

# **Summary of Consultation Responses**

---

## **Local Plan Review Consultation Draft Plan July-September 2017**

## Summary of consultation responses

### Local Plan Review Consultation Draft Local Plan July-September 2017

---

## Contents

### Contents

Chapter 1 – Introduction.....	6
Chapter 2 – Spatial Portrait .....	6
Spatial portrait .....	6
Chapter 3 – Vision and objectives .....	6
Vision and objectives .....	6
Chapter 4 – Spatial strategy and location of development.....	7
Policy RLP1 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development .....	7
Policy RLP 2 – Sustainable development principles.....	7
Policy RLP3 – The Spatial Strategy for Development .....	8
Policy RLP4 – Built development in the towns and villages.....	10
Policy RLP5 – Residential Proposals in Towns and Villages.....	11
Policy RLP6 – Development in the Countryside.....	11
Policy RLP7 – Non-residential development in the countryside.....	12
Policy RLP8 – Re-use of redundant military bases and prisons .....	12
Policy RLP9 – Use of military bases and prisons for operational or other purposes .....	13
Chapter 5 – Creating sustainable communities .....	13
Policy RLP10 – Delivering socially inclusive communities.....	13
Policy RLP11 – Developer contributions .....	13
Policy RLP12 – Sites for residential development.....	14
Policy RLP13 – Cross Boundary Development Opportunity – Stamford North .....	25
Policy RLP14 – Housing density and mix.....	26
Policy RLP15 – Self-build and custom housebuilding .....	27
Policy RLP16 – Affordable housing.....	28
Policy RLP17 – Rural Exception Housing .....	29
Policy RLP18 – Gypsies and travellers .....	29
Chapter 6 - Employment and Economic Development .....	30
Policy RLP19 – New provision for industrial and office development and related uses.....	30
Policy RLP20 – Expansion of existing businesses and protection of existing employment sites.....	31
Policy RLP21 – The rural economy.....	31

## Summary of consultation responses

### Local Plan Review Consultation Draft Local Plan July-September 2017

---

Policy RLP22 – Agricultural, horticultural, equestrian and forestry development ..	31
Policy RLP23 – Local Visitor Economy .....	32
Policy RLP24 – Rutland Water.....	32
Policy RLP25 – Eyebrook Reservoir Area.....	33
Policy RLP26 – Caravans, camping, lodges, log cabins, chalets and similar forms of self-serviced holiday accommodation .....	33
Policy RLP27 – Town centres and retailing.....	33
Policy RLP28 – Primary and secondary shopping frontages.....	34
Policy RLP29 – Site for retail development .....	34
Policy RLP30 – Securing sustainable transport and accessibility through development.....	34
Policy RLP31 – Electric Vehicle Charging Points.....	35
Policy RLP32 – High Speed Broadband .....	36
Chapter 7 - Sustaining our Environment.....	36
Policy RLP33 – Delivering Good design .....	36
Policy RLP34 – Accessibility Standards.....	37
Policy RLP35 – Advertisements.....	38
Policy RLP36 – Outdoor lighting .....	38
Policy RLP37 – Energy efficiency and low carbon energy generation.....	38
Policy RLP38 – The natural environment.....	39
Policy RLP39 – Sites of biodiversity and geodiversity importance.....	39
Policy RLP40 – The historic and cultural environment .....	40
Policy RLP41 – Protecting heritage assets .....	40
Policy RLP42 – Green infrastructure, sport and recreation .....	41
Policy RLP43 – Important open space and frontages .....	41
Policy RLP44 – Provision of new open space .....	42
Policy RLP45 – Landscape Character Impact.....	42
Chapter 8 - Minerals and Waste.....	42
Policy RLP46 – Spatial strategy for minerals development .....	43
Policy RLP 47 – Mineral provision .....	43
Policy RLP48 – Safeguarding Rutland’s Mineral Resources .....	43
Policy RLP49 – Development criteria for mineral extraction.....	43
Policy RLP50 – Site-specific allocations for the extraction of crushed rock.....	43
Policy RLP51 – Site-specific allocations for the extraction of building stone .....	43
Policy RLP52 – Safeguarding of minerals development.....	44

## Summary of consultation responses

### Local Plan Review Consultation Draft Local Plan July-September 2017

---

Policy RLP53 – Borrow Pits .....	44
Policy RLP54 - Development criteria for other forms of minerals development ....	44
Policy RLP55 – Waste management and disposal.....	44
Policy RLP56 – Waste-related development.....	44
Policy RLP57 – Sites for waste management and disposal.....	45
Implementation and monitoring framework .....	46
Appendix 1 – List of strategic policies .....	46
Appendix 2 – List of replaced local plan policies .....	46
Appendix 3 – Local plan evidence base studies.....	46
Appendix 4 – Agricultural, forestry and other occupational dwellings .....	47
Appendix 5 – Parking standards .....	47
Appendix 6 – Areas of biodiversity and geodiversity importance.....	47
Appendix 7 – Designated heritage assets in Rutland .....	48
Appendix 8 – Open space standards .....	48
Appendix 9 – Permitted sites for minerals extraction and recycled aggregates ....	48
Appendix 10 – Waste management needs .....	48
Appendix 11 – Glossary.....	48
Policies Map .....	48

## Summary of consultation responses

### Local Plan Review Consultation Draft Local Plan July-September 2017

---

#### Introduction

##### Purpose of this document

The purpose of this document is to summarise the responses to consultation on the Local Plan Review Consultation Draft Local Plan.

##### The consultation

Consultation took place over an 8-week period from 31 July-25 September 2017.

The document was subject to extensive consultation and publicity in accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. This included:

- documents made available on the Council's website with an on-line form for submitting comments to the Council.
- a press release sent to local newspapers and media;
- email notifications sent to people who had asked to be updated on progress of the local plan and people on the Council's consultation database;
- a summary leaflet was made available at locations across the county;
- a press release was sent to local newspapers and media;
- a public exhibition held at public libraries in Ketton, Oakham, Ryhall and Uppingham and at Rutland County Council Offices in Oakham;
- A community roadshow was held at Cottesmore, Greetham, Ketton, Little Casterton, Oakham, Ryall, Uppingham and Whissendine at which Council officers were available to discuss the plan;
- Meetings were held with groups and stakeholders including the Rutland Parish Councils Forum;
- Documents and response forms were available for inspection at public libraries in Rutland.

Further details can be viewed on the Council's website:

<https://www.rutland.gov.uk/my-services/planning-and-building-control/planning/planning-policy/local-plan-review/>

A total of 364 written responses to the consultation were received together with 749 form letters objecting to a specific allocation in the plan. A list of the respondents is included at Appendix 1 to this document.

##### Format of this document

The numbering and headings in this document correspond with those in the consultation document. The summary does not list every comment but highlights the key responses and issues that have been raised.

Copies of the consultation responses can be viewed on request at the Council Offices in Oakham during normal opening hours.

## Summary of consultation responses

### Local Plan Review Consultation Draft Local Plan July-September 2017

#### Chapter 1 – Introduction

##### Government and agencies

- Historic England requests inclusion of the term 'heritage assets' and their settings in the key issues
- Environment Agency raises a number of issues in relation to the key issues to be addressed in relation to waste water and flooding; it cannot support the plan due to the uncertainties around the provision of wastewater treatment and the environmental risks involved. Suggests detailed wording to ensure the quality of receiving water bodies is protected in line with the Water Framework Objective requirements.

##### Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- Cottesmore Parish Council considers that the aims, objectives and policies of neighbourhood plans should be taken into account during the Local Plan review process;
- Greetham Parish Council does not accept that the Local Plan Review should take no account of neighbourhood plans and sees no evidence that any note has been taken of their neighbourhood plan;

##### Public and interest groups

- Rutland Branch of CPRE comment that Local and Neighbourhood Plans should be taken forward in a co-ordinated way to reflect the thinking in the Neighbourhood Planning legislation

#### Chapter 2 – Spatial Portrait

Spatial portrait		
Agree	Disagree	Other Comments
7 (70%)	2 (20%)	1 (10%)

Total comments: 10

##### Public and interest groups

- The Rutland Branch of CPRE questions whether a strategy is in place for the impact on local infrastructure, employment and traffic flows of this growth, particularly in the south from Corby and the plans to develop the Oxford to Cambridge corridor (O2C).
- A number of comments raise the lack of reference to the potential of development at St George's Barracks and the One Public Estate.

#### Chapter 3 – Vision and objectives

Vision and objectives		
Agree	Disagree	Other Comments
11 (73%)	2 (13%)	2 (13%)

Total comments: 15

##### Government and agencies

## Summary of consultation responses

### Local Plan Review Consultation Draft Local Plan July-September 2017

- Historic England consider that objective 13 would be strengthened to include reference to “heritage assets and their settings”;
- Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups
- Clipsham Parish Meeting comments in relation to SO4: that new housing development in Rutland should be planned, and limited to, meeting local need within the county as defined by independent local needs survey; agree with the target in SO 19 to seek to deliver a net gain in biodiversity but question how this is going to be implemented, measured, monitored and reported; suggests new strategic policies to meet SO 12 to 15;
  - North Luffenham Parish Council comments that to be vital and viable, smaller villages do need improved public transport (SO9), high quality communication infrastructure (Fibre Broadband and mobile phone coverage), employment (SO7), additional low cost housing and an investment in sports and leisure facilities. There is little in the plan that will ensure that this is achieved.

Public and interest groups

- Rutland Branch of CPRE questions what controls are in place for the quarrying which is under the control of SKDC; there is an assumption that existing settlements will be adequate to absorb expected growth. The possibility of a new settlement and the scope offered at St George’s Barracks site should also be addressed; SO12 should be expanded to include the control of pollution (air, light, noise and traffic) in order to maintain the unique character of Rutland’s natural environment; the provision for bypasses around Caldecott and Uppingham should be included due to extra development at Corby using route north.

## Chapter 4 – Spatial strategy and location of development

Policy RLP1 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development		
Agree	Disagree	Other Comments
50 (69%)	18 (25%)	4 (5%)

Total comments: 72

Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- CMYK (Planning and Design) Ltd for Abbey Developments Ltd. consider that the policy should place greater emphasis on the different dimensions of sustainability.
- Savills for Burghley House Preservation Trust Ltd supports the policy but suggests deletion of some of the text in accordance with the plan’s vision and objectives always to maintain an up to date development plan;

Public and interest groups

- Individual comments that not enough emphasis is given to environmentally sustainable development and the protection of natural assets; that infinite growth with finite resources is impossible.

Policy RLP 2 – Sustainable development principles		
Agree	Disagree	Other Comments
51 (62%)	16 (19%)	14 (17%)

Total comments: 81

Government and agencies

## Summary of consultation responses

### Local Plan Review Consultation Draft Local Plan July-September 2017

- Environment Agency recommends an additional bullet point to demonstrate that adequate waste water treatment is already available or can be provided in time to serve the development ahead of its occupation;
- Historic England consider that criteria g would be strengthened and more reflective of the NPPF with the inclusion of “and their settings” at the end of the sentence.

#### Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- Persimmon Homes East Midlands considers that the policy needs to acknowledge that some previously developed sites may be subject to constraints such as contamination and suggests the addition of wording along the lines of "where practically possible" at the end of this point;
- William Davis Ltd considers that C) is contrary to the remainder of the Plan in that the proposed sites for new development are almost exclusively greenfield; it appears to be applicable to all development proposals but won't be in the gift of those developing greenfield sites to firstly bring forward previously developed sites.

#### Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- Edith Weston Parish Council suggest para d would benefit from more clarity in the definition of “density” and suggest strengthening para h to “minimise the adverse impact on and wherever possible enhance the character of the towns, villages, having due regard to neighbourhood plans”.

#### Public and interest groups

- Rutland Branch of CPRE consider this should include the control of pollution in the environment (air, light, noise and traffic);
- Individual comments include that not enough emphasis is given to environmentally sustainable development and protection of natural assets; the SA fails to recognise the unsustainable nature of this agenda and the inherent conflict with the objectives set out in RLP2, especially the need to travel.

