should take the lead role by allocating sufficient sites for new housing and other development. This will help ensure that sufficient sites are brought forward in order to meet the needs that have been identified and that suitable sites are considered on a consistent basis. This would be undertaken in consultation with Town/Parish Councils and Neighbourhood Plan bodies.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Plans are able to provide additional guidance on development or to allocate any additional sites that they consider appropriate in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Local Plan.</p> <p>A review of the Sustainability of Settlements Assessment has been undertaken to support the appraisal of sites and identification of additional sites to be allocated in the new Local Plan.</p>	

Main issues raised	Officer Response	How have these comments been taken into account in the Consultative Draft
<p>The spatial portrait, vision and objectives (Q2)</p> <p>A large majority of respondents (77%) agreed with the spatial portrait, objectives and vision as set out in the Council’s current development plan documents. A number of specific suggestions for changes were made including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural England suggests additional wording in respect of soil resources and green infrastructure; • 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; 	<p>The spatial portrait, vision and objectives have been updated to ensure that they reflect current circumstances.</p> <p>Strategic Objective 5 is amended to refer to “Green infrastructure” rather than “natural green space”. The impact on soil resources will be taken into account in the development site assessments.</p> <p>We are cooperating with South Kesteven District Council in the planning of development on the northern edge of Stamford. However, Stamford is not considered to form part of Rutland’s settlement hierarchy or that it should be identified as a key service centre in Rutland’s Local Plan. The Issues and Options consultation noted that land in Rutland on the edge of Stamford could provide a relatively sustainable location for new development, being adjacent to a market town with a range of facilities and public transport. This might help to support the sustainable growth of Stamford.</p>	<p>The spatial portrait, vision and objectives have been updated to ensure that they reflect current circumstances.</p> <p>Strategic Objective 5 has been amended to refer to “Green infrastructure” rather than “natural green space”.</p> <p>Covered in Policy RLP13</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	How have these comments been taken into account in the Consultative Draft
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DLP Planning 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. <p><u>Parish Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<p>It is not considered that the objectives need to be made more smart or specific, as a number of monitoring indicators have been devised through the sustainability appraisal process to monitor the objectives of the plan.</p> <p>Addressed within the review of the Sustainability of Settlements Assessment.</p> <p>It is not considered that a stronger objective to safeguard the Welland Valley is needed as this is covered by Strategic Objective 12 relating to the natural and cultural environment.</p> <p>The Settlement Hierarchy sets out the distinction between the smaller and larger villages in terms of what might be appropriate for development</p>	<p>The spatial strategy as set out in Policy RLP3 refers to an appropriate scale of housing being achieved in each town and the larger villages by the end of the plan</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	How have these comments been taken into account in the Consultative Draft
<p><u>Public and interest groups</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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; 	<p>It is not considered necessary to give specific protection for the Oakham Canal as this will be given protection under other policies of the plan.</p> <p>A more detailed definition of community facilities is set out in the Policy RLP10 (Delivering socially inclusive communities).</p> <p>There is reference to the role of Neighbourhood Plans in the introductory section of the Consultative Draft. The Strategic Objectives relate more to specific economic, social and environmental aims with respect to the achievement of the Plan's visions.</p> <p>Strategic Objective 12: Natural and cultural environment sets out a wide ranging objective to safeguard and enhance the natural environment. It is not considered necessary to specifically refer to trees and woodland as it is intended that these are covered by the wider objectives and other policies of the</p>	<p>period.</p> <p>Covered within Policy RLP10.</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	How have these comments been taken into account in the Consultative Draft
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	<p>plan.</p> <p>Considered within the redrafting of policies and proposals</p>	
The Spatial Strategy		
The Settlement Hierarchy (Q3)		
<p>The option for a revised hierarchy of 9 Local Service Centres (Option A) received the highest level of support. A range of alternative options have been put forward which involve changing the status of individual villages within the settlement hierarchy.</p> <p>One response proposes that Stamford should be included in the settlement hierarchy.</p>	<p>The Council has continued to maintain the existing spatial strategy of new allocations to meet the housing requirement being split 70% in Oakham and Uppingham and 30% in villages, together with the spatial distribution between the two towns being 80% in Oakham and 20% in Uppingham.</p> <p>The Issues and Options consultation noted that land in Rutland on the edge of Stamford could provide a relatively sustainable location for new development, being adjacent to a market town with a range of facilities and public transport. This might help to support the</p>	<p>The spatial strategy as set out in Policy RLP3 refers to an appropriate scale of housing being achieved in each town and the larger villages by the end of the plan period.</p> <p>Covered in Policy RLP13</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	How have these comments been taken into account in the Consultative Draft
