

Regulation 20 Summary of Consultation Responses – Policy Order

Policy	Reference Number	Representor Number , Name , Organisation	Comment Summary	Officer Response
Introduction	11613663	RC37 , Michael Burton, East Northamptonshire Council	Plan legally compliant and sound. ENC satisfied that RCC as complied with statutory requirements and spirit of Duty to Co-operate, for example in 'making' of Barrowden and Wakerley Neighbourhood Plan.	SUPPORT WELCOMED
Introduction	11692082	RC95 , Kerry Nimmons, Cottesmore Parish Council	Paras 1.8 - 1.11: drastic change to spatial strategy to include SGB in document published in July 2018. No attempt was made to publish a fully integrated new Reg 18 Plan contrary to Government guidance on proper plan-making and so process not legally compliant. 2018 consultation generated large volume of hostility towards new spatial strategy which have been ignored. Lack of full SA prepared alongside Reg 19 Plan. RCC commended for delaying consultation on Reg 19 Plan but then consultation held during pandemic in August - October 2020. Consultation process and opportunity for residents/stakeholders to focus properly during pandemic has been severely compromised.	NO CHANGE - Due process under Reg 18 and Reg 19 followed. Reg 19 consultation extended to 10 weeks and additional measures in place to ensure all household notified of consultation and how they could access copies.
Introduction	20103101	RC113, Brian Grady	Paras 1.8 - 1.11: absence of fully integrated Reg 18 Plan means residents/stakeholders cannot comment on a fully co-ordinated plan contrary to government guidance rendering plan not legally compliant. Drastic changes made to 2017 spatial strategy and hostile comments made in 2018 disregarded. SA carried out in tandem rather than informing plan. Consultation on Reg 19 Plan inadequate and badly timed during pandemic.	NO CHANGE - Due process under Reg 18 and Reg 19 followed. Reg 19 consultation extended to 10 weeks and additional measures in place to ensure all household notified of consultation and how they could access copies.
Introduction	20110101	RC114 , Andrew Brown	Paras 1.8 - 1.11: absence of fully integrated Reg 18 Plan means residents/stakeholders cannot comment on a fully co-ordinated plan contrary to government guidance rendering plan not legally compliant. Drastic changes made to 2017 spatial strategy and hostile comments made in 2018 disregarded. SA carried out in tandem rather than informing plan. Consultation on Reg 19 Plan inadequate and badly timed during pandemic. Current plan should be withdrawn and new Reg 18 Plan produced.	NO CHANGE - Due process under Reg 18 and Reg 19 followed. Reg 19 consultation extended to 10 weeks and additional measures in place to ensure all household notified of consultation and how they could access copies.
Introduction	20110308	RC141 , Andrew Johnson, Morcott Parish Council	Paras 1.8 - 1.11: absence of fully integrated Reg 18 Plan means residents/stakeholders cannot comment on a fully co-ordinated plan contrary to government guidance rendering plan not legally compliant. Drastic changes made to 2017 spatial strategy and hostile comments made in 2018 disregarded. SA carried out in tandem rather than informing plan. Consultation on Reg 19 Plan inadequate and badly timed during pandemic. Current plan should be withdrawn and new Reg 18 Plan produced.	NO CHANGE - Due process under Reg 18 and Reg 19 followed. Reg 19 consultation extended to 10 weeks and additional measures in place to ensure all household notified of consultation and how they could access copies.

Introduction	20110476	RC197 , Philip Davies	Paras 1.9 - 1.11: absence of fully integrated Reg 18 Plan means residents/stakeholders cannot comment on a fully co-ordinated plan contrary to government guidance rendering plan not legally compliant. Drastic changes made to 2017 spatial strategy and hostile comments made in 2018 disregarded. SA carried out in tandem rather than informing plan. Consultation on Reg 19 Plan inadequate and badly timed during pandemic.	NO CHANGE - Due process under Reg 18 and Reg 19 followed. Reg 19 consultation extended to 10 weeks and additional measures in place to ensure all household notified of consultation and how they could access copies.
Introduction	20110502	RC296 , Christopher Renner, Normanton Parish Meeting	Paras 1.9 - 1.11: absence of fully integrated Reg 18 Plan means residents/stakeholders cannot comment on a fully co-ordinated plan contrary to government guidance rendering plan not legally compliant. Drastic changes made to 2017 spatial strategy and hostile comments made in 2018 disregarded. SA carried out in tandem rather than informing plan. Consultation on Reg 19 Plan inadequate and badly timed during pandemic.	NO CHANGE - Due process under Reg 18 and Reg 19 followed. Reg 19 consultation extended to 10 weeks and additional measures in place to ensure all household notified of consultation and how they could access copies.
Introduction	20110518	RC201 , Owen Davies	A new plan should be produced. This time consultation should occur before the plan not after it. Alternative uses for the site were never considered. This should not occur. Different proposals could be a smaller development - say 400 houses. The plan should have all the surveys completed before any proposals, not added in afterwards to justify what has been included in the plan. Alternative sites should be included such as Woolfox.	NO CHANGE - Due process under Reg 18 and Reg 19 followed. Reg 19 consultation extended to 10 weeks and additional measures in place to ensure all household notified of consultation and how they could access copies.
Introduction	11607898	RC258 , Les Allen	Para 1.11: absence of fully integrated Reg 18 Plan means residents/stakeholders cannot comment on a fully co-ordinated plan contrary to government guidance rendering plan not legally compliant. Drastic changes made to 2017 spatial strategy and hostile comments made in 2018 disregarded. SA carried out in tandem rather than informing plan. Consultation on Reg 19 Plan inadequate and badly timed during pandemic.	NO CHANGE - Due process under Reg 18 and Reg 19 followed. Reg 19 consultation extended to 10 weeks and additional measures in place to ensure all household notified of consultation and how they could access copies.
Introduction	11707431	RC255 , Kenneth Bool	Para 1.9: absence of fully integrated Reg 18 Plan means residents/stakeholders cannot comment on a fully co-ordinated plan contrary to government guidance rendering plan not legally compliant. Drastic changes made to 2017 spatial strategy and hostile comments made in 2018 disregarded. SA carried out in tandem rather than informing plan. Consultation on Reg 19 Plan inadequate and badly timed during pandemic.	NO CHANGE - Due process under Reg 18 and Reg 19 followed. Reg 19 consultation extended to 10 weeks and additional measures in place to ensure all household notified of consultation and how they could access copies.

Introduction	11707489	RC255 , Kenneth Bool	Para 1.10: absence of fully integrated Reg 18 Plan means residents/stakeholders cannot comment on a fully co-ordinated plan contrary to government guidance rendering plan not legally compliant. Drastic changes made to 2017 spatial strategy and hostile comments made in 2018 disregarded. SA carried out in tandem rather than informing plan. Consultation on Reg 19 Plan inadequate and badly timed during pandemic.	NO CHANGE - Due process under Reg 18 and Reg 19 followed. Reg 19 consultation extended to 10 weeks and additional measures in place to ensure all household notified of consultation and how they could access copies.
Introduction	11707505	RC255 , Kenneth Bool	Para 1.11: absence of fully integrated Reg 18 Plan means residents/stakeholders cannot comment on a fully co-ordinated plan contrary to government guidance rendering plan not legally compliant. Drastic changes made to 2017 spatial strategy and hostile comments made in 2018 disregarded. SA carried out in tandem rather than informing plan. Consultation on Reg 19 Plan inadequate and badly timed during pandemic.	NO CHANGE - Due process under Reg 18 and Reg 19 followed. Reg 19 consultation extended to 10 weeks and additional measures in place to ensure all household notified of consultation and how they could access copies.
Introduction	20110558	RC188 , Carole Brown, Braunston-in-Rutland Parish Council	Paras 1.9 - 1.11: absence of fully integrated Reg 18 Plan means residents/stakeholders cannot comment on a fully co-ordinated plan contrary to government guidance rendering plan not legally compliant. Drastic changes made to 2017 spatial strategy and hostile comments made in 2018 disregarded. SA carried out in tandem rather than informing plan. Consultation on Reg 19 Plan inadequate and badly timed during pandemic.	NO CHANGE - Due process under Reg 18 and Reg 19 followed. Reg 19 consultation extended to 10 weeks and additional measures in place to ensure all household notified of consultation and how they could access copies.
Introduction	11709033	RC204 , Karen Davies	Para 1.9: LP has not been shaped by early, proportionate and effective management between plan makers and community contrary to NPPF and so is not sound. Inclusion of SGB in plan done without prior consultation with community and, when consulted, comments ignored. Pandemic has limited access to the plan and ability to comment. Plan not evidence based and contradicts previous strategy. New plan should involve community before publication and evidence based.	NO CHANGE - Due process under Reg 18 and Reg 19 followed. Reg 19 consultation extended to 10 weeks and additional measures in place to ensure all household notified of consultation and how they could access copies.
Introduction	11701607	RC206 , David Wilkin	Para 1.24: Lack of proper engagement with local communities over SGB proposal. Plan not justified as housing requirement for Rutland low and does not require a new town. Being brownfield does not justify SGB being developed and alternative plans should be considered.	NO CHANGE - Due process under Reg 18 and Reg 19 followed. Reg 19 consultation extended to 10 weeks and additional measures in place to ensure all household notified of consultation and how they could access copies.
Introduction	11703781	RC192 , Norman Milne, Fight4Rutland Ltd	Paras 1.9 - 1.11: absence of fully integrated Reg 18 Plan means residents/stakeholders cannot comment on a fully co-ordinated plan contrary to government guidance rendering plan not legally compliant. Drastic changes made to 2017 spatial strategy and hostile comments made in 2018 disregarded. SA carried out in tandem rather than informing plan. Consultation on Reg 19 Plan inadequate and badly timed during pandemic.	NO CHANGE - Due process under Reg 18 and Reg 19 followed. Reg 19 consultation extended to 10 weeks and additional measures in place to ensure all household notified of consultation and how they could access copies.

Introduction	20110677	RC242 , J C M Ball	Para 1.9 - 1.11: lack of formal consultation on new plan as a whole that included SGB. Current consultation is limited in nature of responses possible. Due to pandemic a full and fair consultation is not currently possible. New Reg 18 plan should be produced following close working with local communities.	NO CHANGE - Due process under Reg 18 and Reg 19 followed. Reg 19 consultation extended to 10 weeks and additional measures in place to ensure all household notified of consultation and how they could access copies.
Introduction	20110699	RC202 , WJ & PJ Cross	Para 1.9 - 1.11: drastic change to spatial strategy to include SGB in document published in July 2018. No attempt was made to publish a fully integrated new Reg 18 Plan contrary to Government guidance on proper plan-making and so process not legally compliant. 2018 consultation generated large volume of hostility towards new spatial strategy which have been ignored. Lack of full SA prepared alongside Reg 19 Plan. RCC commended for delaying consultation on Reg 19 Plan but then consultation held during pandemic in August - October 2020. Consultation process and opportunity for residents/stakeholders to focus properly during pandemic has been severely compromised.	NO CHANGE - Due process under Reg 18 and Reg 19 followed. Reg 19 consultation extended to 10 weeks and additional measures in place to ensure all household notified of consultation and how they could access copies.
Introduction	201106124	RC331 , TJ & EVR Boone	Drastic change to spatial strategy to include SGB in document published in July 2018. No attempt was made to publish a fully integrated new Reg 18 Plan contrary to Government guidance on proper plan-making and so process not legally compliant. 2018 consultation generated large volume of hostility towards new spatial strategy which have been ignored. Lack of full SA prepared alongside Reg 19 Plan. RCC commended for delaying consultation on Reg 19 Plan but then consultation held during pandemic in August - October 2020. Consultation process and opportunity for residents/stakeholders to focus properly during pandemic has been severely compromised.	NO CHANGE - Due process under Reg 18 and Reg 19 followed. Reg 19 consultation extended to 10 weeks and additional measures in place to ensure all household notified of consultation and how they could access copies.
Introduction	11707737	RC262 , Liz Parsons	Para 1.9 - 1.11: lack of full consultation on 2018 plan that drastically changed spatial strategy to include SGB. A fully integrated new Reg 18 plan should have been produced that residents given opportunity to comment on. Lack of consideration given to objection to 2018 consultation.	NO CHANGE - Due process under Reg 18 and Reg 19 followed. Reg 19 consultation extended to 10 weeks and additional measures in place to ensure all household notified of consultation and how they could access copies.
Introduction	11707545	RC120 , Will Atkinson	Paras 1.9 - 1.11: a new Reg 18 Plan including SGB should be produced and if a full and proper study was undertaken a number of viable and more appropriate locations could be brought forward, including sustainable route of infill and small development that would allow smaller firms to profit rather than large housebuilders. Query timing for drastic change to strategy given pandemic. Heavy opposition to SGB in 2018 and yet plan says it is developed by the Council together with partners and stakeholders. Full consultation required and studies into effects of new town on long term viability of existing key centres and character of the county.	NO CHANGE - Due process under Reg 18 and Reg 19 followed. Reg 19 consultation extended to 10 weeks and additional measures in place to ensure all household notified of consultation and how they could access copies.

Introduction	201106240	RC279 , Malcom Touchin , CPRE Rutland	Para 1.9: departure from LDS and SCI by authorising an additional round of non-statutory public consultation on SGB in 2018. Question if would consultees and interested parties have been aware of implications of 'public consultation on focussed changes' as this was non-statutory and outside the published LDS and SCI. Acknowledge that duty to publish and adhere to an adopted LDS is a procedural matter rather than one that would inherently make the LP unsound. Consideration should be given to whether a revised issues and options stage should be undertaken to ensure community have a full and fair understanding of spatial options open to them.	NO CHANGE - Due process under Reg 18 and Reg 19 followed. Reg 19 consultation extended to 10 weeks and additional measures in place to ensure all household notified of consultation and how they could access copies.
Duty to Cooperate	20110421	RC194 , David Maher, Barton Willmore on behalf of de Merke Estates	The requirement for the Duty to Co-operate is set out at Section 33A of the Planning and Compulsory Act 2004 ("the 2004 Act"). This places an obligation upon local authorities to "co-operate" with relevant authorities in respect of the preparation of development plan documents so far as it relates to a strategic matter (S. 33A(1)).	NO CHANGE - Council has demonstrated how it has met the Duty to Co-operate
Duty to Cooperate	201106233	RC279 , Malcom Touchin , CPRE Rutland	The Framework at Para 35 states that a Plan will be sound if policies are Effective, "...based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic matters that have been dealt with rather than deferred..." It is considered the Plan does not meet this test of soundness for the reasons set out above on matters of legal compliance.	NO CHANGE - Council has demonstrated how it has met the Duty to Co-operate
Spatial Portrait	11645287	RC55 , Tess Nelson, Harborough District Council	Harborough District Council welcomes the innovative engagement on this consultation and supports the digital first approach. We support the continued preparation of this plan as the plan-led system provides certainty for communities and businesses in Harborough District particularly those close to the boundary with Rutland.	SUPPORT WELCOMED
Spatial Portrait	11645302	RC55 , Tess Nelson, Harborough District Council	Harborough District Council will continue to supports the need for cross boundary working on strategic issues whatever the changes that may result from Planning White Paper, as joint working is important for good plan-making.	SUPPORT WELCOMED
Spatial Portrait	11692371	RC95 , Kerry Nimmons, Cottesmore Parish Council	The plan indicates a projected population increase of 2,033 residents by 2036 however the housing requirement for the same period is 2,942 new dwellings. This will equate to a much more significant increase in Rutland's population than suggested in population projection. These figures do not include 650 units at Stamford North but these will still be included as residents of Rutland. Assessments for services are based on an unreasonable estimate of population projections, clearly an unsound basis to base estimates of future provision.	CONSIDER CHANGE TO 2.2 (population projections) to reflect updated population figures. NO CHANGE to new home projections - Evidence in the SHMA identifies that the requirement is appropriate at 130 dpa with a 25% buffer resulting in 160 dwellings per annum. The windfall amount is based on an updated 2020 Windfall Study. Agreement with SKDC is in place regarding Quarry Farm with the issue being accepted through SKDC Local Plan examination.

Spatial Portrait	11691987	RC97 , John Donaldson	No evidence of new employment in SGB. Concerns of the development becoming a commuter town which will create a huge uplift in road traffic during commuter times. There is little evidence of improving the surrounding road systems to allow for this increase. The development will also have negative impact on Rutland Water and undermines policy E6.	NO CHANGE
Spatial Portrait	20102911	RC101 , David Lewis	There is an inconsistency between population projections, the plan indicates a projected population increase of 2,033 residents by 2036 however the housing requirement for the same period is 2,942 new dwellings. These figures do not include 650 units at Stamford North which make a total of 3,592 new homes. This will equate to a much larger increase in Rutland's population than suggested in population projection at around approx. 8,600 residents. Disparity effects infrastructure planning.	CONSIDER CHANGE TO 2.2 (population projections) to reflect updated population figures. NO CHANGE to new home projections - Evidence in the SHMA identifies that the requirement is appropriate at 130 dpa with a 25% buffer resulting in 160 dwellings per annum. The windfall amount is based on an updated 2020 Windfall Study. Agreement with SKDC is in place regarding Quarry Farm with the issue being accepted through SKDC Local Plan examination.
Spatial Portrait	11696679	RC112 , Christopher Sworn, Preston Village Meeting	The plan indicates a projected population increase of 2,033 residents by 2036 therefore why does Rutland need the 2,340 new homes set as the minimum requirement.	CONSIDER CHANGE TO 2.2 (population projections) to reflect updated population figures. NO CHANGE to new home projections - Evidence in the SHMA identifies that the requirement is appropriate at 130 dpa with a 25% buffer resulting in 160 dwellings per annum. The windfall amount is based on an updated 2020 Windfall Study. Agreement with SKDC is in place regarding Quarry Farm with the issue being accepted through SKDC Local Plan examination.
Spatial Portrait	20103102	RC113 , Brian Grady	There is a disparity between population projections, the plan indicates a projected population increase of 2,033 residents by 2036 however the housing requirement for the same period is 2,942 new dwellings. This will equate to a much more significant increase in Rutland's population than suggested in population projection. These figures do not include 650 units at Stamford North but these will still be included as residents of Rutland. Assessments for services are based on an unreasonable estimate of population projections, clearly an unsound basis to base estimates of future provision. There is little evidence to support infrastructure for this shortfall.	CONSIDER CHANGE TO 2.2 (population projections) to reflect updated population figures. NO CHANGE to new home projections - Evidence in the SHMA identifies that the requirement is appropriate at 130 dpa with a 25% buffer resulting in 160 dwellings per annum. The windfall amount is based on an updated 2020 Windfall Study. Agreement with SKDC is in place regarding Quarry Farm with the issue being accepted through SKDC Local Plan examination.

Spatial Portrait	20110102	RC114 , Andrew Brown	There is a disparity between population projections, the plan indicates a projected population increase of 2,033 residents by 2036 however the housing requirement for the same period is 2,942 new dwellings. This will equate to a much more significant increase in Rutland's population than suggested in population projection. These figures do not include 650 units at Stamford North but these will still be included as residents of Rutland. Assessments for services are based on an unreasonable estimate of population projections, clearly an unsound basis to base estimates of future provision. There is little evidence to support infrastructure for this shortfall.	CONSIDER CHANGE TO 2.2 (population projections) to reflect updated population figures. NO CHANGE to new home projections - Evidence in the SHMA identifies that the requirement is appropriate at 130 dpa with a 25% buffer resulting in 160 dwellings per annum. The windfall amount is based on an updated 2020 Windfall Study. Agreement with SKDC is in place regarding Quarry Farm with the issue being accepted through SKDC Local Plan examination.
Spatial Portrait	11639549	RC132 , Bernice Turner, Corby Borough Council	Corby Borough Council have no comments to make relating to the soundness of the Rutland Local Plan, however, request the following modifications be made to ensure accuracy within the Plan 1. Para 2.6, suggested amendment to include "employment" to read: "Corby lies approximately 3 miles south of Rutland and is planned to double in size in the next 30 years including new housing, employment, leisure and shopping facilities".2. Figure 2: Corby's strategic opportunity figure is 14,200 rather than 14,500.	SUPPORT SUGGESTED CHANGES
Spatial Portrait	20110309	RC141 , Andrew Johnson, Morcott Parish Council	The plan indicates a projected population increase of 2,033 residents by 2036 however the housing requirement for the same period is 2,942 new dwellings. This will equate to a much more significant increase in Rutland's population than suggested in population projection. These figures do not include 650 units at Stamford North but these will still be included as residents of Rutland. Assessments for services are based on an unreasonable estimate of population projections, clearly an unsound basis to base estimates of future provision.	CONSIDER CHANGE TO 2.2 (population projections) to reflect updated population figures. NO CHANGE to new home projections - Evidence in the SHMA identifies that the requirement is appropriate at 130 dpa with a 25% buffer resulting in 160 dwellings per annum. The windfall amount is based on an updated 2020 Windfall Study. Agreement with SKDC is in place regarding Quarry Farm with the issue being accepted through SKDC Local Plan examination.
Spatial Portrait	20110430	RC210 , Emilie Carr, Historic England	Paragraph 2.18 is welcomed	SUPPORT WELCOMED
Spatial Portrait	20110477	RC197 , Philip Davies	There is a disparity between population projections, the plan indicates a projected population increase of 2,033 residents by 2036 however the housing requirement for the same period is 2,942 new dwellings. This will equate to a much more significant increase in Rutland's population than suggested in population projection. These figures do not include 650 units at Stamford North but these will still be included as residents of Rutland. Assessments for services are based on an unreasonable estimate of population projections, clearly an unsound basis to base estimates of future provision.	CONSIDER CHANGE TO 2.2 (population projections) to reflect updated population figures. NO CHANGE to new home projections - Evidence in the SHMA identifies that the requirement is appropriate at 130 dpa with a 25% buffer resulting in 160 dwellings per annum. The windfall amount is based on an updated 2020 Windfall Study. Agreement with SKDC is in place regarding Quarry Farm with the issue being accepted through SKDC Local Plan examination.