<b>Policy RLP3 – The Spatial Strategy for Development</b>		
<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
30 (34%)	40 (45%)	17 (19%)

Total comments: 87

#### Government and agencies

- East Northamptonshire Council comments that the “Smaller Service Centres” could be regarded as misleading for the intermediate category of villages; it may be more appropriate to refer to these villages in terms of their wider context; i.e. accessibility to local services and facilities; the plan should recognise cross boundary in terms of the connections between villages;

#### Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- Andrew Granger & Co consider that greater levels of development should be allocated in and around Local Service Centres to limit over-development of the Main Towns and ensure that local services are retained and if possible enhanced;
- Barton Willmore for DeMerke Estates comments that Barleythorpe should be considered as part of and adjoining the urban area of Oakham (Main Town) and in this light it is considered to be a substantial location to accommodate growth.
- Burghley House Preservation Trust considers that the policy text regarding Small Villages should be amended (wording suggested) in light of their proposed change to RLP6;

## Summary of consultation responses

### Local Plan Review Consultation Draft Local Plan July-September 2017

---

- DLP (Planning) Ltd for Larkfleet Homes Ltd proposes that the wording in relation to “Land in Rutland” be redrafted as suggested by them;
- Pegasus Group for Davidsons Developments consider that the policy should specify the proposed distribution between Oakham and Uppingham and make it clear that some 81% of the growth directed to these larger centres will be at Oakham;
- Pegasus Group for Linden Homes Strategic Land propose that the policy be amended to make it clear that any development on the edge of Stamford would be to meet Stamford's housing needs and would be in addition to the identified housing requirements for the County area;
- Rosconn Group comments that neither this policy nor any other policy provides a clear apportionment of growth, which is essential;
- Strutt & Parker LLP for Exton Estate supports the principle of local service centres accommodating a significant proportion of Rutland’s residential development needs (30%) but recommend this figure should be set as a guide and not a maximum;

#### Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- Barrowden Parish Council considers there are flaws within the assessment e.g. in the evaluation of doctor’s surgeries; that definition of infill is required; disagree that the allocations reflect the spatial strategy; ask that the Local Plan follows the example of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan as it sets a level of growth for every settlement;
- Clipsham Parish Meeting raises a number of issues including that "sustainable development" requires a measurable definition; that the 70:30 split seems to be prescriptive and arbitrary and should be revisited recognising the needs and offers of the various towns and parishes; that policies for the smaller villages need to be more restrictive and aligned to open countryside policies; that windfall development, infill development and back land development all need to be tightly conditioned in the smaller villages; that development permissions in the small villages should depend upon proven local need within the village verified by a "local needs survey"; that smaller service centres do not have the level of service facilities which justify the viability of conversion of rural buildings in small villages or the countryside.
- Edith Weston Parish Council is concerned that the policy of limiting development within the smaller service centres to infill on previously developed land and conversion and re-use of existing buildings could cause the smaller service centres to stagnate; that an appropriate level of growth should be set for each settlement, allowing the community to decide on the most appropriate sites in developing their neighbourhood plans;
- North Luffenham Parish Council suggests that consideration be given to set an appropriate level of growth for each settlement, allowing the community to decide on the most appropriate sites;
- Uppingham Town Council asks to delete the word “moderate” in relation to “Uppingham should be a focus for growth”;
- Whissendine Parish Council is concerned that Whissendine has been designated as a 'hub village'. Whissendine is losing those services that would make it a 'hub', it has lost one public house, has a reduced bus service, the school has a full roll, and the highway system is insufficient to cope. The village is also subject to regular flooding;

#### Public and interest groups

## Summary of consultation responses

### Local Plan Review Consultation Draft Local Plan July-September 2017

- Rutland Branch of CPRE questions where the evidence is justifying the 70/30% split for housing development between towns and villages; The main towns should be described as 'market' towns as there are no 'non-main' towns. 'Sustainable' should be defined with suitable measurement terms and how it can be verified;
- Several comments that Ketton has been allocated too high a proportion of development; that the strategy should take a higher proportion of windfall sites; that brownfield development sites should be considered before taking more agricultural land; that schools should be given a higher weighting;
- Individual comments relate to the ranking of villages in the settlement hierarchy including that:
  - Braunston should be a local service centre;
  - Greetham should not be a local service centre;
  - Langham should be a local service centre;
  - Market Overton should be a smaller service centre;
  - Morcott should become a smaller service centre
  - Whissendine should retain its status as a smaller service centre;

<b>Policy RLP4 – Built development in the towns and villages</b>		
<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
31 (53%)	23 (39%)	4 (6%)

Total comments: 58

#### Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- CMYK (Planning and Design) Ltd for Abbey Developments Ltd. comments that best use does not necessarily equate to densest use: what constitutes the best use should be determined by each site's individual characteristics and context.
- Persimmon Homes East Midlands questions how "small scale sustainable development" is defined;
- Marrons Planning for The Burley Estate Farm questions the lack of definition of "small scale"; that broad phraseology is confusing and the words "small scale" are not needed;
- Jeakins Weir consider the policy is needlessly prescriptive in its specification of proposals that are 'small-scale', the policy lacks conformity with the NPPF as it needlessly restricts many potentially suitable sites; reference to "Planned Limits to Development" should be removed;

#### Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- Clipsham Parish Meeting comments that proposals for built development in the smaller service centres and small villages should not share the same policy as applies to the towns;

#### Public and interest groups

- Rutland Branch of CPRE consider there should be a separate paragraph for small villages as opposed to smaller service centres; that the policy should encourage the use of innovative and local materials and design to complement the site; what part of the environment should not be adversely affected - built or natural; are adverse effects to be defined?
- Individual responses question how 'adverse affects' and 'detrimental impacts' be measured; that there is no synergy between the local plan and neighbourhood plans; that the draft plan does not stipulate the size of houses to be built; that development should be in proportion the current population; concerns about the scale of development in Ketton.

## Summary of consultation responses

### Local Plan Review Consultation Draft Local Plan July-September 2017

<b>Policy RLP5 – Residential Proposals in Towns and Villages</b>		
<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
27 (45%)	27 (45%)	5 (8%)

Total comments: 59

#### Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- CMYK (Planning and Design) Ltd for Abbey Developments Ltd. Potential comment that infill sites do not necessarily constitute small sites within substantially built up frontage;
- Jeakins Weir consider there is duplication between Policies RLP4 and RLP5 which is confusing and unacceptably restrictive and will preclude development from coming forward that is acceptable in planning terms but may be on the edge of a settlement or on a greenfield site;
- Marrons Planning for The Burley Estate Farm Partnership consider that the policy is wholly restrictive and relates primarily to small scale residential development rather than residential development as a whole; its application to both towns and villages will severely restrict larger scale development coming forward within the planned limits to development and recommend that a greater amount of flexibility is provided;
- The Burghley House Preservation Trust suggests amendments to wording regarding land within or adjoining the planned limits to development of settlements;

#### Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- Clipsham Parish Meeting consider that residential proposals for the smaller service centres and small villages should not be the same as for the towns and different and more restrictive policies should apply; paragraph (d) should be qualified to allow development only if the existing structure is suitable for conversion;
- Edith Weston Parish Council consider the policy should also be referred to in policies RLP 1 and 2;

#### Public and interest groups

- Rutland Branch of CPRE comments that the brownfield register should be included in the policy.

<b>Policy RLP6 – Development in the Countryside</b>		
<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
27 (46%)	27 (46%)	4 (6%)

Total comments: 58

#### Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- Gladman Developments consider that the Council may wish to consider a more flexible policy in relation to development in the Countryside; in the absence of a 5 year housing land supply the policy would decrease the likelihood that the plan could swiftly respond to a need for additional development;
- Strutt & Parker LLP for Exton Estate considers that the policy is too prescriptive, it does not meet the requirements of the NPPF in the context of the re-use or adaptation of rural buildings - advocates the deletion of sub paragraph B.
- The Burghley House Preservation Trust considers the approach of restraint is not NPPF-compliant and should be amended to allow for residential (and other)

## Summary of consultation responses

### Local Plan Review Consultation Draft Local Plan July-September 2017

development of land adjoining small villages where this would directly contribute to and/or enhance the social sustainability of the village;

Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- Uppingham Town Council considers that the planned limits of development for Uppingham should not be amended by RCC but should be a matter for the refreshed neighbourhood plan;

Public and interest groups

- Limes, Firs & Spurs Residents Association considers that the planned limits of development for Uppingham should be a matter for the refreshed neighbourhood plan.

<b>Policy RLP7 – Non-residential development in the countryside</b>		
<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
28 (58%)	19 (39%)	1 (2%)

Total comments: 48

Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- Strutt & Parker LLP for Cecil Estate Family Trust and the Exton Estate consider that the wording of the policy is too prescriptive; that sub clause E should not be restricted purely to tourism and should be more specific in supporting all rural employment and enterprise opportunities where these conform to other limbs of this policy;
- DLP (Planning) Limited for Larkfleet Homes Ltd considers that a sufficient degree of flexibility is needed and are concerned that the policy would preclude the provision of larger scale employment development in the County should a specific unmet need arise.

<b>Policy RLP8 – Re-use of redundant military bases and prisons</b>		
<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
61 (85%)	2 (2%)	8 (11%)

Total comments: 71

Government and agencies

- Historic England considers that the policy should include a specific criteria in respect of heritage assets and their settings;
- Sport England supports the inclusion of active design in relation to this and all development and design policies;

Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- Astill Planning for CS Ellis Group Ltd considers that RCC needs to actively engage with the existing tenants of the redundant military bases and prisons before the production of detailed planning policy documents relating to such sites;

Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- Clipsham Parish Meeting comments that the potential and the significance of the St. George's barracks need to be properly considered, evaluated and included in the plan;
- Ketton Parish Council considers that the possible development of St George's Barracks could have a big impact on Ketton and its surroundings which needs to be factored in when planning infrastructure improvements needed;

## Summary of consultation responses

### Local Plan Review Consultation Draft Local Plan July-September 2017

- Edith Weston Parish Council considers that an additional sub-clause is needed that refers to any development being of a size, scale and type that minimises any adverse impacts on nearby communities, such as visual, noise, traffic, air quality;
- North Luffenham Parish Council comments that the significance St George's Barracks is huge and has the potential to dwarf many of the planning considerations and proposals contained within the draft local plan;

#### Public and interest groups

- Rutland Branch of CPRE comments that there are several options for the redevelopment of the St George's Barracks site and further implications of the expansion of Kendrew Barracks and the possibility of these sites supporting significant additional housing should be discussed in the plan;
- Individual comments that more detail should be provided on St George's Barracks; that opportunities exist for locating employment within the existing buildings in the south west corner of the site and the actual airfield site and opportunities for building more housing; that the plan should contain a policy that any significant new site should be developed in preference to spoiling villages; that St George's Barracks developed as one of the proposed garden villages in conjunction with Cambridge University.

<b>Policy RLP9 – Use of military bases and prisons for operational or other purposes</b>		
<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
46 (85%)	6 (11%)	2 (3%)

Total comments: 54

## Chapter 5 – Creating sustainable communities

<b>Policy RLP10 – Delivering socially inclusive communities</b>		
<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
47 (79%)	8 (13%)	4 (6%)

Total comments: 59

#### Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- Uppingham Town Council generally agrees with the policy but would like to see banks included in the list of key assets where alternative use would not be supported;
- Limes, Firs & Spurs Residents Association is concerned about the lack of support by RCC for an Uppingham Hopper Bus;

#### Public and interest groups

- One individual comment that social housing and better public transport would be essential

<b>Policy RLP11 – Developer contributions</b>		
<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
36 (76%)	7 (14%)	4 (8%)

Total comments: 47

#### Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

## Summary of consultation responses

### Local Plan Review Consultation Draft Local Plan July-September 2017

- Savills for Burghley House Preservation Trust Ltd suggest that the Council prepares an up to date infrastructure delivery plan as soon as possible having regards to cross boundary infrastructure demands;

#### Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- Clipsham Parish Meeting considers that the policy needs to include the requirement of no net loss of biodiversity and a system of developer contribution applied to fund the replacement of that loss of biodiversity on a nearby site;

#### Public and interest groups

- One individual comment that developer contributions should be strongly enforced and not allowed to be deferred or discounted.