<p>Some parish councils have raised concerns about the status of their villages in the hierarchy, the methodology that was used and application of the sustainability assessment of villages.</p> <p>A number of responses (12) were received from the public objecting to the designation of Braunston as a Smaller Service Centre and questioning the scoring process.</p> <p>The Environment Theme Group considers that the assessment of settlements should be recalibrated to reflect a more realistic determination of sustainability.</p>	<p>sustainable growth of Stamford</p> <p>A review of the Sustainability of Settlements Assessment has been undertaken to support the settlement hierarchy to be promoted in the new Local Plan.</p> <p>.</p>	<p>Covered in Policy RLP3</p>
<p>The amount of new housing (Q4)</p>		
<p>There was a high degree of support overall (81%) for the approach that provides for the amount of growth indicated in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (173 dwellings per annum) (Option A).</p>	<p>The response indicates a high degree of support for providing for the amount of growth indicated in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment although the SHMA has been revised to take account of the latest population projections. This has produced a revised objectively assessed need of an average of 160 dwellings per annum.</p> <p>The SHMA sets out the objectively assessed housing need for Rutland in accordance with government guidance</p>	<p>The Consultative Draft Local Plan provides for a minimum of 160 dwellings per annum over the period 2015-2036 as recommended in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment.</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	How have these comments been taken into account in the Consultative Draft
<p>Comments from those promoting development include that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The figure is a minimum figure and should be reviewed in the light of new demographic projections; • It should be increased to 185 dwellings per annum to provide a balance between demographic change and economic growth; • It should include a 20% buffer as part of the 5 year land supply. <p>Other comments suggest 187 dwellings per annum with a need for more housing to meet the need for single person and starter homes.</p>	<p>and has been agreed with other local authorities in the housing market area.</p> <p>It is accepted that this is a minimum figure.</p> <p>The issue of a 20% buffer relates to the calculation of the 5 year land supply rather than the rather than the objectively assessed housing need.</p> <p>There does not appear to be any clear evidence to suggest that the objectively assessed need figure identified in the SHMA to should be increased to 187 dwellings per annum.</p> <p>The need for single person and starter homes is dealt with under the issue of housing mix (Q6) below.</p>	
<p>Sites for employment, retail or other types of development (Q5)</p>		
<p>A majority of responses (66%) supported the option that additional sites for employment, retail or other types of development should be allocated in the local plan.</p>		

Main issues raised	Officer Response	How have these comments been taken into account in the Consultative Draft
<p>Specific sites were put forward for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment land at Wireless Hill, North Luffenham; • Greetham Quarry for employment <p>A range of additional facilities have been suggested by the responses from the public including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • cinema; • sports; • more frequent railway services; • light industry; • more parking for retail; • more employment in Oakham; • enterprise in rural areas. 	<p>Additional sites assessed to take account of the requirements and recommendations set out in the Employment Land Study</p> <p>An Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is being prepared to support the Local Plan Review. It will provide an evidence base of expected 'pressure points' in relation to existing infrastructure capacity to meet the planned growth.</p> <p>It will address the overall scale of growth, its spatial distribution and the priorities for future investment in infrastructure. It will provide indicative information on potential costs and where the funding might come from, including developer contributions through the Community Infrastructure Levy and legal agreements such as s106 agreements.</p>	<p>Site Allocations for additional employment land are set out in Policy RLP19 of the Consultative Draft Local Plan.</p> <p>A draft IDP and the priority investments in infrastructure to support the planned growth will be published alongside the final draft version of the Local Plan.</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	How have these comments been taken into account in the Consultative Draft
<p>Uppingham First consider that the Local Plan should limit itself to overall targets and empower neighbourhood plans to determine specific sites as in Uppingham.</p>	<p>Site Allocations form part of the strategic policies of the Local Plan. Neighbourhood Plans can seek to allocate more than the Local Plan.</p>	<p>The Consultative Draft Local Plan sets out site allocations to meet housing and employment requirements for the whole of the County.</p>