Spatial Portrait	20110503	RC296 , Christopher Renner, Normanton Parish Meeting	The plan indicates a projected population increase of 2,033 residents by 2036 however the housing requirement for the same period is 2,942 new dwellings. This will equate to a much more significant increase in Rutland's population than suggested in population projection. These figures do not include 650 units at Stamford North but these will still be included as residents of Rutland. Assessments for services are based on an unreasonable estimate of population projections, clearly an unsound basis to base estimates of future provision.	CONSIDER CHANGE TO 2.2 (population projections) to reflect updated population figures. NO CHANGE to new home projections - Evidence in the SHMA identifies that the requirement is appropriate at 130 dpa with a 25% buffer resulting in 160 dwellings per annum. The windfall amount is based on an updated 2020 Windfall Study. Agreement with SKDC is in place regarding Quarry Farm with the issue being accepted through SKDC Local Plan examination.
Spatial Portrait	11706799	RC230 , Ian Briggs, Landesign on behalf of Hanson	Ketton works is referred to as being Regionally significant. National policy and guidance recognises that cement is nationally important.	SUPPORT CHANGE to nationally significant
Spatial Portrait	11706874	RC231 , John Haddon	The vision needs to be wider. The urgency of Climate Change reduction is a big concern. The agricultural economy and the desirably unbuilt landscape give us more opportunity than many places for taking mitigating action. The County could contribute significantly to mitigating greenhouse effects by policies to reduce carbon use as petrol, diesel and natural gas and to capture carbon in the atmosphere.	NO CHANGE
Spatial Portrait	11694415	RC258 , Les Allen	There is a disconnection between population projections, the plan indicates a projected population increase of 2,033 residents by 2036 however the housing requirement for the same period is 2,942 new dwellings. This will equate to a much more significant increase in Rutland's population than suggested in population projection. These figures do not include 650 units at Stamford North but these will still be included as residents of Rutland. Assessments for services are based on an unreasonable estimate of population projections, clearly an unsound basis to base estimates of future provision.	CONSIDER CHANGE TO 2.2 (population projections) to reflect updated population figures. NO CHANGE to new home projections - Evidence in the SHMA identifies that the requirement is appropriate at 130 dpa with a 25% buffer resulting in 160 dwellings per annum. The windfall amount is based on an updated 2020 Windfall Study. Agreement with SKDC is in place regarding Quarry Farm with the issue being accepted through SKDC Local Plan examination.
Spatial Portrait	11707520	RC255 , Kenneth Bool	There is a disparity between population projections, the plan indicates a projected population increase of 2,033 residents by 2036 however the housing requirement for the same period is 2,942 new dwellings. This will equate to a much more significant increase in Rutland's population than suggested in population projection. These figures do not include 650 units at Stamford North but these will still be included as residents of Rutland. Assessments for services are based on an unreasonable estimate of population projections, clearly an unsound basis to base estimates of future provision.	CONSIDER CHANGE TO 2.2 (population projections) to reflect updated population figures. NO CHANGE to new home projections - Evidence in the SHMA identifies that the requirement is appropriate at 130 dpa with a 25% buffer resulting in 160 dwellings per annum. The windfall amount is based on an updated 2020 Windfall Study. Agreement with SKDC is in place regarding Quarry Farm with the issue being accepted through SKDC Local Plan examination.

Spatial Portrait	20110559	RC188 , Carole Brown, Braunston-in-Rutland Parish Council	There is a disparity between population projections, the plan indicates a projected population increase of 2,033 residents by 2036 however the housing requirement for the same period is 2,942 new dwellings. This will equate to a much more significant increase in Rutland's population than suggested in population projection. These figures do not include 650 units at Stamford North but these will still be included as residents of Rutland. Assessments for services are based on an unreasonable estimate of population projections, clearly an unsound basis to base estimates of future provision.	CONSIDER CHANGE TO 2.2 (population projections) to reflect updated population figures. NO CHANGE to new home projections - Evidence in the SHMA identifies that the requirement is appropriate at 130 dpa with a 25% buffer resulting in 160 dwellings per annum. The windfall amount is based on an updated 2020 Windfall Study. Agreement with SKDC is in place regarding Quarry Farm with the issue being accepted through SKDC Local Plan examination.
Spatial Portrait	11708990	RC192 , Norman Milne, Fight 4 Rutland Ltd	There is a disparity between population projections, the plan indicates a projected population increase of 2,033 residents by 2036 however the housing requirement for the same period is 2,942 new dwellings. This will equate to a much more significant increase in Rutland's population than suggested in population projection. These figures do not include 650 units at Stamford North but these will still be included as residents of Rutland. Assessments for services are based on an unreasonable estimate of population projections, clearly an unsound basis to base estimates of future provision.	CONSIDER CHANGE TO 2.2 (population projections) to reflect updated population figures. NO CHANGE to new home projections - Evidence in the SHMA identifies that the requirement is appropriate at 130 dpa with a 25% buffer resulting in 160 dwellings per annum. The windfall amount is based on an updated 2020 Windfall Study. Agreement with SKDC is in place regarding Quarry Farm with the issue being accepted through SKDC Local Plan examination.
Spatial Portrait	20110678	RC242 , J C M Ball	There is a disparity between population projections, the plan indicates a projected population increase of 2,033 residents by 2036 however the housing requirement for the same period is 2,942 new dwellings. This will equate to a much more significant increase in Rutland's population than suggested in population projection. These figures do not include 650 units at Stamford North but these will still be included as residents of Rutland. Assessments for services are based on an unreasonable estimate of population projections, clearly an unsound basis to base estimates of future provision.	CONSIDER CHANGE TO 2.2 (population projections) to reflect updated population figures. NO CHANGE to new home projections - Evidence in the SHMA identifies that the requirement is appropriate at 130 dpa with a 25% buffer resulting in 160 dwellings per annum. The windfall amount is based on an updated 2020 Windfall Study. Agreement with SKDC is in place regarding Quarry Farm with the issue being accepted through SKDC Local Plan examination.
Spatial Portrait	20110687	RC332 , Tom Murie, Tixover Parish Meeting	There is a disparity between population projections, the plan indicates a projected population increase of 2,033 residents by 2036 however the housing requirement for the same period is 2,942 new dwellings. This will equate to a much more significant increase in Rutland's population than suggested in population projection. These figures do not include 650 units at Stamford North but these will still be included as residents of Rutland. Assessments for services are based on an unreasonable estimate of population projections, clearly an unsound basis to base estimates of future provision.	CONSIDER CHANGE TO 2.2 (population projections) to reflect updated population figures. NO CHANGE to new home projections - Evidence in the SHMA identifies that the requirement is appropriate at 130 dpa with a 25% buffer resulting in 160 dwellings per annum. The windfall amount is based on an updated 2020 Windfall Study. Agreement with SKDC is in place regarding Quarry Farm with the issue being accepted through SKDC Local Plan examination.

Spatial Portrait	201106100	RC202 , WJ & PJ Cross	There is a disparity between population projections, the plan indicates a projected population increase of 2,033 residents by 2036 however the housing requirement for the same period is 2,942 new dwellings. This will equate to a much more significant increase in Rutland's population than suggested in population projection. These figures do not include 650 units at Stamford North but these will still be included as residents of Rutland. Assessments for services are based on an unreasonable estimate of population projections, clearly an unsound basis to base estimates of future provision.	CONSIDER CHANGE TO 2.2 (population projections) to reflect updated population figures. NO CHANGE to new home projections - Evidence in the SHMA identifies that the requirement is appropriate at 130 dpa with a 25% buffer resulting in 160 dwellings per annum. The windfall amount is based on an updated 2020 Windfall Study. Agreement with SKDC is in place regarding Quarry Farm with the issue being accepted through SKDC Local Plan examination.
Spatial Portrait	201106125	RC331 , TJ & EVR Boone	There is a disparity between population projections, the plan indicates a projected population increase of 2,033 residents by 2036 however the housing requirement for the same period is 2,942 new dwellings. This will equate to a much more significant increase in Rutland's population than suggested in population projection. These figures do not include 650 units at Stamford North but these will still be included as residents of Rutland. Assessments for services are based on an unreasonable estimate of population projections, clearly an unsound basis to base estimates of future provision.	CONSIDER CHANGE TO 2.2 (population projections) to reflect updated population figures. NO CHANGE to new home projections - Evidence in the SHMA identifies that the requirement is appropriate at 130 dpa with a 25% buffer resulting in 160 dwellings per annum. The windfall amount is based on an updated 2020 Windfall Study. Agreement with SKDC is in place regarding Quarry Farm with the issue being accepted through SKDC Local Plan examination.
Spatial Portrait	11709275	RC249 , Christopher French, Welland Rivers Trust	The pre submission plan does not acknowledge the threat of biodiversity loss to Rutland's natural character and provision of ecosystem services	NO CHANGE covered by policy EN9
Spatial Portrait	11709326	RC249 , Christopher French, Welland Rivers Trust	Details on how the local plan will address environmental issues outlined in the table on page 19 are scarce.	NO CHANGE These issues are covered by chapter 7
Spatial Portrait	11707893	RC262 , Liz Parsons	The plan indicates a projected population increase of 2,033 residents by 2036 therefore Rutland does not need the 2,340 new homes set as the minimum requirement, it should be half this. Assessments for services are based on an unreasonable estimate of population projections, clearly an unsound basis to base estimates of future provision as they will be under resourced.	CONSIDER CHANGE TO 2.2 (population projections) to reflect updated population figures. NO CHANGE to new home projections - Evidence in the SHMA identifies that the requirement is appropriate at 130 dpa with a 25% buffer resulting in 160 dwellings per annum. The windfall amount is based on an updated 2020 Windfall Study. Agreement with SKDC is in place regarding Quarry Farm with the issue being accepted through SKDC Local Plan examination.

Spatial Portrait	11707876	RC120 , Will Atkinson	The supply and demand in unbalanced. The plan indicates a projected population increase of 2,033 residents by 2036 therefore why does Rutland need 2,942 new homes in the same period. These figures do not include 650 units at Stamford North but these will still be included as residents of Rutland.	CONSIDER CHANGE TO 2.2 (population projections) to reflect updated population figures. NO CHANGE to new home projections - Evidence in the SHMA identifies that the requirement is appropriate at 130 dpa with a 25% buffer resulting in 160 dwellings per annum. The windfall amount is based on an updated 2020 Windfall Study. Agreement with SKDC is in place regarding Quarry Farm with the issue being accepted through SKDC Local Plan examination.
Spatial Portrait	201106223	RC162, Adam Murray, Andrew Granger & Co. Ltd. On behalf of Mr PJSR Hill and Pikerace Limited	Local plans need to be flexible and able to adapt to rapid change. Plan strategy needs to take a wider perspective. In Rutland, the new standard method would suggest a dwelling figure of 307 dpa. The proposed transitional arrangements in "Planning for the future" would require a new plan to be adopted within 42 months from the date the legislation is brought into place. There is no evidence that previous levels of housing delivery or previous assessments of need have been taken into account. Both indicators show Rutland is appropriate to plan for a higher level of need than the standard method suggests. The Plan should adopt a housing target of at least 169 dpa which would reflect the long-term delivery and in the middle of the range identified in the most recent SHMA Update. Rutland remains the least affordable district in the HMA. This suggests the Council should adopt a housing target of 232 dpa in order to support continued improvement to affordability. This would still be considerably below the proposed new Standard Method figure of 307 dpa.	NO CHANGE
Spatial Portrait, Vision and Objectives	20110650	RC205 , Ed Rehill, Savills on behalf of The Society of Merchant Venturers	Spatial PortraitThe SMV therefore supports the characteristics of Oakham described in paragraph 2.3 of the Pre-Submission Local Plan Review which states: "Oakham is the larger of the two market towns with a population of about 12,978 and a range of education, community, health and leisure facilities, employment, shopping, a twice weekly market, a railway station and bus station and bus services to the surrounding area."Strategic Objectives3.4. The SMV supports strategic objective 3 (Vibrant and prosperous market towns) on page 24 of the Pre-Submission Local Plan Review which encourages sustainable development at Oakham to support the vibrant and prosperous market town. Vision should include specific reference to Oakham being the most sustainable settlement within the county and the need to encourage significant growth to help maintain and enhance its status as the principal town. The SMV supports the Council's plans for growth and its proposals to facilitate sustainable development in accordance with the NPPF.	SUPPORT WELCOMED NO CHANGE

Strategic Objectives	11696474	RC110 , Sara Glover	SO1: Plan unsound. SGB driven by MOD rather than housing need. No evidence that Edith Weston or North Luffenham need an additional 1000 homes over next 15 years. Lack of employment and services for residents at SGB would lead to traffic congestion on surrounding roads. New housing should be sited around larger settlements; use SGB for alternative purposes, and; reduce housing at Officer's Mess.	NO CHANGE
Strategic Objectives	201106137	RC290 , Peter Dawson	SO2: Reg 19 Plan totally different to Reg 18 Plan and local residents unable to challenge inclusion of SGB in Reg 19 Plan. SGB in inaccessible location, not located where housing need, does not support vitality of other centres, and places too strong emphasis on PDL. Revert to Draft Local Plan for full Reg 18 consultation.	NO CHANGE
Strategic Objectives	201106139	RC290 , Peter Dawson	SO10: TAs for SGB flawed.	NO CHANGE SC2 requires proposals for major development to be supported with TA
Strategic Objectives	201106140	RC290 , Peter Dawson	SO2: viability assessment for SGB flawed.	NO CHANGE
Strategic Objectives	201106146	RC307 , Charles Whittaker	SO2: Reg 19 Plan totally different to Reg 18 Plan and local residents unable to challenge inclusion of SGB in Reg 19 Plan. SGB in inaccessible location, not located where housing need, does not support vitality of other centres, and places too strong emphasis on PDL. Revert to Draft Local Plan for full Reg 18 consultation.	NO CHANGE
Strategic Objectives	201106148	RC307 , Charles Whittaker	SO10: TAs for SGB flawed.	NO CHANGE SC2 requires proposals for major development to be supported with TA
Strategic Objectives	201106149	RC307 , Charles Whittaker	SO2: viability assessment for SGB flawed.	NO CHANGE
Strategic Objectives	201106151	RC308 , Janet Whittaker	SO2: Reg 19 Plan totally different to Reg 18 Plan and local residents unable to challenge inclusion of SGB in Reg 19 Plan. SGB in inaccessible location, not located where housing need, does not support vitality of other centres, and places too strong emphasis on PDL. Revert to Draft Local Plan for full Reg 18 consultation.	NO CHANGE
Strategic Objectives	201106153	RC308 , Janet Whittaker	SO10: TAs for SGB flawed.	NO CHANGE SC2 requires proposals for major development to be supported with TA
Strategic Objectives	201106154	RC308 , Janet Whittaker	SO2: viability assessment for SGB flawed.	NO CHANGE

Strategic Objectives	11706702	RC230 , Ian Briggs, Landesign on behalf of Hanson	There is no Strategic Objective to provide a steady and adequate supply of minerals as required by NPPF paragraphs 207 and 208. The Plan also makes no mention of the great weight that should be given to the benefits of mineral extraction, including to the economy as is required by NPPF paragraph 205. Mineral supply cannot be assumed. It is a fundamental part delivering the buildings and infrastructure a local plan promotes and minerals should be a Strategically Objective. Add new bullet point to SO16: to provide and safeguard a steady and adequate supply of minerals to provide the infrastructure, buildings, energy and goods the country needs together with the necessary ancillary facilities to treat, process and distribute them to satisfy that need, whilst ensuring that best use is made of such primary resources to secure their long term conservation.	CONSIDER CHANGE - to Strategic 16 to include provision of supply of minerals
Strategic Objectives	20091501	RC25 , Kirstie Clifton, Define Planning for William David Homes	Supports the overarching strategic objective of identifying sustainable locations for development (Strategic Objective 1), but considers the reliance upon the delivery of a new garden community (Strategic Objective 2) undermines this and the wider strategic objectives; to maintain diverse and thriving villages, deliver housing to meet everyone's needs, and support rural economies and communities (Strategic Objectives 4, 5 and 9 respectively). William Davis proposes that the Pre-Submission Local Plan cannot be considered to meet the relevant soundness tests as set out under paragraph 35 of the NPPF.	NO CHANGE to strategic objectives. See also response to policies SD1, SD3 and H1
Strategic Objectives	20092901	RC43 , Chris Bramley, Severn Trent	Supportive of approach to protect and sustainably manage resources in SO16 but recommend bullet point added to highlight need for water efficiency.	NO CHANGE covered by policies EN4 and EN5
Strategic objectives	20102201	RC75 , John Pearce, on behalf of Muller Property Group	Generally support SO1 and agree that suitable sites and locations should be identified to accommodate development in a sustainable way. Support SO4 as encouraging sustainable development in villages is key to their ongoing sustainability.	SUPPORT WELCOMED

Strategic Objectives	11706800	RC218 , Geoffrey Clyde	<p>The Local Plan has been produced to include the development at St Georges Barracks (SGB) which we have previously stated to be illegal. The impact of such a large development has not been properly considered for the remainder of the county. It is unlikely to be sustainable and the claims for creating 2000 jobs in the employment zone are unrealistic. There is a lack of reality in comparing the imposition of a "garden community" in an area not well served with transport links and the population growth of Rutland. The Local Plan is seriously unsound in both areas.</p> <p>To base the housing growth of Rutland on one major site is not only unsound but illegal in the manner of incorporating it into the Local Plan. No account taken of changes to public behaviour as result of pandemic. SGB would be unsustainable as not well served by public transport and would be car dependent. Site reduced to 500 houses with improved local facilities and population growth in Rutland recalculated.</p>	NO CHANGE
Strategic Objectives	11707057	RC293 , Rachel Burkitt	<p>Question legality of consultation process and the Councils approach to sign an MOU with the MOD to develop St George's' The scale of St George's is totally out of keeping for Rutland that is an area of outstanding beauty. The plan includes a new town that would cause congestion on the roads and destroy the uniqueness of the area. The claim that people living on the site would take advantage of the employment opportunities there is fanciful. It is more likely that people would commute in or out from Peterborough or from further afield. This is not a sustainable proposition and would lead to an increase in traffic and pollution and put pressure on nearby villages and towns including Uppingham which will see 14,000 houses built close to its borders with Corby putting massive pressure on the A6003 which RCC councillors have discussed widening to cope with the increase in traffic. The policy is also not consistent with the NPPF Section 2. Achieving Sustainable Development paragraph 7-10, and flies in the face on the Government's climate change targets. The town will become a commuter belt for Peterborough and further afield and will inevitably lead to more road widening, destroying verges and wildlife. The cost of providing viable public transport to enable people to go to work is unsustainable. It is too isolated for people to cycle and will lead to a total dependency on cars which will help to frustrate the Government's vision on reducing carbon emissions</p>	NO CHANGE

Strategic Objectives	11583368	RC289 , Peter Burrows	The Plan was not “shaped by early, proportionate and effective engagement between plan makers and communities” as required by the NPPF. Since 2018, there has been a very significant opposition to the proposed allocation of SGB. Therefore, the Council has chosen to promote a new settlement without the support of their local communities. This is contrary to national policy as set out in NPPF para 72. The current strategy identifies strategic development which is: i) Not in an accessible suitable location; ii) Not located where the identified need is; iii) Is of insufficient scale to be considered reasonably self-contained; iv) Does not support the vitality of existing centres and v) Places too strong an emphasis of the merits of the re-use of previously developed land.	NO CHANGE
Strategic Objectives	11707786	RC289 , Peter Burrows	Strategic Objective 1: Sustainable locations for development / Policy H3 – St Georges Garden Community development requirements The Traffic studies for SGB overestimate the current actual use of sustainable transport. They are based on the 2011 Census and a traffic survey from October 2018. Further traffic evidence and assessment is required and this input into viability report before the site should be allocated. Strategic Objective 10: Sustainable transport and infrastructure / Policy SC2 - Securing sustainable transport as above, + the allowance of £4 million as a public transport subsidy has no indication of the level of service that would be aimed for, no time period where the subsidy would be in place, and no indication as to the numbers of housing units that would need to be in place before the subsidy was implemented to enable public transport.	NO CHANGE
Strategic Objectives	11707819	RC289 , Peter Burrows	The Viability assessment for the SGB Strategic site should be reviewed and costed at the true value of the Brownfield site that it actually is. The viability assessment should also model the impact of the large area potentially available for quarrying in very close juxtaposition to the housing development area on potential developers returns	NO CHANGE to strategic objectives