<b>Policy RLP12 – Sites for residential development</b>			
<b>Site</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
• OAK/04 – Oakham, Land south of Brooke Road	14	40 (+749 form letters)	17
• OAK/05 – Oakham, Land off Uppingham Road	16 (64%)	9 (36%)	0
• OAK/08 (A) – Oakham, Land at Stamford Road & Uppingham Road	33 (75%)	10 (22%)	1 (2%)
• OAK/13 – Oakham, Land off Burley Road (part of mixed use development)	14 (40%)	19 (54%)	2 (5%)
• UPP/04 – Uppingham, Land South of Leicester Road	13 (72%)	4 (22%)	1 (5%)
• UPP/05 (A) – Uppingham, Land off Ayston Road	10 (52%)	9 (47%)	0
• UPP/06 (A) – Uppingham, Land off Leicester Road	12 (66%)	4 (22%)	2 (11%)
• UPP/08 – Uppingham, Land North of Leicester Road	11 (73%)	4 (26%)	0
• UPP/11 – Uppingham, Land South of Leicester Road	3 (75%)	1 (25%)	0
• COT/13 – Cottesmore, Land off Mill Lane	7 (14%)	36 (76%)	4 (8%)
• EDI02 (A) – Edith Weston, The Yews, Well Cross	7 (58%)	3 (25%)	2 (16%)
• EMP/01 (A) – Empingham, West of 17 Whitwell Road	8 (53%)	6 (40%)	1 (6%)
• GRE01 (A) – Greetham, Part of Greetham Quarry, Stretton Road (as part of mixed use site)	11 (22%)	37 (77%)	0 (15%)
• GRE/02 – Greetham, Land South of Oakham Road	8 (19%)	33 (80%)	0
• KET/02 – Ketton, Land adjacent to Empingham Road	8 (40%)	9 (45%)	3 (15%)
• KET/03 (A) – Ketton, Land west of Timbergate Road	9 (50%)	7 (38%)	2 (11%)
• MAR/04 – Market Overton, Main Street	1 (3%)	27 (96%)	0
• RYH/04 – Ryhall, River Gwash Trout Farm,	14	8	0

## Summary of consultation responses

### Local Plan Review Consultation Draft Local Plan July-September 2017

<b>Policy RLP12 – Sites for residential development</b>			
<b>Site</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
Belmesthorpe Lane	(63%)	(36%)	
• RYH/06 (A) – Between Meadow Lane and Belmesthorpe Road	7 (15%)	35 (79%)	2
• WHI/06 – Whissendine Land off Melton Road	14 (23%)	45 (76%)	0
• WHI/09 (A) – Whissendine, South Lodge Farm	13 (20%)	44 (70%)	5 (8%)

Total comments: 665 (+749 form letters)

### **General comments**

#### Government and agencies

- Highways England considers that cumulative impacts of growth in Oakham should be subject to a transport assessment in order to better understand the impacts and potential need for mitigation;
- Environment Agency raises concerns about the lack of capacity at the Oakham and Uppingham Waste Water treatment works and considers that a strategy will be needed to deliver the necessary infrastructure and how the issues will be addressed;
- Severn Trent comments that it will complete any necessary improvements to provide the capacity once detailed plans are available; it does not anticipate a capacity problem within the urban areas but development in the rural areas is likely to have a greater impact and require greater reinforcement; encourage the expectation on developers that properties are built to the optional requirement in Building Regulations of 110 litres of water per person per day;

#### Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- Gladman Developments supports the approach to meeting housing need but the DCLG proposals published during the consultation period will need to be considered as to whether there is a need for further uplift to the standardised OAN figure to allow for such issues as economic growth;
- Savills for Society of Merchant Venturers recommends removing the windfall allowance to provide greater surety of supply through allocations; to identify reserve sites and include a policy mechanism to release reserve sites to respond to changing circumstances; to apply a non-implementation rate to the housing requirements table; and a policy mechanism to reserve sites to be released.
- The Rosconn Group makes detailed comments about the figures in paragraph 5.19 and the distribution of development and concludes that additional dwellings need to be allocated in Oakham and Uppingham; that windfalls should be discounted for the first 3 or 5 years;

#### Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- Barrowden Parish Council asks that all Local Service Centres have a growth target for the number of additional dwellings to be added in the next 20 years;
- Clipsham Parish Meeting requests that the policy includes the status of sites to show whether they are greenfield or brownfield; that if housing needs of Stamford and Corby lead to development within Rutland then the number of houses required must form part of the 1,503 additional housing requirement for Rutland.

## Summary of consultation responses

### Local Plan Review Consultation Draft Local Plan July-September 2017

---

- Greetham Parish Council is concerned at the scale of development proposed in their village and considers that the plan should include setting limits on the percentage increase by which particular settlements can grow; it is concerned about the site appraisals and that there is no transparency in the process of selecting preferred sites;
- Ketton Parish Council comments that housing allocations would require considerable infrastructure inputs of which there is no mention;
- Market Overton Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group comments that the allocation in their village detracts from RLP Strategic Objective 14;
- North Luffenham Parish Council is concerned that to overrule neighbourhood plan proposals damages the whole concept of localism;
- Oakham Town Council considers that the strategy proposed in the Local Plan is aligned with the Town Council's vision for the development, sustainability and needs of Oakham Parish.
- The Oakham Neighbourhood Planning group submitted the results of a neighbourhood planning survey that showed a majority of respondents feel that small groups of up to 20 houses spread across a variety of sites would be appropriate.
- Uppingham Town Council considers that the site allocations and planned limits to development should be set by the Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan refresh;
- Whissendine Parish Council has concerns regarding the volume of new housing potentially allocated within the village.

#### Public and interest groups

- The Limes, Firs and Spurs Residents Association considers that sites should be dealt with via the refreshed Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan;
- Rutland Branch of CPRE considers para 5.18 is misleading as the number of houses already completed and committed means that only 75 houses per annum is the future specific need from 2016 onwards. Windfall sites of 34 per annum (para 5.23) are unplanned as to location and are therefore assumed to be in villages; why are brownfield sites not specified?
- Individual responses question how the proposed 25% increase in housing fits in with the national figure of 10%, whether windfall is the best way to allocate housing land; why there are no sites for "satellite" development in the county;

#### **OAK04**

#### Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- Marrons for Taylor Wimpey supports the allocation but considers that 139 units should be a minimum figure; considers that the proposal would have a positive impact on the amenity of existing residents and would not detrimentally affect journey times through and in the vicinity of the level crossing; that a larger allocation on land in their ownership could provide for additional infrastructure and parking;

#### Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups and neighbourhood planning groups

- Braunston Parish Council comments there is no easy road access to this site; that the additional traffic generated by 200+ more cars will compromise the safe operation of the nearby rail crossing and will add to the traffic on the Brooke Road towards Braunston;

#### Public and interest groups

## Summary of consultation responses

### Local Plan Review Consultation Draft Local Plan July-September 2017

---

- A form letter returned by 749 respondents protests against the proposal citing reasons of traffic congestion and queues at the Brooke Road level crossing; that increased traffic from the development will make this worse; the crossing is already deemed as high risk and an increased volume of traffic will make this more dangerous;
- The Oakham South West Action Group states that it spoke to about 800 local people and found concerns about traffic congestion, parking, need for infrastructure and better design of development and the impact on the countryside of developing a greenfield site.
- A range of individual concerns are raised including that it would exacerbate existing problems of traffic congestion and parking on and around Brooke Road and the level crossing, in the town centre and wider afield; impact on the landscape and setting of the town; loss of biodiversity, wildlife and agricultural land; flooding issues; lack of infrastructure, including doctors and schools and employment opportunities; that other sites around Oakham are more appropriate for development; some suggest an additional road bridge or crossing under the railway is needed in Oakham.

#### **OAK05**

##### Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- Jeakins Weir believes the site represents a totally illogical extension of the town and is a significant distance from key services and amenities, unlikely to promote sustainable development;
- Pegasus Group for Davidsons Developments supports the allocation and submits a preliminary landscape and development strategy and indicative masterplan.

##### Public and interest groups

- Some individual concerns are raised about the loss of a rural approach to Oakham, impact on traffic congestion, lack of infrastructure such as doctors, schools and dentists.

#### **OAK08**

##### Government and agencies

- Historic England raises concerns about potential harm to a key approach to the Conservation Area and other heritage assets;

##### Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- Savills for the Society of Merchant Venturers agree with the proposal and submits a detailed response in its support;

##### Public and interest groups

- Some individual concerns are raised about loss of a rural approach to Oakham, impact on traffic congestion, the lack of infrastructure such as doctors, schools and dentists.

#### **OAK13**

##### Government and agencies

- Historic England comments that a high level of assessment would be required in relation to the impact of the proposal on Burley Park Registered Park and Garden and other historic assets;

##### Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

## Summary of consultation responses

### Local Plan Review Consultation Draft Local Plan July-September 2017

---

- Jeakins Weir considers that the proposal will place significant pressure on surrounding land which will have significantly reduced landscape and visual sensitivity and will lead to unallocated sites coming forward on an ad hoc basis;
- Marrons for the Central England Co-operative comments that the proposal would extend the settlement boundary to “wrap round” the Society’s land, which should also be included in the settlement boundary.

#### Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups and neighbourhood planning groups

- Barleythorpe Parish Council comments that little substance appears to have been given to health, education and other community facilities and these must be enhanced in the Barleythorpe area to cope with the development.

#### Public and interest groups

- Individual concerns that site is subject to periodic flooding, creating homes distant from schools; expansion should be kept within the ring road; brown field sites should be used first; increased traffic, noise and pollution; review needed of impact on the level crossing; impact on schools and health infrastructure, damage to wildlife.

#### **UPP04**

##### Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- Insight Town Planning Ltd for Langton Developments submits a detailed representation in support of the proposal which it considers to be available, suitable and can be delivered in the next 5 years;

##### Government and agencies

- Historic England raises concerns about potential for harm to the Castle Hill scheduled monument;

##### Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- Uppingham Town Council supports allocation of the site for housing;

##### Public and interest groups

- One local resident is concerned about the loss of open spaces and countryside and the impact on their family.

#### **UPP05A**

##### Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- Uppingham Town Council does not support the proposal without an independent review to demonstrate safe access to the site and no adverse impact on the employment site opposite; it also impacts the northern entrance to the town in terms of 'townscape';

##### Public and interest groups

- Some individual concerns are raised about access to the site, traffic congestion, impact on views and the landscape; one states that the Local Plan ignores the Uppingham Local Plan regarding land on Ayston Road;
- The Limes, Firs and Spurs Residents Association considers that the site access is restricted and would have negative impact on the local landscape.

#### **UPP06A**

##### Government and agencies

- Historic England comments that the site is within an area of ridge and furrow and the advice of the County Archaeological advisor should be sought;

## Summary of consultation responses

### Local Plan Review Consultation Draft Local Plan July-September 2017

---

- The Leicestershire and Rutland Environmental Records Centre comments on the biodiversity value of the site and that a survey is needed before any decision;  
Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups
- Uppingham Town Council supports allocation of the site for housing which is already allocated in the neighbourhood plan;  
Public and interest groups
- Some individual concerns are raised about access to the site, traffic congestion, impact on views and the landscape; one states that the Local Plan ignores the Uppingham Local Plan regarding land on Ayston Road;
- The Limes, Firs and Spurs Residents Association considers that the site access is restricted and would have a negative impact on the local landscape;

#### UPP08

##### Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- Uppingham Town Council supports allocation of the site for housing which is already allocated in the neighbourhood plan;

##### Public and interest groups

- Individual comments raise concerns about the loss of open spaces and countryside and the impact on their family; that a small reduction in the site is needed to protect the line of the Uppingham bypass.

#### UPP11

##### Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- Uppingham Town Council supports allocation of the site for housing which is already allocated in the neighbourhood plan;

##### Public and interest groups

- The Limes, Firs and Spurs Residents Association agrees with the proposal;
- One local resident disagrees with the proposal and is concerned about the loss of open spaces and countryside and the impact on their family.

#### COT13

##### Government and agencies

- The Leicestershire and Rutland Environmental Records Centre is concerned that this may good grassland and recommends that a survey is completed before making a decision on the application;

##### Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- HSSP architects on behalf of client disagree with the proposal as they consider the site assessment is flawed when related to the appraisal of site COT04;
- Strutt & Parker LLP for the Exton Estate supports the proposal and point out that the site could accommodate in excess of 60 units and closer to 110 dwellings (market and non-market);
- William Davis Ltd stresses the benefits of including the site in the local plan;

##### Government and agencies

- Historic England comments that the site is adjacent to the Conservation Area and the advice of the County Archaeological advisor should be sought;
- The Leicestershire and Rutland Environmental Records Centre comments that this appears to be good grassland with ridge and furrow and that a survey is needed before any decision is made.

##### Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

## Summary of consultation responses

### Local Plan Review Consultation Draft Local Plan July-September 2017

---

- Cottesmore Parish Council considers that the site appraisal process has not been sufficiently robust in selecting the site and rejecting other options; concerns about drainage and access, loss of views and countryside, flooding, extending the distance to services and facilities.

#### Public and interest groups

- A range of individual concerns are raised about access, traffic congestion, infrastructure and public services unable to cope; lack of local employment; village school oversubscribed; inadequate bus service; flooding; too large for the size of village; impact on views and the local environment; noise; impact on wildlife; loss of ridge and furrow and good quality agricultural land; proximity to an emergency military runway, contrary to the neighbourhood plan.