<p>The housing mix (Q6)</p> <p>The highest level of support was for specifying in broad terms the mix of dwelling types, sizes and tenures, rather than specifying this in detail, or not specifying this.</p> <p>Those promoting development have raised concerns that the local plan should be flexible and should not seek to control the mix of housing types or be over-prescriptive on this issue.</p> <p>Other responses have raised the need for specific types of housing such as bungalows for older people wishing to downsize and starter homes for single people.</p>	<p>The NPPF requires the Council to plan for a mix of housing and identify the size, type, tenure and range of housing that is required in particular locations, reflecting local demand.</p> <p>The highest level of support is for specifying in broad terms the mix of dwelling types, sizes and tenures and is proposed that this approach be applied in the Local Plan Review.</p> <p>It is intended that the policies of the plan will set out in broad terms the mix of dwelling types, sizes and tenures that will be required. It is not intended that the plan will allocate sites for specific types or housing or that it will be over-prescriptive by setting out specific requirements for types of dwellings or dwelling mix on individual sites.</p>	<p>The policies of the Consultative Draft Local Plan set out in broad terms the mix of dwelling types, sizes and tenures that will be required according to the recommendations set out in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment.</p> <p>The requirements for provision of starter homes will be considered in the light of any forthcoming government guidance on this topic.</p> <p>The Consultative Draft Local Plan sets accessibility standards</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	How have these comments been taken into account in the Consultative Draft
	<p>These policies will help to address the need for specific types of housing such as bungalows for the elderly, although the detailed requirements for provision of specific types of housing on a site are likely to remain as issues for considering at the planning application stage on the merits of the application.</p> <p>It is also intended that the plan will set accessibility standards for certain types of dwellings, which the government has indicated local authorities may wish to do if considered and set out in policies in their local plans.</p> <p>Mandatory requirements for provision of starter homes may be required as a result of forthcoming government policy.</p>	<p>for certain types of dwellings.</p>
<p>Distribution of growth between the towns and villages (Q7)</p>		
<p>The highest level of support overall (28%) was for maintaining the current apportionment of new development between the towns and villages.</p>	<p>The current 70/30% split between the towns and villages is intended to reflect the relative sustainability of the settlements concerned. The highest level of support is for maintaining the current apportionment and there appears to be</p>	<p>Policy RLP3 sets out the spatial strategy for development in the County.</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	How have these comments been taken into account in the Consultative Draft
<p>Highways England considers that the cumulative impacts of growth at Oakham and Uppingham should be subject to a transport assessment.</p> <p>Historic England is concerned at the lack of reference to historic assets in the options.</p> <p>Landowners, developers, agents and business have suggested a range of different scenarios with several favouring a higher proportion of development to the villages and rural areas. There was no clear preference among Parish Councils or other respondents.</p>	<p>no clear preference for another option.</p> <p>Highways impacts will be considered within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>The impact of development on historic assets is considered as part of the site appraisal process and is addressed in other policies of the plan and in the appraisal of sites.</p> <p>The other distribution scenarios put forward have been considered but there does not appear to be strong evidence or consensus for a change in the approach.</p>	
<p>Distribution of growth between Oakham and Uppingham (Q8)</p>		
<p>There was no clear overall preference for any of the options although marginally more support (33%) for maintaining the current apportionment between the two towns (Option A).</p>	<p>The current 80/20% split between Oakham and Uppingham is intended to reflect the relative sustainability of the two towns. Oakham is considerably larger with better transport links, employment and wider range of services and facilities.</p>	<p>Policy RLP3 sets out the spatial strategy for development in the County.</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	How have these comments been taken into account in the Consultative Draft
<p>Among those promoting development, some responses suggest that Uppingham should receive a higher 30% proportion of growth, whereas others consider that it should stay the same or the proportion to Oakham should be increased.</p> <p>The majority of parish councils agreed with a higher level of growth for Uppingham (Option C) or another option. There was more support among the public for maintaining the current apportionment or higher growth at Oakham.</p>	<p>There is marginally more support for maintaining the current apportionment although some support for increasing the apportionment to Uppingham. Increasing the apportionment to Uppingham is not considered necessary given its lower sustainability rating and that housing completions in the town since 2011 have been considerably below the 20% already required under the current plan.</p> <p>There does not appear to be any strong evidence or consensus for a change in the current apportionment.</p>	
<p>Directions for growth around Oakham (Q9)</p>		