Strategic Objectives	20110606	RC287 , Paul Belton , CARTER JONAS on behalf of Pigeon Capital Management Ltd.	Strategic Objective 5: Pigeon objects to the minimum Local Housing Need Assessment figure being quoted within this Strategic Objective as it does not represent the actual Annual Housing Requirement which has been established through the Plan's evidence base and which is correctly identified later in the Plan (Chapter 5).In order to ensure that the Plan clearly and correctly sets out the housing requirement that has identified through the evidence base, and which is required to be met to ensure that sufficient new homes are delivered to meet everyone's needs (the objective), Strategic Objective 5 should it be amended to delivering the minimum annual housing requirement of 162 dwellings rather than 130 dwellings.	NO CHANGE to strategic objectives
Strategic Objectives	20110645	RC303 , Robin King	<p>Question legality of consultation process and the Councils approach to sign an MOU with the MOD to develop St George's'</p> <p>The Plan was not "shaped by early, proportionate and effective engagement between plan makers and communities" as required by the NPPF.</p> <p>Since 2018, there has been a very significant opposition to the proposed allocation of SGB. Therefore, the Council has chosen to promote a new settlement without the support of their local communities. This is contrary to national policy as set out in NPPF para 72.</p> <p>The current strategy identifies strategic development which is:</p> <p>i) Not in an accessible suitable location; ii) Not located where the identified need is; iii)Is of insufficient scale to be considered reasonably self-contained; iv)Does not support the vitality of existing centres and v)Places too strong an emphasis of the merits of the re-use of previously developed land.</p>	NO CHANGE
Strategic Objectives	20110647	RC303 , Robin King	<p>Strategic Objective 1: Sustainable locations for development / Policy H3 – St Georges Garden Community development requirements The Traffic studies for SGB overestimate the current actual use of sustainable transport. They are based on the 2011 Census and a traffic survey from October 2018. Further traffic evidence and assessment is required and this input into viability report before the site should be allocated. Strategic Objective 10: Sustainable transport and infrastructure / Policy SC2 - Securing sustainable transport as above, + the allowance of £4 million as a public transport subsidy has no indication of the level of service that would be aimed for, no time period where the subsidy would be in place, and no indication as to the numbers of housing units that would need to be in place before the subsidy was implemented to enable public transport.</p>	NO CHANGE

Strategic Objectives	20110648	RC303 , Robin King	The Viability assessment for the SGB Strategic site should be reviewed and costed at the true value of the Brownfield site that it actually is. The viability assessment should also model the impact of the large area potentially available for quarrying in very close juxtaposition to the housing development area on potential developers returns	NO CHANGE to strategic objectives
Strategic Objectives	20110655	RC305 , Roslyn Deeming, Natural England	Natural England considers that Objective 16 should also make reference to nature-based solutions to climate change which would include enhancing green infrastructure and connecting natural habitats.	SUPPORT SUGGESTED CHANGE - to Strategic Objective 16
Strategic Objectives	20110660	RC336 , Janet Hughes	One aim is to make Oakham a better place for residents and tourists. To do this, more car parking spaces are needed, as outlined in the Task and Finish Group's report. There is no mention of new car parks or the removal of yellow lines in the local plan. Furthermore, more houses would put a strain on parking and on health facilities, so new housing should be kept to a minimum.	NO CHANGE
Strategic Objectives	201106109	RC261 , Linda Burrows	The Viability assessment for the SGB Strategic site should be reviewed and costed at the true value of the Brownfield site that it actually is. The viability assessment should also model the impact of the large area potentially available for quarrying in very close juxtaposition to the housing development area on potential developer's returns. SO2: Reg 19 Plan totally different to Reg 18 Plan and local residents unable to challenge inclusion of SGB in Reg 19 Plan. SGB in inaccessible location, not located where housing need, does not support vitality of other centres, and places too strong emphasis on PDL. Revert to Draft Local Plan for full Reg 18 consultation.	NO CHANGE to strategic objectives
Strategic Objectives	2011061091	RC261 , Linda Burrows	The Plan was not "shaped by early, proportionate and effective engagement between plan makers and communities" as required by the NPPF. Since 2018, there has been a very significant opposition to the proposed allocation of SGB. Therefore, the Council has chosen to promote a new settlement without the support of their local communities. This is contrary to national policy as set out in NPPF para 72. The current strategy identifies strategic development which is: i) Not in an accessible suitable location; ii) Not located where the identified need is; iii) Is of insufficient scale to be considered reasonably self-contained; iv) Does not support the vitality of existing centres and v) Places too strong an emphasis of the merits of the re-use of previously developed land.	NO CHANGE

Strategic Objectives	2011061093	RC261 , Linda Burrows	Strategic Objective 1: Sustainable locations for development / Policy H3 – St Georges Garden Community development requirements The Traffic studies for SGB overestimate the current actual use of sustainable transport. They are based on the 2011 Census and a traffic survey from October 2018. Further traffic evidence and assessment is required and this input into viability report before the site should be allocated. Strategic Objective 10: Sustainable transport and infrastructure / Policy SC2 - Securing sustainable transport as above, + the allowance of £4 million as a public transport subsidy has no indication of the level of service that would be aimed for, no time period where the subsidy would be in place, and no indication as to the numbers of housing units that would need to be in place before the subsidy was implemented to enable public transport.	NO CHANGE
Strategic Objectives	201106158	RC226, Guy Longley, Pegasus group on behalf of Davidsons Developments Limited.	Support Strategic Objective 3 in relation to Oakham. Allocated site (H1.2) will contribute towards meeting this objective	SUPPORT WELCOMED
Strategic Objectives	201106169	RC335 , Guy Longley , Pegasus group on behalf of Vistry	We are concerned that the allocation of St Georges Barracks potentially undermines the ability of the Council to deliver its strategic objective to support the role of the larger villages over the plan period. We make separate representations on the spatial strategy and proposed housing allocations. As framed, the plan is unsound as it does not provide sufficient development opportunities in the larger sustainable villages like Ketton.	NO CHANGE to strategic objectives
Strategic Objectives	201106185	RC322 , Sue Churchill	The Plan was not “shaped by early, proportionate and effective engagement between plan makers and communities” as required by the NPPF. Since 2018, there has been a very significant opposition to the proposed allocation of SGB. Therefore, the Council has chosen to promote a new settlement without the support of their local communities. This is contrary to national policy as set out in NPPF para 72. The current strategy identifies strategic development which is: i) Not in an accessible suitable location; ii) Not located where the identified need is; iii) Is of insufficient scale to be considered reasonably self-contained; iv) Does not support the vitality of existing centres and v) Places too strong an emphasis of the merits of the re-use of previously developed land.	NO CHANGE

Strategic Objectives	201106187	RC322 , Sue Churchill	Strategic Objective 1: Sustainable locations for development / Policy H3 – St Georges Garden Community development requirements The Traffic studies for SGB overestimate the current actual use of sustainable transport. They are based on the 2011 Census and a traffic survey from October 2018. Further traffic evidence and assessment is required and this input into viability report before the site should be allocated. Strategic Objective 10: Sustainable transport and infrastructure / Policy SC2 - Securing sustainable transport as above, + the allowance of £4 million as a public transport subsidy has no indication of the level of service that would be aimed for, no time period where the subsidy would be in place, and no indication as to the numbers of housing units that would need to be in place before the subsidy was implemented to enable public transport.	NO CHANGE
Strategic Objectives	201106188	RC322 , Sue Churchill	The Viability assessment for the SGB Strategic site should be reviewed and costed at the true value of the Brownfield site that it actually is. The viability assessment should also model the impact of the large area potentially available for quarrying in very close juxtaposition to the housing development area on potential developers returns	NO CHANGE to strategic objectives
Strategic Objectives	201106224	RC162, Adam Murray, Andrew Granger & Co. Ltd. On behalf of Mr PJSR Hill and Pikerace Limited	Strategic Objective 2: Deliver a new garden community It is considered that the allocation of SGB should not be identified as a strategic objective, because it is not an objective but rather a response to Objective 1. The promotion of the allocation to an objective confuses the Sustainability Appraisal in that to some extent it places other reasonable alternatives at an immediate disadvantage because only SGB can be assessed positively against this objective. SGB is not actually capable of fulfilling the objectives set out. This is because it will not be appropriately supported by any identified community infrastructure and services and will not be able to meet garden community principles and is not the correct location and cannot deliver the required attributes of such a garden community.	NO CHANGE
Strategic Objectives	2011062241	RC162, Adam Murray, Andrew Granger & Co. Ltd. On behalf of Mr PJSR Hill and Pikerace Limited	OBJECT to Strategic Objective 5 which needs to take account of past completion rates and the effects this has had on affordability in Rutland, and the Council's own evidence on housing needs in Rutland. The housing target of 130 dpa will not adequately 'meet the needs of the whole community' as this level of delivery will not meet the levels of need identified in the Council's own evidence, and will worsen affordability pressures which are already significant in the County. Rewording suggested to 'The Plan will deliver 232 homes a year...'	NO CHANGE to strategic objectives

Strategic Objectives	201106234	RC279 , Malcom Touchin , CPRE Rutland	Strategic Objectives are not wholly consistent with achieving the “Vision of Rutland in 2036”, that the Strategic Objectives are in some cases incompatible with each other, and that the policies in the plan do not achieve and/or conflict with some of the Strategic Objectives. In these circumstances, it is questionable whether the legal requirement to identify the strategic priorities and to include policies to address those priorities could be concluded to be rationally satisfied by the RLP. For example: SO1: incompatible with SGB (SO2) due to uncertainty over viability, transport and minerals issues. SO2: incompatible with majority of objectives due to uncertainty over viability and not sustainable. SO3: incompatible with SO2; impact of SGB on viability of existing towns not assessed. SO4: incompatible with SO2 as impact of SGB on villages not assessed. SO5: incompatible with SO2 as affordable housing concentrated only on 2 sites. SO6: unclear how this can be achieved without sufficient infrastructure funding in settlements. SO8: incompatible with SO2 as impact of SGB on existing settlements not assessed. SO9: not achievable due to restrictive Policy E5. SO1, SO11 and SO12: incompatible with SO2 due to reasons set out for SO1, SO3 and SO4. Fundamental review of overall plan strategy required undertaken with SA/SEA.	NO CHANGE
Strategic Objectives	11709634	RC250 , Helen Wood	Size and location of SGB totally inappropriate for Rutland. A total lack of empathy and community with the people that matter i.e. Rutlanders. Lack of consideration and justification through the whole process. RCC are being blinkered by MOD. A better site is available within Rutland and using the site for a "normal" number of houses i.e. a village size of up to 350 would be far more suitable for Rutland. There has been very little thought given to infrastructure and transport needs within the Evolving Masterplan other than a few new entrances to the SGB site. No plans are in place to protect Edith Weston and the roads are not adequate for today's traffic let alone traffic created by 2215 houses and new business park. The proposed park and cycle for Rutland Water will cause further congestion on our narrow country roads. There are no direct bus routes to Oakham and future plans are very vague to say the least. A more in-depth study and traffic monitoring is required before any mass development is proposed.	NO CHANGE to strategic objectives

Strategic Objectives, H2	11697407	RC112 , Christopher Sworn, Preston Village Meeting	Not consulted on Reg 19 Plan. NPPF requires 'the Local Plan to be shaped by early, proportionate and effective engagement between the Plan makers and communities'. RCC did consult residents about the inclusion of the ST George's Barracks scheme in the Local Plan. It is widely known that most of the responses were negative, and yet RCC has persisted in including the scheme in the Pre-submission Local Plan. SGB would be out of character and scale when compared with existing settlements. Delete SGB and focus development on Oakham/Uppingham and 10 larger villages.	NO CHANGE to strategic objectives
Strategic Objectives, H2	11699799	RC112 , Christopher Sworn, Preston Village Meeting	New garden community at SGB not sympathetic to character of villages such as Preston due to size. SGB not required to meet projected population growth. New development instead to be concentrated in Oakham and Uppingham. SGB not required to meet RCC's housing needs and should be deleted, instead focusing on SO3 and SO4.	NO CHANGE
Strategic Objectives, H2	11700419	RC112 , Christopher Sworn, Preston Village Meeting	Development of SGB contrary to rural character of Rutland. Site should be returned to agriculture or woodland.	NO CHANGE
Strategic Objectives, H2, H3	11697361	RC118 , Helen Jacobsen	My concern is that the infrastructure and services of the proposed new town on the St George's Barracks site are not being created. The LP wants 'locally accessible work spaces within a well-designed, healthy and sociable community, appropriately supported by community infrastructure and services'. These are not being provided, at least not until after 2036. Number of dwellings at SGB should be significantly reduced.	NO CHANGE
Strategic Objectives, SC2	11700019	RC112 , Christopher Sworn, Preston Village Meeting	Rep relates primarily to SD2, H2/H3. SGB will add to traffic and will be car dependent at least in early stages for services and facilities. Constructing more houses in Oakham and Uppingham would not necessarily have same result. Problems of providing public transport in a rural county. SGB should be removed from the plan.	NO CHANGE
Vision and Objectives	11548430	RC2 , Helen Duckering, Langham Parish Council	In RLP 2017 there are 19 paragraphs detailing how the Vision for Rutland is formed. In this document there are only 6. It looks like those paragraphs in RLP 2017 that were laid out after the box containing the Vision have been dropped.	NO CHANGE
Vision and Objectives	20110212	RC124 , Michael Nyss	Local Plans should be developed by consultation between RCC and local communities. Little if any consultation with Empingham PC or other Parish Councils. From 2015-2019 vision statements changed and 1500 objections in 2018 ignored.	NO CHANGE
Vision and Objectives	11701544	RC131 , J Corby	Sustainability appraisal prepared after Reg 18 consultation contrary to NPPF and vision statements have been prepared without public consultation over inclusion of SGB.	NO CHANGE - SA process and conclusions are robust

Vision and Objectives	11702336	RC140 , Tim Smith, North Luffenham Parish Council	Paras 3.1 - 3.6: lack of community support for SGB and housing need exaggerated to justify SGB. Alternatives not given full consideration.	NO CHANGE
Vision and Objectives	20110698	RC247 , John Clarkson , LRWT	Para 3.1: does not emphasise importance of natural environment in enhancing quality of life for residents. Suggest adding 'an attractive landscape rich with healthy populations and distributions of characteristic species and habitats.'	NO CHANGE covered in Strategic Objective 3
Vision and Objectives	11702918	RC148 , Laurence Howard	Para 3.1: proper consultation not taken place at Reg 18 stage. Lack of local support for SGB means Plan not legally compliant.	NO CHANGE
Vision and Objectives	11703794	RC159 , Timothy Smith	Para 3.6: vision not developed by Council together with partners and stakeholders as lack of local support for scale of SGB. Alternatives, including a reduction in number of houses at SGB, not considered.	NO CHANGE
Vision and Objectives	20110431	RC210 , Emilie Carr, Historic England	Disappointing that heritage not referenced in 5th bullet point in the Vision of Rutland in 2036. Greater reference made to national importance of highly graded assets at SGB in SO2. SO13-15 welcomed but reference to heritage assets and their setting should be included.	CONSIDER CHANGE to vision
Vision and Objectives	11703901	RC228 , Hilary Smith	Para 3.6: Plan unsound as lack of local support for SGB. Alternatives, such as a reduction in number of houses to 350-500, planting woodland in place of quarrying, not considered and important due to proximity to Rutland Water.	NO CHANGE
Vision and Objectives	20110450	RC181 , Rowan Scholtz, Empingham Parish Council on behalf of 161 residents	Inclusion of SGB in 2018 consultation should have been in a new Local Plan including a new SA. Lack of consultation on Vision for the County. Reg 19 Plan should be withdrawn and local communities consulted on whether growth should take place in a Garden Village or continue to be centred around towns and villages.	NO CHANGE
Vision and Objectives	20110470	RC195 , David Duffin	Chapter 3 unsound as inconsistent with national policy. Vision for Rutland not developed by the Council together with partners and stakeholders. Variety of vision statements and Empingham PC not consulted on latest version. Lack of local support for SGB; conflicts with climate change as car dependent and reasonable alternatives not considered.	NO CHANGE
Vision and Objectives	11608851	RC259 , Vivien Piggott	SO2: SGB will be car dependent due to lack of services/employment; will not be distinct from Edith Weston, and; will diminish Uppingham and Oakham. SGB should be reduced to a modest sized scheme.	NO CHANGE
Vision and Objectives	11706440	RC276 , Peter White	Para 3.1: strongly support comments of Empingham Parish Council (RC181 / 20110450).	NO CHANGE
Vision and Objectives	11692812	RC327 , Edward Jarron	Para 3.7: SGB based on needs of MOD rather meeting needs of Rutland. Suggest a phased approach to address inevitable disruption from such a large project. Reduce build rate to 50 dpa with a maximum of 500 houses on the site to allow infrastructure, employment, environmental and social concerns to be managed.	NO CHANGE

Vision and Objectives	20110524	RC284 , Neil Johannessen	SO2: Plan unsound as SGB not justified and reliance on Quarry Farm housing being gifted to SKDC not sound.	NO CHANGE
Vision and Objectives	11706753	RC302 , Robert Grafton	Shift in spatial strategy from 2017 Plan to include SGB should have included SA. Lack of community support for SGB contrary to NPPF and so Plan unsound. Vision not developed by the Council together with partners and stakeholders. Plan should be withdrawn to allow proper consultation with residents.	NO CHANGE
Vision and Objectives	20110538	RC323 , Sue Millar	Plan unsound as Vision not developed by the Council together with partners and stakeholders. No Parish Council can recall being consulted on latest version of Vision. Objections to SGB ignored.	NO CHANGE
Vision and Objectives	11707260	RC233 , Jonathan Griffin	Para 3.6: lack of consultation over Vision for Rutland. Reg 19 Plan finished before Corporate Plan was published. Lack of community support for SGB. Reg 18 Plan should be started again with relevant SA.	NO CHANGE
Vision and Objectives	11707261	RC257 , Lelia O'Connell	Para 3.6: lack of consultation over Vision for Rutland. Reg 19 Plan finished before Corporate Plan was published. Lack of community support for SGB. Reg 18 Plan should be started again with relevant SA.	NO CHANGE
Vision and Objectives	20110605	RC287 , Paul Belton , CARTER JONAS on behalf of Pigeon Capital Management Ltd.	Support objectives of vision: delivery of sufficient new homes, new housing within town and village communities, prudent use of resources, and active/healthy life for everyone. 2nd bullet point in vision (balanced age profile with residents living in vibrant, thriving towns and villages including new garden community) worded as though only applies to new garden community. Vision should include objective that new communities have option of travelling on foot, by bicycle or by bus. Suggested rewording of bullet 2.	CONSIDER CHANGE
Vision and Objectives	11709150	RC240 , James White	Para 3.1: strongly support comments made by Empingham Parish Council.	NO CHANGE
Vision and Objectives	20110663	RC246 , Victor Pheasant , Chairman Empingham Parish Council	Vision in Reg 19 Plan never subject of consultation with community. Local Plan driven by needs of MOD. Remove reference to SGB.	NO CHANGE
Vision and Objectives	20110668	RC205 , Ed Rehill, Savills on behalf of The Society of Merchant Venturers	3.2. The SMV consider that reference should be made in this paragraph that Oakham is the most sustainable settlement within the County. A vision of Rutland in 2036 3.3. The SMV consider that the 'Vision' on page 23 of the Pre-Submission Local Plan Review should include specific reference to Oakham being the most sustainable settlement within the County and the need to encourage significant growth to help maintain and enhance its status as the principal town within the County	NO CHANGE

Vision and Objectives	201106190	RC329 , Tim Collins	Vision unsound as lack of early and effective public engagement and local support for SGB contrary to NPPF. Alternatives for SGB not given adequate consideration.	NO CHANGE
Vision of Rutland 2036	11709189	RC245 , Judy Cade	Vision: no need for amount of housing at SGB and should revert to plan that concentrates new building at Uppingham and Oakham.	NO CHANGE
Vision of Rutland 2036	11709358	RC249 , Christopher French, Welland Rivers Trust	Vision for Rutland should include reference to conservation and restoration of the natural environment as set out in SO13. Add to vision: 'A place where we have responded to the challenge of biodiversity loss by creating, restoring and connecting priority habitats, mandating high levels of net gain through the planning process and reconnected Rutlanders with their local natural environment through the creation and improvement of new biodiverse publicly accessed green space.'	NO CHANGE
SD1	11613770	RC37 , Michael Burton, East Northamptonshire Council	Matters such as access to services and facilities and the functional relationships between villages to the south of the County (Welland Valley) and those within East Northamptonshire should be recognised. This should be reflected in the evidence base for the settlement hierarchy at Policy SD2.	NO CHANGE
SD1	20092902	RC43 , Chris Bramley, Severn Trent	Support the general principles behind policy SD1 in particular the need to incorporate water efficiency and of the need to protect existing assets from new development	SUPPORT NOTED
SD1	11657565	RC72 , Nigel Cooper	SD1 should be amended (and EN1 modified) to introduces a general presumption against development in the countryside so as to safeguard and enhance the intrinsic character and beauty of the Rutland countryside and landscape	NO CHANGE - this would be contrary to NPPF
SD1	20103001	RC106 , Nick Grace, Grace Machin on behalf of Tony Wray	Does NOT sufficiently support local small housebuilders and will severely restrict the opportunities for small local house builders and developers who will not be able to participate in the large housing schemes identified by the residential allocations.	NO CHANGE
SD1	11696636	RC111 , Andrew Robinson	The new town at St George's Barracks is unlikely to be sustainable. Many residents will be commuters to jobs elsewhere. The provision of public transport is unlikely to be adequate, particularly in the early stages when house numbers are low. There is no planned secondary school, so children will have to travel and it will be a car-dependent housing estate in the countryside.	NO CHANGE
SD1	20110201	RC122 , Josh Plant, Gladman Developments	Policy should include reference to a decision-making process that accords with the Framework's presumption in favour of sustainable development, within this Policy	NO CHANGE