#### **ED102A**

##### Government and agencies

- Historic England comments that this would result in the loss of an important open space within the Conservation Area and harm to other heritage assets;
- The Leicestershire and Rutland Environmental Records Centre comments that it would probably request a survey for the site in support of a planning application and it is possible the site may need mitigation;

#### **GRE01A**

##### Government and agencies

- The Leicestershire and Rutland Environmental Records Centre comments on the biodiversity value of the site and that it has possible geological value;

##### Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- DLP Planning for Hereward Homes (Greetham) Ltd makes a detailed submission in support of the proposal which it considers has potential for residential use as part of a complementary mixed use scheme;

##### Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- Greetham Parish Council makes a detailed submission that disagrees with the proposals for Greetham on the basis that it ignores and undermines the neighbourhood plan process; it is not appropriate in scale and content; the overall strategy does not meet the fundamental requirement for sustainability; there is no transparency in the process for selecting sites; there are deficiencies in the consultation process; it is concerned that it was specifically advised that it could not include the site in its neighbourhood plan;
- Clipsham Parish Meeting comments that the potential adverse impacts would appear to far outweigh any possible benefits to the Greetham community and the site should be removed from the policy;

##### Public and interest groups

- A range of individual concerns are raised including that it would override and ignore the neighbourhood plan; road safety and traffic congestion, roads too narrow and unable to cope; sewerage and surface water flooding problems; infrequent bus services, lack of employment, school and health facilities; proximity to a working quarry, contrary to existing consents which require the site to be restored to a recreation site after quarrying;
- Leicestershire and Rutland RIGS group comment that the main geology interest is in the western area of the RIGS site and the site has potential for a geodiversity trail; it would be quite possible to work with any developers to identify and

## Summary of consultation responses

### Local Plan Review Consultation Draft Local Plan July-September 2017

---

maintain a small stable section of the geological exposure without preventing the proposed development.

#### **GRE02**

##### Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- Greetham Parish Council makes a detailed submission that disagrees with the proposals for Greetham (as for site GRE01 above). It is also concerned that the site is within Cottesmore Parish and that any community infrastructure and precept levies will go to Cottesmore Parish Council; it considers that the decision to choose this site in preference to site EMP/03 in Empingham is not sensible and submits evidence to this effect;
- Cottesmore Parish Council considers that the site should count towards the Cottesmore housing figure as it is in its parish;

##### Public and interest groups

- A range of concerns are raised including that it disregards the neighbourhood plan and is in Cottesmore Parish; road safety and traffic congestion, roads too narrow and unable to cope; sewerage and surface water flooding problems; infrequent bus services, lack of employment, school and health facilities; proximity to a working quarry; impact on landscape on the approach to the village, sterilisation of land for a village bypass.

#### **KET02**

##### Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- Ketton Parish Council raises concerns about access to the site but that affordable housing here would not be excessive;

##### Public and interest groups

- A range of individual concerns are raised including the size of the development being out of scale with the size of the village, the amount of development proposed for Ketton compared to other villages; access and steep gradient of the road, the narrowness of village roads, parking and pollution from additional traffic; proximity to the village school which is oversubscribed.

#### **KET03**

##### Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- Pegasus Group for Linden Homes makes a detailed submission in support of the proposal which it considers provides a suitable and deliverable housing site not subject to any overriding constraints;

##### Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- Ketton Parish Council comments that there would be an impact on the High St/ Empingham Road junction which would need assessing and managing; that children's open space should be designated 'potential new school site' in order to keep this a possibility whilst the opportunity exists.

##### Public and interest groups

- Individual concerns are raised about the size of the development being out of scale with the size of the village, that local infrastructure is inadequate, traffic concerns; that children's open place space should be a potential new school site incorporating a SEN facility.

#### **MAR04**

##### Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

## Summary of consultation responses

### Local Plan Review Consultation Draft Local Plan July-September 2017

---

- Market Overton Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group raises concerns about the site's sustainability in relation to Policy RLP2 in terms of placing demands on local resources, the lack of a school, severe impact on roads in the village and surrounding area; concerned that a developer would complete a project within a short period of time which would not take into account that the housing needs of a community could change over a 20 year period;

#### Public and interest groups

- Individual concerns are raised including the scale of the development and its impact on the character of the village and the Limes/Finches, too high density, highway safety, unsuitable access from Bowling Green Lane, lack of local facilities and impact on local doctors and schools, lack of local employment and public transport, devaluation of property values, potential archaeological remains, other sites in the village would be more appropriate.

#### **RYH04**

#### Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- Ryhall Parish Council agree with the proposal and requests that housing at the lower end of the scale be stipulated, say starter homes of 2 or 3 bedrooms;

#### Public and interest groups

- Individual responses raise concerns about flooding and the road between Belmesthorpe and Ryhall not being wide enough to take traffic;

#### **RYH06A**

#### Government and agencies

- The Environment Agency comments that part of sites proposed in Ryhall are at risk of flooding and ask that it be made clear that development in those areas at risk of flooding should be avoided whilst taking climate change into account;
- Historic England comments that it is a site of potential archaeological interest and that the advice of the county archaeological advisor should be sought;

#### Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- Ryhall Parish Council disagrees with the proposal for a number of reasons including that it has previously been declared an area of local landscape value; it is agricultural land and important green space; flood plain; it will increase pollution, access and road congestion; it goes against the previous findings of a government inspector.

#### Public and interest groups

- A range of individual concerns are raised including that the development would out of scale with the village; development on flood plain; impact on the landscape and area of local landscape value; loss of high quality agricultural land, wildlife, pollution; noise; lack of schools, health and social infrastructure; it goes against the previous decisions of government inspector; traffic congestion, road safety and access issues;

#### **WHI06**

#### Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- Greenlight Developments on behalf of clients supports the allocation and states that its land interests include land to the south which could be used for further benefits to any housing scheme;

#### Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- Whissendine Parish Council agrees that this is one of the least worst sites within the sites currently under consideration but it has concerns regarding the potential

## Summary of consultation responses

### Local Plan Review Consultation Draft Local Plan July-September 2017

---

loss of areas with historical significance and requests a full archaeological survey of the site prior to any development proceeding;

#### Public and interest groups

- A range of individual concerns are raised including that the development would be out of scale with the village; the impact on setting and viability of a grade 2 listed windmill; surface water run-off and flooding; sewerage problems; impact on the landscape and approach to the village; wildlife, pollution, noise, inadequate schools; health and social infrastructure; lack of public transport, narrow roads, traffic congestion, road safety and access issues. Some individual responses support the proposal as it would bring affordable housing and young families to the village.

#### **WHI09A**

#### Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- Landmark Planning on behalf of client agree with the proposal which it considers is available for development in the short term, free from significant constraints and is a viable development site;

#### Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- Whissendine Parish Council agrees that this is one of the least worst sites within the sites currently under consideration but has concerns regarding the potential loss of areas with historical significance;

#### Public and interest groups

- A range of individual concerns are raised including that the development would be out of scale with the village, impact on the landscape and views of the village, surface water run-off and flooding, sewerage problems, narrow roads, traffic congestion, parking, highways, road safety and access, noise, pollution, lack of public transport, employment, schools, health and social infrastructure. Some responses support the proposal as it would bring affordable housing to the village.

### **Other sites proposed for new housing and other development**

#### Barleythorpe

- Barton Willmore for DeMerke Estates submits a site for 152 dwellings on land to the north of Barleythorpe;
- The Planning Hub Ltd for Simon Holt refers to the client's land in Barleythorpe Village that previously had permission for development;

#### Barrowden

- L Johnson proposes a plot of land in Barrowden;

#### Cottesmore

- CMYK Planning and Design Ltd for Abbey Developments Ltd requests allocation of land at Harrier Close Cottesmore for 12 dwellings;
- HSSP Architects for client considers that Site COT04 has been wrongly scored in relation to site COT/13;
- RT Architects for client considers that site COT/01 at Main Street, Cottesmore should be considered for a smaller scale housing of 8 dwellings;

#### Empingham

- Peter Brett Associates proposes that land at Exton Road, Empingham should be included as an allocation in the plan;

#### Great Casterton

- Strutt & Parker for Cecil Estate Family Trust requests that land owned at Great Casterton (SHELAA/GRT/01 and GRT03) should be reconsidered;

## Summary of consultation responses

### Local Plan Review Consultation Draft Local Plan July-September 2017

---

#### Greetham

- B Sellars puts forward a 5 acre site on the B668 Stretton Road in Greetham;
- Mike Sibthorpe Planning for client proposes a new residential site to the north of the current housing allocation H4 at North Brook Close Greetham;

#### Ketton

- Catalyst and the head teacher of Ketton Primary School support the inclusion of site KET01 Park Farm Ketton as a site for a new primary school and special educational needs facility;
- Ketton Parish Council considers that Home Farm Ketton (KET08) should also be for business provision;
- Savills for Hanson is concerned that sites KET/06 and KET08 in Ketton have been dismissed as allocations, which does not offer the sufficient certainty or commitment;

#### Langham

- Andrew Granger & Co considers that site LAN/01 in Langham is suitable and should be included in the allocations;
- Marrons Planning for Davidsons Homes submits a site for 45-50 dwellings at Ranksborough Farm Langham;

#### Manton

- Grace Machin Planning Property on behalf of client puts forward a site for a self-build housing project of up to 2 dwellings;

#### Oakham

- DLP (Planning) Ltd for Bowbridge Land requests consideration of land to the west of Barleythorpe Road, Oakham (SHELAA/BAE/02) for 20-25 houses;
- Jeakins Weir objects to the omission of land east of Uppingham Road, Oakham (OAK/02) and makes a detailed submission in support of the site;
- Marrons Planning for Central England Co-operative requests that its land be included within the defined limits of development and identified as a local/district/retail centre;
- Marrons Planning for Taylor Wimpey proposes additional land at Brooke Road, Oakham (LPR/OAK/07) for 250-300 dwellings;
- Marrons Planning for the Burley Estate Farm Partnership seeks allocation of vacant allotment land at Brooke Road, Oakham for 40 dwellings;
- The Rosconn Group promotes land to the south of Braunston Road Oakham as an omission site which is readily available and suitable for residential development.

#### Ryhall

- Richard Dunnett on behalf of a client puts forward additional housing site at the River Gwash Fish Farm;

#### South Luffenham

- Astill Planning for CS Ellis Group Ltd proposes an extension to the Wireless Hill employment area and its inclusion as a key employment area;

#### Tinwell

- DLP Planning for Hereward Homes Ltd puts forward land at Home Farm, Tinwell;

#### Uppingham

- 3d Planning for TP Scott and Son object to the omission of a suitable site at the Beeches, Uppingham for 98 dwellings;
- Astill Planning for Welland Vale Nurseries proposes the allocation of the nursery site for retail use;

## Summary of consultation responses

### Local Plan Review Consultation Draft Local Plan July-September 2017

- ANCER SPA for Lynton Developments considers that site UPP/02 at Uppingham Gate should be listed in Policy RLP12 if it is appropriate for mixed use development;
- Matrix Planning for Robinson puts forward a site off Goldcrest and north of Firs Avenue, Uppingham for 63 dwellings;
- One individual response proposes a site for development to the rear of 5 Stockerston Road, Uppingham
- Uppingham Town Council considers that the Welland Vale site (UPP/10) is part of the retail offer and will be considered in the neighbourhood plan refresh

<b>Policy RLP13 – Cross Boundary Development Opportunity – Stamford North</b>			
<b>Site</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
General comments	4 (25%)	6 (37%)	6 (37%)
• LIT/01 – Little Casterton, Land at Quarry Farm (Stamford North)	12 (40%)	18 (60%)	-
• LIT/02 – Land at Quarry Farm (Stamford North)	12 (40%)	18 (60%)	-

Total comments: 76

#### Government and agencies

- Highways England comments that there is likely to be a cumulative impact on the A1 which will need to be considered through a Transport Assessment;

#### Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- Casterton College supports the proposals and stresses the importance of road safety on Sidney Farm Lane;
- DLP Planning for Larkfleet Homes Ltd supports the proposals but requests that the policy refers to 650 homes and a “Nature Park” rather than a Country Park; that the development should be CIL exempt as the infrastructure needed is likely to be in Stamford and South Kesteven rather than Rutland;
- Savills for the Burghley House Preservation Trust supports the proposals and submits a draft Stamford North Delivery Statement setting out a proposed means of delivering the scheme in an appropriate and coordinated manner to the benefit of the communities in both council areas.
- The Rosconn Group considers that the policy should be clarified to make clear that the site allocation is being made solely to help meet the housing need of South Kesteven District and not Rutland District and will not contribute to the 5-year land supply for Rutland;

#### Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- Clipsham Parish Meeting considers that the developments require local consultation and agreement and that the Council needs to devise clear policies to strictly control such development within its borders;
- Great Casterton Parish Council comments that the developments may increase traffic through the village and traffic alleviation measures must be considered;
- Langham Parish Council comments that there needs to be policy clarification of the Rutland housing numbers to be gained and the developments will need careful amelioration;
- Stamford Town Council/Neighbourhood Planning Forum supports the allocation in principle but considers a holistic approach is needed to cover a relief road, an

## Summary of consultation responses

### Local Plan Review Consultation Draft Local Plan July-September 2017

education campus, infrastructure and serviced, green spaces, design policies and guidelines, parking spaces, policies in the neighbourhood plan and an east-west link which should be the subject of a joint study.

