



---

**Rutland County Council**  
Local Plan Authority Monitoring  
Report  
1<sup>st</sup> April 2019 – 31<sup>st</sup> March 2020

## Executive Summary

- The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 introduced the requirement for local planning authorities to produce an Annual Monitoring Report in order to monitor policy implementation and progress made against the Local Development Scheme (LDS).
- Under the Localism Act 2011 an Annual Monitoring Report is now referred to as an Authority Monitoring Report (AMR). Previous Government guidance on monitoring indicators has been revoked and superseded by new Planning Regulations. Although these regulations prescribe certain information that these Authority Monitoring Reports need to contain, there is significant scope for LPAs to determine what indicators to include.
- This Authority Monitoring Report (AMR) is prepared by Rutland County Council and monitors the development plan over the period 1<sup>st</sup> April 2019– 31<sup>st</sup> March 2020.
- This AMR reports upon the monitoring indicators identified in the Local Plan, comprising the Core Strategy DPD (July 2011); the Site Allocations and Policies Development Plan Document (October 2014) and the Minerals Core Strategy and Development Policies DPD (October 2010).

The key findings of the report are summarised below:

- There were 184 net additional dwellings completed in the time period from the 1<sup>st</sup> April 2019 to 31 March 2020.
- There is a 5.2 year housing supply of deliverable land for housing for the period from the 1<sup>st</sup> April 2019 to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2024, when compared to the housing requirement set out in the Core Strategy. This is based on the Sedgefield Approach and includes the 5% buffer required by the National Planning Policy Framework. The five Year land Supply Report can be found at: <https://www.rutland.gov.uk/my-services/planning-and-building-control/planning/planning-policy/local-plan-evidence-base/housing/>
- Rutland County Council has embarked on the Local Plan Review, the Regulation 19 consultation Local Plan and associated evidence was in preparation during the monitoring period.

## Contents

|   |    |
|---|----|
| 1.0 Introduction .....                                  | 3  |
| 2.0 Local Development Scheme.....                       | 4  |
| 3.0 Neighbourhood Plans.....                            | 6  |
| 4.0 Duty to Cooperate .....                             | 7  |
| 5.0 Community Infrastructure Levy.....                  | 8  |
| 6.0 Self-Build and Custom House-building Register ..... | 8  |
| 7.0 Brownfield Register .....                           | 10 |
| 8.0 Monitoring Indicators .....                         | 11 |
| APPENDIX 1 .....  | 14 |
| APPENDIX 2 .....  | 30 |
| APPENDIX 3.....   | 39 |

## 1.0 Introduction

- 1.0 This Authority Monitoring Report (AMR) produced by Rutland County Council covers the period 1<sup>st</sup> April 2019 – 31<sup>st</sup> March 2020 whilst also providing an up to 'publication date' statement on progress of the preparation of The Local Plan Review. The AMR is intended to monitor the progress of the preparation of the Local Plan and the effectiveness of policies. It will allow the community to be informed of how planning is affecting the area they live, work and study in.
- 1.1 Since the first monitoring report, covering the period 2004-05, the Council has progressively addressed areas where monitoring information was not previously available; where information is still unavailable the AMR indicates how and when this will be addressed.
- 1.2 The Planning Policy Section collects and holds most of the data contained within the AMR. Ecology and Minerals monitoring data is held by Leicestershire County Council and Northamptonshire County Council respectively as part of a service level agreement. Additional monitoring is also provided by the Environment Agency in regard to flooding issues.

### 1.3 Requirements of the Authority Monitoring Report

Rutland County Council is required, by the Localism Act 2011 to produce an Authority Monitoring Report (AMR). The general requirements of what must be covered in the AMR are set out in the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (Regulation 34). These include:

- Timetable and progress of any local plan and supplementary planning documents outlined within the Council's Local Development Scheme (including reasons for any delay and the date of any approved or adopted documents);
- Progress made against policies where an annual number is specified;
- Progress with Neighbourhood Plans being prepared;
- Details of actions under section 33A (Duty to Co-operate) of the Act made by the local authority ; and
- Information of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) receipts or expenditure undertaken by the Council as local charging authority;

### 1.4 Review

The monitoring framework will be kept under review and will be amended to reflect any changes in emphasis and priorities in terms of information to be collected to monitor additional indicators. This will enable a consistent and reliable approach to the collection and analysis of monitoring information on core output, local and contextual indicators.

- 1.5 The monitoring framework will continue to develop as work progresses on the preparation of Local Development Documents (LDDs)

## 2.0 Local Development Scheme

- 2.1 This section considers whether the timetable and milestones of the preparation of documents listed in the Local Development Scheme (LDS) is being met, as required by Section 34(1) of the 2012 Regulation.
- 2.2 The AMR covers the period 1st April 2019 to 31st March 2020 and the information below reflects this monitoring period. However it is important to recognise that up to date progress on the preparation of the Local Plan Review can be found on the [Local Development Scheme webpage](#).
- 2.3 The Council is preparing a new Local Plan, which when adopted will replace all existing adopted Local Plan documents. Since the approval of the last LDS in December 2019, publication of the Local Plan under Regulation 19 for formal consultation, was postponed as a result of Covid-19 restrictions which resulted in the need to revise the LDS.
- 2.4 The latest scheme was approved by Cabinet on Tuesday 16th June 2020 which replaces the timetable approved by Cabinet in December 2019 and is displayed in Table 1 (below).
- 2.5 The decision was made to extend the Local Plan public consultation for an extra 4 weeks. The consultation closed on the 6 November 2020. This extension has implications for the below timetable.

**Table 1: Progress on Preparing the Rutland Local Plan 2018 - 2036**

| RUTLAND LOCAL PLAN REVIEW |  |                                |  |
|---------------------------|--|--------------------------------|--|
| STAGE                     | MILESTONE  | TARGET DATE IN LDS (June 2020) | ACTUAL PROGRESS (as of September 2020)   |
| <b>Regulation 18</b>      | Consultation on Issues and Options   | Sept 2015 - February 2016      | November 2015 – January 2016   |
|                           | Public participation on preferred options consultation document (if appropriate) | August – September 2017        | August – September 2017  |
|                           | Public consultation on focused changes and additional sites                      | July – August 2018             | July – August 2018   |
| <b>Regulation 19</b>      | Public consultation on proposed submission document                              | February 2020                  | Regulation 19 consultation delayed. Postponed public consultation ran from 27 <sup>th</sup> August – 6 <sup>th</sup> November 2020 |
| <b>Regulation 22</b>      | Submission to Secretary of State   | December 2020                  |  |
| <b>Regulation 24</b>      | Independent Examination  | April/May 2021                 |  |
|                           | Receipt of Inspector's Report  | To be confirmed                |  |



|                          |                                      |                 |  |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------|--|
| <b>Regulation<br/>26</b> | Adoption and publication of document | To be confirmed |  |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------|--|

### **Other Local Development Documents**

- 2.6 The AMR should identify any Supplementary Planning Documents that have been adopted in the relevant monitoring period. No new SPD documents were adopted in the monitoring period. [View the adopted SPD's in Rutland on our website.](#)
- 2.7 The Council reviewed and updated the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) and this was adopted on 18 August 2020 (after the monitoring period). This document guides community involvement and consultation undertaken in the preparation of the Local Plan as well as supplementary planning documents and planning applications.
- 2.8 Some of the changes included in the second review document are temporary, in response to COVID-19 safety guidelines which have affected all aspects of the Council's planning functions. In particular they have affected the ability to make documents available in public places including local libraries, hold exhibitions, circulate leaflets, attend forums or meetings and the submission of paper based representations as well as the ability for people and groups to meet together to prepare joint responses to applications and planning documents. The changes made focus on the use of electronic and web based formats in the planning process as recommended by the Government.

### **Adopted Development Plan Documents at Time of Publication of Authority Monitoring Report**

#### **Core Strategy DPD**

- 2.9 The Core Strategy DPD was adopted in July 2011. This document sets out the vision, objectives, spatial strategy and policies for development in Rutland up to 2026. It applies to the whole of the administrative area of Rutland County Council.

#### **Site Allocations and Policies DPD**

- 2.10 The Site Allocations and Policies Development Plan Document (SAP DPD) was adopted by Rutland County Council on 13 October 2014.
- 2.11 The DPD allocates sites for development and sets out policies for determining planning applications. It also applies to the whole of the administrative area of Rutland County Council.

#### **Minerals Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD**

- 2.12 The Minerals Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD was adopted in October 2010. It sets out the vision, objectives, spatial strategy, policies and development control policies to guide minerals development in Rutland up to 2026 and forms part of the Local Plan for Rutland.

2.13 The Minerals Core Strategy and Development Control Policies replaced the policies within the Leicestershire Minerals Local Plan Review.