SD1	11702448	RC140 , Tim Smith, North Luffenham Parish Council	<p>Policy SD1 sets out the local plan issues which NEED to be considered when determining whether development is sustainable:</p> <p>Many factors within SD1 will not “Translate” into a sound outcome in relation to SGB, they are not deliverable and with current economic uncertainty surrounding viability of SGB cannot be just assumed.</p>	NO CHANGE
SD1	11702724	RC144 , Charles Cade	Rutland does not need this number of houses, any new building should be in and around the county towns	NO CHANGE
SD1	11703769	RC153 , Michael Anker	<p>Policy SD1 sets out the local plan issues which NEED to be considered when determining whether development is sustainable:</p> <p>Many factors within SD1 will not “Translate” into a sound outcome in relation to SGB, they are not deliverable and with current economic uncertainty surrounding viability of SGB cannot be just assumed.</p>	NO CHANGE
SD1	20110432	RC210 , Emilie Carr, Historic England	Policy SD1 – criteria I) is welcomed	SUPPORT WELCOMED
SD1	11673527	RC318 , Stewart Patience, Anglian Water Services Ltd	Wording of Criterion i) regarding waste water treatment capacity should be revised to reflect the developers correct responsibility	CONSIDER CHANGE TO include suggested wording to policy SD1 criterion i)
SD1	11600939	RC316 , Sharon Ashworth	The policy states that the intention is to “locate a development where it minimises the need to travel”. The words “wherever possible “are used. This is entirely unsatisfactory when considering the needs of human beings. The proposed settlement does not meet sustainability principles as there is no clear evidence about serving the community in terms of education and employment. How we will live with the impact of the COVID - 19 Pandemic presents massive challenges at every level. The humanitarian and prudent decision would be to pause and reflect on what is needed for the future of Rutland.	NO CHANGE
SD1	11684255	RC263 , Nicola Farr, Environment Agency	We support this policy, in particular points (h), (j), (k), (l), (p). Amend point (i) to align with policy EN5, requiring development proposals to 'demonstrate' rather than 'ensure' that adequate waste water treatment is already available or can be provided in time to serve new development ahead of its occupation. However, developers do have a responsibility to contribute towards ensuring this through liaison with the relevant sewerage company.	CONSIDER CHANGE TO include suggested wording to policy SD1 criterion i)

SD1	11702218	RC333 , Toni Wilkin	National Guidelines for Spatial Development state that policy should provide sustainable development across the county rather than at one site. Housing and employment are needed across the county in particular in regard to affordable housing. The point of affordable housing is so these residents need to be close to schools and jobs to negate the need for costly transport	NO CHANGE
SD1	11686576	RC206 , David Wilkin	The development of SGB in the local plan is required by national policy to be sustainable. There is no intention to provide a secondary school and medical provision is uncertain i.e. it is a bolt-on housing estate and not a genuine sustainable village. The strategy and has nothing to do with a proper unbiased vision for the needs of the county. Furthermore it would be to the detriment of the county's two main centres, Oakham and Uppingham who both would benefit by their sensible extra housing provision which would reduce the extra use of private cars for SGB residents need to travel for work, schooling and shopping.	NO CHANGE
SD1	201106123	RC166, Steve Lewis-Roberts, PEGASUS GROUP on behalf of Rosconn Strategic land.	Clause c) of Policy SD1 should be amended to make it clear that the Council is not pursuing a 'brownfield first' strategy and the supporting text should make reference to the need for the plan to provide for a mix of brownfield and greenfield sites in towns and sustainable villages to meet the housing requirement.	CONSIDER CHANGE TO SD1 c)
SD1	11709315	RC248 , Rosemary Harris	A Draft Local Plan which included the St. George's redevelopment has not been available for consultation. National Planning policy will soon be changing so policies contained in this Plan will most likely be superseded.	NO CHANGE
SD1	201106159	RC226, Guy Longley, Pegasus group on behalf of Davidsons Developments Limited.	Proposed clause c) of Policy SD1 implies that the Council will adopt a sequential approach to development on previously developed land. This is not consistent with the NPPF which, whilst encourage the best use of opportunities on previously developed land, does not set out a 'brownfield first' approach to development.	CONSIDER CHANGE TO include suggested wording to policy SD1 criterion c)
SD1	201106170	RC335 , Guy Longley , Pegasus group on behalf of Vistry	Proposed clause c) of Policy SD1 implies that the Council will adopt a sequential approach to development on previously developed land. This is not consistent with the NPPF which, whilst encourage the best use of opportunities on previously developed land, does not set out a 'brownfield first' approach to development.	CONSIDER CHANGE TO include suggested wording to policy SD1 criterion c)

SD1	201106197	RC180, Billy Lloyd, DLP Planning Ltd. On behalf of Hereward Homes	Policy SD1 c) is in conflict with policies SD2 and SD3 which seek to restrict development in low order settlements i.e. local service centre classification and below, to development within 'planned limits'. We consider that the use of brownfield land should be prioritised where it is appropriate to do so and where it can meet significant elements of the need for development. It follows that SD1 c) is therefore not justified, nor will it be effective or consistent with national planning policy which seeks to encourage the redevelopment of previously developed land adjoining settlements.	NO CHANGE IN RESPONSE TO THIS REPRESENTATION But note proposed change to policy SD1 criterion c) to remove the sequential approach for brownfield sites - using the proposed wording of other representations has been supported
SD1	11663100	RC61 , Lance Wiggins, Landmark Planning	Policy SD1 has not been positively prepared, in particularly criteria c) which implies a brownfield first approach inconsistent with para 117 of NPPF and criteria e) which requires all development (even that of just 1 house) to provide mix of type and tenure. These criteria risks harming the effective achievement of sustainable development and it is inconsistent with guidance set out in paragraph 117 of the Framework.	NO CHANGE
SD1	20110607	RC287 , Paul Belton , CARTER JONAS on behalf of Pigeon Capital Management Ltd.	Support for policy SD1. Allocation of land off Burley Road Oakham will respond positively to the requirements of Policy SD1.	SUPPORT WELCOMED
SD1, H2	20110642	RC212 , Paul Boggust, Edith Weston Parish Council	Policy SD2 as it relates to SGB is unsound. SGB is in an unsustainable location due to transport, facilities, over-provision of employment land and climate change; not viable; result in coalescence with Edith Weston; harmful impact on heritage assets, landscape and sustainability of other settlements; not entirely brownfield, and; gypsy/traveller provision not assessed. SGB reduced to 350 dwellings.	NO CHANGE – The site assessment process which included consultation with technical stakeholders has identified that St Georges is a suitable site for a new settlement. Policies H2 and H3 set out development and delivery principles and development requirements to ensure the site is developed in a sustainable way.
SD1, SD6, EN3, EN8	20102922	RC102 , Harold Dermott	Policy SD1 section (h): 'Minimise the impact on climate change and include measures to take account of future changes in the climate' is close to meaningless as a statement and a policy. Policy SD6(e) states: 'incorporate high quality design and construction including the need for energy efficiency, renewable energy and waste management' should be the basis for ALL development in Rutland, not just 'Re-use of redundant military bases and prisons'. This statement should be used in policy SD1 h). EN3 does not meet the 'climate change' strategic objective defined in Strategic Objective 16 – 'increasing use of renewable energy', as claimed at the end of the policy. Text and wording of EN8 sets out a presumption against approval of renewable schemes and no reference to benefits of energy storage or roof top generation	CONSIDER CHANGE to SD1 h)

SD2	11548431	RC2 , Helen Duckering, Langham Parish Council	Does changing the definition of 'Oakham' to 'Oakham and Barleythorpe' build in confusion about numbers?	NO CHANGE
SD2	11552207	RC6 , Steve Thomas	Plan not sound. Due to lack of employment opportunities in Rutland SGB will lead to residents commuting outside county so better option is to locate new settlement next to A1 at ex-RAF Witham, Kendrew Barracks or RAF Wittering, or at Woolfox site. SGB will lead to disruption, noise and pollution from increased local traffic.	NO CHANGE
SD2	20091103	RC24 , Peter Hitchcox	Greetham does not meet criteria as a 'Local Service Centre Village' given that there is no school or surgery, only infrequent public transport links and part-time post office. Future plans should be changed to reflect this if the village remains as it is.	NO CHANGE
SD2	11608295	RC31 , Graham Fergus, First City Limited	Support Policy SD2 as applies presumption in favour of sustainable development required in NPPF and ensuring housing delivery. Welcome role of smaller villages, including Braunston, where small scale development can widen range of properties available and enhancing a sustainable community.	SUPPORT WELCOMED
SD2	20100101	RC49 , Simon Pease, Ancer Spa Ltd on behalf of Lynton Developments Ltd	Uppingham should not be designated as a 'Small Town' in Policy SD2. It is a multi-functional 'Market Town' which performs an important strategic role. Elsewhere in the Plan such as paragraphs 6.39 and 6.55, Uppingham along with Oakham is referred to as a Town Centre. Paragraph 4.9 should be deleted in its entirety as no justification to reduce demand within or on edge of existing settlements as a result of allocation of SGB. Figure 4 should be amended to show Uppingham as a 'Market Town.'	NO CHANGE
SD2	11645315	RC55 , Tess Nelson, Harborough District Council	Supports a spatial strategy that focuses development in towns and larger villages whilst allowing for essential development in smaller villages and limiting development in countryside all of which provide certainty for Harborough residents close to RCC's boundary.	SUPPORT WELCOMED
SD2	20102202	RC75 , John Pearce, on behalf of Muller Property Group	No objection to settlement hierarchy set out in SD2, including Whissendine being a Local service centre but object to over reliance on SGB to deliver approx. half of the housing allocation. Alternative small and medium sized housing sites, such as MPG's additional land at Stapleford Road, Whissendine, should be allocated to provide a buffer in case of any delay to the delivery of new housing at SGB.	NO CHANGE

SD2	11686606	RC82 , Simon Machen, Barmach Ltd on behalf of Mr D Hollis, owner of sites SHELAA/COT/03 and SHELAA/COT/04 (TA22 and TA23) off Rogues Lane, Cottesmore	Plan not sound as over reliance on SGB to meet housing need. As housing need relatively low (160 dpa) new housing growth should be directed towards existing settlements to protect/support services. Local Plan should be paused while consultation on government planning reforms taking place (which may reduce housing need by 20%). Number of houses in Local service centres has been reduced to 187 homes in plan period. Promotion of SHELAA/COT/03 and 04.	NO CHANGE
SD2	11692404	RC95 , Kerry Nimmons, Cottesmore Parish Council	Cottesmore Parish Council: spatial strategy does not achieve aims of sustainable development as SGB removed from where housing and employment needs are derived, and will concentrate affordable housing and new employment development in one location; Cottesmore, as with other LSCs, will be disadvantaged. Uncertainty over employment delivery, lack of secondary school and IDP unclear on health care provision. The Local Plan process should be paused to allow new dialogue between residents/stakeholders and RCC.	NO CHANGE - contradicts support given to Policy SD2 by Cottesmore PC in 20103021.
SD2	11692935	RC95 , Kerry Nimmons, Cottesmore Parish Council	Plan not sound. No mention of Woolfox proposal in Plan although does appear in number of background documents and so difficulty in mounting objection based on legality or soundness. Lack of justification for SGB or alternatives and resulted in Cottesmore facing development of 10,000 residential units, far exceeding Rutland's housing requirement. SGB/Woolfox would leach potential investment from towns and local centres.	NO CHANGE
SD2	20102901	RC100 , William Brand	Plan unsound as Braunston is largest village (c 584 population) within 2 miles of Oakham, has good access to the main town, and should be classified as a Local service centre. Scoring used in settlement hierarchy matrix does not take into proximity of services at Oakham. Total score should be 26 points not 7.	NO CHANGE
SD2	20102912	RC101 , David Lewis	Plan not sound as spatial strategy not consistent with NPPF as development of SGB would not achieve sustainable development. SGB is remote and will increase car dependency, contrary to government's climate change agenda. Site not considered brownfield by residents. Spatial strategy should be revisited so that it meets the economic, environmental and social objectives set out in NPPF. Reduce SGB to 500, increase allocations to local service centres and villages, increase windfall assumption and include Quarry Farm within RCC's housing figures.	NO CHANGE

SD2	20103002	RC106 , Nick Grace, Grace Machin on behalf of Tony Wray	Manton identified as Smaller village in Policy SD2 and should be identified as a Local service centre taking into account its strategic position around the key tourist destination of Rutland Water and location between Oakham and Uppingham. The pub in Manton provides tourist accommodation and licensed for motor homes/caravan parking; public bus services to nearby towns. Its reclassification would allow for small scale growth through allocation of sites/infill developments. Policy SD2 excludes reference to delivery of self-build projects.	NO CHANGE
SD2	20103012	RC95 , Kerry Nimmons, Cottesmore Parish Council	Welcome designation of Cottesmore as a Local Service Centre as it will ensure a sensible spread of development and ensure well-being of businesses and other facilities such as the Primary School.	SUPPORT WELCOMED
SD2	20103103	RC113 , Brian Grady	Plan not sound as spatial strategy not consistent with national policy as fails to meet aims of sustainable development; will lead to significant level of growth in a location well away from housing need and employment opportunities; will concentrate affordable housing in one location, and; away from sustainable means of transport. Strategy should be completely revisited and Local Plan paused.	NO CHANGE
SD2	20110103	RC114 , Andrew Brown	Spatial strategy not consistent with national policy as does not achieve aims of sustainable development and the SGB proposal at heart of spatial strategy is unsound. Local Plan should be paused and spatial strategy revisited to allow better dialogue with residents.	NO CHANGE
SD2	20110202	RC122 , Josh Plant, Gladman Developments	Support the Spatial Strategy set out in Policy SD2.	SUPPORT WELCOMED
SD2	20110305	RC137 , Clifford Bacon, Clipsham Parish	: Plan not sound as SGB promoted with lack of evidence and lack of comparison with Woolfox that could be argued to be more sustainable as a self-contained community. Promotion of SGB has led to Woolfox coming forward and no requirement for number of houses proposed at Woolfox. Large developments in the countryside not appropriate for Rutland and Woolfox not in line with national planning policy.	NO CHANGE

SD2	11702182	RC82 , Simon Machen, Barmach Ltd on behalf of Mr D Hollis, owner of sites SHELAA/COT/03 and SHELAA/COT/04 (TA22 and TA23) off Rogues Lane, Cottesmore	Plan not sound as over reliance on SGB to meet housing need. As housing need relatively low (160 dpa) new housing growth should be directed towards existing settlements to protect/support services. Local Plan should be paused while consultation on government planning reforms taking place (which may reduce housing need by 20%). Number of houses in Local service centres has been reduced to 187 homes in plan period. Promotion of SHELAA/COT/02 as suitable site for allocation.	NO CHANGE
SD2	20110312	RC141 , Andrew Johnson, Morcott Parish Council	Plan not sound as SGB promoted with lack of evidence and lack of comparison with Woolfox that could be argued to be more sustainable as a self-contained community. Promotion of SGB has led to Woolfox coming forward and no requirement for number of houses proposed at Woolfox. Large developments in the countryside not appropriate for Rutland and Woolfox not in line with national planning policy.	NO CHANGE
SD2	11702562	RC112 , Christopher Sworn, Preston Village Meeting	Spatial Strategy not compliant with national policy as reliant on SGB that would not constitute sustainable development. Housing figures for Rutland too high and housing needs could be met without SGB. Houses should be located where services and employment opportunities and 650 houses at Quarry Farm should form part of RCC's housing figures.	NO CHANGE
SD2	11703777	RC153 , Michael Anker	SGB contrary to Policy SD2 will adjoin and overwhelm Edith Weston, and; change the character/historic setting of North Luffenham and EW.	NO CHANGE
SD2	11703782	RC153 , Michael Anker	SKDC have no requirement for Quarry Farm housing allocation and sustainable growth in Oakham and Uppingham should take place instead. Gifting of allocation conflicts with Local Plan as not supporting vitality of Rutland's own service and population centres and no Statement of Common Ground prepared between 2 authorities. Revert to Spatial Strategy in 2017 Local Plan and include Quarry Farm allocation as part of RCC's housing allocation.	NO CHANGE
SD2	11703788	RC153 , Michael Anker	Objectives in Local Plan will not be met as SGB will not be sustainable for many years; much of the site is greenfield land; it will detract from vibrance and vitality of market towns and local villages. Revert to 2017 Local Plan.	NO CHANGE
SD2	11703803	RC153 , Michael Anker	Figure 4: Settlement hierarchy and spatial strategy not factual as location of SGB (shown as small yellow dot) should be shown as larger dot than Uppingham and Edith Weston.	NO CHANGE

SD2	11702489	RC157 , Rosemary Powell	Local Plan designates Whissendine as a Local Service Centre but it is questionable whether this makes it one of the most sustainable places where growth could be directed due to: no assessment of whether capacity for extra school places; narrow main street means issues of parking and pedestrian safety; history of flooding not taken into account. Reassessment of sustainability criteria for Local Service Centres required.	NO CHANGE
SD2	11703799	RC157 , Rosemary Powell	Lack of effective engagement in formulating current Spatial Strategy resulting in SGB that does not have support of local communities, contrary to NPPF. Spatial Strategy not sustainable as SGB is remote, not self-contained and places too much emphasis on re-use of PDL. SGB will have detrimental effect on vitality of 2 market towns and other centres. The plan should adopt a more dispersed Spatial Strategy which includes some development on SGB.	NO CHANGE
SD2	20110423	RC194 , David Maher, Barton Willmore on behalf of de Merke Estates	Support Policy SD2 that directs development towards most sustainable settlements, including the Main Town of Oakham. Heavy reliance on SGB means that land west of B640, Barleythorpe, Oakham (BAE/03) should be allocated.	NO CHANGE
SD2	20110433	RC210 , Emilie Carr, Historic England	Within paragraph on SGB in Policy SD2 reference should be made to Grade II* Thor Missile and other heritage assets and their settings due to their very particular importance and to more closely reflect Strategic Objective `13.	NO CHANGE
SD2	11704789	RC213 , Benjamin Green	Allocation of SGB conceived via a Memorandum of Understanding between RCC and MOD without full Council approval and contrary to RCC Constitution.	NO CHANGE
SD2	11704829	RC214 , Rosaline Green	Lack of evidence that SGB needed or required and would not benefit local residents.	NO CHANGE
SD2	20110506	RC296 , Christopher Renner, Normanton Parish Meeting	Plan not sound. No mention of Woolfox proposal in Plan although does appear in number of background documents and so difficulty in mounting objection based on legality or soundness. Lack of justification for SGB or alternatives and resulted in NE Rutland facing development of 10,000 residential units, far exceeding Rutland's housing requirement. SGB/Woolfox would leach potential investment from towns and local centres.	NO CHANGE
SD2	20110546	RC267 , Mark Harris, Bidwells on Behalf of Taylor Wimpey	Support spatial strategy set out in Policy SD2 that includes Oakham as the main town in Rutland at the top of the settlement hierarchy. Policy does not appear to place an emphasis on SGB referring to it as fulfilling role of a Local Service Centre.	SUPPORT WELCOMED

SD2	11707567	RC255 , Kenneth Bool	Plan not sound. No mention of Woolfox proposal in Plan although does appear in number of background documents and so difficulty in mounting objection based on legality or soundness. Lack of justification for SGB or alternatives and resulted in NE Rutland facing development of 10,000 residential units, far exceeding Rutland's housing requirement. SGB/Woolfox would leach potential investment from towns and local centres.	NO CHANGE
SD2	11707045	RC235 , Andrew Wood	RCC are saying that the Local Plan applies a strategic approach to policy SD2 to generally limiting a development in the countryside to that which has an essential need to be there. A new settlement of 2215 houses is way above Rutland's essential needs, not only does it take away development away from the original Rutland Local Plan, but it will also give Rutland a new Town, comparable in size to Uppingham. Rutland is a county of small quaint individual villages and the St Georges' development should reflect both this and the true needs of Rutland. A small village of say 350 houses would meet both of these essential needs.	NO CHANGE
SD2	20110562	RC188 , Carole Brown, Braunston-in-Rutland Parish Council	Plan not sound. No mention of Woolfox proposal in Plan although does appear in number of background documents and so difficulty in mounting objection based on legality or soundness. Lack of justification for SGB or alternatives and resulted in NE Rutland facing development of 10,000 residential units, far exceeding Rutland's housing requirement. SGB/Woolfox would leach potential investment from towns and local centres.	NO CHANGE
SD2	11707930	RC233 , Jonathan Griffin	Spatial Strategy not consistent with national policy as does not achieve aims of sustainable development and relies on brownfield SGB that is removed from where housing and employment needs of county are derived leading to car dependency and detrimental impacts on vitality of other settlements. Uncertainty over employment delivery, lack of secondary school and IDP unclear on health care provision. The Local Plan process should be paused to allow new dialogue between residents/stakeholders and RCC.	NO CHANGE
SD2	20110608	RC287 , Paul Belton , CARTER JONAS on behalf of Pigeon Capital Management Ltd.	Supports Policy SD2 as using the settlement hierarchy to determine scale of planned development across county is fundamental to promotion of sustainable development. Supports Oakham being identified as a Main Town. Promoting H1.3 - land off Burley Road, Oakham.	SUPPORT WELCOMED