#### Public and interest groups

- A range of concerns are raised include increased traffic congestion and traffic cutting through Little Casterton to the A1; the need for a bypass of Little Casterton, the lack of infrastructure and local facilities; the impact on local residents, services, public transport, school runs and parking in Stamford; that any houses in within the County boundaries must be included in Rutland's housing totals; that the requirement that "development is expected to include" is too weak and that the requirements for a country park and a strong mitigation framework need to be strengthened;
- The Rutland Branch CPRE considers that more detail is needed on the extent of future development and that the proposed new homes are in addition to the SHMA figures;

<b>Policy RLP14 – Housing density and mix</b>		
<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
24 (43%)	21 (38%)	10 (18%)

Total comments: 55

#### Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- CMYK (Planning and Design) Ltd for Abbey Developments Ltd. comments that where development is taking place housing mix should principally reflect local character;
- Marrons Planning for Taylor Wimpey objects to the proposed mix as the recommendations in the SHMA were based on demographic analysis and assumptions and have not taken account of market demand; that the policy should be expressed in a more flexible way so as to respond to market demand;
- Pegasus Group for Linden Homes and Davidsons Developments considers that it should be for the market to determine the mix on a demand led basis and it inappropriate for the Council to determine the mix of market housing on sites; policy should be amended to indicate that a mix of housing will be sought on sites subject to local circumstances and site specific issues including potential issues of viability;
- Savills for Society of Merchant Venturers recommends a housing mix based on up to date evidence rather than the SHMA;
- Strutt & Parker LLP for Cecil Estate Family Trust considers the 3rd paragraph of this policy is too prescriptive and needs further qualification; specific reference should be had to individual settlements' housing needs, rather than applying the generic needs of the county to these specific sites.
- William Davis Ltd. requests that the policy be amended to make it clear that housing mix, like density (as described in the first part of the policy) is expected to vary depending on the location and character of the site;

#### Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- Barrowden Parish Council comments that the policy is extremely weak and ineffectual and ask that it cites the table in para 5.40 as well as making it a specific requirement that developers offer starter homes and homes suitable for downsizing for our elderly community; it requests a much stronger policy be included to encourage developers to provide starter homes;

## Summary of consultation responses

### Local Plan Review Consultation Draft Local Plan July-September 2017

- Cottesmore Parish Council considers that the policy is not robust enough and should put more emphasis on meeting local requirements, to help people onto the housing ladder and to provide the down-sizing opportunities
- Ketton Parish Council considers that the % mix should be mandatory, and stated in the policy, in order to maintain mixed and vibrant communities;
- Uppingham Town Council considers this is in conflict with the Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan and is not convinced that all new developments should provide a mix of property types;
- Greetham Parish Council is concerned that the terminology used is subjective and no indication is given about how these subjective requirements will be made and by whom;

#### Public and interest groups

- Limes, Firs & Spurs Residents Association comment that mix and density should be a matter for the Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan;
- Rutland Branch of CPRE agree there should be a mix on any development, but it should not be too prescriptive, to allow for local needs and environment; and there should also be variable density of housing;
- Individual comments that the need is for smaller houses, particularly affordable housing; concern about lack of mention of design quality issues; that a %age mix should be mandatory in order to maintain mixed and vibrant communities;

<b>Policy RLP15 – Self-build and custom housebuilding</b>		
<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
23	10	7

Total comments: 40

#### Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- DLP (Planning) Limited for Larkfleet Homes Ltd consider that the percentage requirements seem excessive, a figure of 3% would be more appropriate;
- Gladman Developments consider the policy is not justified on the evidence referred to in paragraphs 5.48 and 5.49 and will lead to a delay in delivery of allocated sites;
- Grace Machin Planning and Property for a client objects to the policy not explicitly highlighting that self-build and custom build sites can come forward on sites which do not form part of a larger residential allocation and suggests suitable wording.
- Marrons Planning for Taylor Wimpey suggest that the second sentence in para 5.49 which refers to 60 dwellings per year being for self-build is a typo and should refer to 60 dwellings over the plan period;
- Pegasus Group for Linden Homes Strategic Land and Davidsons Developments consider there is insufficient evidence to justify the requirement and suggest identifying smaller sites for self-build or a supportive criteria based policy;
- Persimmon Homes East Midlands strongly questions the evidence base for the requirement and the implications for viability of development; would like to see the wording in para 5.52 included in the policy;
- Savills for Burghley House Preservation Trust Ltd questions the approach of including self and custom build plots within larger development sites; these would be more attractive on infill development sites or smaller, edge of settlement rounding off locations across the district; that locations within neighbourhood plans would be a better approach;

## Summary of consultation responses

### Local Plan Review Consultation Draft Local Plan July-September 2017

- Savills for Society of Merchant Venturers considers there is no evidence to demonstrate this level of need and that this should be considered on a case by case basis when determining the housing mix of the site;
- William Davis Ltd objects to the policy as it changes the house building delivery mechanism from one form of house building company to another without any consequential additional contribution to boosting housing supply; it will conflict with health and safety practices on major sites and create uncertainty over the form and character of development; provision should be sought by negotiation rather as a requirement for all sites;

#### Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- Uppingham Town Council generally supports the policy but does not agree with para 2 requiring 5% of new build to be allocated to self-build;

#### Public and interest groups

- Limes, Firs & Spurs Residents Association cannot see justification for forcing developers to allocate 5% of plots for self-build.

<b>Policy RLP16 – Affordable housing</b>		
<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
38 (64%)	12 (20%)	9 (15%)

Total comments: 59

#### Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- CMYK (Planning and Design) Ltd for Abbey Developments Ltd. considers that the extent of exceptional circumstances should be defined to provide clarity and certainty;
- DLP (Planning) Limited for Larkfleet Homes Ltd considers the plan needs to list the different type of affordable housing models and the policy needs to be flexible to account for viability and scale issues with clear policy wording on different approaches developers can take where there is little or no interest from registered providers;
- Marrons Planning for Taylor Wimpey comments that market conditions, economic viability and other infrastructure requirements may impact upon the quantum of affordable housing that can be delivered; consideration should also be given to the tenure mix and dwelling type on the site; the policy needs to explicitly specify flexibility in respect of affordable products and funding mechanisms;
- Savills for Burghley House Preservation Trust Ltd suggests an up to date ‘Whole Plan Viability Assessment’ is needed to assess the ability of proposals to accommodate 30% affordable housing;
- William Davis Ltd comments that no evidence is presented at present to demonstrate that this level of provision is viable;

#### Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- Oakham Neighbourhood Plan Group suggests use of the word “must” or “will” instead of “should” to take a firmer line;
- Ketton Parish Council suggests reducing the minimum development size, which would require 30% affordable housing from 11 houses to 6; it should state that commuting lump sums or off site alternatives should not be permitted; would like to see an addition to the policy regarding encouragements/incentivisation of the formation of Housing Associations or Trusts that would allow affordable housing to remain affordable in the long term;
- North Luffenham Parish Council comments that RCC must ensure that Housing Associations managing shared ownership of affordable homes act in a totally

## Summary of consultation responses

### Local Plan Review Consultation Draft Local Plan July-September 2017

transparent way in the on-going allocation process, to ensure that such properties are made available in perpetuity to local people in housing need;

#### Public and interest groups

- Individual comments that the definition of affordable homes needs to be inclusive of 'starter homes'; that no detailed study has been carried out to 'identify' the need in individual villages and Oakham and Uppingham; emphasis should be on the RCC /Spire Homes building its own properties for rent; the 30% requirement should apply to sites with say 6 or more houses rather than just the 11 or more shown at present; that commuting lump sums and off-site provision in lieu should not be allowed except in very special circumstances; affordable housing would be better in the towns where the transport links are better, not in rural areas where travel is essential and employment and amenities limited.

<b>Policy RLP17 – Rural Exception Housing</b>		
<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
17 (62%)	9 (33%)	1 (3%)

Total comments: 27

#### Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- Strutt & Parker LLP for Cecil Estate Family Trust and Exton Estate considers the wording is too prescriptive and advocates the deletion of sub paragraphs C, D and E;

#### Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- North Luffenham Parish Council considers there is a need to ensure that Housing Associations managing shared ownership affordable homes, act in a totally transparent way in the on-going allocation process, to ensure that such properties are made available in perpetuity to local people in housing need.

<b>Policy RLP18 – Gypsies and travellers</b>		
<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
12 (22%)	40 (74%)	2 (3%)

Total comments: 54

#### Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- Clipsham Parish Meeting comments that future uses of St. George's Barracks may be of some relevance to this policy;
- Langham Parish Council considers that further expansion of sites will not encourage community cohesion and may even help develop a 'them and us' attitude; it would be preferable for gypsies and travellers to be subject to the same planning rules as the rest of the population; request clarification and justification of the proposed figure of 13 residential pitches against the current position of the two sites in Langham Parish;

#### Public and interest groups

- Rutland Branch of CPRE suggests that the Council allocates a site on the military base at North Luffenham;
- Individual comments that the provision of sites should be solely on a provisional basis; adverse effects of traveller sites on security, safety, village life and environmental hygiene.

## Summary of consultation responses

### Local Plan Review Consultation Draft Local Plan July-September 2017

## Chapter 6 - Employment and Economic Development

<b>Policy RLP19 – New provision for industrial and office development and related uses</b>			
<b>Site</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
• OAK/13 - Land to northeast of Oakham off Burley Road	4	11	-
• GRE/01- Land at Greetham Quarry	5	22	1
• UPP/02 - Land at Uppingham Gate, Uppingham	8	2	-
• KET/11 - Land at Pitt Lane, Ketton	6	2	2

Total comments: 63

### **General comments**

#### Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- Uppingham Town Council raises concerns about the viability of Uppingham Gate (UPP02) if employment land expands in the remainder of the county;

#### Public and interest groups

- One individual comment that there is already a lot of vacant property and premises available and no extra sites are needed;
- The Rutland Branch of CPRE wishes to see evidence that there is a requirement for employment premises and questions whether there is capacity on existing brownfield sites to avoid expanding beyond Oakham Bypass.

### **GRE/01**

#### Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- DLP Planning Ltd for Hereward Homes (Greetham) Ltd considers that this an attractive and deliverable site for a range for employment uses;

#### Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- Greetham Parish Council considers that the site is poorly chosen as it is not central to Rutland, is poorly served by public transport, is not near a large population and will exacerbate traffic problems;

#### Public and interest groups

- A range of concerns are raised including that it would override and ignore the neighbourhood plan; road safety and increased traffic congestion; narrow and dangerous footpaths; increased noise; the sewerage system cannot cope; lack of infrastructure, school and doctors surgery; visual landscape and environmental impacts; contrary to existing consents which require the site to be restored to a recreation site after quarrying; concerns that the quarry will expand into a new community in its own right;
- The Rutland Branch of CPRE is concerned about development at Greetham Quarry.

### **KET/11**

#### Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- Ketton Parish Council considers that development of this area for business needs encouraging by RCC and that Home Farm, High Street Ketton (KET08) should also be for business provision;

## Summary of consultation responses

### Local Plan Review Consultation Draft Local Plan July-September 2017

#### **OAK/13**

##### Public and interest groups

- A range of individual concerns are raised including the scale of the development being too large; additional traffic and HGVs; being out of character for a countryside green field site; traffic and noise pollution; damage to the environment and visual appeal.

#### **UPP02**

##### Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- ANCER SPA for Lynton Developments disagrees with the proposal as it considers that the policy must include a degree of enabling development such as residential or retail to cross-subsidize development costs;

##### Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- Cottesmore Parish Council comments that the plan is less pro-active in identifying employment opportunities on any significant scale, except in and around Oakham, and parishes are facing increased housing provision but without any parallel commitment to employment;
- Uppingham Town Council supports the site for employment but would support some joint use for employment and some residential;

##### Public and interest groups

- The Limes, Firs and Spurs Residents Association is concerned about the viability of the site if employment land expands in the remainder of the county.

<b>Policy RLP20 – Expansion of existing businesses and protection of existing employment sites</b>		
<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
23 (82%)	4 (14%)	1 (3%)

Total comments:28

##### Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- Astill Planning for CS Ellis Group Ltd seeks the inclusion of Wireless Hill at South Luffenham as a key employment site; seeks identification of the policy on the draft policies maps, which is necessary to provide clarity.

##### Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- Barrowden Parish Council requests that an additional element be added to the policy to encourage developers to provide employment opportunities around the seven existing identified sites;
- Uppingham Town Council comments regarding site UPP/02 and the possibility that this it becomes mixed employment and residential development land;

<b>Policy RLP21 – The rural economy</b>		
<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
25 (78%)	6 (18%)	1 (3%)

Total comments: 32

- No specific comments.