### **Adopted Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD), at Time of Publication of Authority Monitoring Report**

#### **Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document**

2.14 There were no SPDs adopted during the monitoring period.

Currently adopted SPDs include<sup>1</sup>:

- Wind Turbine Developments Supplementary Planning Document (December 2012)
- Ashwell Business Park Supplementary Planning Document (January 2013)
- Extensions to Rural Dwellings Supplementary Planning Document (March 2015)
- Garden Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (March 2015)
- Shop Front Supplementary Planning Document (March 2015)
- Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document (January 2016)

## **3.0 Neighbourhood Plans**

3.1 This section is based on the most up to date information available and therefore includes information which occurred after 31st March 2020.

3.2 Following the introduction of Neighbourhood Planning with the Localism Act 2011 and the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012, 11 Neighbourhood Areas have been designated in Rutland.

3.3 Neighbourhood Plans are community-led frameworks for guiding future development. The plans may contain a vision, aims, proposals and planning polices for improving and conserving the area; as well as allocations of key sites for specific kinds of development. Once adopted, neighbourhood plans become part of the statutory development plan.

**Table 2: Status of neighbourhood plans in Rutland**

| Designated Area      | Date            | Neighbourhood Plan Status                       |
|----------------------|-----------------|---|
| Barrowden & Wakerley | 27 April 2015   | Adopted 12 November 2019                        |
| Cottesmore           | April 2015      | Adopted 11 July 2016, Modified 22 November 2016 |
| Edith Weston         | April 2012      | Adopted 9 June 2014                             |
| Greetham             | February 2014   | Adopted 9 October 2017                          |
| Langham              | 5 December 2013 | Adopted 21 April 2017                           |
| Ketton & Tinwell     | September 2018  | Area designated                                 |

<sup>1</sup> For more information on adopted SPDs see <https://www.rutland.gov.uk/my-services/planning-and-building-control/planning/planning-policy/supplementary-planning-documents-spd/>

|                       |                  |   |
|-----------------------|------------------|---|
| Market Overton        | 19 July 2016     | Area designated                               |
| North Luffenham       | 12 February 2020 | Area designated                               |
| Oakham & Barleythorpe | April 2015       | Submission plan received by RCC November 2020 |
| Uppingham             | 26 November 2012 | Adopted 11 January 2016                       |
| Whissendine           | July 2020        | Area designated                               |
| Wing                  | June 2017        | Area designated                               |

3.4 You can view more information in the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans on the [neighbourhood planning](#) pages of our website.

## 4.0 Duty to Cooperate

4.1 The Localism Act 2011 introduced a Duty to Cooperate (DtC) in relation to planning and sustainable development. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) confirms the duty on Local Planning Authorities to address 'strategic matters' with their partners when developing a Local Plan.

4.2 In essence, the council has a duty to engage constructively with other councils and public bodies on a continuous basis on planning issues that cross administrative boundaries, in order to maximise the effectiveness of the Local Plan.

4.3 The Council intends to submit its new Local Plan for examination at the end of 2020 and this will be accompanied by a full Duty to Cooperate 'Statement of Compliance'. There is an interim report that accompanies the consultation on the 'Publication' version of the plan. The interim report demonstrates the Duty to Co-operate work to date. It identifies the 'strategic planning matters' that have been identified, the 'Partners' that have been engaged (including 'Prescribed Bodies') and the 'Statements of Common Ground' that are being pursued in order to demonstrate that the Duty to Cooperate has been met.

4.4 Several 'Statements of Common Ground' are being prepared concerning a variety of Strategic Matters.

4.5 In developing the Local Plan, the Council has engaged with a number of key organisations on an ongoing basis in the context of the Duty to Cooperate. Some of the key partners are:

- Local Planning Authorities in the Peterborough Sub-Regional Housing Market Area (HMA);
- Adjoining Local Authorities that are not in the Housing Market Area (including Melton Borough, Harborough District, East Northamptonshire District, Corby Borough and North Northamptonshire Joint Planning Unit);
- The Environment Agency;
- Historic England;
- Natural England;
- Highways England;
- Homes England;
- East Leicestershire & Rutland and South West Lincolnshire Clinical Commissioning Groups;



- Great Lincolnshire Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP)
- 4.6 The 'strategic planning matters' identified include:
- Identifying the appropriate Housing Market Area;
  - Identifying the appropriate Functional Economic Market Area;
  - Meeting the objectively assessed housing needs;
  - Provision of a New Garden Community at St George's Barracks;
  - Delivering sites and developing policies to meet employment land requirements;
  - Delivering the social infrastructure required to support growth – including health and education provision;
  - Delivering the transport infrastructure required to support growth, prioritising more sustainable modes of transport and mitigating adverse transport impacts;
  - Protecting bio-diversity and important natural environment features including species, habitats, ecological networks, geo-diversity and landscape. In particular seeking to protect Rutland Water an internationally important site for nature conservation with a major role as a recreational facility; and
  - Protecting and enhancing the built and historic environment.
- 4.7 Engagement with Duty to Cooperate Partners has been based around the strategic matters which have helped to focus discussions and the issues contained in Statements of Common Ground.

## 5.0 Community Infrastructure Levy

- 5.1 The CIL is a locally set charge on development. It is intended to give more certainty to developers over how much their development will need to contribute to meeting the costs of infrastructure.
- 5.2 It is intended to supplement other funding streams to ensure that new development infrastructure can be provided to support local growth and to give councils and communities more choice and flexibility in how they fund infrastructure.
- 5.3 The Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule was adopted by the Council in January 2016, and CIL was implemented on 1 March 2016.
- 5.4 The monitoring of CIL is conducted through the Infrastructure Funding Statement which is published separately each year. This can be found at: <https://www.rutland.gov.uk/my-services/planning-and-building-control/planning/planning-policy/infrastructure-funding-statement/>

## 6.0 Self-Build and Custom House-building Register

- 6.1 The government introduced legislation and regulations in 2015 and 2016 that require local authorities to maintain a register of individuals and associations seeking to acquire serviced plots of land for their own self build and custom house building. From March 2018, the register was split into Part 1 and Part 2:

for entry onto Part 1 of the register individual applicants and every member of an association must meet all the eligibility criteria including a local connection test.<sup>2</sup>

- 6.2 Local authorities are required to grant permission for sufficient plots of land to meet the demand as demonstrated by the register (Part 1) arising in each base period. The authority has three years from the end of each base period within which to grant permission for the equivalent number of plots suitable for self-build and custom housebuilding as there are entries for that base period.
- 6.3 The first base period started in March 2016 when the Council established the register and concluded on the 30<sup>th</sup> October 2016. Each subsequent base period is for a period of 12 months beginning immediately after the end of the previous base period. Subsequent base periods will, therefore, run from 31<sup>st</sup> October to 30<sup>th</sup> October each year.
- 6.4 The number of entries added to the register is shown in Table 2a below. The Council has yet to review the register for the first two base periods to determine how many entries should be included in Part 1 of the register. It is anticipated that this will reduce the number of plots the Council are required to grant permission for (as included on Part 1 of the register) and that as a consequence the requirement will be met by the number of permissioned plots (Table 2b).
- 6.5 Since the introduction of the local connection test the number of entries on the Self build and custom building register has decreased significantly.
- 6.6 Table 2b summarises the number of dwellings granted planning permission which were granted self-build relief via CIL. The actual number of self-build dwellings could be higher as developments which do not adhere to the regulations entitling them to CIL relief are not included.

**Table 2a: Number of Self Build Entries added in the base period**

|  | Base Period 1<br>(March to Oct 2016) | Base Period 2<br>(Oct 2016 – Oct2017) | Base Period 3<br>(Oct 2017 – Oct 2018) | Base Period 4<br>(Oct 2018 – Oct 2019) | Base Period 5<br>(Oct 2019 – Oct 2020) |
|--|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Part 1                                 | 15*                                  | 27*                                   | 2                                      | 1                                      | 1                                      |
| Part 2                                 | /                                    | /                                     | 0                                      | 0                                      | 2                                      |
| Total applicants on Part 1 of register | 15                                   | 42                                    | 44                                     | 45                                     | 47                                     |

\*Before Local Connection test was introduced.

<sup>2</sup> For more information on the Rutland Self Build and Custom Housebuilding Register see <https://www.rutland.gov.uk/my-services/planning-and-building-control/planning/self-build-and-custom-house-building-register/>

**Table 2b: Number of Self Build Plots\***

| Number of plots awarded CIL self build exemption (in the base period) |   |   |   |   | Total     |
|---|---|---|---|---|-----------|
| Base Period 1 (March to October 2016)                                 | Base Period 2 (October 2016 – October 2017) | Base Period 3 (October 2017 – October 2018) | Base Period 4 (October 2018 – October 2019) | Base Period 5 (October 2019 – October 2020) |           |
| 6   | 14  | 6   | 6   | 13  | <b>45</b> |

\*not including CIL self-build exemptions for barn conversions

- 6.7 In order to help increase the supply of self-build and custom housebuilding, the Council has also included a draft policy in the emerging Local Plan that would require developers of sites of 50 dwellings or more to supply at least 2% of dwelling plots for sale to self-builders and/or custom housebuilding, subject to appropriate demand being identified.