SD2	20110632	RC256 , Kenneth Siddle, Wing Parish Council	Spatial Strategy not sound as not justified, effective and does not achieve sustainable development in accordance with NPPF. Wing should be designated as a Local service centre as supported by residents in consultation over developing Neighbourhood Plan. Move away from Small Service Centre for Wing in draft plan can only be explained by promotion of unsustainable housing allocation to SGB. Independent assessment of SGB TA and Viability Assessment by F4R and supported by Wing PC question transport impact and viability of SGB (dealt with under Policy H2). SGB should be removed from SD2 and growth directed towards towns and local and small service centres as proposed in 2017 Local Plan. 650 houses gifted to SKDC should be part of RCC's allocation.	NO CHANGE
SD2	11707126	RC164 , David Jones, Barleythorpe Parish Council	Grouping together of Oakham and Barleythorpe in Local Plan has been done without consulting PC or residents. High level of development in Barleythorpe without promised community infrastructure (primary school and community centre) and no expansion of health services. H1.5 and E1.2 should be limit for new development and any other development restricted to addressing deficits in community facilities. Grouping of Oakham and Barleythorpe could lead to major development steered into Barleythorpe into Oakham. Barleythorpe should retain its status as a Smaller Service Centre.	NO CHANGE
SD2	11709064	RC204 , Karen Davies	Spatial Strategy not consistent with national policy as does not achieve aims of sustainable development and relies on brownfield SGB that is removed from where housing and employment needs of county are derived leading to car dependency and detrimental to viability of existing settlements. No provision for a secondary school. Reduce SGB to 300 homes and reinstate policy of small sustainable developments in existing towns and villages.	NO CHANGE
SD2	11706346	RC310 , Sally Mullins, Whitwell Parish Meeting	Policy SD2 highlights the spatial strategy for development - Small restraint villages as highlighted in the plan must be protected from development and future development in the countryside, however it is interesting that Normanton which is of great significance to Rutland and Rutland Water is not highlighted in the plan. How will Normanton be affected? The impact of SGB on its heritage and importance within Rutland could be dramatically affected - I would urge the Planning Department to seek the advice of the Conservation officer as to how this area could be protected.	NO CHANGE

SD2	20110651	RC205 , Ed Rehill, Savills on behalf of The Society of Merchant Venturers	Welcomes the identification of Oakham as the only 'Main Town' in Policy SD2 and considers that additional growth must be allocated to the town and the Planned Limits to Development amended to include allocated housing sites. Local Plan should deliver 307 dpa based on Standard Methodology 2. Policy SD2 should recognise that SGB can only be delivered in part during the plan period and over reliance on one site providing 47% total housing supply together with lack of evidence on lead in times, delivery rates, infrastructure requirements and viability for SGB mean that a further housing allocation at Stamford Road, Oakham (OAK/08a) required.	SUPPORT WELCOMED/NO CHANGE
SD2	11709116	RC333 , Toni Wilkin	Spatial Strategy not consistent with national policy as does not achieve aims of sustainable development and relies on SGB that is removed from where housing and employment needs of county are derived. Uncertainty over health care provision. In light of this and pandemic, the Local Plan process should be paused to allow new dialogue between residents/stakeholders and RCC.	NO CHANGE
SD2	11709002	RC192 , Norman Milne, Fight 4 Rutland Ltd	Spatial Strategy not consistent with national policy as does not achieve aims of sustainable development and relies on brownfield SGB that is removed from where housing and employment needs of county are derived leading to car dependency and detrimental impacts on vitality of other settlements. Uncertainty over employment delivery, lack of secondary school and IDP unclear on health care provision. The Local Plan process should be paused to allow new dialogue between residents/stakeholders and RCC.	NO CHANGE
SD2	20110681	RC242 , J C M Ball	Woolfox, as with SGB, would concentrate development in countryside away from traditional settlement centres leading to leaching of potential investment away from larger settlements.	NO CHANGE - Woolfox site has not been allocated
SD2	11709044	RC192 , Norman Milne, Fight 4 Rutland Ltd	Plan not sound. No mention of Woolfox proposal in Plan although does appear in number of background documents and so difficulty in mounting objection based on legality or soundness. Lack of justification for SGB or alternatives and resulted in NE Rutland facing development of 10,000 residential units, far exceeding Rutland's housing requirement. SGB/Woolfox would leach potential investment from towns and local centres.	NO CHANGE - Woolfox site has not been allocated

SD2	20110690	RC332 , Tom Murie, Tixover Parish Meeting	Plan not sound. No mention of Woolfox proposal in Plan although does appear in number of background documents and so difficulty in mounting objection based on legality or soundness. Lack of justification for SGB or alternatives and resulted in NE Rutland facing development of 10,000 residential units, far exceeding Rutland's housing requirement. SGB/Woolfox would leach potential investment from towns and local centres.	NO CHANGE - Woolfox site has not been allocated
SD2	11709165	RC168 , Alex Miller, Miller Motorsport	Reliance on SGB has led to limited growth proposed in Local Service Centres. Lack of evidence or justification for SGB. Development in LSCs should be increased with sites allocated in previous plan re-introduced.	NO CHANGE
SD2	201106103	RC202 , WJ & PJ Cross	Woolfox, as with SGB, would concentrate development in countryside away from traditional settlement centres leading to leaching of potential investment away from larger settlements.	NO CHANGE - Woolfox site has not been allocated
SD2	201106128	RC331 , TJ & EVR Boone	Woolfox, as with SGB, would concentrate development in countryside away from traditional settlement centres leading to leaching of potential investment away from larger settlements.	NO CHANGE - Woolfox site has not been allocated
SD2	201106160	RC226, Guy Longley, Pegasus group on behalf of Davidsons Developments Limited.	Support identification of Oakham as most sustainable settlement in Policy SD2; support for SGB to not form part of settlement hierarchy until appropriate provision of services and facilities, and; approach with Quarry Farm site supported.	SUPPORT WELCOMED
SD2	11709028	RC262 , Liz Parsons	SGB not sustainable as would be car dependent; would increase need to travel; would not support vitality of existing centres. No plans for secondary school and uncertainty over GP surgery.	NO CHANGE - IDP sets out infrastructure needs to support development
SD2	201106171	RC335 , Guy Longley , Pegasus group on behalf of Vistry	Support identification of Ketton as LSC in Policy SD2. Ketton most sustainable of LSCs in SofS update. 'Small scale growth' that is permitted in LSCs should be defined. Promotion of land off Timbersgate Road, Ketton as allocated site. Suggest rewording under LSCs to: Growth appropriate in scale and design to the size and character of the service centre to support....	SUPPORT WELCOMED/NO CHANGE
SD2	11709098	RC262 , Liz Parsons	Plan not sound as lack of evidence for SGB and other alternatives, including Woolfox, not given appropriate consideration.	NO CHANGE
SD2	201106178	RC171 , Andrew Gore, Marrons Planning on behalf of Jeakins Weir Ltd	Lack of evidence for, and significant opposition to, SGB contrary to NPPF. Strategy not sustainable as SGB is in remote location, of insufficient scale to be self-contained, does not support vitality of existing centres and places too much emphasis on re-use of PDL. SGB should be deleted and further growth directed towards Oakham and Uppingham and LSCs.	NO CHANGE
SD2	11708132	RC120 , Will Atkinson	Lack of consideration given to Woolfox or other alternatives to SGB as the best location for a new settlement.	NO CHANGE

SD2	2011061951	RC321 , Sue Green, House Builders Federation	The Council should confirm that distribution of new housing in spatial strategy meets the locational housing needs of the resident population.	NO CHANGE
SD2	201106198	RC180, Billy Lloyd, DLP Planning Ltd. On behalf of Hereward Homes	Hereward Homes (Greetham) Ltd: Policy SD2 does not reflect Strategic Objective 1: 'making as much use as possible of PDL'. Policy fails to set out 'exceptional' locations such as SGB, land on edge of Stamford and former Greetham Quarry. Suggested rewording of Policy SD2 to include 'the opportunity to maximise the use of PDL' and extra para: 'Land at Greetham Quarry will be allocated to meet an unaddressed need...'	NO CHANGE
SD2	201106225	RC162, Adam Murray, Andrew Granger & Co. Ltd. On behalf of Mr PJSR Hill and Pikerace Limited	Scale of SGB not sound as: not sustainable or viable and delivery rates unlikely to be met, and; no comparative assessment of transport and accessibility issues between SGB and Woolfox.	NO CHANGE - detailed comparative assessment of Woolfox and SGB undertaken to inform decision making.
SD2	201106235	RC279 , Malcom Touchin , CPRE Rutland	Plan not sound as lack of evidence in SA on where is growth most needed/beneficial taking into account community infrastructure needs over the plan period. Questions methodology behind assessment of options in SA, including comparison of Woolfox and SGB in terms of climate change, heritage impacts, transport and nature conservation. Demonstrably reasonable alternative options to deliver housing requirements including SUEs to the main towns and a mixed use scheme at SGB which should be subject of further consultation.	NO CHANGE - SA process and conclusions are robust
SD2	11698640	RC161 , Abigail MacCartney	Plan not deliverable as SGB reliant on HIF grant and Council funding to be viable. SGB should be reduced to 500 homes which can be delivered using existing infrastructure.	NO CHANGE
SD2	11707875	RC120 , Will Atkinson	Over reliance on SGB which is not sustainable where delivery of housing, including affordable housing, could be delayed. Long term viability of LSCs already affected by pandemic and reduction in development/investment will harm their viability. SGB will join up urban area to banks of Rutland Water.	NO CHANGE
SD2	11709723	RC275 , Mike Wyatt	SGB not required for housing and employment now or in the future and will have detrimental impact on character of villages and create traffic and noise. Revert to 2017 Local Plan and consider other uses for SGB.	NO CHANGE
SD2	201106255	RC292 , Paul Browne	A specific area should be allocated adjacent to each town in order to protect and support existing character, reduce urban sprawl and protect settlement's setting.	NOTED - NO CHANGE

SD2	20111812	RC197 , Philip Davies	SGB not sustainable development being remote; would lead to reliance on private car; is unlikely to attract good quality employment, and; lack of secondary school. SGB should be reduced to 300 houses and plan produced that protects and develops existing settlements.	NO CHANGE
SD2	11663157	RC61 , Lance Wiggins, Landmark Planning	Plan not sound as scale of development permitted in Smaller villages under Policy SD2 too restrictive and not in accordance with para 78 NPPF that 'villages should grow and thrive'. Should be revised to include development on land adjoining the PLD s where this would include an element such as a new village shop which would support and enhance sustainable communities.	NO CHANGE
SD2, Figure 4	11709366	RC121 , Leslie Wilson	Support Wing PC's comments. Spatial Strategy not sound as not justified, effective and does not achieve sustainable development in accordance with NPPF. Wing should be designated as a Local service centre as supported by residents in consultation over developing Neighbourhood Plan. Move away from Small Service Centre for Wing in draft plan can only be explained by promotion of unsustainable housing allocation to SGB. Independent assessment of SGB TA and Viability Assessment by F4R and supported by Wing PC question transport impact and viability of SGB (dealt with under Policy H2). SGB should be removed from SD2 and growth directed towards towns and local and small service centres as proposed in 2017 Local Plan. 650 houses gifted to SKDC should be part of RCC's allocation.	NO CHANGE
SD2, H1	20103104	RC113 , Brian Grady	Plan not sound as no justification or evidence for moving from previous plan strategies of new homes being located in main towns and larger villages, and; lack of effective engagement with stakeholders. Plan should be started again so as to ensure all stakeholders are involved in process as required by NPPF. The 600 dwellings at Quarry Farm should be included for Rutland and the remaining requirement can be accommodated comfortably with the allocations identified for Oakham with Barleythorpe, Uppingham and Local Service Centres. St Georges or Woolfox are not required.	NO CHANGE -
SD2, H1	20110104	RC114 , Andrew Brown	Plan not sound as lack of evidence for SGB and spatial strategy changed without engagement or support of local residents. Growth and investment should be spread more evenly across the county and SGB will bring into question viability of towns and larger service centres.	NO CHANGE - Site assessment evidence has identified the St George's site as a suitable site to provide a new garden community. The SA report considers a wide range of alternative approaches for the distribution and scale of development. The viability work has been published on the Council's website and is considered to be sufficient and appropriate to support the allocation of St George's

SD2, H1	20110479	RC197 , Philip Davies	Plan not sound. No mention of Woolfox proposal in Plan although does appear in number of background documents and so difficulty in mounting objection based on legality or soundness. Lack of justification for SGB or alternatives and resulted in NE Rutland facing development of 10,000 residential units, far exceeding Rutland's housing requirement. SGB/Woolfox would leach potential investment from towns and local centres. A 25% buffer is excessive and will result in overdevelopment and exaggerates the housing need in Rutland. The OAN (independent needs assessment) showed that Rutland needs 127 dwellings per annum but RCC have identified 160 dwellings per annum. Windfall numbers in Rutland have been historically around 50 per annum but the Local Plan only includes 20 per annum. The requirement of 1905 dwellings can be realised if windfall numbers are taken at 50 dwellings per annum (totalling 750 dwellings) and the 650 at Stamford North are included for Rutland, then 600 are required for Rutland which can be accommodated in the towns and local service centres.	NO CHANGE Woolfox site is not allocated and therefore not included in the plan
SD2, H1, H2	20111801	RC269 , Martin Seldon , Highways England	As part of spatial strategy, Policy SD2, Neighbourhood Plans might need to undertake a review and align their policies with the new Local Plan once adopted, and HE would welcome future engagement with Parish/Town Councils to understand future growth aspirations and their impact on the SRN. Highways England will be consulted on HIF for SGB. TA for SGB will need to assess impact on A1 (part of SRN). Will engage with RCC on developments which impact on SRN.	NO CHANGE
SD2, H2	11576271	RC16 , Jayne Isaac, Greetham Parish Council	Fully supports the process and presentation of the latest Local Plan for Rutland. A fair and measured approach has been taken on all issues with a thorough consultation of stakeholders and the public at all stages. SGB development was handled in a frank and open way. We feel the centring of services and resources in one larger location not only creates a dynamic development but also prevents the over development of our unique Rutland villages. We also agree that the alternative site for a Garden Village on the A1 site near Stretton was not in any way at a stage that it could be considered. Whilst RCC's application of the criteria for making us be designated a Local Service Centre village followed the guidelines, for future Local Plans we challenge the rationale used in coming up with this formula. We do not have a School, Doctor, full time Post Office or good transport links and feel we are not able to sustain the demands that could be put on a Local Service Centre village.	SUPPORT WELCOMED

SD2, H2	11690560	RC91 , Andrew Gray	SGB not sustainable development. Reduce housing to footprint of the base with no development on green spaces.	NO CHANGE - majority of development will be on area of the site which is currently built on. CONSIDER ADDING indicative plan to show broad land use blocks at St George's to provide clarity
SD2, H2	11697510	RC98 , Janice Patient	Allocation of SGB has led to lack of allocations in Cottesmore which, as a local service centre, would lead to loss of services. SGB should be removed and additional allocations put in towns and larger villages. Spatial strategy has over reliance on SGB to detriment of Cottesmore with its small allocation of new housing. 600+ houses at Stamford should form part of RCC housing allocation.	NO CHANGE
SD2, H2	11700810	RC98 , Janice Patient	Not morally right to give away 600+ houses in order to justify new garden community and reduction in number of houses in towns and service centre villages, including allocation of only 8 dwellings in Cottesmore. Remove SGB as housing allocation, retain 600+ houses at Stamford North and locate new housing in existing towns and villages.	NO CHANGE
SD2, H2	20110311	RC141 , Andrew Johnson, Morcott Parish Council	Plan not sound as lack of evidence for SGB and spatial strategy changed without engagement or support of local residents. Growth and investment should be spread more evenly across the county and SGB will bring into question viability of towns and larger service centres. Plan should be started again so as to ensure all stakeholders are involved in process as required by NPPF.	NO CHANGE
SD2, H2	20110689	RC332 , Tom Murie, Tixover Parish Meeting	Reasonable alternatives for location of development not considered in Reg 19 Plan with lack of evidence for allocation of SGB and strategy changed without engaging support of local communities. Focusing new development towards larger settlements across the county would be more sustainable and consistent with national policy. Local Service Centres require a level of growth to sustain their role and spatial strategy would put this at risk. A new Reg 18 Plan should be prepared built around more effective community participation. Lack of local support for SGB; Spatial Strategy places reliance on SGB that is not accessible and doesn't support viability or economy of existing towns and larger villages. Remove SGB from Plan.	NO CHANGE

SD2, H2	201106102	RC202 , WJ & PJ Cross	Reasonable alternatives for location of development not considered in Reg 19 Plan with lack of evidence for allocation of SGB and strategy changed without engaging support of local communities. Focusing new development towards larger settlements across the county would be more sustainable and consistent with national policy. Local Service Centres require a level of growth to sustain their role and spatial strategy would put this at risk. A new Reg 18 Plan should be prepared built around more effective community participation. Lack of evidence for SGB as part of Spatial Strategy. SGB is non-sustainable and non-accessible and will not support viability or economy of existing towns and larger villages.	NO CHANGE
SD2, H2	201106127	RC331 , TJ & EVR Boone	Reasonable alternatives for location of development not considered in Reg 19 Plan with lack of evidence for allocation of SGB and strategy changed without engaging support of local communities. Focusing new development towards larger settlements across the county would be more sustainable and consistent with national policy. Local Service Centres require a level of growth to sustain their role and spatial strategy would put this at risk. A new Reg 18 Plan should be prepared built around more effective community participation. Lack of evidence for SGB as part of Spatial Strategy. SGB is non-sustainable and non-accessible and will not support viability or economy of existing towns and larger villages.	NO CHANGE
SD2, H2, H3	20110310	RC141 , Andrew Johnson, Morcott Parish Council	Spatial Strategy not consistent with national policy as reliant on SGB and this does not achieve aims of sustainable development. This strategy will disadvantage other Local Centres; concentrate affordable housing in one location; lead to greater reliance on private car; lack of employment opportunities; maximising use of brownfield land should not override other policies in the NPPF. Local Plan process should be paused to allow dialogue between council and residents/stakeholders.	NO CHANGE
SD2, H2, H3	20110478	RC197 , Philip Davies	Spatial Strategy not consistent with national policy as does not achieve aims of sustainable development and relies on brownfield SGB that is removed from where housing and employment needs of county are derived leading to car dependency and detrimental impacts on vitality of other settlements. Uncertainty over employment delivery and IDP unclear on health care provision. The Local Plan process should be paused to allow new dialogue between residents/stakeholders and RCC.	NO CHANGE

SD2, H2, H3	20110504	RC296 , Christopher Renner, Normanton Parish Meeting	Spatial Strategy not consistent with national policy as does not achieve aims of sustainable development and relies on brownfield SGB that is removed from where housing and employment needs of county are derived leading to car dependency and detrimental impacts on vitality of other settlements. Uncertainty over employment delivery and IDP unclear on health care provision. The Local Plan process should be paused to allow new dialogue between residents/stakeholders and RCC.	NO CHANGE
SD2, H2, H3	11706941	RC186 , Catherine Davenport	Spatial Strategy not consistent with national policy as does not achieve aims of sustainable development and relies on brownfield SGB that is removed from where housing and employment needs of county are derived leading to car dependency and detrimental impacts on vitality of other settlements. Uncertainty over employment delivery, lack of secondary school and IDP unclear on health care provision. The Local Plan process should be paused to allow new dialogue between residents/stakeholders and RCC.	NO CHANGE
SD2, H2, H3	11707134	RC280 , Nick Davenport	Spatial Strategy not consistent with national policy as does not achieve aims of sustainable development and relies on brownfield SGB that is removed from where housing and employment needs of county are derived leading to car dependency and detrimental impacts on vitality of other settlements. Uncertainty over employment delivery, lack of secondary school and IDP unclear on health care provision. The Local Plan process should be paused to allow new dialogue between residents/stakeholders and RCC.	NO CHANGE
SD2, H2, H3	11707537	RC255 , Kenneth Bool	Spatial Strategy not consistent with national policy as does not achieve aims of sustainable development and relies on brownfield SGB that is removed from where housing and employment needs of county are derived leading to car dependency and detrimental impacts on vitality of other settlements. Uncertainty over employment delivery, lack of secondary school and IDP unclear on health care provision. The Local Plan process should be paused to allow new dialogue between residents/stakeholders and RCC.	NO CHANGE
SD2, H2, H3	20110560	RC188 , Carole Brown, Braunston-in-Rutland Parish Council	Spatial Strategy not consistent with national policy as does not achieve aims of sustainable development and relies on brownfield SGB that is removed from where housing and employment needs of county are derived leading to car dependency and detrimental impacts on vitality of other settlements. Uncertainty over employment delivery and IDP unclear on health care provision. The Local Plan process should be paused to allow new dialogue between residents/stakeholders and RCC.	NO CHANGE