<p>Overall there appears to be no clear preference for any single direction of growth although there was marginally more support for Option 1 (18%) followed by Option 3 - (17%) and Option 2 (14%).</p> <p>The Environment Agency has indicated that options 2,4,7 and 8 may lie near or within flood zones. Historic England considers that further work is required in relation to heritage assets. Anglian Water comments that consideration should be given to the implications for the foul sewerage network.</p>	<p>A consistent approach to appraising sites in Oakham has been undertaken prior to setting out provisional allocations in a draft Local Plan for consultation.</p> <p>Work is ongoing to consider the infrastructure implications and this will inform the Infrastructure Delivery Plan which will accompany the next version of the Local Plan. Flooding and historic environment considerations have been</p>	<p>Provisional site allocations for new housing and employment opportunities in Oakham are set out in the Consultative Draft Local Plan.</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	How have these comments been taken into account in the Consultative Draft
<p>Oakham Town Council supports options 1,3 and 5 and Langham Town Council and Langham Neighbourhood Planning Group support Options 1,2,3,4 and 8.</p> <p>Among the public and interest groups the highest level of support was for Option 1 followed by Option 2 land to the south east of Oakham. Individual responses raise concerns that development should not go outside the bypass, that development should be on the town centre side of the railway and that care should be taken to prevent merging of settlements.</p> <p>The Environmental Theme Group prefers Option 1 followed by Options 3,5,7 and 8 subject to more detailed assessment. It considers that Option 6 could be sustainable for employment industrial use but Option 4 would not be suitable because of visual impact and existing woodland.</p>	<p>taken into account through the site appraisal process.</p>	
<p>Directions for growth around Uppingham (Q10)</p>		
<p>There is clear agreement (83%) for continuing to focus future growth on allocated sites to the north and west of the town.</p> <p>The Environment Agency has indicated that areas to the</p>	<p>All sites have been appraised, taking account of projected amount of growth and settlement hierarchy.</p> <p>Issues to be picked up and</p>	<p>Provisional site allocation for new housing and employment opportunities in</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	How have these comments been taken into account in the Consultative Draft
<p>north and west of Uppingham lie within flood zone 1.</p> <p>Historic England considers that further work is required in relation to heritage assets.</p> <p>Anglian Water comments that consideration should be given to the implications for the foul sewerage network.</p> <p>Four parish councils/meetings support future growth taking place to the north west of the town. Uppingham Town Council and Neighbourhood Plan Group consider that this should be determined in the Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Uppingham First considers that the Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan should focus on the north and west of the town for housing development while the emerging Town Centre and Business Zones Plan should explore the potential for growth on brown field sites in the town centre and a new development zone for retail, parking and starter homes.</p> <p>Individual comments from the public put forward a number of alternative options</p>	<p>addressed in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>Flooding and historic environment considerations have been taken into account through the site appraisal process.</p>	<p>Uppingham are set out in the Consultative Draft Local Plan.</p>
<p>The provision of aggregates (Q11)</p>		
<p>There is clear preference (89%) for the proposed</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>The Consultative Draft</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	How have these comments been taken into account in the Consultative Draft
<p>approach to providing for a steady and adequate supply of minerals (Option A).</p> <p>There is clear agreement from Parish Councils and Meetings and the public for this approach.</p> <p>The Minerals Product Association however does not 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. It considers that 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</p> <p>Clipsham Quarry Company and Bullimore Sand and Gravel Ltd s 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.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Local Aggregates Assessment (LAA) has been prepared in accordance with Government policy and guidance, and agreed with the AWP. The emerging plan will seek to maintain landbanks as set out in Government policy.</p> <p>The NPPF states that plans must be kept up-to-date, in addition the plans monitoring framework and annual LAA will analyse emerging trends regarding aggregate production and sales. Where a significant variance is identified in line with the monitoring framework remedial action would be triggered – which may include review.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the figure of 0.19Mtpa is not a cap - this will be appropriately reflected in the plan</p>	<p>Local Plan provides 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 ten year rolling period (2004 – 2013) set out in the LAA; 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; and not identifying a provision rate for other forms of mineral extraction and aggregate production.</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	How have these comments been taken into account in the Consultative Draft
	policies. At this stage no evidence/local circumstances have been identified to support an increase from the 0.19mtpa provision figure.	