<b>Policy RLP22 – Agricultural, horticultural, equestrian and forestry development</b>		
<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>

## Summary of consultation responses

### Local Plan Review Consultation Draft Local Plan July-September 2017

25 (89%)	1 (3%)	2 (7%)
----------	--------	--------

Total comments: 28

#### Public and interest groups

- Rutland Branch of CPRE comments that these provisos should be in all other development policies.

<b>Policy RLP23 – Local Visitor Economy</b>		
Agree	Disagree	Other Comments
31 (86%)	-	5 (13%)

Total comments: 36

#### Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- Ketton Parish Council comments that there seems to be no mention of second homes; if we are encouraging tourism then we need to consider second homes and what restrictions/disincentives may need to be applied;

#### Public and interest groups

- Rutland Branch of CPRE comments that a park and ride scheme would be useful and would help promote tourism to local towns;
- One individual comment that there is no mention of second homes.

<b>Policy RLP24 – Rutland Water</b>		
Agree	Disagree	Other Comments
32 (76%)	-	10 (23%)

Total comments: 42

#### Government and agencies

- Historic England requests that heritage assets and their settings should be referenced within this policy;

#### Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- Anglian Water Services Limited comments that the policy does not recognise that development may be needed at the reservoir by the operator and there is no positive policy reference to the need for development associated with Rutland Water; requests the policy be amended to state that the Local Planning Authority will support proposals which involve the role, function and operation of Rutland Water reservoir, its treatment works and associated network;

#### Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- Empingham Parish Council Local Plan considers that the plan should include information as to how RCC proposes to ensure effective control of Anglia Water's commercial activities including the economic, environmental and social cost to settlements;

#### Public and interest groups

- Rutland Branch of CPRE comments that the two reservoirs should be rigorously protected equally and that given the degree of tourist development already in place, further development for Rutland Water should be significantly protected;
- One individual comment that the policy should contain a form of words which ensures that all activities both on and off the water are covered by planning permission requirements;

## Summary of consultation responses

### Local Plan Review Consultation Draft Local Plan July-September 2017

<b>Policy RLP25 – Eyebrook Reservoir Area</b>		
<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
24 (88%)	1 (3%)	2 (7%)

Total comments: 27

<b>Policy RLP26 – Caravans, camping, lodges, log cabins, chalets and similar forms of self-serviced holiday accommodation</b>		
<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
22 (81%)	4 (14%)	1 (3%)

Total comments: 27

#### Government and agencies

- The Environment Agency comments that caravans, camping, log cabins and chalets are highly vulnerable to flooding and should not be permitted in flood risk areas;

#### Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- Uppingham Town Council comments that the policy does not seem to address caravan and camping sites and would wish to see evidence from RCC as to the stance being taken;

<b>Policy RLP27 – Town centres and retailing</b>		
<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
24 (75%)	4 (12%)	4 (12%)

Total comments: 32

#### Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- Marrons Planning for Central England Cooperative considers that the policy fails to acknowledge the existence of the Society's Burley Road site as a long established and key component of Oakham's retail infrastructure; requests that the policy be amended to reflect the site's status by the inclusion of a third bullet to refer to other retail centres identified on the Inset Maps;

#### Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- Langham Parish Council's main concern is the West End of the Town Centre; would welcome the focus of improvements in this area; coordination between the bus and train services would enhance the visitor and resident experience;
- Uppingham Town Council challenges the recommendations of the Retail Capacity Assessment Update 2016 which seeks to downgrade some of Uppingham's primary shopping area in direct defiance of the Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan; gives notice that it intends to commission its own independent retail assessment and requires that RCC await the outcome of this before moving this matter forward.

#### Public and interest groups

- Limes, Firs & Spurs Residents Association is opposed to the intention to restrict development in Uppingham in favour of Oakham;
- Individual comments that the proposal for a one-way in the town centre will destroy, rather than preserve, the character of the town; that infrastructure in Oakham, the Health Centre is already a problem.

## Summary of consultation responses

### Local Plan Review Consultation Draft Local Plan July-September 2017

<b>Policy RLP28 – Primary and secondary shopping frontages</b>		
<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
21 (87%)	2 (8%)	1 (4%)

Total comments: 24

- Uppingham Town Council gives notice that it intends to commission its own independent retail assessment and requires that RCC await the outcome of this before moving this matter forward;

#### Public and interest groups

- Limes, Firs & Spurs Residents Association comments that the proposal to amend existing primary retail areas in Queen Street and High Street West to secondary areas flies in the face of the Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan.

<b>Policy RLP29 – Site for retail development</b>			
<b>Site</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
General comments	3 (42%)	3 (42%)	1 (14%)
R1 - Tim Norton, Long Row	11 (61%)	5 (27%)	2 (11%)

Total comments: 25

#### Government and agencies

- Historic England considers that the height and bulk should be restricted to a similar height to existing in order to prevent harm to the significance of heritage assets;

#### Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- Oakham Neighbourhood Plan Group comments that there is no business development planned in zones E, F and H in the Oakham Neighbourhood Plan which were preferred by respondents to the ONP;
- Uppingham Town Council considers that the Oakham-centred approach is failing in its duty to all residents of Rutland and requests to see firm evidence to support the policy;

#### Public and interest groups

- Several individual comments raise concerns about the positioning of the site so close to the railway crossing; one comments that the site should also be available for housing plus food retail uses;

<b>Policy RLP30 – Securing sustainable transport and accessibility through development</b>		
<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
25 (59%)	8 (19%)	9 (21%)

Total comments: 42

#### Government and agencies

- Network Rail would encourage the inclusion of a policy statement that proposals which increase the use of level crossings will generally be resisted and where development would prejudice the safe use of a level crossing an alternative bridge crossing will be required to be provided at the developers expense; any development being proposed in the vicinity of level crossings, particularly those traversed by public roads, should be reviewed to ensure that meeting the cost of

## Summary of consultation responses

### Local Plan Review Consultation Draft Local Plan July-September 2017

appropriate risk mitigation works in relation to the size of the development does not affect the viability of the allocation;

#### Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- Malcolm Sargent Primary School is anxious about the speed and volume of vehicle traffic on local roads, the danger that this poses to their pupils' safety, and how this should be ameliorated; would encourage special consideration to the planning of the road networks that will support new developments in the local plan and how these will assist in the aim of safe school journeys for children;

#### Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- Barrowden Parish Council comments that the policy is very short in detail regarding how improved transport choices will be provided, provision of foot ways and cycle ways and asks that a more specific policy be included to deal with sustainable transport;
- Ketton Parish Council comments that the policy contains very little detail on how the aims will be achieved and there is no mention of cross border co-operation in terms of safe cycleways e.g. Rutland Water to Stamford; suggests extensions in both directions of the Ketton-Tinwell cycle path;
- Uppingham Town Council considers the policy is at variance with RLP27 which seeks to restrict the development of shopping amenities in Uppingham;

#### Public and interest groups

- Rutland Branch of CPR considers that there is an omission from this policy of some solution to the Oakham level crossing, which is projected to close for 40 minutes in the hour; support is needed from residents in the north of the town for the High Street proposal - more consultation should be made when the Local Transport Plan is available; the impact of out of County development should be included in the Local Transport Plan;
- A range of concerns are raised including that the policy lacks detail and there is no mention of cross-border cooperation in terms of cycleways; it is essential that the Council uses the plan to provide an adequate road network within the county; unrealistic to expect increases in movements to be provided by public transport, cycling and walking; the need for improvement on the A606 and A6003 consideration of by-passes for Empingham, Whitwell, Langham, Uppingham and Caldecott; that facilities for foot and cycle paths to bus stops are needed in Uppingham.

<b>Policy RLP31 – Electric Vehicle Charging Points</b>		
<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
30 (81%)	6 (16%)	1 (2%)

Total comments: 37

#### Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- Marrons Planning for Taylor Wimpey comments that there is no definition of "adequate arrangements" which should be explained in the accompanying text; it would also be helpful to define the curtilage of the property for the avoidance of doubt; here is no reference to viability in the policy, which is essential as there may be instance where it can be demonstrated that the proposed policy renders a scheme unviable;
- Savills for Burghley House Preservation Trust Ltd requests that the Council considers the financial implications of such a requirement within the updated "Whole Plan Viability Assessment" as the plan progresses.

#### Public and interest groups

## Summary of consultation responses

### Local Plan Review Consultation Draft Local Plan July-September 2017

- A range of individual comments are made including that every new residential property must provide adequate arrangements for charging electric vehicles at 7 kW; that there are no technical reasons why communal parking areas could not be provided with charge points; that the word “rapid” is changed to “fast”; that the number of charging points needs to be increased; that the electricity infrastructure is unable to cope with demand now.

Policy RLP32 – High Speed Broadband		
Agree	Disagree	Other Comments
46 (82%)	4 (7%)	6 (10%)

Total comments: 56

#### Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- Marrons Planning for Taylor Wimpey disagrees with the policy as it does not provide sufficient flexibility in how it would be applied and it should acknowledge that the requirement should be subject to viability;
- Persimmon Homes East Midlands considers there needs to be some flexibility built into the wording of the policy to allow for those scenarios where it is not always possible to install.

#### Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- Barrowden Parish Council proposes that a minimum standard for all new developments is that the FTTP be provided as a minimum to the edge of the property or the development as appropriate and on developments in excess of 10 dwellings FTTP to be a mandatory provision;
- Empingham Parish Council comments that the Local Plan should record the increasing importance of mobile phones and the action needed to encourage the four network providers to provide comprehensive and reliable high-speed mobile network coverage;
- Ketton Parish Council considers that the policy seems too weak given that fixed fibre superfast broadband is essential for many services and that it should be mandatory that optical fibre is provided to at least the edge of all new houses and developments;
- North Luffenham Parish Council considers that broadband to the Premises (FTTP) is considered inadequate and at present 80% of the village report inadequate mobile phone coverage irrespective of the provider;
- Uppingham Town Council would like to see evidence that alternative service providers are being encouraged by RCC to ensure that Rutland receives the very best deal;

#### Public and interest groups

- One individual comment that it should be mandatory that optical fibre should be provided to at least the edge of all new houses and developments.

## Chapter 7 - Sustaining our Environment

Policy RLP33 – Delivering Good design		
Agree	Disagree	Other Comments
39 (73%)	5 (9%)	9 (16%)

Total comments: 53

## Summary of consultation responses

### Local Plan Review Consultation Draft Local Plan July-September 2017

#### Government and agencies

- East Northamptonshire Council and the North Northamptonshire JPU consider it may also be helpful to refer to the role of green infrastructure in delivering ecosystem services;
- The Environment Agency suggests detailed changes of wording including reference to water efficiency standards, the need for net biodiversity gains, habitat creation areas and tree planting on new developments and reference to Blue Infrastructure;

#### Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- Anglian Water Services Limited comments that the Local Plan does not include a policy which refers to the inclusion of SuDSs as part of new development; there is no reference to foul drainage and sewerage treatment;
- Marrons Planning for Taylor Wimpey comment that under i) landscaping, preservation is generally not possible and almost all development will cause visual change;

#### Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- Barrowden Parish Council requests paragraph 7.6 be added to the policy;
- Clipsham Parish Meeting refers to the importance of masterplanning by SPDs for developments of more than 5 homes;
- Ketton Parish Council refers to the need for adequate drainage of paved and tarmacked areas, need for parking to access services in a village;
- Market Overton Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group states that low density developments are preferred and suggests a maximum height of new dwellings;
- Morcott Parish Council considers that the policy lacks the necessary detailed advice to planners;
- Oakham Neighbourhood Plan Group considers that the plan should reflect the views of the respondents to the Oakham Neighbourhood Plan and the dissatisfaction with style of new buildings that erode the charm of Oakham;
- Uppingham Town Council considers that the policy does not go far enough and recommends a policy that requires an independent architectural review on every site of more than 25 dwellings

<b>Policy RLP34 – Accessibility Standards</b>		
<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
35 (89%)	2 (5%)	2 (5%)

Total comments: 39

#### Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- Marrons Planning for Taylor Wimpey consider it imperative that the requirement is subject to viability and that there is evidence to support it; suggests a third exception criterion to recognise that detailed design, siting and layout mean the requirement cannot be met for all 4 bed units;
- Pegasus Planning for Linden Homes do not consider there is sufficient evidence or viability testing to justify this requirement;
- Persimmon Homes East Midlands support the requirements alongside the inclusion of some flexibility if it impacts on viability or a heritage asset;

#### Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- Barrowden Parish Council requests that the policy be applied to houses required for downsizing in rural villages of 2 and 3 bedroomed homes;

## Summary of consultation responses

### Local Plan Review Consultation Draft Local Plan July-September 2017

- Clipsham Parish Meeting questions why it not considered appropriate to include national space standards in the policy.