SD2, H2, H3	11707916	RC257 , Lelia O'Connell	Spatial Strategy not consistent with national policy as does not achieve aims of sustainable development and relies on brownfield SGB that is removed from where housing and employment needs of county are derived leading to car dependency and detrimental impacts on vitality of other settlements. Uncertainty over employment delivery, lack of secondary school and IDP unclear on health care provision. The Local Plan process should be paused to allow new dialogue between residents/stakeholders and RCC.	NO CHANGE
SD2, H2, H3	20110679	RC242 , J C M Ball	Spatial Strategy not consistent with national policy as does not achieve aims of sustainable development and relies on brownfield SGB that is removed from where housing and employment needs of county are derived leading to car dependency and detrimental impacts on vitality of other settlements. Uncertainty over employment delivery, lack of secondary school and IDP unclear on health care provision. The Local Plan process should be paused to allow new dialogue between residents/stakeholders and RCC.	NO CHANGE
SD2, H2, H3	20110688	RC332 , Tom Murie, Tixover Parish Meeting	Spatial Strategy not consistent with national policy as does not achieve aims of sustainable development and relies on brownfield SGB that is removed from where housing and employment needs of county are derived leading to car dependency and detrimental impacts on vitality of other settlements. Uncertainty over employment delivery, lack of secondary school and IDP unclear on health care provision. The Local Plan process should be paused to allow new dialogue between residents/stakeholders and RCC.	NO CHANGE
SD2, H2, H3	201106101	RC202 , WJ & PJ Cross	Spatial Strategy not consistent with national policy as does not achieve aims of sustainable development and relies on brownfield SGB that is removed from where housing and employment needs of county are derived leading to car dependency and detrimental impacts on vitality of other settlements. Uncertainty over employment delivery, lack of secondary school and IDP unclear on health care provision. The Local Plan process should be paused to allow new dialogue between residents/stakeholders and RCC.	NO CHANGE
SD2, H2, H3	201106126	RC331 , TJ & EVR Boone	Spatial Strategy not consistent with national policy as does not achieve aims of sustainable development and relies on brownfield SGB that is removed from where housing and employment needs of county are derived leading to car dependency and detrimental impacts on vitality of other settlements. Uncertainty over employment delivery, lack of secondary school and IDP unclear on health care provision. The Local Plan process should be paused to allow new dialogue between residents/stakeholders and RCC.	NO CHANGE

SD2, H2, Inset Maps	20110680	RC242 , J C M Ball	Reasonable alternatives for location of development not considered in Reg 19 Plan with lack of evidence for allocation of SGB and strategy changed without engaging support of local communities. Focusing new development towards larger settlements across the county would be more sustainable and consistent with national policy. Local Service Centres require a level of growth to sustain their role and spatial strategy would put this at risk. A new Reg 18 Plan should be prepared built around more effective community participation. Spatial Strategy places reliance on SGB that is not accessible and doesn't support viability or economy of existing towns and larger villages. Remove SGB from Plan.	NO CHANGE
SD2, Inset Maps	20110468	RC328 , Robert Harrison ,	SGB is unsustainable and there is a lack of support from local communities and Parish Councils contrary to national planning policy. Proper consultation over plan has not been undertaken and no alternative uses for SGB considered. Housing needs should be met where they are required. Revert to 2017 Spatial Strategy.	NO CHANGE
SD2, SD3	20091502	RC25 , Kirstie Clifton, Define Planning for William David Homes	Policy SD2 appropriately proposes the scale of development should reflect the settlement hierarchy and acknowledges need for small scale growth of Local Service Centres to support their service role. This approach not supported through restrictions under Policy SD3 or H1 given lack of allocations in these sustainable settlements and within Cottesmore specifically. Land north of Mill Lane (SHMA Site COT/13) is suitable, available, achievable and hence deliverable in NPPF terms and should be allocated under Policy H1.	NO CHANGE – Policy SD3 allows for development within the planned limits of development of appropriate scale and design. For larger scale sites such as SHELA/COT/13 this would have to be set out as an allocation in order to amend the PLD around it, and it has not been selected. The site assessment process was a robust assessment which allocated sufficient sites to meet the requirement set out.
SD3	11548432	RC2 , Helen Duckering, Langham Parish Council	Why has the specificity and detail of RLP5 been dropped?	NO CHANGE – Detail is provided in the justification text for Policy SD3
SD3	11556190	RC8 , Elizabeth Field	On page 34, chapter 4, within Policy SD3 section d) states that the neighbouring occupants will be safeguarded through adequate separation and design of the development and e) that adequate safe and convenient access will be provided and that no unacceptable disturbance will arise from vehicular movements emerging from the site. This cannot be achieved for H1.7 Main Street Cottesmore Details comments relating to site H1.7 responded to under Policy H1.	NO CHANGE – Policy SD3 does set out detailed criteria in relation to design, visual amenity, existing pattern of development, amenity and highway safety. All sites have been assessed fully through the site assessment process, involving technical consultees. Neighbours and technical consultees will also be consulted through the development management process.
SD3	11608513	RC31 , Graham Fergus, First City Limited	We support the Planned limits of development confirmed on Inset Plan 9 for Braunston in Rutland.	SUPPORT WELCOMED

SD3	20103003	RC106 , Nick Grace, Grace Machin on behalf of Tony Wray	It is considered that the Planned Limits of Development (PLD) completely ignores new development in Manton over the last five years. New build development, stables, ménage, gymnasium, and sport grounds have all been developed. New caravan and camping sites have been approved and formal garden areas all exceed the currently identified PLD. It is therefore both appropriate and justified at this time that careful consideration be given to amending the Manton PLD as it is not justified. The PLD has excluded land to the North of St Marys Rd and the Horse and Jockey Public House. Amending the PLD boundary would allow a development of 1 to 4 houses to come forward which would be consistent with Policy SD3.	NO CHANGE - PLD policy has worked effectively through last Local Plan for delivering housing in sustainable locations and to restricting development to appropriate scale in smaller villages. Policy H10 allows for Rural exceptions for local need and entry level homes - the policy also allows for affordable housing to be cross subsidised by market housing. The site could also be progressed through the Neighbourhood Planning process, if the opportunity arises in the future.
SD3	20110203	RC122 , Josh Plant, Gladman Developments	The Framework is clear that sustainable development should proceed without delay in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, the use of settlement limits is likely to arbitrarily restrict such development from coming forward; this does not accord with the positive approach to growth required. Furthermore, the policy maps, as currently drafted, make it difficult to ascertain which settlements are subject to 'Planned limits to development'. Therefore, if the Council were to continue with Policy SD3 it may be prudent to provide further clarity within the Policy text and maps.	NO CHANGE – Policy SD3 refers to the settlement hierarchy in SD2 as to which settlements SD3 applies to. This can then be cross referenced with the inset maps.
SD3	20110609	RC287 , Paul Belton , CARTER JONAS on behalf of Pigeon Capital Management Ltd.	Pigeon has no in-principle objection to Policy SD3 and the associated adoption of planned limits of development. Having decided to define the limits for development it is to be expected that Policy SD3 seeks to limit growth beyond the defined areas. Comments relate to Site H1.3 and are responded to under Policy H1.	NO CHANGE – No change to Policy SD3. Response to H1.3 set out under Policy H1.
SD3	201106199	RC180, Billy Lloyd, DLP Planning Ltd. On behalf of Hereward Homes	We do not fundamentally object to Policy SD3 so far as it provides a series of 5 criteria by which development proposals will be considered. However Policy SD3 as drafted, is inconsistent with the hierarchy and proposals expressed in Policy SD2. With regard to the hierarchy we question why the proposed St Georges Garden Community is not subject to the definition of a planned limit to its development but appears to have a different sort of area definition? Similarly, no planned limit of development appears to be applied on Inset 48 to define the limits of the proposed allocation of land to the north of Stamford at Quarry Farm. Moreover the broad identification and intended reliance upon planned limits of development renders the application of Policy SD3 in conflict with Policies SD1 and SD2. Specifically, Policy SD1 c) states that new development should make the most productive use of previously developed land within or on the edge of (our emphasis) settlements. Clearly if it is not within a settlement it must be external to it. Site at Greetham Quarry (SHELAA/GRE/01) is responded to under Policy H1.	NO CHANGE – The scale and extent of Greetham Quarry does not meet criteria for inclusion within the PLD of Greetham. St George's and Quarry Farm are not existing settlements with Planned Limits of Development at the present time. Once these sites are developed and the extent of the built form has been determined a Planned Limit of Development can be drawn up and utilised.

SD3	201106247	RC193 , Charlotte Bailey, DLP Planning Limited on behalf of Larkfleet	St Georges Garden Community is not subject to the definition of a planned limit to its development but appears to have a different sort of area definition. Similarly, no planned limit of development appears to be applied on Inset 48 to define the limits of the proposed allocation of land north of Stamford at Quarry Farm. Moreover, no limit can be applied to Uppingham where the proposal is that the required housing allocations are determined in a review of the current Neighbourhood Plan. We would invite the definition of a Planned Limit to Development for Uppingham to include the land necessary to enable sufficient housing to be built – specifically to include land at Ayston Road; or in the alternative the Policy should be amended to make clear that the future Planned Limit to development for Uppingham will be determined by way of the Neighbourhood Plan Review.Land west of Ayston Road, Uppingham (SHELAA/UPP/05) is responded to under Policy H1.	NO CHANGE – The extent of the Ayston Road site should not be included within the PLD of Uppingham. This site should be assessed through the site assessment process for allocation by the UNP review due to its scale. St George’s and Quarry Farm are not existing settlements with Planned Limits of Development at the present time. Once these sites are developed further in terms of where the extent of the built form will be located and where open space and green infrastructure will be, then a Planned Limit of Development can be drawn up and utilised.
SD3, H1, Inset 15	11692726	RC95 , Kerry Nimmons, Cottesmore Parish Council	What is the reasoning and justification for what is a proposed and significant change (certainly by standards of a village in Rutland) to the Planned Limits of Development (PLD) boundary in relation to Harrier Close, Cottesmore? Three times recently RCC has refused different residential planning applications and an Inspector at appeal in 2016 clearly stated that this is not a sustainable location for development.All the other significant changes to the PLD in the Plan are either to consolidate a development already built or granted planning permission or to be consistent with a proposed new housing allocation, as for example at Policy H1.7, land off Main Street in Cottesmore. The Plan is not sound on this point – it is seeking to disguise what is effectively a number of new housing sites. Furthermore, unlike in the 2017 Plan, there are now development principles included for each of the new allocated sites. This has not happened at Harrier Close. It is also, of course, contrary to the Cottesmore Neighbourhood Plan and no attempt has been made either in 2017 or now to reconcile this difference, in discussion with the Parish Council, during consideration of the consultation responses.	NO CHANGE The inclusion of Harrier Close brings this development in line with other small developed areas across the County which have PLD drawn around them.See also response to para 10.7-10.9
SD4	11548433	RC2 , Helen Duckering, Langham Parish Council	Does not the change of wording of this Policy, to ‘building in the countryside will be encouraged if..... ‘from RLP 6 ‘building in the countryside will not be allowed unless.....’ suggest that building in the countryside is acceptable, whereas previously it was clear that it was NOT acceptable.	NO CHANGE – The wording of SD4 states ‘New housing development will be supported in the countryside where it provides’. It goes onto identify the different cases in which it may be supported subject to requirements.

SD4	11663233	RC61 , Lance Wiggins, Landmark Planning	Policy SD4 relates to residential in the countryside, that is to say any development which would be located outside of the PLD of settlements in addition those settlements that do not have identified PLD. The exceptions to the restraint policy which would operate In countryside locations include affordable housing, the re-use of rural buildings and residential extensions. It is considered that in order to assist villages 'grow and thrive' as identified as an aim in paragraph 78 of the Framework, small scale residential schemes which adjoin the PLD of a settlement and which include facilities which will support or enhance the range of local services should be included in the list of exceptions in policy SD4. This would be consistent with representations that have been made relating to a site in Exton where a scheme for six dwellings including a flat over a new village shop is being prepared. This scheme is considered to adhere to the Council's local plan priorities which include encouraging vibrant communities and ensuring development is supported by services.	NO CHANGE – Policy SD5 considers non-residential development outside PLD and H10 allows for Rural exceptions for local need and entry level homes - the policy also allows for affordable housing to be cross subsidised by market housing.
SD4	11708975	RC263 , Nicola Farr, Environment Agency	Re-use of buildings for residential use: section 4.29 notes that certain changes of use of agricultural buildings do not require planning permission subject to prior approval on certain matters. As stated, further details are set out in the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015. However, we suggest adding that in the case of change of use to dwellings, flood risk is one of the matters to be considered.	CONSIDER CHANGE – Add a bullet point to C) Re-use or adaptation of rural buildings for residential use to states – In the case of buildings in Flood Zones 2 or 3, a site-specific flood risk assessment has demonstrated that the dwelling and future users will be safe over the lifetime of the property.
SD4	201106200	RC180, Billy Lloyd, DLP Planning Ltd. On behalf of Hereward Homes	Policy SD4 does not allow for the redevelopment of previously developed land within the countryside which is in direct conflict with the provisions of the NPPF and Policy SD1 c) of the Plan. Whilst the policy recognises the re-use of rural buildings, reference should also be made to the re-use of previously developed land.	NO CHANGE – SD4 does comply with Paragraph 79 of the NPPF and Policy SD1.
SD5	11706780	RC318 , Stewart Patience, Anglian Water Services Ltd	Anglian Water: Support amended policy SD5 which now refers to essential investment in utilities infrastructure being supported where it is in the designated countryside	SUPPORT WELCOMED
SD5	201106201	RC180, Billy Lloyd, DLP Planning Ltd. On behalf of Hereward Homes	Policy SD5 as drafted refers (correctly) to supporting sustainable development in the countryside. The supporting criteria do not however allow for a consistent approach to addressing the priority accorded to making best and most productive use of previously developed land set out in NPPF paragraph 117 and Policy SD1 c). Policy SD4 should reflect the need for the Local Plan to address circumstances where sustainable previously developed sites exist outside defined settlements. Only through such amendment can there be an internal consistency of approach within the Local Plan between the Sustainable Development policies and between the Local Plan and national policy requirements.	NO CHANGE - covered by supporting text for policy E4

SD5	11663273	RC61 , Lance Wiggins, Landmark Planning	Policy SD5 sets out the non-residential developments that the Council consider acceptable in principle in the countryside. Whilst criterion e) includes new employment growth related to tourism, leisure or rural enterprise, there is no reference to village shops or similar essential rural services which would positively support the vitality of rural communities as referred to in paragraph 78 of the Framework. The inclusion of such uses within criterion e) would greatly assist in delivering the Council's Local Plan priorities on vibrant communities and ensuring that development is supported by services.	NO CHANGE Not considered appropriate in countryside locations
SD5	11657591	RC72 , Nigel Cooper	Policy SD5 is very broad. For example it would not prevent major agriculture related development in the countryside or more particularly in the open countryside. Policy SD5 should refer to a general presumption against development in the countryside, and particularly in the open countryside, as set out in Policy EN1 (following amendment- see my submission). This modification is intended to ensure any development has a minimum impact on the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside as required by paragraph 170 of National Planning Policy Framework. A general presumption against development in the countryside, and particularly in the open countryside, is set out in Policy EN1. As an exception to Policy EN1 sustainable development in the countryside (and not in the open countryside) will only be supported	NO CHANGE
SD5	11703812	RC153 , Michael Anker	Page 38 Non – Residential development in the countryside National Planning Policy supports sustainable growth and expansion of all types of businesses and enterprises in Rural areas. BUT - in Chapter 4.34 This states that: “A critical requirement for this type of activity is often likely to be avoiding development that is visually intrusive to the form or character of the wider countryside setting” Although SGB will be in the main residential it will have 14 hectares (proposed) of Non-Residential development which is a large area, it could be argued that these 14 hectares will be visually intrusive to the form or character of the wider countryside especially as the topography is that of a hill top location overlooking the Internationally recognized site of Rutland Water to the North and the acclaimed Chater Valley to the South.	NO CHANGE
SD6	20092903	RC43 , Chris Bramley, Severn Trent	Recommend that water efficiency is also incorporated into bullet point e.	CONSIDER CHANGE TO bullet e) of policy

SD6	201106202	RC180, Billy Lloyd, DLP Planning Ltd. On behalf of Hereward Homes	This policy currently focuses only on the re-use of redundant military bases and prisons and excludes any other forms of major previously developed sites. This policy should be broadened to allow for the consideration of any major previously developed sites including and specifically the former Greetham Quarry.	NO CHANGE
SD6	20110639	RC212 , Paul Boggust, Edith Weston Parish Council	Policy does not make it clear that it does not apply to St Georges. Policy is unclear what it is seeking to achieve. Rather than the requirement of a masterplan or an SPD, a proposal to re-use a large redundant site should clearly be considered as part of a development plan document (as is recognized at para 4.39) on the basis that such a proposal would be likely to trigger a review of the local plan.	NO CHANGE - Supporting text makes it clear policy does not apply to St George's.
SD6, H2, H3	11703820	RC153 , Michael Anker	The proposed SGB development will not fulfil any of the criteria in policy SD6 and this Policy cannot therefore be adhered to and is therefore contrary to National Planning Policy. The strategic objectives cannot be met.	NO CHANGE - Supporting text makes it clear policy does not apply to St George's.
SD7	20092904	RC43 , Chris Bramley, Severn Trent	Support policy but recommend that water efficiency is also incorporated into bullet point f	CONSIDER CHANGE TO bullet point f)
SD7	20110434	RC210 , Emilie Carr, Historic England	Criteria d is welcomed, but reference should be made to heritage assets and their settings	CONSIDER CHANGE TO add heritage assets and their settings to bullet d)
Meeting housing Need	11709136	RC262 , Liz Parsons	A 25% buffer is excessive and will result in overdevelopment. The delivery of windfall sites has been underestimated.	NO CHANGE - Evidence in the SHMA identifies that the 25% buffer is appropriate. The windfall amount is based on an updated 2020 Windfall Study.
Meeting Housing Need	2011061950	RC321 , Sue Green, House Builders Federation	The Council's statement in para 5.3 supports a housing requirement of 160 dwellings per annum (2,880 dwellings between 2018 – 2036). This is the housing requirement figure on which 5YHLS calculations should be based. The Council is confusing minimum LHN starting point, the housing requirement and HLS. The Government's current and revised standard methodologies identify the minimum annual LHN, which is only a minimum starting point. This is not a housing requirement figure (ID: 2a-002-20190220).	NO CHANGE – The SHMA evidences the provision of a 25% buffer on top of the Local Housing Need Standard Calculation of 127 dwellings per annum (rounded to 130) set out by Central Government. This buffer provides an increase in supply which provides flexibility and addresses issues of affordability. The standard methodology amendment is still being considered and is not advanced enough at this stage to impact on the evidence that informs the Local Plan.

Meeting Housing Needs	11692791	RC95 , Kerry Nimmons, Cottesmore Parish Council	A 25% buffer is excessive and will result in overdevelopment and exaggerates the housing need in Rutland. The OAN (independent needs assessment) showed that Rutland needs 127 dwellings per annum but RCC have identified 160 dwellings per annum. Windfall numbers in Rutland have been historically around 50 per annum but the Local Plan only includes 20 per annum. The requirement of 1905 dwellings can be realised if windfall numbers are taken at 50 dwellings per annum (totalling 750 dwellings) and the 650 at Stamford North are included for Rutland, then 600 are required for Rutland which can be accommodated in the towns and local service centres. A new community is not required.	NO CHANGE - Evidence in the SHMA identifies that the need is appropriate at 160 dwellings per annum. The windfall amount is based on an updated 2020 Windfall Study. Memorandum of Understanding with SKDC is in place regarding Quarry Farm.
Meeting Housing Needs	11707196	RC280 , Nick Davenport	The viability of St George's is questioned. Infrastructure is required to ensure that St George's would not be car dependent. A 25% buffer is excessive.	NO CHANGE - Evidence in the SHMA and viability study is robust.
Meeting Housing Needs	11707158	RC186 , Catherine Davenport	The viability of St George's is questioned. Infrastructure is required to ensure that St George's would not be car dependent. A 25% buffer is excessive.	NO CHANGE - Evidence in the SHMA and viability study is robust.
Meeting Housing Needs	11707582	RC255 , Kenneth Bool	A 25% buffer is excessive and will result in overdevelopment and exaggerates the housing need in Rutland. The OAN (independent needs assessment) showed that Rutland needs 127 dwellings per annum but RCC have identified 160 dwellings per annum. Windfall numbers in Rutland have been historically around 50 per annum but the Local Plan only includes 20 per annum. The requirement of 1905 dwellings can be realised if windfall numbers are taken at 50 dwellings per annum (totalling 750 dwellings) and the 650 at Stamford North are included for Rutland, then 600 are required for Rutland which can be accommodated in the towns and local service centres. A new community is not required.	NO CHANGE - Evidence in the SHMA identifies that the need is appropriate at 160 dwellings per annum. The windfall amount is based on an updated 2020 Windfall Study.
Meeting Housing Needs	20110610	RC287 , Paul Belton , CARTER JONAS on behalf of Pigeon Capital Management Ltd.	The 25% buffer is supported and the housing need figure of 162 dwellings per annum is supported by the evidence base. Objection raised to the housing requirement being quoted as 130 dwellings per annum and 2340 over the plan period. These figures do not represent the full housing requirement identified through the Local Plan's evidence base. These figures should not be used to determine the housing requirement or the 5 year housing and supply target.	NO CHANGE – The SHMA evidences the provision of a 25% buffer on top of the Local Housing Need Standard Calculation of 127 dwellings per annum (rounded to 130) set out by Central Government. This buffer provides an increase in supply which provides flexibility and addresses issues of affordability.
Meeting Housing Needs	11709074	RC262 , Liz Parsons	St George's has been selected without consideration of alternative sites. St George's is not accessible. Oakham and Uppingham are more sustainable.	NO CHANGE – A range of alternatives have been assessed as part of the site assessment process. St George's will create opportunities for the provision of a sustainable community and remove the current constraints due to the scale of development identified.