The spatial strategy and criteria for minerals extraction (Q12)		
<p>There is clear agreement overall (86%) to the proposed approach to the spatial strategy and criteria for minerals extraction (Option A).</p> <p>Northamptonshire County Council agrees with the proposal for minerals appointment and that locally important stone be included in MSAs.</p> <p>There is clear support from Parish Councils and Meetings and the public for the proposed approach.</p> <p>The Minerals Product Association does not agree with this approach 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. It considers 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) and remove the requirement for them to be small scale</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The I&O paper and emerging plan do not oppose or prohibit new sites coming forward – it does however identify that there is not a need for the plan to include new sites as sufficient provision can be delivered through existing commitments (regarding limestone as crushed rock aggregate and raw materials for cement). The Area for Future Extraction and relevant plan policies (e.g. development criteria) enable sites to be brought</p>	<p>The current spatial strategy and location elements have been taken forward into the Consultative Draft Local Plan- updated as necessary to reflect national policy and guidance. This includes: the designated areas for future minerals extraction and area of search; the development criteria (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</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	How have these comments been taken into account in the Consultative Draft
and limited to local markets or heritage end uses.	forward where these are not identified as allocations. Where operators submit sites through the Call for Sites / plan-making process these will be given due consideration and assessed on a merits basis as per the Site Assessment Methodology. Quantified limitations placed on building stone production through the adopted plan will be subject to review through the plan making process as part of ensuring that policy is compliant with national policy/guidance.	specifically for crushed rock aggregate (limestone) or raw materials to support cement production as permitted reserves and landbanks are considered to be adequate over the plan period. However, during the call for sites / I&O consultation sites were brought forward for extraction of building stone. These sites will be given due consideration and assessed on a merits basis as per the Site Assessment Methodology and may be included where appropriate in the Draft Plan.
Sites for minerals extraction and aggregates production (Q13)		
There is clear agreement overall (89%) that additional sites will need to be allocated.	Noted.	At this stage no additional sites for

Main issues raised	Officer Response	How have these comments been taken into account in the Consultative Draft
<p>Proposals were submitted put forward for limestone extraction at Greetham Quarry and an extension to Clipsham Quarry to meet requirements.</p> <p>The Minerals Product Association considers that the justification for providing no additional sites has yet to be demonstrated in a Local Aggregate Assessment that addresses the shortcomings it has identified.</p> <p>There is clear disagreement from Parish Councils/Meetings that additional sites will be needed.</p>	<p>Where operators submit sites through the Call for Sites / plan-making process these will be given due consideration and assessed on a merits basis as per the Site Assessment Methodology.</p> <p>The I&O paper and emerging plan do not oppose or prohibit new sites coming forward – it does however identify that there is not a need for the plan to include new sites as sufficient provision can be delivered through existing commitments (regarding limestone as crushed rock aggregate and raw materials for cement). The Area for Future Extraction and relevant plan policies (e.g. development criteria) enable sites to be brought forward where these are not identified as allocations.</p>	<p>crushed rock aggregate (limestone) or raw materials to support cement production are considered necessary or have been brought forward through the call for sites / I&O consultation sites.</p> <p>Where operators submit sites through the plan-making process these will be given due consideration and assessed on a merits basis as per the Site Assessment Methodology.</p>
<p>Changes to the minerals safeguarding area (Q14)</p>		
<p>The majority (63%) agree that the current minerals safeguarding area (MSA) and planning requirements for development within the MSA should be refined as proposed Option B).</p> <p>Northamptonshire County Council agrees with the proposal for minerals appointment and that locally</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p>MSAs have been refined to address local circumstances (including identification of building stone resources) and align with national policy and guidance.</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	How have these comments been taken into account in the Consultative Draft