## 7.0 Brownfield Register

- 7.1 7.1 The Council is required to prepare and publish annually a Brownfield Land Register (BLR). This provides information on brownfield (previously developed) land that is suitable for housing. The inclusion of a site on the BLR is required to meet certain assessment criteria set out in Regulations<sup>3</sup>.
- 7.2 The BLR consists of two parts:
- Part 1 is a list of brownfield sites which could be considered suitable for housing
  - Part 2 is made up of sites taken forward from Part 1 to be given Permission in Principle (PIP)<sup>4</sup>.
- 7.3 There are currently five sites on Part 1 of the Rutland BLR. There are no sites included on Part 2 of the register. Further information on the Rutland BLR including details of the sites included on the register can be found on the Council's website.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>3</sup> For more information see <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2017/403/contents/made>

<sup>4</sup> PiP will set out the principles of development in terms of the use, location and amount of development. However, planning permission is not granted until Technical Details Consent is applied and approved by the Council.

<sup>5</sup> See <https://www.rutland.gov.uk/my-services/planning-and-building-control/planning/brownfield-land-register/>

## 8.0 Monitoring Indicators

8.1 Monitoring indicators are set in the Core Strategy DPD (July 2011), the Site Allocations and Policies DPD, and the Minerals Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD (October 2010).

8.2 The Planning Obligations and Developer Contributions SPD (January 2016) requires the council to publish an annual report detailing information relating to all agreements entered into, financial contributions received and the completion of proposals funded from financial contributions. These indicators mirror those set for Core Strategy Policy CS8: Developer Contributions, and as such, will be covered by the development plan monitoring indicators.

### 8.3 Core Strategy and Site Allocations Monitoring Indicators

The Core Strategy holds 49 monitoring indicators relating to the 25 policies; and the Site Allocations and Policies DPD holds 30 monitoring indicators relating to 20 policies. Below is a summary of the monitoring data, the detailed information for each indicator can be found in Appendix 3 and Appendix 4 respectively. This section provides an overview of the indicator outcomes and performance. Below is a commentary on some of the key indicators over the whole plan period to date.

### 8.4 CS2, CS3, CS4, CS9 & SP2

A total of 200 dwellings were completed within the monitoring period (with a net completion figure of 184 dwellings), contributing to policy CS9 and SP2's requirement to deliver a minimum of 3000 new dwellings (150 per annum) over the plan period. The total number of net completions is 2386 for the plan period so far (2006-2020). This equates to 170 dwellings per annum.

Over 90% of all dwellings were completed in Oakham and Uppingham, which exceeds the Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy target of 70%. Only 3.5% of dwellings were completed within Local Service Centres; and 6% in Smaller Service Centres and Restraint Villages. Housing completions in this monitoring period have not met the balance set as a target however development has taken place in the most sustainable locations.

### 8.5 CS5

A total of 119 dwellings were completed within Oakham, 57 of which were completed within the Sustainable Urban Extension as well as a vet surgery. This maintains the target of ensuring sustainable development to help meet the needs of the local communities and local economy.

### 8.6 CS8

The CIL and S106 agreements for planning applications continue to ensure that financial contributions and non- financial covenants are put in place to ensure the provision/improvement of infrastructure in the community. The CIL is monitored and managed for all developments that qualify.

The total value of developer contributions via S106 for the monitoring period was £639,921.81 and 6 s106 agreements were signed in the monitoring period. The CIL balance at the end of the monitoring period is identified within the Infrastructure Funding Statement located: <https://www.rutland.gov.uk/my->

- 8.7 **CS9**  
74 dwellings (37%) were completed on previously developed land, above the 25% target.
- 8.8 **CS10**  
The density target of at least 40dph in the towns was not achieved. Of the 111 dwellings completed in Oakham and Barleythorpe on sites of 10+ dwelling; 44% were developed at less than 30dph; 3.6% at between 40 and 50dph; and 52.3% over 50dph. Of the 57 dwellings in Uppingham, 100% were developed at less than 30dph.
- No dwellings on sites of 10+ were completed in any of the villages in this period
- 8.9 **CS11**  
33 affordable homes were completed, not reaching the target of 40 affordable dwellings per annum. No affordable homes were completed on exception sites. Whilst there was one application dismissed at appeal, there were no applications supported at appeal when citing Policy SP9 Affordable Housing, within a reason for refusal.
- CS12**  
No Planning permissions were granted for permanent pitch, transit pitches and plots for show people within the monitoring period.
- 8.10 **CS13, CS14 & SP2's**  
35362.56 m<sup>2</sup> of new employment land was completed during the monitoring period, contributing to Policies CS14 and SP2's target to ensure an additional 5ha of employment land provision up to 2026. However, this was offset by the loss of 784.82 m<sup>2</sup> of employment land to non B Use Class uses. The CS13 target was achieved as there was an overall addition of employment land ensuring a continuous supply of general employment land to provide local jobs for sustaining the local economy.
- 8.11 **CS15**  
There were 4 new or improved tourism related facilities within the 2019-20 monitoring period.
- 8.12 **CS16**  
Three rural buildings were converted into residential use to provide five dwellings within the 19/20 period however no buildings in the countryside were converted to non-residential uses.
- 8.13 **CS17, SP3 & SP12**  
875.41 m<sup>2</sup> net of town centre uses were completed in Oakham and Uppingham, contributing to the increase of vitality and viability of town centres (Policy CS17, SP3 and SP12).
- 8.14 **CS18**  
100% of all dwellings completed in the monitoring period of sites of 10+ dwellings were on sites within 30 minutes public transport time of a key service.
- 8.15 **CS19 & SP15**

One application was supported and thirteen applications were refused at appeal when citing Policy SP15 Design and Amenity.

No planning permissions were approved contrary to Environment Agency advice on flooding and water quality grounds.

**8.16 CS20 & SP18**

No large scale energy generation schemes were installed within the monitoring period

**8.17 CS21**

We want to prevent loss of biodiversity in Rutland. We can report that the following protected species records were added to Ecology Alert Layers:

- 5 new badger setts
- 73 new bat roosts records representing at least 22 new roosts and updates to at least 10 previously known roosts
- 2 new great crested newt ponds.
- 2 Candidate Local Wildlife Sites have been added to the record.

There were no applications dismissed at appeal due to the impact of the proposal on protected species but three were dismissed at appeal due to landscape impacts (Policies CS21 and SP19).

**8.18 CS22**

Three planning applications were dismissed at appeal due to the impacts on listed buildings and/or conservation areas (Policies CS22, SAPDPD 15 and 20). One planning application was supported on appeal.

**8.19 CS23 & CS24**

There were no developments refused and supported at appeal due to the loss of green infrastructure or within the five Rutland Water recreation areas (Policies CS24 and SP26) and Eyebrook Reservoir Area (Policy SP27).

**Minerals Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Monitoring Indicators**

8.20 Full details of this data collected for the monitoring indicators can be found in Appendix 3.

8.21 No applications were received for new mineral developments between 1st April 2019 and 31st March 2020.

8.22 The NPPF requires an annual Local Aggregate Assessment (LAA) to be produced by Mineral Planning Authorities in order to plan for a steady and adequate supply of aggregates. The latest LAA for Rutland has been prepared by Northamptonshire County Council and can be found at on Rutland County Council's website:

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



## APPENDIX 1 Core Strategy Monitoring Indicators

| Policy  |   | Indicator  | 2018 – 2019 Monitoring Data  |   |            | Target   |               |            |  |     |       |                              |   |      |   |    |    |                    |   |    |              |     |      |  |
|---|---|--|--|---|------------|----------|---------------|------------|--|-----|-------|------------------------------|---|------|---|----|----|--------------------|---|----|--------------|-----|------|--|
| CS1   | Sustainable development principles  | No specific indicator identified.  | N/A  |   |            |          |               |            |  |     |       |                              |   |      |   |    |    |                    |   |    |              |     |      |  |
| CS2   | The spatial strategy  | Number and percentage of dwellings completed in Oakham and Uppingham, Local Service Centres, Smaller Service Centres and Restraint Villages. | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Location</th> <th>Total (gross)</th> <th>% of Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>Oakham and Uppingham (including Barleythorpe)</b></td> <td>181</td> <td>90.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Local Service Centres</b></td> <td>7</td> <td>3.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Smaller Service Centres and Restraint Villages</b></td> <td>12</td> <td>6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Countryside</b></td> <td>0</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Total</b></td> <td>200</td> <td>100%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |   |            | Location | Total (gross) | % of Total | <b>Oakham and Uppingham (including Barleythorpe)</b> | 181 | 90.5% | <b>Local Service Centres</b> | 7 | 3.5% | <b>Smaller Service Centres and Restraint Villages</b> | 12 | 6% | <b>Countryside</b> | 0 | 0% | <b>Total</b> | 200 | 100% | To ensure that 70% of all dwellings to be completed in Oakham and Uppingham and 30% elsewhere. |
|   |   |  | Location   | Total (gross)                                       | % of Total |          |               |            |  |     |       |                              |   |      |   |    |    |                    |   |    |              |     |      |  |
| <b>Oakham and Uppingham (including Barleythorpe)</b>  | 181   | 90.5%  |  |   |            |          |               |            |  |     |       |                              |   |      |   |    |    |                    |   |    |              |     |      |  |
| <b>Local Service Centres</b>                          | 7   | 3.5%   |  |   |            |          |               |            |  |     |       |                              |   |      |   |    |    |                    |   |    |              |     |      |  |
| <b>Smaller Service Centres and Restraint Villages</b> | 12  | 6%   |  |   |            |          |               |            |  |     |       |                              |   |      |   |    |    |                    |   |    |              |     |      |  |
| <b>Countryside</b>                                    | 0   | 0%   |  |   |            |          |               |            |  |     |       |                              |   |      |   |    |    |                    |   |    |              |     |      |  |
| <b>Total</b>  | 200   | 100%   |  |   |            |          |               |            |  |     |       |                              |   |      |   |    |    |                    |   |    |              |     |      |  |
|   | The number and percentage of dwellings refused permission contrary to the spatial strategy and supported at appeal. | No applications were supported at appeal when citing this policy within reason for refusal.  |  | To minimise development in unsustainable locations. |            |          |               |            |  |     |       |                              |   |      |   |    |    |                    |   |    |              |     |      |  |

| Policy |                             | Indicator  | 2018 – 2019 Monitoring Data  | Target   |
|--------|-----------------------------|--|--|--|
| CS3    | The settlement hierarchy    | Number and percentage of dwellings completed in Oakham and Uppingham, Local Service Centres, Smaller Service Centres and Restraint Villages. | See indicator for Policy CS2   | To minimise development in unsustainable locations ensure that 70% of all dwellings to be completed in Oakham and Uppingham and 30% elsewhere. |
| CS4    | The location of development | Number of dwellings completed in each settlement and the countryside.  | See indicator for Policy CS2   | To minimise the level of development outside the planned limits of developments as specified in Policy CS3 and CS4.                            |
| CS5    | Spatial strategy for Oakham | Number and percentage of dwellings completed within the sustainable urban extension and elsewhere in Oakham.                                 | A total of 119 net dwellings were completed within Oakham and Barleythorpe during the monitoring period. Of the 119 dwellings, 57 dwellings were completed within the Sustainable Urban Extension, which equates to 47.8% of completions in Oakham and Barleythorpe. | To ensure sustainable development to help meet the needs of the local communities and local economy.   |
|        |                             | Number of shops, facilities and employment completed within the Sustainable Urban Extension.   | A total of 1 shop/facility was completed within the Sustainable Urban Extension within the monitoring period. This is a veterinary surgery.  |  |

| Policy |  | Indicator  | 2018 – 2019 Monitoring Data   | Target   |
|--------|--|--|---|--|
| CS6    | Re-use of redundant military bases and prisons | No indicator identified.   | <p>No indicator identified.</p> <p>The closure of the St. George's Barracks, North Luffenham was announced in 2017 and is currently expected to close in 2022. Consultation on a high level masterplan was undertaken between May and June 2018. The site is proposed as a new garden community in the Rutland Local Plan (Regulation 19)</p>   |  |
| CS7    | Delivering socially inclusive communities      | Number and type of services and facilities lost in Rutland by location.                          | No services or facilities were lost to other uses via planning consent during this monitoring period.   | No net loss of facilities to ensure community facilities are provided to meet local needs.   |
| CS8    | Developer contributions                        | Number of agreements signed.   | 6 S106 Agreements were signed in this monitoring period. One Supplemental Agreement was completed. One Unilateral Undertaking was completed.  | To ensure that the completion of improvements to or provision of infrastructure or commuted sums reflects that agreed in S.106 agreement, (including the scale and timing of provision). |
|        |  | Total value of developer contributions.  | <p>The total value of developer contributions via S106 for the monitoring period was £639,921.81.</p> <p>CIL information will be provided through the Infrastructure Funding Statement which can be found at: <a href="https://www.rutland.gov.uk/my-services/planning-and-building-control/planning/planning-policy/infrastructure-funding-statement/">https://www.rutland.gov.uk/my-services/planning-and-building-control/planning/planning-policy/infrastructure-funding-statement/</a></p> |  |
|        |  | The level of commuted sum payments towards affordable housing on sites of less than 5 dwellings. | £ 181,224.74 was collected for affordable housing developments on sites of more than 5 dwellings.   |  |

| Policy |   | Indicator  | 2018 – 2019 Monitoring Data   | Target  |
|--------|---|--|---|---|
| CS9    | Provision and distribution of new housing | Number of dwellings completed annually in Rutland.   | See indicator for Policy CS2.   | To provide at least 3000 new dwellings up to 2026 and meet the yearly targets as identified in the Council's latest housing trajectory.<br><br>The Council will seek to maintain a rolling 5 year supply of housing to ensure there is a flexible supply of deliverable land for housing. |
|        |   | Percentage of new and converted dwellings completed on Previously Developed Land (PDL).  | 74 dwellings (37%) were completed on previously developed land.   | At least 25% (approx 31 pa) of new housing development to be on PDL in order to minimise the use of green field sites.  |
| CS10   | Housing density and mix                   | Percentage of new dwellings completed in the villages at a net density of at least 30 dwellings per hectare (dph) and at least 40 dph in the built up area of Oakham and Uppingham on completed schemes of 10+ houses. | <p><b>Oakham, Barleythorpe and Uppingham:</b><br/>Of the 111 dwellings completed in Oakham and Barleythorpe on sites of 10+ dwelling; 44% were developed at less than 30dph; 3.6% at between 40 and 50dph; and 52.3% over 50dph. It is to be noted that the dwellings developed at a density of over 50dph comprise of 58 assisted living apartments in an extra care housing development.</p> <p>Of the 57 dwellings completed in Uppingham on sites of 10+ dwelling, 100% were developed at a density of less than 30dph.</p> <p><b>Villages:</b><br/>No dwellings on sites of 10+ were completed in this period.</p> | To ensure development are in keeping with and reflect the character of their surroundings.  |

| Policy                      | Indicator   | 2018 – 2019 Monitoring Data  | Target   |
|-----------------------------|---|--|--|
|                             | Percentage of dwellings completed by the number of bedrooms.  | Data unavailable.  | To ensure a mix of housing types is maintained that meets the needs of the community by increasing provision of smaller 1, 2, and 3 bedroom dwellings as a proportion of new dwellings built. Targets to be set in the Site Allocations and Policies DPD.                |
| CS11 Affordable housing     | Number and percentage of affordable houses delivered and completed as part of a residential development scheme.           | 33 affordable homes were completed during the monitoring period.   | Provide 40 affordable dwellings pa.<br><br>30% of all completions on sites of eleven or more dwellings to be affordable housing (Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document 2016).   |
|                             | Number of affordable houses completed on exception sites.   | No affordable homes were completed on exception sites.   |  |
| CS12 Gypsies and travellers | Number of Gypsy and Traveller pitches completed for permanent pitch, transit pitches and number of plots for show people. | <p><b>Gypsy and Traveller</b><br/>No planning permissions granted.</p> <p><b>Show People</b><br/>No planning permissions granted.</p> <p><b>Transit Pitches</b><br/>No planning permissions granted.</p> | <p>The Leicestershire and Rutland Gypsy and Travellers Needs Assessment requires Up to 2 permanent, up to 5 transit pitches and 3 plots for show people.</p> <p>A revised Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Show people Accommodation Assessment was published in 2016</p> |