Meeting housing needs, Housing buffer, Housing windfalls	201106172	RC335 , Guy Longley , Pegasus group on behalf of Vistry	The evidence provided in the SHMA 2019 provides a sound basis for the Council to plan for a housing requirement of 160 dwellings per annum. This should be the minimum requirement, in which case there is no buffer proposed. Flexibility is critical given the plan's reliance on St George's Barracks. Provision for a total of 3,420 dwellings over the plan period should be identified. The additional provision of 478 dwellings would logically be distributed to Oakham and the Services Centres in the same proportions as set out in the Plan, meaning a further 140 dwellings would be directed to Service Centres. The amount of dwellings allocated in service centres has reduced since the 2017 Draft of the plan, due to the inclusion of St George's Barracks. Due to the uncertainty of delivery at St George's and the need to meet the needs of rural communities, a wider range of sites in a range of locations are needed.	NO CHANGE – The SHMA evidences the provision of a 25% buffer on top of the Local Housing Need Standard Calculation of 127 dwellings per annum (rounded to 130) set out by Central Government. This buffer provides an increase in supply which provides flexibility and addresses issues of affordability.
Housing Buffer	11647753	RC157 , Rosemary Powell	Using a mid-way figure between the standard calculation for housing need of 127 dwellings per annum and the SHMA figure of 190 dwellings per annum based on economic growth is not sound. There is no basis for the 25% uplift. The minimum buffer required is 5%. Inflated figures for housing requirement is very likely to result in unnecessary levels of environment and social damage and will also result in potential over-development.	NO CHANGE - Evidence in the SHMA identifies that the 25% buffer is appropriate.
Housing Buffer	20110460	RC283 , Neil Johnson	The 25% buffer provides a scale of development which seems excessive having regard to the amount completed since 2000. Development should be orientated towards meeting need rather than satisfying demand.	NO CHANGE - Evidence in the SHMA identifies that the 25% buffer is appropriate.
Housing Buffer	11694607	RC258 , Les Allen	The 25% buffer is not justified and is likely to lead to unnecessary levels of environment and social damage and overdevelopment. The windfall site contribution is underplayed. The 650 dwellings at Stamford North should be included for Rutland. Taking into account the windfall and 650 dwellings at Stamford North, neither St George's nor Woolfox are required to meet Rutland's needs. Vacant properties leased by the MOD are not taken into consideration.	NO CHANGE - Evidence in the SHMA identifies that the 25% buffer is appropriate. The windfall amount is based on an updated 2020 Windfall Study. Memorandum of Understanding with SKDC is in place regarding Quarry Farm.
Housing Buffer	20110547	RC267 , Mark Harris, Bidwells on Behalf of Taylor Wimpey	Support for the recognition that the housing need is 160 dwellings per annum. However if this is the need, there is not a buffer in place and the additional 30 dwellings per annum cannot be relied upon to allow for slippage.	NO CHANGE – The SHMA evidences the provision of a 25% buffer on top of the Local Housing Need Standard Calculation of 127 dwellings per annum (rounded to 130) set out by Central Government. This buffer provides an increase in supply which provides flexibility and addresses issues of affordability.

Housing Buffer	11707976	RC233 , Jonathan Griffin	A 25% buffer is excessive and will result in overdevelopment and exaggerates the housing need in Rutland. The requirement of 1905 dwellings can be realised if windfall numbers are taken at 50 dwellings per annum (totalling 750 dwellings) and the 650 at Stamford North are included for Rutland, then 600 are required for Rutland which can be accommodated in the towns and local service centres. A new community is not required.	NO CHANGE - Evidence in the SHMA identifies that the requirement is appropriate at 160 dwellings per annum. The windfall amount is based on an updated 2020 Windfall Study. Memorandum of Understanding with SKDC is in place regarding Quarry Farm.
Housing Buffer	20110611	RC287 , Paul Belton, CARTER JONAS on behalf of Pigeon Capital Management Ltd.	Support for the 25% buffer identified.	SUPPORT WELCOMED
Housing Buffer	20110612	RC287 , Paul Belton, CARTER JONAS on behalf of Pigeon Capital Management Ltd.	Support identified for 25% buffer to help address affordability issues and demographic trends and the annual housing need figure of 162 dwellings.	SUPPORT WELCOMED
Housing Buffer	20110613	RC287 , Paul Belton, CARTER JONAS on behalf of Pigeon Capital Management Ltd.	Objection raised to the housing requirement being quoted as 130 dwellings per annum and 2340 over the plan period. These figures do not represent the full housing requirement identified through the Local Plan's evidence base. These figures should not be used to determine the housing requirement or the 5 year housing and supply target.	NO CHANGE – The SHMA evidences the provision of a 25% buffer on top of the Local Housing Need Standard Calculation of 127 dwellings per annum (rounded to 130) set out by Central Government. This buffer provides an increase in supply which provides flexibility and addresses issues of affordability.
Housing Buffer	11709070	RC299 , Richard Bonser	The quantity of housing is distributed unevenly across the county. Delivery is uneven across the plan period.	NO CHANGE – Delivery identified in Policy H1 is in line with the requirements of Policy SD2 which sets out the spatial strategy for development which includes the provision of a new community at St George's Barracks.

Housing Buffer	20110669	RC205 , Ed Rehill, Savills on behalf of The Society of Merchant Venturers	<p>The proposed Standard Methodology 2 for assessing local housing need, published by the Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government earlier this year, calculates the housing need for Rutland as 307 dwellings per year. This is a significant increase on the 162 dwellings per year anticipated to be delivered via the emerging Rutland Local Plan Review. The SMV consider that the emerging Local Plan Review must plan to deliver a greater level of housing to enable it to respond to the potential significant increase in local housing need, when based on the Standard Methodology 2. The SMV generally support the objective to direct the greater proportion of the remaining development to Oakham and that such an approach to the spatial distribution will achieve a sustainable pattern of development. However, the SMV considers that a greater proportion should be given to Oakham to reflect it as the most sustainable town in the County and the only defined “main town”. The SMV question whether the level of growth at Oakham, as a result of directing the majority of the growth to St George’s Barracks, will impact on Oakham maintaining its status as the “main town” within the County. These concerns can be overcome by directing additional growth to Oakham. The inclusion of reserve sites would also assist in ensuring the Local Plan has sufficient contingency in its planned housing supply.</p>	NO CHANGE – Site assessment is robust and meets the housing requirement set out in the Local Plan. The standard methodology amendment is still being considered and is not advanced enough at this stage to impact on the evidence that informs the Local Plan.
Housing Buffer	201106161	RC226, Guy Longley, Pegasus group on behalf of Davidsons Developments Limited.	<p>The evidence provided in the SHMA 2019 provides a sound basis for the Council to plan for a housing requirement of 160 dwellings per annum. This should be the minimum requirement, in which case there is no buffer proposed. The report of the Local Plans Expert Group, March 2016 recommended that local plans should be required to make provision for developable reserve sites equivalent to 20% of their housing requirement to provide extra flexibility to respond to changes in circumstances. The plan should make provision for the housing requirement of 160 dwellings per year as identified in the SHMA 2019 with an additional 20% buffer to provide flexibility. Flexibility is critical given the plan’s reliance on St George’s Barracks.</p>	NO CHANGE – The SHMA evidences the provision of a 25% buffer on top of the Local Housing Need Standard Calculation of 127 dwellings per annum (rounded to 130) set out by Central Government. This buffer provides an increase in supply which provides flexibility and addresses issues of affordability.
Housing Buffer, H1	11608260	RC40 , Tom Reilly	<p>Objection to St George’s Barracks. Vast majority of residents are against the delivery of 2,300 homes. The NPPF states that it should be endorsed by local residents. There is a lack of infrastructure for the Garden Village Community. There will be a reliance on the private car because of a lack of public transport. Housing requirement of 2300 dwellings is far more than previously calculated.</p>	NO CHANGE – Consultation has been carried out. St George’s will create opportunities for the provision of a sustainable community and remove the current constraints due to the scale of development identified.

Housing Buffer, Housing trajectory	201106179	RC171 , Andrew Gore, Marrons Planning on behalf of Jeakins Weir Ltd	Expecting delivery on site at St George's within the 2025/26 monitoring period, as identified in Table 2 and the Housing Trajectory is extremely unrealistic. Average time taken to get planning approval for schemes of 2000 dwellings plus is 6.1 years. Marketing the site and selling to developers would take a further year.	NO CHANGE – The delivery rate per annum has taken into account the research in the Lichfield and Savill Reports. Delivery is identified in the trajectory based on discussions with the site promoters.
Housing Windfalls	11702441	RC157 , Rosemary Powell	Windfall allowance is underestimated. The 3 year average from 2016/17 to 2018/19 in this study is 25 per annum. The 8 year average from 2011/12 is 30 per annum. No uplift is applied due to new PD rights for conversion of agricultural and office buildings.	NO CHANGE – The windfall assumption is based on an updated 2020 Windfall Study, which provides robust evidence.
Housing Windfalls	20110461	RC283 , Neil Johnson	The 650 dwellings on land in Rutland at Quarry Farm could make a valuable contribution to meeting Rutland's housing requirement. The standard calculation figure of 127 has been rounded up to 130 for the purposes of the calculation, adding a further 54 dwellings. Further development over and above the 200 identified for Uppingham could be provided, as this is determined through the Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan, who could plan for more development. The 1000 identified for delivery at St George's could be exceeded within the plan period. The windfall figure at 20 dwellings per annum is insufficient as they are estimated to be 50 dwellings per annum.	NO CHANGE - Statement of Common Ground with SKDC is in place regarding Quarry Farm. Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan will be responsible for the final capacity for Uppingham, a general guide for the amount is set out in paragraph 5.7. There needs to be some flexibility for the UNP to have the opportunity to allocate sites through the Neighbourhood Plan. The windfall amount is based on an updated 2020 Windfall Study. For the St George's Garden Community to become a viable and self-sustaining settlement it needs to be of a required size to provide the social infrastructure and facilities needed for a successful new community. Reducing the capacity will not achieve this.
Housing Windfalls	20110548	RC267 , Mark Harris, Bidwells on Behalf of Taylor Wimpey	Lack of justification for the inclusion of a 20 home windfall allowance. No compelling evidence to confirm that the 20 windfall developments per annum will continue into the future. The Windfall Study shows a decreasing level of completions and does not provide proper analysis of the type of sites where windfall opportunities may arise. The windfall allowance is over inflated.	NO CHANGE – The Windfall Study July 2020 is a robust evidence base at recording the delivery of windfall sites. Policy SD3 continues to support the delivery of windfall sites, as well as the permitted development rights that allow for the conversion of buildings to residential use.
Housing Windfalls	11695589	RC285 , Pam Allen	St George's Barracks should not be identified as entirely brownfield.	NO CHANGE – Paragraph 5.6 states that 'it is important to note that on its closure for operational use, the proposals for development on the site would take place on land, all of which constitutes previously developed land' and 'it is acknowledged that in accordance with the definition (brownfield), not all of the site should be considered suitable for development'.

Housing Windfalls	20110614	RC287 , Paul Belton , CARTER JONAS on behalf of Pigeon Capital Management Ltd.	The housing need figure of 162 dwellings per annum is clearly supported by the evidence base. The housing need figure of 162 dwellings is therefore sound. In contrast, the statement provided in paragraph 5.1 that the Local Plan shall make provision to meet the minimum requirement for 127 dwellings per annum and 2,340 dwellings over the Plan period is not supported by the evidence base, is not consistent with national policy and will not be effective. It is therefore unsound.	NO CHANGE - Evidence in the SHMA identifies that the requirement is appropriate at 130dpa with a 25% buffer resulting in 160 dwellings per annum.
Housing Windfalls	20110652	RC205 , Ed Rehill, Savills on behalf of The Society of Merchant Venturers	The SMV is concerned that, based on the available evidence, 1,000 dwellings at St Barracks Community Garden cannot be delivered within the Plan period. As such, the minimum housing requirement for the most sustainable settlement should be increased and an additional site allocated to overcome this uncertainty. The Council's own evidence recommends that the SMV land at Stamford Road (OAK/08a) is suitable for allocation. The site achieves a better RAG score in the Council's Site Assessment when compared to proposed allocated site OAK/13a and OAK/13b.	NO CHANGE – Site assessment is robust and meets the housing requirement set out. Delivery is identified in the trajectory based on discussions with the site promoters. PLD does not require amendment. CHANGE – Site Assessment methodology to be published. It should be noted that as a result of this representation, it has been identified that the quantitative scoring that formed part of an initial approach has not been removed from the site assessment documents, after the decision was taken not to utilise the quantitative scoring for the allocation of sites, but rather a qualitative assessment approach as identified at paragraph 2.11 of the Methodology for Assessing Potential Sites Update December 2019. Site Allocations Assessment therefore should be updated with the removal of reference to the previous scoring approach. It should be reiterated that the quantitative scoring was not used in assessing the most appropriate sites for allocation, this was done through a qualitative assessment as identified in the published methodology.
Housing Windfalls	11709178	RC165 , Alastair Harrison, Frogmore Consulting	The Small Sites Windfall Assessment (July 2020) does not cover the past 18 months. This study should have specifically focused on tier 3 settlements. Development in tier 3 villages is important to enable them to thrive. Settlement boundaries should have been reviewed and specific potential sites for windfall housing identified.	NO CHANGE – The Windfall Study July 2020 is a robust evidence base.
Housing Windfalls	11709046	RC243 , Joanna Bonser	The 160 dwellings per annum is excessive. The windfall allowance has been underestimated. More housing is proposed than is needed.	NO CHANGE - Evidence in the SHMA identifies that the requirement of 160 dwellings per annum is appropriate. The windfall amount is based on an updated 2020 Windfall Study.

Site Submission	20102205	RC75 , John Pearce, on behalf of Muller Property Group	Support inclusion of H1.18 South Lodge Farm, Whissendine. The draft allocation forms part of the current site that is subject of an outline planning application submitted by MPG (2020/0172/OUT) who are seeking permission for up to 66 dwellings on 3.48 hectares. Notwithstanding MPG's support for the proposed allocation we object to the omission of the balance of the site that is currently the subject of the planning application as part of the allocation.	NO CHANGE – The site boundary as assessed is considered to be a logical extension to the village whilst providing the required number of dwellings.
Site Submission	20110426	RC194 , David Maher, Barton Willmore on behalf of de Merke Estates	A higher level of growth can be achieved in Oakham and other settlements.	NO CHANGE - Site assessment process is robust and based on assessment of technical consultees.
Site Submission	20110672	RC205 , Ed Rehill, Savills on behalf of The Society of Merchant Venturers	Representation submitted on behalf of Society of Merchant Venturers who promoted site OAK/08b through the SHELAA process. Further technical assessment has been carried out which identifies that site OAK/08b could accommodate in the region of 80 dwellings. The evidence does not robustly justify why sites OAK/13a and OAK/13c have been proposed for allocation over OAK/08b and OAK/08a. With regard to OAK/13a and OAK/13c the Council have been mindful of the benefits of a combination of sites. The same assessment of the combination of OAK/05, OAK/08a and OAK/08b has not taken place. The allocation of OAK/08b in tandem with proposed allocation H1.2 would provide benefits to walking linkages, cycleways, potential provision of new facilities and green space network enhancements.	NO CHANGE – Site assessment is robust. Delivery is identified in the trajectory based on discussions with the site promoters

Site Submission	201106121	RC223 , Geoff Armstrong, Armstrong Rigg Planning on behalf of Manor Oak Homes	The strategy for Local Service Centres (LSC) is unjustified and therefore unsound as it is not an appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternative of allocating more land in the most sustainable Local Service Centres. There is little correlation between the most sustainable LSC's and the number of proposed dwellings. The allocation of a greater (both actual and proportionally) number of dwellings to some of the less sustainable LSC's conflicts with Strategic Objective 1 (Sustainable Locations for Development) of the emerging Local Plan Review which seeks to identify locations and sites suitable to accommodate development sustainably, providing an opportunity to access services and facilities locally, maintaining the need to minimise travel and reduce carbon emissions. Edith Weston and Market Overton which sit at the lower end of the rankings will increase by 18% and 13%, respectively, while Ketton and Ryhall will only increase by 7.3% and 5.5%, respectively, despite being the most sustainable LSC's and having received extremely limited growth since 2006. If sustainable patterns of development are to be achieved that sustain the role and function of villages then it is paramount that an adequate supply of deliverable sites are allocated in the most sustainable LSCs. The proposed allocation of St. George's Barracks has resulted in a lower level of growth being directed to the Local Service Centres.	NO CHANGE – Site assessment is robust and the sites allocated meet the requirement set out. A range of alternative approaches were assessed.
H1	11556356	RC8 , Elizabeth Field	H1.7 Land off Main Street Cottesmore: The development will have a detrimental impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties and the existing access. Ecological survey not completed and highway assessment desk based only. Existing residents not consulted. Proposed allocations have changed since the last version of the plan without consultation of the residents of Cottesmore.	NO CHANGE – Consultation has been carried out. Consultation with technical stakeholders carried out as part of the site assessment process.
H1	11556449	RC9 , Rupert Turton	In effect by having a plan out to 2035 with no time constraint everything will be preloaded in the early years.	NO CHANGE – Delivery is identified in the trajectory based on discussions with the site promoters at the current time.
H1	11559290	RC13 , Leslie Moverley	Query why Cottesmore, Empingham and Langham have not been allocated a “fair” number of new dwellings. The need for Uppingham to have further development to plan up to 2036 rather than the current plans for 2026 are also identified. Query raised about why the numbers have been reduced for the garden village.	NO CHANGE - The most appropriate sites across the Local Service Centres that met the requirement set out were allocated.

H1	11576804	RC17 , Claire Colton	Site H1.7 - Land off Main Street Cottesmore: No mention of hedgehogs, dormice, voles and other at risk rodent and marsupial species. Access is too narrow for large vehicles. This site would be very suitable for small conservation area for at risk species. Site H2 – St George’s Garden Community: Why are only 100 houses identified as being delivered between 2025 and 2027?	NO CHANGE - The sites have been subject to a thorough site appraisal process. Site specific policies set out for H1.7 in Chapter 10 identify at g) and k) the importance of biodiversity net gain. Highway engineers have confirmed that the access is suitable for the scale of development identified. RCC and the DIO have discussed and agreed the delivery timescales for St George’s.
H1	20090901	RC18 , Ian McAlpine	The 160 dpa is excessive and will lead to a gross over supply. Strongly oppose St George’s. It is an inappropriate location and will exceed local requirements. It does not fit with SD6 in relation to protecting and enhancing the countryside. The officers mess site for 70 dwellings is the only acceptable development in this area.	NO CHANGE – Robust evidence base to support the inclusion of SGB.
H1	20090903	RC18 , Ian McAlpine	Increase in projected future housing requirement from 130 dwellings per annum to 160 is excessive and will lead to an oversupply. Strongly oppose St Georges Garden Community which would be a new town to rival the county town of Oakham. The proposed development does not comply with policy SD6. Adjacent villages of Edith Weston and North Luffenham will be overwhelmed. The only acceptable development in this area is the proposal to build 70 homes at the existing Officers Mess site.	NO CHANGE – Support noted for Officers Mess site. Proposed 160 dpa is evidenced by the SHMA. - Site assessment evidence has identified the St George’s site as a suitable site to provide a new garden community. SD6 excludes St George’s.
H1	11583830	RC19 , David Hodson	Meets requirements for housing over plan period.	SUPPORT WELCOMED
H1	11583944	RC20 , Gillian Hodson	It is good that most of the housing needs for the county are being met by use of a brown field site.	SUPPORT WELCOMED
H1	11585973	RC22 , Derek Evers	All representations by residents have been ignored, particularly with respect to housing development in Oakham. Urbanisation of land outside the bypass along Burley Road and loss of green space within the county.	NO CHANGE – Site specific policies recognise the need for a significant landscaping scheme for Site H1.3. Health infrastructure and Highways and Transport improvements and initiatives are identified in the CIL Charging Schedule.
H1	20091503	RC25 , Kirstie Clifton, Define Planning for William David Homes	The Local Plan proposes a significant buffer in order to more closely reflect the estimated housing need identified in the SHMA which should be considered a minimum. When applying the new standard methodology proposed in the White Paper, the housing need for Rutland is 307dpa. Growth is disproportionately allocated to St George’s Barracks, risking the prevention of sustainable growth of Local Service Centres. Potential for under-delivery from St George’s and in turn an impact on the five year land supply. No evidence that 300 windfall dwellings will come forward. Local Service Centres can support larger scale development. Only 8 dwellings are allocated in Cottesmore, despite it ranking joint second in the Settlement Hierarchy Update 2019.	NO CHANGE - Site assessment process is robust and based on assessment of technical consultees.