<b>Policy RLP35 – Advertisements</b>		
<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
23 (100%)	-	-

Total comments: 23

<b>Policy RLP36 – Outdoor lighting</b>		
<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
26 (89%)	1 (3%)	2 (6%)

Total comments: 29

#### Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- Clipsham Parish Meeting considers that a strategic policy statement is needed for the protection of dark skies and to prevent light pollution;
- The Rutland Branch of CPRE considers that the policy should be strengthened to avoid pollution of the night sky, and there should be similar provision in respect of other pollution;

<b>Policy RLP37 – Energy efficiency and low carbon energy generation</b>		
<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
35 (79%)	3 (6%)	6 (13%)

Total comments: 44

#### Government and agencies

- Historic England has very strong concerns that the proposed large scale areas suitable for wind turbine developments are not based on robust evidence and could lead to pressure for developments that are likely to result in harm to Rutland's heritage assets;

#### Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- Anglian Water Services is concerned that the policy covers wind turbines but not other renewable technologies and does not outline the circumstances in which renewable proposals on its land will be supported; the policy should be redrafted to include a positive reference to renewable development;
- Anglian Water recommends additional wording to state that all new housing developments will be encouraged to be energy efficient and that all new non-domestic buildings will be encouraged to meet BREEAM design standards for energy efficiency; residential developments in the area served by Anglian Water should meet the optional higher water efficiency standard of 110 litres per occupier per day, as set out in Building regulation part G2;

#### Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- Clipsham Parish Meeting considers that reference should be made to the Wind Turbines SPD and that a sister SPD is needed to cover applications for large solar farms;
- Great Casterton Parish Council considers that wind farms are unsightly and any development would have an adverse effect on the character of its village;
- Pickworth Parish Meeting considers that an amendment to the map is needed so as not to give the impression that wind turbines can be built in the centre of villages and in private gardens;

## Summary of consultation responses

### Local Plan Review Consultation Draft Local Plan July-September 2017

#### Public and interest groups

- Rutland Branch of the CPRE comments that solar farms and low carbon energy generation should not cause loss of biodiversity and should minimise impact on wildlife;
- One individual comment that all new developments should be required to include PV Panels;

Policy RLP38 – The natural environment		
Agree	Disagree	Other Comments
40 (78%)	2 (3%)	9 (17%)

Total comments: 51

#### Government and agencies

- The Environment Agency suggests additions to the policy to state that all developments should aim for net biodiversity gain; that habitat creation areas should be provided on-site; that blue infrastructure should be referenced alongside green infrastructure; that any loss of which should be resisted; an addition to the possible list of networks;

#### Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- The Environment Bank considers that the policy should be worded to ensure that all biodiversity needs to be conserved with development required to compensate for all biodiversity impact and inclusion of a biodiversity compensation system if desired;

#### Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- Barrowden Parish Council is concerned that there is no reference to species outside those protected by law such as glow-worms; suggests under e) networks could involve non-designated land;
- Clipsham Parish Meeting welcomes the policy but is concerned that biodiversity data is not monitored and there are no records available;
- Ketton Parish Council comments that there is no mention of and noise pollution and the effects of vibrations which are potential pollution issues in Ketton;
- Oakham Neighbourhood Plan Group comments that respondents to the Oakham Neighbourhood Plan indicated their concern for conserving or enhancing the quality and diversity of the natural environment;

#### Public and interest groups

- The Rutland Branch of the CPRE states that this should be demonstrably applied to all developments and that more comprehensive policies are needed for the preservation of the natural environment and for limiting pollution in order to comply fully with the NPPF;
- The Woodland Trust requests that the policy in b) should be amended to give stronger protection to ancient and veteran trees and would like reference to habitat creation in h) to include planting of trees and woodland;
- Individual comments include that by applying the DEFRA metric, biodiversity can be evaluated for all sites; concerns about noise, vibration and traffic in relation to development at Ketton; that policies do not go far enough to support borrow pits.

Policy RLP39 – Sites of biodiversity and geodiversity importance		
Agree	Disagree	Other Comments
38 (86%)	1 (2%)	5 (11%)

Total comments: 44

## Summary of consultation responses

### Local Plan Review Consultation Draft Local Plan July-September 2017

#### Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- Clipsham Parish Meeting comments that all developments whether protected or not require a measured impact assessment of the development;

#### Public and interest groups

- The Rutland Branch of the CPRE considers that c) should apply to all sites regardless of importance;
- The Woodland Trust requests that the policy should be amended to give stronger protection to ancient and veteran trees and reference to habitat creation to include planting of trees and woodland;

<b>Policy RLP40 – The historic and cultural environment</b>		
<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
45 (81%)	2 (3%)	8 (14%)

Total comments: 55

#### Government and agencies

- Historic England considers that the policy should be amended to be strategic in order to ensure soundness in accordance with the NPPF and query whether a local list will be produced; non-designated heritage assets and archaeology should be addressed within the supporting text; “Historic assets” should be revised to read “heritage assets” and the last sentence could be reworded to read “where this does not harm their significance” ;

#### Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- Ketton Parish Council refers to anomalies in the status of listed buildings and conservation areas in Ketton;
- North Luffenham Parish Council considers it essential that Rutland County Council appoints a Conservation Officer to deliver the requisite service;

#### Public and interest groups

- Leicestershire and Rutland Bridleways Association is concerned at the lack of mention of public rights of way or any strategy for their protection and preservation, nor for the former Oakham to Melton canal.
- The Rutland Branch of the CPRE questions why the site of the Battlefield of Losecoat Field has not been designated;
- A range of individual concerns are raised, including how the policies are to be enforced; that there is a lack of clear guidance to resist inappropriate development; that master planning and supplementary guidance on historic/conservation areas are needed.

<b>Policy RLP41 – Protecting heritage assets</b>		
<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
45 (83%)	1 (1%)	8 (14%)

Total comments: 54

#### Government and agencies

- Historic England considers that the policy should be amended to be strategic to ensure soundness in accordance with the NPPF and questions whether a local list will be produced; that non-designated heritage assets and archaeology should also be addressed within the supporting text; question whether a specific shopfronts policy could be included;

## Summary of consultation responses

### Local Plan Review Consultation Draft Local Plan July-September 2017

#### Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- Barrowden Parish Council suggests removal of reference to desk-top analysis as this sets too low a benchmark;
- Edith Weston Parish Council considers the policy should include any development which is likely to have an impact on heritage assets, whether in conservation areas or not;
- North Luffenham Parish Council considers it essential that Rutland County Council appoints a Conservation Officer to deliver the requisite service;

#### Public and interest groups

- The Rutland Branch of the CPRE questions how the policy is to be enforced given the large number of assets in Rutland;
- A range of individual concerns are raised including how the policies are to be enforced; that there is a lack of clear guidance to resist inappropriate development and that master planning and supplementary guidance on historic/conservation areas are needed;

<b>Policy RLP42 – Green infrastructure, sport and recreation</b>		
<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
44 (83%)	3 (5%)	6 (11%)

Total comments: 53

#### Government and agencies

- The Environment Agency considers that all reference to Green Infrastructure should be altered to Blue and Green Infrastructure (see comments also under Policy RLP38 above);
- East Northamptonshire Council and the North Northamptonshire JPU comment that it may also be helpful to refer to the role of green infrastructure in delivering ecosystem services and that corridors of relevance to Rutland and North Northamptonshire could be identified and referenced in the Plan;
- Sport England supports the policy but has some concerns (see comments also under Policy RLP44 below);

#### Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- Ketton Parish Council considers there is a need to incorporate some communal open space/play areas in all housing developments in Ketton;

#### Public and interest groups

- The Leicestershire and Rutland Bridleways Association is concerned that there is neither mention of bridleways nor the needs of the horse-riding community nor the former Oakham to Melton canal;
- The Woodland Trust comments that trees and woods could be incorporated as part of GI in new development and recommends adding the Woodland Trust's Access to Woodland Standard.

<b>Policy RLP43 – Important open space and frontages</b>		
<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
45 (93%)	2 (4%)	1 (2%)

Total comments: 48

#### Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

## Summary of consultation responses

### Local Plan Review Consultation Draft Local Plan July-September 2017

- Marrons Planning for The Burley Estate Farm Partnership disagrees with the designation of an area of important open space at Brooke Road, Oakham which it considers as being wholly inappropriate and unjustified;
- Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups
- Barrowden Parish Council seeks for important open spaces in its village to be re-evaluated;
  - Great Casterton Parish Council would be strongly opposed to any development on remaining green areas in its village;

<b>Policy RLP44 – Provision of new open space</b>		
<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
40 (86%)	1 (2%)	5 (10%)

Total comments: 46

#### Government and agencies

- Sport England supports the policy but does not support the use of standards for outdoor sports and playing fields and sports halls and indoor sports facilities is; concerned that the playing pitch element of the Sport and Recreation Strategy has not apparently been reviewed; concerned that CIL will not deliver funding towards off- site sports provision;

#### Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- Persimmon Homes East Midlands questions whether the proposed standards for Sports Hall/Indoor Provision are per 1,000 population;

#### Public and interest groups

- The Rutland Branch of CPRE considers that it is not clear whether existing facilities are sufficient and therefore what new open space is actually required; a distance of 20 or 30 minutes driving time is out of County, therefore more should be available nearby;
- The Woodland Trust comments that trees and woods could be incorporated as part of GI in new development and recommends adding the Woodland Trust's Access to Woodland Standard;

<b>Policy RLP45 – Landscape Character Impact</b>		
<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
38 (86%)	3 (6%)	3 (6%)

Total comments: 44

#### Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- Clipsham Parish Meeting considers that the last paragraph needs amending to read: "Proposals for minerals and waste development will be required to undertake a landscape impact assessment---";

#### Public and interest groups

- The Rutland Branch of CPRE considers that proposals for minerals and waste development should be required to “undertake impact assessment and comply with the agreed measures ... “ which would strengthen the policy requirements.

## Chapter 8 - Minerals and Waste

## Summary of consultation responses

### Local Plan Review Consultation Draft Local Plan July-September 2017

<b>Policy RLP46 – Spatial strategy for minerals development</b>		
<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
16 (76%)	5 (24%)	-

Total comments: 21

<b>Policy RLP 47 – Mineral provision</b>		
<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
15 (71%)	6 (28%)	-

Total comments: 21

<b>Policy RLP48 – Safeguarding Rutland’s Mineral Resources</b>		
<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
20 (83%)	4 (16%)	-

Total comments: 24

<b>Policy RLP49 – Development criteria for mineral extraction</b>		
<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
15 (68%)	4 (18%)	3 (13%)

Total comments: 22

#### Government and agencies

- Historic England considers that the policy would be strengthened by the addition of the words “heritage assets and their settings”;

#### Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- Clipsham Parish Meeting recommends specific reference to adverse impacts of additional HGV traffic in the development criteria for minerals extraction ;

#### Public and interest groups

- The Rutland Branch CPRE considers that specific mention of the adverse impacts of HGV traffic in connection with mineral extraction should be made including dust generation and quarry slurry.

<b>Policy RLP50 – Site-specific allocations for the extraction of crushed rock</b>			
<b>Site</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
• M4a Greetham Quarry North West extension	13 (43%)	15 (50%)	2 (6%)

Total comments: 30

#### Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- DLP Planning for Hereward Homes (Greetham) Ltd supports the identification of site M4a for the quarry extension which it considers is appropriate, needed and can be implemented as a continuation of the current quarrying operations;

#### Public and interest groups

- A range of individual concerns are raised about visual, environment, traffic and transport impacts; being too near the village; environmental health; traffic issues including effects of dust and blasting on nearby housing, walkers, horse riders and dog walkers.

<b>Policy RLP51 – Site-specific allocations for the extraction of building stone</b>			
<b>Site</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Other</b>

## Summary of consultation responses

### Local Plan Review Consultation Draft Local Plan July-September 2017

			Comments
• M5a Hooby Lane Quarry extension	14 (70%)	5 (25%)	1 (5%)

Total comments: 20

#### Policy RLP52 – Safeguarding of minerals development

Agree	Disagree	Other Comments
14 (77%)	4 (22%)	-

Total comments: 18

#### Policy RLP53 – Borrow Pits

Agree	Disagree	Other Comments
13 (76%)	4 (23%)	-

Total comments: 17

#### Policy RLP54 - Development criteria for other forms of minerals development

Agree	Disagree	Other Comments
14 (73%)	4 (21%)	1 (5%)

Total comments: 19

#### Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- Barrowden Parish Council recommends that a third civic amenity site near Oakham is brought forward at an early date and included as a specific site in the local plan;
- Uppingham Town Council does not feel that sufficient evidence has been provided to allow such a wide ranging policy (which lacks detail) to be adopted without such evidence being first provided.