| Policy                                   | Indicator   | 2018 – 2019 Monitoring Data   | Target  |                         |             |                   |                   |                     |        |   |   |   |           |        |      |    |      |
|--|---|---|---|-------------------------|-------------|-------------------|-------------------|---------------------|--------|---|---|---|-----------|--------|------|----|------|
| CS13 Employment and economic development | The amount of additional employment land and premises completed and available - by type and location. | <p><b>B completions (Total = 35362.56m<sup>2</sup>)</b></p> <p><b>B1a completions by floorspace (Total = 752.8m<sup>2</sup>)</b><br/> Empingham: 107.5m<sup>2</sup><br/> Oakham: 109.3m<sup>2</sup><br/> Tinwell: 536 m<sup>2</sup></p> <p><b>B1b completions by floorspace (Total = 0m<sup>2</sup>)</b><br/> None</p> <p><b>B1c completions by floorspace (Total = 150m<sup>2</sup>)</b><br/> Uppingham: 150m<sup>2</sup></p> <p><b>B2 completions by floorspace (Total = 864m<sup>2</sup>)</b><br/> Essendine: 809.64m<sup>2</sup><br/> Uppingham: 54.36m<sup>2</sup></p> <p><b>B8 completions by floorspace (Total = 33595.76m<sup>2</sup>)</b><br/> Barleythorpe: 166.2m<sup>2</sup><br/> Burley: 127.55m<sup>2</sup><br/> Edith Weston: 32813m<sup>2</sup><br/> Gunthorpe: 489.01m<sup>2</sup></p> | No loss of employment land to ensure a continuous supply of general employment land to provide local jobs for sustaining the local economy. |                         |             |                   |                   |                     |        |   |   |   |           |        |      |    |      |
|  | The amount of employment land lost to other uses.   | 784.82 m <sup>2</sup> of employment floorspace was lost to other uses during the monitoring period.   |   |                         |             |                   |                   |                     |        |   |   |   |           |        |      |    |      |
|  | Proportion of employment in high tech and knowledge based, leisure and tourism industries.            | <p><b>Employee jobs by industry: (NOMIS, 2018)</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Rutland (employee jobs)</th> <th>Rutland (%)</th> <th>East Midlands (%)</th> <th>Great Britain (%)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Total employee jobs</td> <td>15,000</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Full-time</td> <td>10,000</td> <td>66.7</td> <td>68</td> <td>67.5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>  |   | Rutland (employee jobs) | Rutland (%) | East Midlands (%) | Great Britain (%) | Total employee jobs | 15,000 | - | - | - | Full-time | 10,000 | 66.7 | 68 | 67.5 |
|  | Rutland (employee jobs)   | Rutland (%)   | East Midlands (%)   | Great Britain (%)       |             |                   |                   |                     |        |   |   |   |           |        |      |    |      |
| Total employee jobs                      | 15,000  | -   | -   | -                       |             |                   |                   |                     |        |   |   |   |           |        |      |    |      |
| Full-time                                | 10,000  | 66.7  | 68  | 67.5                    |             |                   |                   |                     |        |   |   |   |           |        |      |    |      |



| Policy | Indicator   | 2018 – 2019 Monitoring Data  | Target |
|--------|---|--|--------|
|        |   | Part-time 5,000 33.3 32 32.5<br>Employee jobs by industry<br>B : Mining And Quarrying 300 2.0 0.2 0.2<br>C : Manufacturing 1,750 11.7 12.9 8.1<br>D : Electricity, Gas, Steam And Air Conditioning Supply 5 0.0 0.8 0.5<br>E : Water Supply; Sewerage, Waste Management And Remediation Activities 250 1.7 0.7 0.7<br>F : Construction 500 3.3 4.4 4.7<br>G : Wholesale And Retail Trade; Repair Of Motor Vehicles And Motorcycles 2,250 15.0 16.7 15.2<br>H : Transportation And Storage 400 2.7 5.5 4.8<br>I : Accommodation And Food Service Activities 1,750 11.7 7.0 7.6<br>J : Information And Communication 400 2.7 2.9 4.2<br>K : Financial And Insurance Activities 75 0.5 1.7 3.5<br>L : Real Estate Activities 150 1.0 1.3 1.7<br>M : Professional, Scientific And Technical Activities 1,000 6.7 6.4 8.7 |        |
|        | Numbers of new or improved educational or vocational training facilities. | The construction of an outdoor riding arena and associated timber stables at Wilds Lodge School, Empingham.  |        |
|        | New business registration rate.   | The latest published data is for 2018. There were 1,855 active enterprises in the County compared to 1,870 in 2017. Of the new enterprises established in 2017, 86.5% survived the first year. <sup>6</sup>  |        |

<sup>6</sup> Source: Business Demography 2018, ONS

| Policy  | Indicator   | 2018 – 2019 Monitoring Data  | Target   |
|---|---|--|--|
| CS14 New provision for industrial and office development and related uses | <p>Total amount of additional employment floor space – by type and location.</p> <p>Total amount of employment floorspace on PDL – by type.</p> | <p>See indicator for Policy CS13</p> <p><b>B completions (Total = 35196.36m<sup>2</sup>)</b></p> <p><b>B1a completions by floorspace (Total = 752.8m<sup>2</sup>)</b><br/> Empingham: 107.5m<sup>2</sup><br/> Oakham: 109.3m<sup>2</sup><br/> Tinwell: 536 m<sup>2</sup></p> <p><b>B1b completions by floorspace (Total = 0m<sup>2</sup>)</b><br/> None</p> <p><b>B1c completions by floorspace (Total = 150m<sup>2</sup>)</b><br/> Uppingham: 150m<sup>2</sup></p> <p><b>B2 completions by floorspace (Total = 864m<sup>2</sup>)</b><br/> Essendine: 809.64m<sup>2</sup><br/> Uppingham: 54.36m<sup>2</sup></p> <p><b>B8 completions by floorspace (Total = 33429.56m<sup>2</sup>)</b><br/> Burley: 127.55m<sup>2</sup><br/> Edith Weston: 32813m<sup>2</sup><br/> Gunthorpe: 489.01m<sup>2</sup></p> | <p>To ensure an additional 5 ha of employment land provision up to 2026. Targets to be set in the Site Allocations and Policies DPD.</p> |
| CS15 Tourism  | <p>Number of new or improved tourism-related facilities by location.</p>  | <p>The following were completed during this monitoring period:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extension of a public house to facilitate hotel accommodation in Oakham</li> <li>• Conversion of an agricultural field to a seasonal campsite and associated facilities in South Luffenham</li> <li>• Conversion of a barn to Brewhouse for a hotel in Uppingham</li> <li>• Conversion of offices to an Escape room in Oakham</li> </ul>   | <p>To ensure tourism development takes place in the most sustainable locations in accordance with Policy CS4.</p>                        |

| Policy                          | Indicator  | 2018 – 2019 Monitoring Data  | Target  |
|---------------------------------|--|--|---|
| CS16 The rural economy          | Number of rural buildings in the countryside that are re-used and/or redeveloped for non-residential use.      | There were no permissions granted for the conversion of buildings in the countryside to non-residential uses.  | To ensure that no inappropriate development is allowed. All new and reused rural buildings in the countryside to be for agricultural, employment, tourist or community use, or for residential use related to agriculture and forestry. |
|                                 | Number of rural buildings in the countryside lost to residential use.  | Three planning applications were given permission for the conversion of a rural buildings to residential use (providing 5 dwellings).  |   |
|                                 | The number of schemes refused for extension of existing businesses in the countryside and supported at appeal. | <p>One application for the extension of an existing café/restaurant via the addition of an accompanying guest house was refused but supported at appeal.</p> <p>Three schemes for extensions of businesses were refused and dismissed at appeal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One application for the development of 3 holiday lets was refused and dismissed at appeal.</li> <li>• One application for the erection of 5 holiday chalets and associated storage facilities in Morcott was refused and dismissed at appeal.</li> <li>• One temporary rural worker dwelling and agricultural building was refused and dismissed at appeal.</li> </ul> |   |
| CS17 Town centres and retailing | Total amount of floor space m <sup>2</sup> by type for 'town centre uses' in Oakham and Uppingham.             | Total amount of floor space completed by use in Oakham and Uppingham town centres:<br><b>A1:</b> 0m <sup>2</sup><br><b>A2:</b> 0m <sup>2</sup><br><b>A3:</b> 875.41m <sup>2</sup><br><b>A4:</b> 0 m <sup>2</sup><br><b>A5:</b> 0m <sup>2</sup><br><b>D1:</b> 260.45m <sup>2</sup>  | Increase the vitality and viability of town centres and to ensure 100% of new retail development to be located within existing town centres.  |