<p>important stone be included in MSAs.</p> <p>Parish Councils and Meetings largely supported Options A or B while the majority of the public supported Option B.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>It should be noted that a complete review of the MSAs is not considered necessary; however it will be necessary to update these to reflect more recent minerals resources data released in 2013, national policy and guidance.</p>	<p>Aligning with national requirements may also see the limited river terrace sand and gravel deposits within the County included in the MSAs (as these are of national importance).</p>
<p>Future waste requirements (Q15)</p>		
<p>There is clear agreement overall (89%) to the proposed approach to identifying waste arisings and the indicative waste management and disposal capacity requirements (Option A).</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The plans monitoring framework will identify Rutland's capacity and municipal waste contract matters, however the Councils remit does not extend to facilities beyond its boundaries or private commercial arrangements. The Council will continue to engage with other WPAs regarding DtC matters and through other avenues (e.g. M&W discussion / learning groups) in order to keep abreast of future plans and status of facilities of strategic interest.</p>	<p>Waste arisings and indicative waste management and disposal capacity requirements have been identified as per the method outlined in the Local Waste Management Needs Assessment 2015.</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	How have these comments been taken into account in the Consultative Draft
Most Parish Councils and Meetings and the public and interest groups agree with Option A.	Noted.	
Low level radioactive waste (Q16)		
<p>There is clear agreement overall (91%) that a new policy addressing LLW management and disposal outlining local planning requirements should be prepared for inclusion in the Local Plan (Option A).</p> <p>Environment Agency welcomes the recognition 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 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.</p> <p>Barrowden Parish Council considers 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.</p> <p>Most Parish Councils and Meetings and the public and interest groups agree with Option A.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. It should be noted that facilities for the management/disposal of such wastes typically service a national/multi-region catchment due to economies of scale.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p>Policy RLP55 includes criteria related to radioactive waste management and disposal.</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	How have these comments been taken into account in the Consultative Draft
Waste management and disposal (Q17)		
<p>All responses (100%) agreed with the proposed approach to be taken to the spatial strategy and locational elements regarding waste management and disposal (Option A).</p> <p>Northamptonshire County Council supports the continuation of development of a sustainable waste management network and recognises the need for cross boundary movements.</p> <p>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. It considers that there is potential benefit in allowing for some importation of these inert materials to assist reclamation of Clipsham Quarry during the Plan period.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p>The spatial strategy and locational elements of the Consultative Draft Local Plan include for waste management and disposal. 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 associate with restoration of quarries.</p>
Additional sites for waste management use (Q18)		
<p>The majority of responses (68%) overall agree the existing allocations and enabling policies are sufficient to</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>At this stage no new sites for waste management</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	How have these comments been taken into account in the Consultative Draft
<p>allow sites to come forward over the plan period Option B).</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Some responses from Parish Councils and meetings and the public and interest groups have suggested that additional civic amenity sites may be needed to meet the needs of a growing population.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The management methods and required capacity identified for the waste streams would not be provided for by Civic Amenity sites as these sites do not accommodate the necessary technologies.</p> <p>Where operators submit sites through the Call for Sites / plan-making process these will be given due consideration and assessed on a merits basis as per the Site Assessment Methodology.</p>	<p>have been identified through the Call for Sites / I&O consultation, however support was received for existing allocations.</p> <p>Where operators submit sites through the plan-making process these will be given due consideration and assessed on a merits basis as per the Site Assessment Methodology.</p>
<p>Infrastructure (Q19)</p>		