#### Policy RLP55 – Waste management and disposal

Agree	Disagree	Other Comments
22 (81%)	2 (7%)	3 (11%)

Total comments: 27

#### Public and interest groups

- Rutland CPRE comments that there is no mention of increased sewage disposal capacity to cover the proposed housing developments and questions whether Rutland's Management Plan justifies the figures quoted;

#### Policy RLP56 – Waste-related development

Agree	Disagree	Other Comments
22 (91%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)

Total comments: 24

#### Government and agencies

- Historic England suggests it would be helpful to replace the words “historic environment” with “heritage assets and their settings” to ensure compliance with the NPPF;

## Summary of consultation responses

### Local Plan Review Consultation Draft Local Plan July-September 2017

<b>Policy RLP57 – Sites for waste management and disposal</b>			
<b>Site</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
• W1 - Cottesmore, Burley Road	14 (87%)	2 (12%)	-
• W2 - Greetham, Wood Lane	10 (62%)	6 (37%)	-
• W3 - Ketton, Ketco Avenue	9 (75%)	2 (16%)	1 (8%)

Total comments: 44

#### **W1**

No specific comments

#### **W2**

##### Public and interest groups

- A range of concerns are raised by individual responses including that environmental health and traffic increase would be unmanageable and unacceptable; visual landscape and environmental impacts; requests for traffic and transport modelling, and that the neighbourhood plan should be heeded.

#### **W3**

##### Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- Ketton Parish Council is concerned that the site appears to go through/include an SSSI and that the proposed area for the deposition of inert waste should be reduced to exclude the SSSI; questions the implications in terms of the original planning permissions granted for the restoration and landscaping of the excavated quarry that did not include any waste disposal and how waste will be brought to the quarry; suggests by rail only, to minimise the impact on the roads through the village; questions what measures would be put in place to minimise dust and noise disturbance in the village, given that the proposed Empingham Road housing development will be adjacent to the quarry.

##### Public and interest groups

- A range of concerns are raised including that inert waste disposal could substantially increase HGV traffic on the A6121 which must be minimised and rail delivery required/enforced; that waste disposal was not permitted as part of the original planning application, only restoration; that the boundary of the SSSI needs amending; that local impact have not been considered and existing local concerns not addressed.

<b>Policy RLP58 – Restoration and aftercare</b>		
<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
23 (92%)	-	2 (8%)

Total comments: 25

##### Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- Clipsham Parish Meeting questions how the Greetham Quarry proposed land allocation for mixed development shown in RLP 12 squares with this policy which are clearly at variance with it;

## Summary of consultation responses

### Local Plan Review Consultation Draft Local Plan July-September 2017

#### Public and interest groups

- Rutland Branch of CPRE questions how Greetham Quarry development complies with this Policy and considers that RLP12 item 13 appears to be contradictory.

<b>Implementation and monitoring framework</b>		
<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
5 (71%)	1 (14%)	1 (14%)

Total comments: 7

#### Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- Clipsham Parish Meeting comments that monitoring criteria and targets need to be set out in detail at this stage and there is evidence that the present monitoring regime is deficient and does not monitor biodiversity loss or geodiversity loss, contrary to DEFRA and NPPF guidelines. Proposed monitoring criteria, indicators and targets should be fully set out in an addendum for public consultation.

#### Public and interest groups

- Rutland Branch of CPRE comments that there should be policy on action to be taken to redress shortfalls in compliance with policies. Measurements to be applied to monitoring should be made clear.

<b>Appendix 1 – List of strategic policies</b>		
<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
9 (60%)	3 (20%)	3 (20%)

Total comments: 15

#### Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- Greetham Parish Council believes too many policies have been listed and this severely limits what Neighbourhood Plans can determine;

#### Public and interest groups

- Rutland Branch of CPRE is concerned that the list of policies should provide clarity on which are 'strategic' policies as it appears that most of the policies are regarded as 'strategic'; this is excessive and likely to provide severe constraints on Neighbourhood Plans. The list should be reviewed to allow Neighbourhood planning requisite flexibility in accordance with Localism legislation.

<b>Appendix 2 – List of replaced local plan policies</b>		
<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
8 (66%)	4 (33%)	-

Total comments: 12

<b>Appendix 3 – Local plan evidence base studies</b>		
<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
10 (35%)	16 (57%)	2 (7%)

Total comments: 28

#### Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- Clipsham Parish Meeting questions whether several studies could objectively be considered relevant for the period 2016-2036; also that a number of plans appear not to be available yet are needed to provide essential supporting evidence for this local plan;

## Summary of consultation responses

### Local Plan Review Consultation Draft Local Plan July-September 2017

- Oakham Neighbourhood Plan Group considers that the Oakham and Barleythorpe Neighbourhood Plan Big Survey should form part of the Local Plan evidence base;

#### Public and interest groups

- Rutland Branch of CPRE considers that the Strategic Transport Assessment and the Parking Sufficiency Studies for Oakham and Uppingham dated 2010 are out of date considering the housing development since that time and should be updated in support of the Local Plan update; there is no Infrastructure Study.

<b>Appendix 4 – Agricultural, forestry and other occupational dwellings</b>		
<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
10 (76%)	3 (23%)	-

Total comments: 13

<b>Appendix 5 – Parking standards</b>		
<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
15 (55%)	7 (25%)	5 (18%)

Total comments: 27

#### Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- Persimmon Homes East Midlands considers that the number of communal car parking spaces required is excessive and unjustified and would result in a totally car parking dominated layout;
- William Davis Ltd considers that the policy could be misconstrued to read that the requirement is for both shared communal spaces and allocated spaces; this should be edited to denote the provision is one or the other; moreover, the use of number of habitable rooms over number of bedrooms in determining parking space numbers is a step away from what is deemed as the norm and should also be altered to ensure clarity and transparency;

#### Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- Barrowden Parish Council requests that that the minimum number of parking spaces be increased with five and six rooms requiring 3 spaces and seven rooms and above requiring 4 spaces; that no off-road parking be allowed arising from new developments in villages with narrow roads and no footways;
- Langham Parish Council considers that the standards for residential parking would benefit from a review as present standards are not practical; the lack of adequate parking provision is causing problems at the new Barleythorpe (Oakham North); minimum standards for disabled parking should be increased;
- Oakham Neighbourhood Plan Group questions how the Council ensures that these parking standards are met and whether the Oakham North development meets these standards;

#### Public and interest groups

- individual comments raise concerns that parking on the roads on all new development sites built within Oakham in the last 4 years the current parking provisions are not adequate; that parking standards in Whissendine are appalling.

<b>Appendix 6 – Areas of biodiversity and geodiversity importance</b>		
<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
11 (73%)	3 (20%)	1 (6%)

Total comments: 15

## Summary of consultation responses

### Local Plan Review Consultation Draft Local Plan July-September 2017

#### Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

- North Luffenham Parish Council proposes two new 'Areas of Local Importance' in North Luffenham: the Village Walkway and Oval Recreation Ground;

#### Public and interest groups

- One individual comment that the verges and landscape are omitted from the Appendix 6.

<b>Appendix 7 – Designated heritage assets in Rutland</b>		
<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
9 (100%)	-	-

Total comments: 9

<b>Appendix 8 – Open space standards</b>		
<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
17 (89%)	2 (10%)	-

Total comments: 19

<b>Appendix 9 – Permitted sites for minerals extraction and recycled aggregates</b>		
<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
9 (56%)	7 (43%)	-

Total comments: 16

#### Public and interest groups

- Individual responses consider that more clarity is required in respect of the impact of blasting on nearby properties at Greetham Quarry and the blighting effect on the use of Great Lane by walkers, dog walkers, horse and bicycle riders. that local impact has not been considered and local concerns not addressed.

<b>Appendix 10 – Waste management needs</b>		
<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
13 (81%)	2 (12%)	1 (6%)

Total comments: 16

<b>Appendix 11 – Glossary</b>		
<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
7 (87%)	1 (12%)	-

Total comments: 8

<b>Policies Map</b>		
<b>Agree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Other Comments</b>
3 (37%)	3 (37%)	2 (25%)

Total comments: 8

#### Landowners, developers, agents and businesses

- Marrons Planning for Central England Cooperative Society comment that its site comprises "abutting land" with the benefit of planning permission for built development;

#### Parish/Town Councils and Meetings and Neighbourhood Planning Groups

## **Summary of consultation responses**

### **Local Plan Review Consultation Draft Local Plan July-September 2017**

---

- Ashwell Parish Council questions the title of Inset Map 2 (Ashwell South) and insists it be removed;
- Oakham Neighbourhood Plan Group comments that Brooke Road's (Oakham) now-vacated allotments are still shown as open space rather than a site for development; perhaps the site's edge could be utilised to straighten out Brooke Road to reduce congestion at the crossing when residents park on the road.

**List of respondents to Rutland Local Plan Review Consultation Draft  
Plan – July 2017**

---

**1) Government and agencies**

Anglian Water Services Limited  
 East Northamptonshire Council  
 Environment Agency  
 Highways England  
 Historic England  
 Leicestershire and Rutland Environmental Records Centre  
 Natural England  
 Network Rail  
 North Northamptonshire Joint Planning & Delivery Unit  
 Office of Rail and Road  
 Severn Trent  
 Sport England

**2) Landowners, developers, agents, businesses**

3d Planning for T P Scott and Son  
 Andrew Granger & Co  
 Astill Planning for CS Ellis Group Ltd  
 Barton Willmore for DeMerke Estates  
 Burghley House Preservation Trust  
 Casterton College  
 Catalyst  
 CMYK (Planning and Design) Ltd for Abbey Developments Ltd.  
 DLP (Planning) Limited for Bowbridge Land  
 DLP (Planning) Limited for Hereward Homes  
 DLP (Planning) Limited for Larkfleet Homes Ltd  
 DLP (Planning) Ltd for Hereward Homes (Greetham) Ltd  
 Environment Bank  
 Gladman Developments  
 Grace Machin Planning & Property  
 Greenlight Developments for Miller Family  
 Hanson UK  
 Harris McCormack Architects for RAS Showground  
 Ketton Primary School  
 Hereward Homes (Greetham) Ltd  
 HSSP Architects for Mr Hollis  
 Hughes Craven Ltd  
 Insight Town Planning Ltd for Langton Developments Ltd  
 J & D Creasey Ltd  
 Jeakins Weir  
 Landmark Planning  
 Lynton Developments  
 Malcolm Sargent Primary School  
 Marrons Planning for Central England Cooperative  
 Marrons Planning for Davidsons Homes  
 Marrons Planning for Taylor Wimpey  
 Marrons Planning for The Burley Estate Farm Partnership  
 Matrix Planning Ltd for Robinsons  
 Mike Sibthorp Planning for J Howden  
 Pegasus Group for Davidsons Developments

**List of respondents to Rutland Local Plan Review Consultation Draft  
Plan – July 2017**

---

Pegasus Group for Linden Homes Strategic Land  
 Persimmon Homes East Midlands  
 Peter Brett Associates LLP  
 Rosconn Group  
 RT Architects  
 Savills for Burghley House Preservation Trust Ltd,  
 Savills for Hanson Aggregates Ltd  
 Savills for Society of Merchant Venturers  
 Strutt & Parker LLP for Cecil Estate Family Trust  
 Strutt & Parker LLP for Exton Estate  
 Strutt & Parker LLP for Morcott Estate  
 The Planning Hub Ltd for Simon Holt  
 Welland Vale Nurseries Ltd  
 William Davis Ltd

**3) Parish councils and meetings and neighbourhood planning groups**

Ashwell Parish Council  
 Barleythorpe Parish Council  
 Barrowden Parish Council  
 Braunston Parish Council  
 Clipsham Parish Meeting  
 Cottesmore Parish Council  
 Edith Weston Parish Council  
 Empingham Parish Council  
 Great Casterton Parish Council  
 Greetham Parish Council  
 Ketton Parish Council  
 Langham Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group  
 Langham Parish Council  
 Manton Parish Council  
 Market Overton Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group  
 Morcott Parish Council  
 North Luffenham Parish Council  
 Oakham Neighbourhood Plan Group  
 Oakham Town Council  
 Pickworth Parish Meeting  
 Ryhall Parish Council  
 Stamford Town Council/NP Forum  
 Stretton Parish Council  
 Uppingham Town Council  
 Whissendine Parish Council

**4) Public and interest groups**

364 responses from individuals  
 749 form letters

Leicestershire and Rutland Bridleways Association  
 Leicestershire and Rutland RIGS group  
 Limes, Firs & Spurs Residents Association  
 Oakham South West Action Group  
 Rutland Branch of CPRE

**List of respondents to Rutland Local Plan Review Consultation Draft  
Plan – July 2017**

---

The Woodland Trust