| Policy                                       | Indicator   | 2018 – 2019 Monitoring Data   | Target  |
|--|---|---|---|
|  | The amount of retail development completed by floor space m <sup>2</sup> .  | <p>Total retail development completed by floor space in Oakham and Uppingham:</p> <p><b>A1:</b> 0m<sup>2</sup><br/> <b>A2:</b> 0m<sup>2</sup><br/> <b>A3:</b> 875.41m<sup>2</sup><br/> <b>A4:</b> 0m<sup>2</sup><br/> <b>A5:</b> 0m<sup>2</sup></p> <p>In this monitoring period, 576.41m<sup>2</sup> of A1 use floorspace and 125m<sup>2</sup> of A4 use floorspace was converted to A3 use. With the addition of 174m<sup>2</sup> of new A3 floorspace.</p> | To ensure that up to 2234 m <sup>2</sup> of convenience and up to 5484 m <sup>2</sup> of comparison floor space up to 2026. |
| CS18 Sustainable transport and accessibility | Number of transport schemes implemented   | <p><b>Sustainable travel initiatives</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Various levels of Cycle training: Bikeability in primary schools in which 617 Rutland Children took part.</li> <li>• My Bike: re conditioned bikes for low income families. Through this scheme 170 individuals received a reconditioned bike.</li> <li>• The installation of various bus shelters across the county</li> </ul>   | Rutland LTP 2006-11 contains various targets to 2020 monitored through Annual Progress Reports                              |
|  | Amount of new residential development on sites of 10+ dwellings within 30 minutes public transport time of: GP, a hospital, a primary school, a secondary school, areas of employment, and retail centre. | 100% of all dwellings completed on development sites of 10 or more dwellings) were completed in the monitoring period on sites of 10+ dwellings within 30 minutes public transport time of: GP, a hospital, a primary school, a secondary school, areas of employment and retail centre.  | To provide new housing in locations with good access to jobs, facilities and services.                                      |

| Policy                     | Indicator  | 2018 – 2019 Monitoring Data | Target   |
|----------------------------|--|-----------------------------|--|
| CS19 Promoting good design | Number of planning permissions approved contrary to Environment Agency advice on flooding and water quality grounds. | None                        | No applications should be allowed, contrary to Environment Agency advice, development in areas at risk from flooding, or which would threaten water quality. |
|                            | Percentage of new publicly funded housing built to Lifetime Homes standard (local indicator).                        | N/A                         | All new publicly funded housing to meet Lifetime Homes Standard to ensure high standards of sustainable design in new development.                           |

| Policy | Indicator  | 2018 – 2019 Monitoring Data  | Target   |
|--------|--|--|--|
|        | <p>Number and percentage of housing sites (10+ dwellings) with a building for life assessment score of 16 or more, rated very good.</p> <p>Number and percentage of housing sites (10+ dwellings) with a building for life assessment score of 14 to 15.</p> <p>Number and percentage of housing sites (10+ dwellings) with a building for life assessment score of between 10 and 13.</p> | <p>The assessment for this criteria has changed to 'Building for a Healthy life' therefore no assessments have been conducted in this monitoring period.</p> | <p>To ensure that Rutland's distinctive and attractive environment is maintained all sites to achieve a minimum score of 10.</p> |
|        | <p>Number and percentage of permissions incorporating SUDs Schemes.</p>  | <p>This indicator is not monitored.</p>  | <p>To reduce the risk of flooding.</p>   |



| Policy  | Indicator  | 2018 – 2019 Monitoring Data   | Target  |
|---|--|---|---|
| CS20 Energy efficiency and low carbon energy generation | Renewable energy generation by installed capacity and type.  | No large scale energy generation schemes were installed.  | To increase the amount of renewable energy generation capacity installed.   |
|   | Percentage of new dwellings that meet the relevant code for sustainable homes.                         | The Code for Sustainable Homes was withdrawn by the Government in 2015.   | To ensure that all new homes reach at least level 4 of the code for sustainable homes.  |
|   | Percentage of non-residential development meeting BREEAM very good standard.                           | Data not collected  | To ensure higher levels of energy efficiency, non-residential development over 500 m <sup>2</sup> will be required to meet BREEAM very good standard. |
| CS21 The natural environment                            | Change in areas of biodiversity importance.  | Protected species records added to Ecology Alert Layers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5 new badger setts</li> <li>• 73 new bat roosts records representing at least 22 new roosts and updates to at least 10 previously known roosts</li> <li>• 2 new great crested newt ponds.</li> </ul> 2 Candidate Local Wildlife Sites has been added to the record. | No net loss of areas of biodiversity importance.  |
|   | Number of applications refused due to impact on nature conservation interests and supported at appeal. | There were no applications refused and supported at appeal due to impact on protected species.  | No applications be allowed to impact on nature conservation interests to ensure development minimises the impact of biodiversity and wildlife.        |

| Policy  | Indicator   | 2018 – 2019 Monitoring Data   | Target   |
|---|---|---|--|
|   | Number of applications refused due to landscape impacts and supported at appeal.  | <p>3 applications were refused and dismissed at appeal where this policy was cited as a reason for refusal. These were;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One application for the felling of a tree in Uppingham</li> <li>• One application for an agricultural track in Clipsham due to its impact on landscape character</li> <li>• One application for temporary rural worker dwellings and an agricultural building in Manton</li> </ul>   | No applications be allowed to adversely impact on the landscape to ensure development minimises the impact and reflects the local landscape character.                 |
| CS22 The historic and cultural environment                  | Number of applications refused due to Listed Building and/or Conservation Area reasons and supported at appeal.   | <p>The following three planning applications were dismissed at appeal due to the impacts on listed buildings and/or conservation areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The retention of solar thermal panel on a stone dwelling in Ridlington.</li> <li>• The development of 3 affordable and one market dwelling in Lyddington</li> <li>• Creation of a driveway and parking area in Braunston.</li> </ul> <p>One planning application was refused then supported at appeal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A single story extension in Caldecott</li> </ul> | No application to be allowed to ensure that development reflects the local character and special features.   |
| CS23 Green infrastructure, open space, sport and recreation | The number and percentage of applications refused planning permission as would result in a loss of green infrastructure contrary to CS23 and supported at appeal. | There were no planning applications refused and supported at appeal due to the loss of green infrastructure.  | <p>To minimise the loss of green infrastructure.</p> <p>Targets for open space, sport and recreation facilities to be set in the Site Allocation and Policies DPD.</p> |

| Policy                | Indicator   | 2018 – 2019 Monitoring Data  | Target   |
|-----------------------|---|--|--|
| CS24 Rutland Water    | Number and type of development refused and supported at appeal within the 5 defined recreation areas.               | There was no development refused and supported at appeal within the five Rutland Water recreation areas.   | No inappropriate development is allowed to ensure that development respects the nature conservation features of this internationally important site and doesn't have an adverse impact on the landscape. |
|                       | Number and type of development approved within the Rutland Water Area.  | No Development approved.   |  |
|                       | Number of caravan and camping sites permitted within the Rutland Water Area outside the 5 defined recreation areas. | No caravan and camping sites have been permitted in the Rutland Water Area during the monitoring period.   |  |
| CS25 Waste management | The amount of waste produced in Rutland and the management methods  | <p>Total waste arising: 20,207.32 tonnes</p> <p>This breaks down into the following-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Total sent for recycling / composting / reuse: 11,391.10 tonnes</li> <li>• Total sent for energy recovery: 8,816.22 tonnes</li> <li>• Total sent for other disposal: 0 tonnes</li> </ul> | Waste production forecasts (MSW, Candi, CDandE).   |

| <b>Policy</b> | <b>Indicator</b>   | <b>2018 – 2019 Monitoring Data</b>   | <b>Target</b>  |
|---------------|--|--|--|
|               | The permitted and operational waste management capacity. | The permitted capacity of each Civic Amenity Site is 7,666 tonnes per annum. During the period 1st April 2019 to 31st March 2020 Luffenham CA site accepted 1,958.96 tonnes of waste and Cottesmore CA site accepted 3,457.99 tonnes of waste. | Estimated capacity requirements.                           |
|               | MSW diverted from landfill for recycling.                | Total sent for recycling / composting / reuse: 11,391.10 tonnes  | MWMS targets for recycling, composting, recovery and Lats. |