<p>There is clear agreement overall (92%) that additional infrastructure will be required to support the new development in Rutland that will be required in the period to 2036.</p> <p>The Environment Agency commented that there is limited licensed headroom to accommodate further growth at Oakham at the Waste Water Recycling facility to</p>	<p>An Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is being prepared to support the Local Plan Review. It will provide an evidence base of expected 'pressure points' in relation to existing infrastructure capacity to meet the planned growth.</p> <p>It will address the overall scale of growth, its spatial distribution and the</p>	<p>A draft IDP and the priority investments in infrastructure to support the planned growth will be published at the next stage of the Local Plan.</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	How have these comments been taken into account in the Consultative Draft
<p>accommodate future growth and it is imperative that Anglian Water Services are consulted to discuss infrastructure provision.</p> <p>A range of specific infrastructure needs have been raised including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better GP, hospital and medical provision in and around Oakham and elsewhere; • More parking spaces in the two towns; • New roads; bypasses; footpaths and cycleways;; better traffic calming measures; • Need for more school places • Need for improved broadband provision, particularly in the villages; • More green opens spaces, larger play areas and open spaces with larger housing development • Improvements to sewerage and urban drainage systems; • A swimming pool and children’s pool; • Better policing and social care • Better public transport, more frequent buses and trains; • Improvements to emergency services • A new arts centre/cinema • More sheltered housing and housing for the elderly; • Smaller and more affordable housing in the villages; <p>Uppingham First proposes a range of public and private</p>	<p>priorities for future investment in infrastructure. It will provide indicative information on potential costs and where the funding might come from, including developer contributions through the Community Infrastructure Levy and legal agreements such as s106 agreements.</p>	

Main issues raised	Officer Response	How have these comments been taken into account in the Consultative Draft
<p>infrastructure projects for Uppingham including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a new entrance to the Station Road Industrial Estate and the compulsory purchase and upgrade of its highway; • delivery of the Uppingham Mast Project detailed in the Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan; • extension of 'fibre to the premise' broadband to all parts of Uppingham; • creation of a new cycle path from the A47 to the town centre; • a new shared space initiative incorporating the surface of the Market Place to give priority to pedestrians; • various highway and footpath improvements; • building of a new long stay car park near Uppingham Town Centre; • a community owned solar power farm. 	<p>To be considered, if appropriate, within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>	
Other Issues (Q20)		
<p>A range of issues have been raised including:</p> <p><u>Government and agencies</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	<p>Policies on the reuse of redundant military bases will be carried forward.</p> <p>Continuing with a separate minerals local plan would not meet government guidance that local authorities should</p>	<p>Existing policies and text be carried forward but be amended as necessary to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reflect the

Main issues raised	Officer Response	How have these comments been taken into account in the Consultative Draft
<p>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;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 in the Issues and Options and recommends that heritage policy should be strategic; 	<p>prepare a single local plan. Minerals and waste policies will be included although they may be in a separate part of the plan.</p> <p>As stated above, the importance of the Welland Valley for green infrastructure is considered captured within the overall Strategic Objectives of the Consultative Draft Local Plan but it is recognised that there is a need for cross-boundary cooperation with neighbouring authorities in this respect.</p> <p>Consideration will be given to Environment Agency's suggested changes to wording of the policies. Any changes in flood zones will be taken into account in the appraisal of sites put forward for development.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Existing policies that recognise the importance of historic assets will be carried forward</p>	<p>Environment Agency's suggested changes to wording of the policies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reflect any changes in flood zones in the appraisal of sites put forward for development. • indicate that neighbourhood plans must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Local Plan. • reflect any changes in government policy on development outside planned limits • reflect any changes in government policy on local infrastructure requirements including Building for Life, Lifetime Homes Standards and the Code for Sustainable Homes.