## APPENDIX 2

### Site Allocations Monitoring Indicators

| Policy |  | Indicator   | 2018 - 2019 Monitoring Data  | Target  |
|--------|--|---|--|---|
| SP1    | Presumption in favour of sustainable development | No specific indicator   | N/A  | N/A   |
| SP2    | Sites for residential development                | Total dwelling completions by settlement hierarchy and identification if the site is an allocated or windfall site.   | See monitoring data for Policies CS2, CS3 and CS9<br><br>107 dwellings completed were within allocated sites including 48 dwellings as part of the Oakham Sustainable Urban Extension. 93 dwellings were completed on windfall sites.  | To deliver a minimum of 3000 dwellings over the plan period by providing a consistent supply of housing sites.                  |
|        | New employment land                              | Amount of employment land (m <sup>2</sup> /ha) committed by type and settlement hierarchy and the identification if the site is an allocated site or a windfall site. | See monitoring data for Policies CS13 and CS14<br><br>Employment land committed is as follows:<br><br>B1a: 752.8 m <sup>2</sup> windfall<br>B1c: 150 m <sup>2</sup> windfall<br>B2: 864 m <sup>2</sup> windfall<br>B8: 33595.76 m <sup>2</sup> windfall<br><br>No new employment development was completed on allocated, or safeguarded employment sites | To provide 5 hectares of new employment land in or adjoining the market towns and local service centres within the plan period. |

| Policy |   | Indicator  | 2018 - 2019 Monitoring Data  | Target  |
|--------|---|--|--|---|
| SP3    | Sites for Retail Development                | Amount of gross and net additional retailing floorspace (m2) committed and completed by type and location and settlement hierarchy and the identification if the site is an allocated or windfall site | <p>See monitoring data for Policy CS17</p> <p>During the monitoring year planning permission was granted for:</p> <p>A3: 865.41m<sup>2</sup> (826.41m<sup>2</sup> of this occurred in Oakham and 49m<sup>2</sup> occurred in Uppingham)</p> <p>No new retail development was completed on an allocated site.</p> | To accommodate additional retail development need in Rutland for the plan period identified in the Retail Capacity Study. |
| SP4    | Sites for waste management and disposal     | Completed waste related developments by type and settlement hierarchy and the identification if the site is an allocated site or a windfall site.  | There have been no waste related development completions within the monitoring period.   | To provide the additional waste capacity requirements identified in Core Strategy Policy CS25 – Waste management disposal |
| SP5    | Built development in the towns and villages | <p>Number of applications refused citing this policy.</p> <p>Number of applications supported at appeal when citing this policy within a reason for refusal.</p>                                       | <p>None.</p> <p>No applications were supported at appeal when citing this policy within reason for refusal.</p>  | To ensure that new development is contained within the Planned Limits of Development in towns and villages.               |

| Policy |  | Indicator   | 2018 - 2019 Monitoring Data  | Target   |
|--------|--|---|--|--|
| SP6    | Housing in the countryside                     | Total dwelling completions in the countryside.  | 3 agricultural buildings (barns) were converted to form 5 dwellings within the countryside.<br><br>57 of the proposed 103 dwellings were completed on the land South of Leicester Road, Uppingham (Former farm land).  | To avoid new isolated homes in the countryside             |
|        |  | Number of rural worker dwellings  | No rural worker dwelling applications were made in the monitoring period.  |  |
|        |  | Number of applications supported at appeal when citing this policy within a reason for refusal  | 2 applications were refused and dismissed at appeal using this policy as reason for refusal. These are; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The development of 3 affordable dwellings and 1 market dwelling in Lyddington</li> <li>• The development of a bed and breakfast facility in Great Casterton.</li> </ul> 1 application was supported at appeal using this policy; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Two storey extension and change of use to a mixed use café/restaurant/guest house in Morcott</li> </ul> |  |
| SP7    | Non-residential development in the countryside | Number of rural buildings converted, re-used or replaced in the countryside for employment use. | See monitoring data for Policy CS16  | To avoid unsustainable development within the countryside. |

| Policy |                                       | Indicator   | 2018 - 2019 Monitoring Data  | Target   |
|--------|---------------------------------------|---|--|--|
|        |                                       | Number of applications supported at appeal when citing this policy within a reason for refusal. | <p>The following 5 applications were refused and dismissed at appeal when citing Policy SP7 within a reason for refusal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The development of 3 shepherd huts for holiday lets in Ridlington.</li> <li>• An agricultural track in Clipsham</li> <li>• Demolition of a pub and replacing with 3 drive-in units and 1 drive-to unit with associated parking in Greetham</li> <li>• The development of a bed and breakfast facility in Great Casterton</li> <li>• The erection of 5 holiday chalets and storage in Morcott.</li> </ul> <p>No applications were supported at appeal when citing Policy SP7 within a reason for refusal.</p> |  |
| SP8    | Mobile Homes and residential caravans | Number of mobile homes and residential caravan applications approved                            | No mobile homes or residential caravans were approved during the monitoring period.  | To meet the Housing need for Rutland.  |
| SP9    | Affordable housing                    | Number of applications supported at appeal when citing this policy within a reason for refusal. | <p>1 application was dismissed at appeal when citing this policy within a reason for refusal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The development of 3 affordable dwellings and one market dwelling in Lyddington.</li> </ul> <p>No applications were supported at appeal</p>   | To ensure affordable housing is fit-for purpose and promotes sustainable communities |



| Policy |  | Indicator  | 2018 - 2019 Monitoring Data   | Target  |
|--------|--|--|---|---|
| SP10   | Market housing within rural exception sites                      | Total amount of completed rural exception sites<br><br>Number and percentage of market housing in each rural exception site completed. | No rural exception sites were completed during the monitoring period.<br><br>N/A  | To ensure that no more than 9 market homes are built on exception sites in a Local Service Centre or 5 market homes are built on exception sites in Smaller Service Centres/Restraint Villages. |
| SP11   | Use of military bases and prisons for operations or other uses   | No indicator identified.   | N/A   | N/A   |
| SP12   | Town centre area, primary and secondary shopping frontages.      | Floorspace lost to non A1 uses within the Primary Shopping frontages.  | 503 m <sup>2</sup> of A1 floorspace was lost to A3 uses in Primary Shopping frontages.                                    | To retain the predominantly retail character of the Primary and Secondary Shopping Frontages.   |
|        |  | Floorspace lost to non A class uses within the Secondary Shopping Frontages.   | 125 m <sup>2</sup> of A4 floorspace was lost to Sui generis use from the conversion of a public house to a hotel and bar. |   |
| SP 13  | Agricultural, horticultural, equestrian and forestry development | No indicator identified.   | N/A   | N/A   |
| SP14   | Telecommunications and high speed broadband                      | No indicator identified.   | N/A   | N/A   |

| Policy                  | Indicator   | 2018 - 2019 Monitoring Data  | Target  |
|-------------------------|---|--|---|
| SP15 Design and Amenity | Number of applications supported at appeal when citing this policy within a reason for refusal. | <p>1 application was supported at appeal where this policy was cited as a reason for refusal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alteration and extension to an existing garage in Ketton.</li> </ul> <p>The following 13 applications were dismissed at appeal where this policy was cited as a reason for refusal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The development of 3 affordable dwellings and 1 market dwelling in Lyddington.</li> <li>• A single storey extension to a dwelling in Caldecott</li> <li>• An extension and garage proposal in Ryhall</li> <li>• The erection of a temporary rural workers dwelling and agricultural building in Manton</li> <li>• An agricultural track in Clipsham</li> <li>• An outline application for 40 dwellings in Oakham</li> <li>• An extension in Empingham</li> <li>• Demolition of a pub and replacing with 3 drive-in units and 1 drive-to unit with associated parking in Greetham</li> <li>• The creation of a driveway and parking area in Braunston</li> <li>• The development of a bed and breakfast facility in Great Casterton</li> <li>• An extension and alterations to a dwelling in Whissendine</li> <li>• An inappropriate building developed without planning permission in Bisbrooke</li> <li>• An extension and alterations to a dwelling in Ryhall</li> </ul> | To ensure that all developments effectively address the key principles in design and amenity.   |
| SP16 Advertisements     | Number of applications supported at appeal when citing this policy within a reason for refusal. | There were no applications supported at appeal when citing Policy SP16 within a reason for refusal.  | To ensure that advertisements do not have a significant effect on the built environment or the appearance and character of the countryside. |

| Policy |  | Indicator  | 2018 - 2019 Monitoring Data   | Target   |
|--------|--|--|---|--|
| SP17   | Outdoor lighting                                 | Number of applications supported at appeal when citing this policy within a reason for refusal.  | There were no applications supported at appeal when citing Policy SP17 within a reason for refusal. | To ensure that outdoor lighting will not have an adverse effect on the environment, character and amenity of an area.  |
| SP18   | Wind Turbines and low carbon energy developments | No indicator identified – indicators for Core Strategy Policy CS20 are sufficient.   | N/A   | N/A  |
| SP19   | Biodiversity and geodiversity conservation.      | Number of planning permissions granted that could have an adverse or beneficial impact on protected species, designated sites and BAP habitats | No relevant applications approved.  | To ensure all development maintains, protects and enhances biodiversity and geodiversity conservation interests.   |
| SP20   | The historic environment                         | Number of applications supported at appeal when citing this policy within a reason for refusal.  | See monitoring data for Policy CS22.  | To ensure development projects and activities will protect and where possible enhance historic assets and their settings, maintain local distinctiveness and the character of identified features. |
| SP21   | Important open space and frontages               | Number of applications supported at appeal when citing this policy within a reason for refusal.  | There were no applications supported at appeal when citing Policy SP21 within a reason for refusal. | To protect the important open spaces and frontages in Rutland, which are an integral part of the built environment.  |

| Policy |  | Indicator   | 2018 - 2019 Monitoring Data  | Target  |
|--------|--|---|--|---|
| SP22   | Provision of new open space  | No indicator identified.  | N/A  | N/A   |
| SP 23  | Landscape character in the countryside   | Number of applications supported at appeal when citing this policy within a reason for refusal. | <p>1 application was supported at appeal where this policy was cited as a reason for refusal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Alteration and extension to an existing garage in Ketton.</li> </ul> <p>1 application was dismissed at appeal when citing Policy SP23 within a reason for refusal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The erection of a temporary rural workers dwelling and agricultural building in Manton</li> </ul> | N/A   |
| SP24   | Caravan and camping sites  | Number of applications supported at appeal when citing this policy within a reason for refusal. | There were no applications supported at appeal when citing Policy SP24 within a reason for refusal.  | To ensure that caravan and camping development does not have a detrimental impact on the local environment, visual amenity and levels of car usage in the local area. |
| SP25   | Lodges, log cabins , chalets and similar forms of self-services holiday accommodations | No indicator identified   | N/A  | N/A   |
| SP 26  | Rutland Water Recreation Areas   | No indicator identified – indicators for Core Strategy policy CS24 are sufficient.              | N/A  | N/A   |
| SP27   | Eyebrook Reservoir Area  | Number of applications supported at appeal when citing this policy within a reason for refusal. | There were no applications supported at appeal when citing Policy SP27 within a reason for refusal.  | To protect the special nature conservation interests and the tranquil and unspoilt character of the area.   |

| Policy                         | Indicator   | 2018 - 2019 Monitoring Data   | Target  |
|--------------------------------|---|---|---|
| SP28 Waste-related development | Number of applications supported at appeal when citing this policy within a reason for refusal. | There were no applications supported at appeal when citing Policy SP28 within a reason for refusal. | To avoid and/or mitigate potentially adverse impacts of Waste related development to acceptable levels. |

### APPENDIX 3 Minerals Core Strategy Monitoring

| Policy        | Indicator   | Target  | Performance   |
|---------------|---|---|---|
| <b>MCS1</b>   | Sustainability of new mineral developments  | All permissions to accord with MPS1's objectives  | No applications determined in period of AMR   |
| <b>MCS2 A</b> | Output of primary aggregates  | To meet sub-regional annual apportionment (0.30 Mtpa)/ emerging annual provision rate (0.19 Mtpa) | Monitoring information unavailable. In 2019 the national aggregates monitoring survey was undertaken by MHCLG and results are yet to be published.  |
| <b>MCS2 B</b> | Consented reserves at Ketton Quarry   | Landbank to be maintained above 15 years  | Limestone reserves at Ketton Quarry in 2019 cannot be identified due to commercial confidentiality. When the site was granted for permission for an extension in 2002 the permitted limestone reserves were 16.6 Mt which will be exhausted in around 11 years. |
| <b>MCS2 C</b> | New building stone extraction areas permitted   | Maintain permitted building and roofing stone reserves over plan period                           | No applications determined in period of AMR   |
| <b>MCS2 D</b> | Number of minerals permissions with significant adverse impacts upon the environment or communities | Zero  | No applications determined in period of AMR   |
| <b>MCS3</b>   | Location of new minerals development  | All permissions for aggregates and cement use to be located in areas shown on Key Diagram         | No applications determined in period of AMR   |
| <b>MCS4</b>   | Location of new mineral developments related to Ketton Cement Works                                 | All permissions for Ketton Cement Works to be located in Area of Search shown in Fig. 4           | No applications determined in period of AMR   |
| <b>MCS5</b>   | Permitted extensions to existing aggregate sites  | All permissions to have proven a need and accord with other policies                              | No applications determined in period of AMR   |
| <b>MCS6</b>   | New extraction areas permitted for building and roofing stone                                       | Maintain permitted building and roofing stone reserves over plan period                           | No applications determined in period of AMR   |

|              |   |  |  |
|--------------|---|--|--|
| <b>MCS7</b>  | Number of pollution incidents and complaints attributed to permitted minerals developments                  | Progressive annual reductions over plan period                             | Seven.   |
| <b>MCS7</b>  | Number of new permissions with conditions/legal agreements governing community participation                | All new permissions which involve new extraction and/or increase in output | No applications determined in period of AMR  |
| <b>MCS8</b>  | Number of minerals permissions deemed to have significant adverse impacts on Rutland Water                  | Zero   | No applications determined in period of AMR  |
| <b>MCS9</b>  | Number of substantiated complaints relating to disturbance from minerals related off-site traffic           | Progressive annual reduction over plan period                              | Nine   |
| <b>MCS9</b>  | Number of mineral site transport plans in place   | All new extraction and/or increased output permissions                     | No applications determined in period of AMR  |
| <b>MCS10</b> | Area of land/volume of reserve sterilised by other development  | Monitoring Information unavailable   | Monitoring information unavailable   |
| <b>MCS11</b> | Quantity of recycled/secondary aggregates produced per annum  | Progressive increase from 2007 levels over the plan period                 | One facility produced recycled aggregates in 2019. Sales data is confidential. No secondary aggregates produced.   |
| <b>MCS12</b> | Amount of land restored, by type, for biodiversity/geological conservation                                  | All new extraction sites to contribute to Council's primary objective      | No quarries undergoing restoration in 2019   |
| <b>MDC1</b>  | Minerals permissions granted with impacts at unacceptable levels  | Zero   | No applications determined in period of AMR  |
| <b>MDC2</b>  | Number of pollution incidents recorded by the Environment Health Officer attributed to minerals development | Zero   | <p>Nine complaints regarding either; Greetham, Ketton or Wakerley Quarry.</p> <p><b>Greetham Quarry April 2019</b>, 4 complaints about dust from on-site operations areas affected Great Lane and Bullfield Close. Impact confirmed by site visits &amp; more people affected than complained. Passed through to mineral planning authority to investigate,</p> <p><b>Greetham Quarry March 2020</b>, 3 complaints about dust from on-site operations areas affected Great lane and Bullfield Close. Impact confirmed by site visits &amp; more people affected than complained.</p> |

|             |  |  |  |
|-------------|--|--|--|
|             |  |  | <p><b>Note:</b> repeated complaints about 'track out' onto highway mainly directed to Planning</p> <p><b>Ketton Quarry April 2019</b>, 1 complaint from Manor View about 'cement dust' referred to Environment Agency.</p> <p><b>Wakerley Quarry.</b> Formal complaint by Barrowden Parish Council concerning noise and dust from the site and non-compliance. Further complaints about activities. Passed through to mineral planning authority to investigate.</p> |
| <b>MDC2</b> | Number of applications granted contrary to advice of Environment Health Officer or Environment Agency on air quality grounds   | None   | One  |
| <b>MDC3</b> | Number of applications granted contrary to Historic England advice regarding adverse impact upon nationally designated cultural or heritage sites  | Zero   | None   |
| <b>MDC4</b> | Number of permissions that maintain and enhance the landscape and townscape  | All new extraction permissions   | No applications determined in period of AMR  |
| <b>MDC5</b> | Number of applications granted contrary to English Heritage/Council's archaeological curator advice regarding adverse impact upon sites of archaeological, historical and architectural importance | Zero - unless appropriate mitigation measures implemented              | No applications determined in period of AMR  |
| <b>MDC6</b> | Number of minerals permissions located in or adversely impacting upon regionally or locally designated sites   | Zero - unless appropriate mitigation/compensation measures implemented | No applications determined in period of AMR  |
| <b>MDC7</b> | Number of planning permissions granted contrary to Environment   | Zero   | No applications determined in period of AMR  |



|              |  |   |  |
|--------------|--|---|--|
|              | Agency objection on water resource grounds   |   |  |
| <b>MDC8</b>  | Number of planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency objection on grounds of flooding impacts                                       | Zero  | No applications determined in period of AMR  |
| <b>MDC9</b>  | Number of new permissions for recycled/substitute materials  | All permissions located in accordance with policy criteria            | No applications determined for new aggregate recycling facilities in period of AMR |
| <b>MDC10</b> | Area of land/volume of reserve sterilised by non-mineral development of other than a minor nature (floorspace or site area below 10,000 sq m or 1ha) | Monitoring Information unavailable                                    | Monitoring information unavailable   |
| <b>MDC11</b> | Number of substantiated complaints relating to disturbance from minerals related off-site traffic  | Progressive annual reduction over plan period                         | See MCS9   |
| <b>MDC11</b> | Number of mineral site transport plans in place  | All new extraction and/or increased output permissions                | No applications determined in period of AMR  |
| <b>MDC12</b> | Amount of land restored, by type, for biodiversity/geological conservation   | All new extraction sites to contribute to Council's primary objective | No sites undergoing restoration in 2019  |