Main issues raised	Officer Response	How have these comments been taken into account in the Consultative Draft
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 • <u>Landowners, developers, agents and businesses</u> • need for continual dialogue with South Kesteven District Council in respect of land on the edge of Stamford; • 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; • Lucas Land on behalf of client comment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ that spatial policies will need to reflect the role of the 	<p>The provision of subsidised bus services is outside the scope of the plan but any significant changes to bus services will be taken into account in determining the future location of development.</p> <p>We will work together with Melton Borough Council and other neighbouring authorities under the “duty to cooperate”.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>We will work closely with South Kesteven District Council in respect of land on the edge of Stamford.</p> <p>Local Wildlife Sites are designated on the basis of established criteria and (with the exception of Candidate Local Wildlife Sites) agreed by a panel of ecologists and nature conservation officers.</p> <p>The text of the plan will indicate that Neighbourhood Plans must be in general</p>	<p>Covered in Policy RLP13</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	How have these comments been taken into account in the Consultative Draft
<p>Uppingham and Oakham Schools as employers;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 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. <p><u>Parish Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Barrowden Parish Council wishes to make representation 	<p>conformity with the strategic policies of the Local Plan. Other comments noted.</p> <p>The plan will be updated to reflect any changes in government policy and local infrastructure requirements including Building for Life, Lifetime Homes Standards and the Code for Sustainable Homes.</p> <p>A draft viability assessment of the whole Local Plan Review has been prepared and the implications of the CIL charging schedule will be taken into account. This is published to accompany the Consultative Draft Local Plan.</p> <p>No further representations have been</p>	<p>Covered in policies RLP14-16 and RLP34</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	How have these comments been taken into account in the Consultative Draft
<p>to Rutland County Council about potential changes to the Planned Limits of Development;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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; • 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. 	<p>received from Barrowden Parish Council in respect of potential changes to the Planned Limits of Development.</p> <p>Noted, although the Local Plan sets out the policy context for restoration rather than specific site details which should be determined through decision making on planning applications.</p> <p>The preparation of an Infrastructure Delivery Plan will help in this regard.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>	<p>Covered in Policy RLP57</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	How have these comments been taken into account in the Consultative Draft
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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”. <p><u>Public and Interest Groups</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	<p>Noted. The text of the plan will indicate that Neighbourhood Plans must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Local Plan.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. Extending the rights of way network is outside the scope of the local plan review. This is a matter for the Local Transport Plan.</p> <p>It is not considered necessary to give specific protection for the Oakham Canal as this will be given protection under other policies of the plan.</p>	<p>Covered in Policy RLP39</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	How have these comments been taken into account in the Consultative Draft
<p>conservation and/or restoration opportunities;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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; • Uppingham First comments that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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 	<p>Policies have been carried forward that require that the natural environment be conserved and enhanced in line with the local Bio Diversity Action Plan (BAP). Policies in the minerals local plan will carried forward that require that the restoration of mineral workings enhance and complement the natural environment. The setting of specific restoration targets however is a matter for the planning application process. Policies that require provision of new open space have been carried forward.</p> <p>The views of Uppingham Town Council along with all other relevant Town and parish Council have been sought on the site appraisal process. The text of the plan will indicate that neighbourhood plans must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Local Plan.</p> <p>The minimum site size is based on the recommended minimum site size</p>	<p>Covered in Policy RLP57</p>

Main issues raised	Officer Response	How have these comments been taken into account in the Consultative Draft
<p>minimum size of site as a site is either viable or it is not (para 2.10);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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); <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Individual responses include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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. 	<p>recommended in government guidance on housing and economic land availability assessments.</p> <p>Other comments noted.</p> <p>Other comments noted.</p> <p>Planned Limits of Development have only been amended in specific circumstances. This is an issue best considered by the local community through a Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Other comments noted.</p>	
<p>11. Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SA/SEA) and Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA)</p>		

Main issues raised	Officer Response	How have these comments been taken into account in the Consultative Draft
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Historic England is concerned that the Initial 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. Clipsham Parish Meeting makes a number of detailed comments in relation to the SA/SEA Baseline Scoping Report & Initial SA. 	<p>Comments noted. Due to the directions of growth being broad, they generally score equally at this stage.</p> <p>Comments noted. The SA, including the sustainability objectives, has been developed in consultation with the statutory bodies, including the Environment Agency; Natural England; and Historic England.</p>	<p>An updated SA accompanies the Consultative Draft Local Plan. The SA will evolve as the Local Plan develops, assessing the economic, social and environmental effects of the plan and how the plan will contribute to achieving sustainable development.</p>