H1	11595095	RC26 , Josephine Dunn	Too many greenfield sites have been identified. H1.17 and H1.18 are a greenfield sites. These should not be suitable for development until all brownfield sites have been utilised. Should these sites be considered at a later date it should be for rented social housing or part ownership only? A new sewer and surface water drain is required for the whole village due to current systems being insufficient. Access to H1.18 is on a blind corner and is unsuitable.	NO CHANGE - There were not sufficient brownfield sites alone to meet the housing requirement. Affordable housing targets are set out in Chapter Ten for each of the allocated sites which takes into account the whole plan viability assessment. Consultation with technical stakeholders carried out as part of the site assessment process.
H1	11604344	RC30 , Andrew Greasley	Objection to H1.2 Land off Uppingham Road, Oakham. Site ranking and site selection differs from 2017 approach and the process is not robust. Consultation with residents on site selection has not taken place, in particular because neighbouring properties to site H1.2 were still being completed and were not occupied. Setting out mitigation for each of the allocated sites is flawed.	NO CHANGE – Site assessment process is robust. Site specific policies set out in Chapter 10 for each of the allocations are based on advice from technical consultees and planning judgement and are appropriate and achievable.
H1	11608483	RC31 , Graham Fergus, First City Limited	In the light of the evidence of the past delivery rates on small windfall sites in recent years we agree that the Plan should make an allowance for a minimum of 20 windfall sites per annum for the period 2022 - 2036.	SUPPORT WELCOMED
H1	20092401	RC35 , Nick Grace, GraceMachin Planning on behalf of Simon Holt	The indicative capacity of H1.5 is identified as 8 dwellings. Planning application (2019/1389/FUL) is currently being considered for 6 dwellings which meets with the principles a-j set out in the site specific policy H1.5 in Chapter Ten. The planning application has been amended to take into account concerns raised through the development management process reducing the capacity from 8 to 6 dwellings.	CONSIDER POTENTIAL CHANGE – At the current time until the planning application is determined, the indicative capacity should remain as 8. If the planning application is approved with a capacity of 6 prior to the examination, the capacity of the site can be amended.
H1	20092905	RC43 , Chris Bramley, Severn Trent	H1.14 Main Street, Market Overton: The proposed development is not anticipated to result in any significant adverse impact on the performance of the sewerage network, provided surface water is managed sustainably. The site is indicated to contain a number of existing sewers, therefore it is important that developers engage early with Severn Trent to ensure that the impact of these assets of the site layout are understood, and that the existing assets are protected. There is a surface water sewer indicated within the site boundary, therefore there should be no connection of surface water to the foul or combined sewers.	NO CHANGE - Constraints and recommendation for early engagement between site developer and Severn Trent noted.
H1	20092906	RC43 , Chris Bramley, Severn Trent	H1.17 Land of Melton Road, Whissendine The proposed development of Main Street, Market Overton is not anticipated to result in any significant adverse impact on the performance of the sewerage network, provided surface water is managed sustainably. There is a surface water sewer indicated within Melton Road, adjacent to the site, therefore no surface water shall be permitted to connect to the foul sewer network.	NO CHANGE - Constraints noted.

H1	20092907	RC43 , Chris Bramley, Severn Trent	The proposed development of South Lodge Farm, Whissendine H1.18 is not anticipated to result in any significant adverse impact on the performance of the sewerage network, provided surface water is managed sustainably. It is recommended that early conversations are held with Severn Trent to ensure that an appropriate surface water outfall is identified.	NO CHANGE - Recommendation for early engagement between site developer and Severn Trent noted.
H1	20093001	RC45 , Keith Pepperdine, Pepperdine and Freckingham on behalf of land owners	Owners of a site in Empingham put the site forward for consideration in 2018 as part of the Additional Sites consultation. Site has not been assessed by RCC. However it is considered suitable and is available and should be considered for allocation.	SITE TO BE ASSESSED
H1	20100102	RC49 , Simon Pease, Ancer Spa Ltd on behalf of Lynton Developments Ltd	The projected rate of development at St Georges Garden Community of 100 dwellings per annum should be challenged as it is likely to be less, particularly in the first five years. Therefore adequate provision should be made in other towns in the county to ensure that there is not a shortfall in housing supply. The allocation for Uppingham should be increased to 300 dwellings. Site UPP/02 at Uppingham Gate should be allocated as a mixed-use site including a residential element.	NO CHANGE – RCC and the DIO have discussed and agreed the delivery timescales for St Georges. Further allocations are not required in Uppingham to meet the housing supply requirements.
H1	11653317	RC57 , Susannah Bartram	I feel this is an easy option for Rutland council to take without actually needing the amount of housing required. The infrastructure would never support the proposed development. It has been rushed through for profit and no thought or care has been made for the surrounding villages it will destroy. The proposed settlement should be moved back from Edith Weston.	NO CHANGE – Robust evidence base to support the inclusion of SGB.
H1	20101301	RC59 , Sue Lammin, Whissendine Parish Council	H1.18 (site ref. WHI/09a) South Lodge Farm Whissendine : The Parish Council have serious concerns about use of this site for development as its been listed as a site of environmental and heritage importance and is a LE7796 Natural England registered site and Historic Environment Recorded site MLE 24620 with fossilized medieval ridge and furrow surface. The site is not justified because there are alternative sites available.	NO CHANGE - Site assessment is robust.
H1	20101405	RC60 , Sarah Legge, Melton Borough Council	No call for sites since 2015. The buffer applied to the housing requirement should be justified by the Housing Delivery Test. In addition, historic lapse rates should be checked fully to provide a more robust approach to calculating a specific percentage.	NO CHANGE - Evidence in the SHMA identifies that the 25% buffer is appropriate. There have been three additional consultation stages where sites have been submitted for consideration since the Call for Sites. The lapse rate is calculated annually and published in the Five Year Land Supply Report.

H1	11663417	RC62 , Vivienne Greasley	Site ranking and site selection is not robust. Consultation with residents on site selection has not taken place, in particular because future neighbours to site H1.2 were not consulted. Changes to planned limits of development were not highlighted.	NO CHANGE – The community has been consulted. Site assessment process is robust.
H1	11666030	RC65 , Charles Speirs	H1.18 South Lodge Farm Whissendine: The proposed development site would destroy a medieval field system which is a scheduled monument and legally protected.	NO CHANGE - Site assessment is robust.
H1	20102203	RC75 , John Pearce, on behalf of Muller Property Group	We are unsure upon what basis the Council have arrived at the 25% uplift identified in paragraph 5.2. We would support a greater uplift if one was justified or required. A further buffer is also sought by MPG in order to protect against the non-implementation or delivery on the Barracks site in a timely manner. As such, MPG contend that an additional flexibility allowance of 10 – 15% should be included over and above the 2,925 dwellings that are currently proposed in the Plan. National government consultation indicates that a revised LHN for Rutland will be 307 dpa. We would advocate that the Local Plan includes an early review mechanism to ensure that it can respond flexibly to the changes in national planning and housing policy	NO CHANGE – The SHMA evidences that the 25% buffer is appropriate. Policy IMP2 addresses reviewing the plan. Response to inclusion of wider boundary for H1.18 dealt with under H1.18 representations.
H1	20102206	RC75 , John Pearce, on behalf of Muller Property Group	Support inclusion of H1.18 South Lodge Farm, Whissendine. The draft allocation forms part of the current site that is subject of an outline planning application submitted by MPG (2020/0172/OUT) who are seeking permission for up to 66 dwellings on 3.48 hectares. Notwithstanding MPG's support for the proposed allocation we object to the omission of the balance of the site that is currently the subject of the planning application as part of the allocation.	NO CHANGE – The site boundary as assessed is considered to be a logical extension to the village whilst providing the required number of dwellings.
H1	11682299	RC79 , Laura Turner	H1.18 South Lodge Farm Whissendine: Site proposes to destroy a heritage asset, well-preserved Medieval ridge and furrow earthworks of rare quality and form. This is contrary to the NPPF, Local Plan strategic objectives 1 and 13 and policies EN15 and EN16. This is the last piece of Medieval ridge and furrow landscape to this facet of the village, since beyond it has been ploughed-out by modern agriculture. There are other alternative sites available. The site is also a water retention buffer, helping to mitigate flooding events in Whissendine. The main street through the village is effectively a single track, with several blind corners which is congested, particularly during school times. The site has a poor access.	NO CHANGE - Site assessment is robust.

H1	11686634	RC82 , Simon Machen, Barmach Ltd on behalf of Mr D Hollis, owner of sites SHELAA/COT/03 and SHELAA/COT/04 (TA22 and TA23) off Rogues Lane, Cottesmore	<p>Heavy reliance on the delivery of St George's Barracks which limits allocations in other parts of the county. Deliverability of St George's within the timescales identified is not realistic.</p> <p>Significant reduction in the number of new homes proposed within the Local Service Centres is considered contrary to the stated strategic objective of supporting diverse and thriving villages. The rationale for a single small allocation within Cottesmore is unclear and not justified within the plan especially in the context of the higher housing number proposed for other Local Services Centres such as Ketton, Ryhall and Whissendine. It is considered that sites SHELAA/COT/03 and SHELAA/COT/04 are suitable sites for allocation.</p>	NO CHANGE – Delivery is identified in the trajectory based on discussions with the site promoters. 12 sites are allocated across the Local Service Centres. Site assessment is robust.
H1	20102711	RC89 , Richard Drabble	H1.18 South Lodge Farm Whissendine: Site proposes to destroy a heritage asset, well-preserved Medieval ridge and furrow earthworks of rare quality and form. The site is not identified as a heritage asset in the site assessment process. There are other alternative sites available in Rutland. The Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Study Addendum Final Report March 2017 is incorrect and should show that the site is high landscape sensitivity and with low capacity. The report fails to separate significantly different areas for analysis. The SA also has not been updated with the right landscape sensitivity of a red RAG rating. The ridge and furrow landscape at this site acts as a water retention buffer and reservoir, so mitigating even worse flooding events in Whissendine. The main street through the village is effectively a single track, with several blind corners which is congested, particularly during school times.	NO CHANGE - Site assessment is robust.
H1	11691035	RC92 , Christopher Jordan	The number of dwellings provided at St Georges site (H2) should be reduced from 1000 to 350 dwellings on the basis that the 650 dwellings at Quarry Farm (Policy H4) should be included. The site area for residential development for site H2 is left blank in Policy H1. The Officers Mess (H1.8) and St Georges Garden Community (H2) should be considered as one development. No reference is made to the 150+ MOD houses in Edith Weston that are being sold on the open market or when the rest of this housing stock will be released.	NO CHANGE – Development and delivery principles and development requirements for St George's Garden Community are set out under Policy H2 and H3. Agreement with SKDC is in place regarding Quarry Farm with the issue being accepted through SKDC Local Plan examination.

H1	11692508	RC95 , Kerry Nimmons, Cottesmore Parish Council	A range of reasonable alternatives have not been considered. A sustainability appraisal did not accompany the Development Plan document in July 2018. Significant opposition to the July 2018 consultation on St George's Barracks. The spatial strategy is not appropriate for Rutland and should have proportionate growth and investment spread more evenly across the county. The current strategy has chosen to place a considerable emphasis on a location that is not accessible and doesn't support the viability or the economy of the existing town centres and the larger villages including Cottesmore.	NO CHANGE - Site assessment evidence has identified the St George's site as a suitable site to provide a new garden community. The SA report considers a wide range of alternative approaches for the distribution and scale of development. 12 sites are allocated across the Local Service Centres.
H1	20103105	RC113 , Brian Grady	A 25% buffer is not required. It would represent over development. If windfalls are assessed at a reasonable number reflecting historic levels over the last 10 years of 50 per year and the 600 dwellings at Quarry Farm are included the remaining requirement can be accommodated comfortably with the allocations identified for Oakham with Barleythorpe, Uppingham and Local Service Centres. St Georges or Woolfox are not required.	NO CHANGE - Evidence in the SHMA identifies that the 25% buffer is appropriate. The windfall amount is based on an updated 2020 Windfall Study. Agreement with SKDC is in place regarding Quarry Farm with the issue being accepted through SKDC Local Plan examination.
H1	20110105	RC114 , Andrew Brown	A 25% buffer is excessive and will result in overdevelopment and exaggerates the housing need in Rutland. Windfall numbers in Rutland have been historically around 50 per annum but the Local Plan only includes 20 per annum. The requirement of 1905 dwellings can be realised if windfall numbers are taken at 50 dwellings per annum (totalling 750 dwellings) and the 650 at Stamford North are included for Rutland, then 600 are required for Rutland which can be accommodated in the towns and local service centres.	NO CHANGE - Evidence in the SHMA identifies that the 25% buffer is appropriate. The windfall amount is based on an updated 2020 Windfall Study. Agreement with SKDC is in place regarding Quarry Farm with the issue being accepted through SKDC Local Plan examination.
H1	11697320	RC118 , Helen Jacobsen	No evidence provided to demonstrate that having delivery of 130 dpa will restrict housing supply sufficiently to raise house prices. There is no need for a 25% buffer. No exceptional circumstances identified. There are not enough jobs to support the amount of new housing.	NO CHANGE – THE SHMA 2019 provides the justification for the 25% and how it will address affordability. Robust evidence base to support the inclusion of SGB.
H1	11697377	RC118 , Helen Jacobsen	H1.8 Officers Mess, Edith Weston: No justification provided for the size of the development proposed. Local residents have not been consulted and therefore it has not been positively prepared.	NO CHANGE – Consultation has been carried out. Consultation with technical stakeholders carried out as part of the site assessment process.
H1	20110211	RC122 , Josh Plant, Gladman Developments	Over reliance on the delivery of St George's Garden Community and there is need for the allocation of additional small and medium sized sites across a range of locations to support a five year housing land supply and to protect from any slippage in the delivery of St George's Garden Community.	NO CHANGE to amount of sites allocated. Sufficient sites are allocated to meet the requirement and delivery timescales for St Georges have been discussed and agreed with DIO.

H1	20110216	RC126 , M E Jeal	H1.18 South lodge Farm, Whissendine: Site proposes to destroy a heritage asset, well-preserved Medieval ridge and furrow earthworks of rare quality and form. The site is not identified as a heritage asset in the site assessment process. There are other alternative sites available in Rutland. The Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Study Addendum Final Report March 2017 is incorrect and should show that the site is high landscape sensitivity and with low capacity. The report fails to separate significantly different areas for analysis. The SA also has not been updated with the right landscape sensitivity of a red RAG rating. The ridge and furrow landscape at this site acts as a water retention buffer and reservoir, so mitigating even worse flooding events in Whissendine. The main street through the village is effectively a single track, with several blind corners which is congested, particularly during school times.	NO CHANGE - Site assessment is robust.
H1	20110304	RC137 , Clifford Bacon, Clipsham Parish	A 25% buffer is excessive and will result in overdevelopment and exaggerates the housing need in Rutland. Windfall numbers in Rutland have been historically around 50 per annum but the Local Plan only includes 20 per annum. The requirement of 1905 dwellings can be realised if windfall numbers are taken at 50 dwellings per annum (totalling 750 dwellings) and the 650 at Stamford North are included for Rutland, then 600 are required for Rutland which can be accommodated in the towns and local service centres.	NO CHANGE - Evidence in the SHMA identifies that the 25% buffer is appropriate. The windfall amount is based on an updated 2020 Windfall Study. Agreement with SKDC is in place regarding Quarry Farm with the issue being accepted through SKDC Local Plan examination.
H1	20110306	RC137 , Clifford Bacon, Clipsham Parish	Excessive level of oversupply cannot be justified. The plan number assumes 20 windfall dwellings per year when the last few years the actual numbers have been nearer 50. If windfall development of 50 new homes per year to 2036 is included in the housing numbers and if the proposed 650 new dwellings in Rutland at Stamford North are included, as they should be in Rutland figures, the number of new homes in Rutland by 2036 will be over 4,000. It is not logical to provide affordable housing at St George's which is a rural site.	NO CHANGE - Evidence in the SHMA identifies that the 25% buffer is appropriate. Site assessment evidence has identified the St George's site as a suitable site to provide a new garden community. The SA report considers a wide range of alternative approaches for the distribution and scale of development.

H1	11702243	RC82 , Simon Machen, Barmach Ltd on behalf of Mr D Hollis, owner of sites SHELAA/COT/03 and SHELAA/COT/04 (TA22 and TA23) off Rogues Lane, Cottesmore	<p>Heavy reliance on the delivery of St George's Barracks which limits allocations in other parts of the county. Deliverability of St George's within the timescales identified is not realistic.</p> <p>Significant reduction in the number of new homes proposed within the Local Service Centres is considered contrary to the stated strategic objective of supporting diverse and thriving villages. The rationale for a single small allocation within Cottesmore is unclear and not justified within the plan especially in the context of the higher housing number proposed for other Local Services Centres such as Ketton, Ryhall and Whissendine. It is considered that site SHELAA/COT/02 is a suitable site for allocation within the village, close to local services.</p>	NO CHANGE – Delivery is identified in the trajectory based on discussions with the site promoters. 12 sites are allocated across the Local Service Centres. Site assessment is robust.
H1	20110313	RC141 , Andrew Johnson, Morcott Parish Council	A 25% buffer is excessive and will result in overdevelopment and exaggerates the housing need in Rutland. The requirement of 1905 dwellings can be realised if windfall numbers are taken at 50 dwellings per annum (totalling 750 dwellings) and the 650 at Stamford North are included for Rutland, then 600 are required for Rutland which can be accommodated in the towns and local service centres. A new community is not required.	NO CHANGE - Evidence in the SHMA identifies that the requirement is appropriate at 160 dwellings per annum. The windfall amount is based on an updated 2020 Windfall Study. Agreement with SKDC is in place regarding Quarry Farm with the issue being accepted through SKDC Local Plan examination.
H1	11702452	RC157 , Rosemary Powell	Site H1.18 (WHI/09a) is located on a field with well preserved and coherent medieval ridge and furrow earthworks and therefore its inclusion in the Local Plan as a site appropriate for allocation is not in line with the National Policy Planning Framework. It is not consistent with policies EN15 historic landscapes and EN16 archaeological remains. The landscape study which states a landscape sensitivity of moderate and capacity of medium to high is problematic because it fails to separate out the different areas for specific analysis and does not recognise the potential significance of the ridge and furrow landscape.	NO CHANGE - Site assessment is robust.
H1	20110424	RC194 , David Maher, Barton Willmore on behalf of de Merke Estates	A higher level of growth can be achieved in Oakham and other settlements.	NO CHANGE - Site assessment process is robust and based on assessment of technical consultees.

H1	20110435	RC210 , Emilie Carr, Historic England	<p>H1.7, H1.8, H1.10, H1.11, H1.12, H1.1, H1.2, H1.3, H1.14, H1.15, H1.16 – sound.</p> <p>H1.13 – criteria in site specific policies should be expanded – see chapter 10.</p> <p>H1.17 and H1.18 – High archaeological potential is flagged in relation to both sites in Whissendine. See previous responses to planning applications also.</p>	NO CHANGE – No change with regard to policy H1, see chapter 10 for further consideration of comments.
H1	20110462	RC283 , Neil Johnson	The St George's Barracks development is not appropriate (H2). Questionable sustainability, only part is previously developed, impact on landscape, impact on character and appearance of Edith Weston and North Luffenham, impact of construction work and traffic over a long build out period and inadequacy of roads.	NO CHANGE – Site assessment process has identified the St George's site as a suitable site to provide a new garden community.
H1	20110467	RC328 , Robert Harrison	RCC claim that the St George's site is required to provide affordable houses to the County is both wrong and unjustified. Rutland's annual requirement of 127 houses per annum is 40% supplied by "windfall developments" and the balance would be met for the next 10 years by the reinsertion of the 650 dwellings gifted to SKDC.	NO CHANGE - Evidence in the SHMA identifies that the need is appropriate at 160 dwellings per annum. The windfall amount is based on an updated 2020 Windfall Study. Agreement with SKDC is in place regarding Quarry Farm with the issue being accepted through SKDC Local Plan examination.
H1	11704507	RC182 , Colin Wilkinson, Planit-X Town & Country Planning Services	Large portion of housing and employment is directed to St George's Barracks which limits allocations in Oakham, the main town in the county. Opportunities for the town to respond to the housing needs of Oakham's growing elderly population will be very limited.	NO CHANGE –Site assessment is robust and responds to the spatial strategy set out in Policy SD2.
H1	11705385	RC98 , Janice Patient	Why is COT/03 not allocated when it could provide affordable housing within the village envelope? How was H1.7 chosen for allocation? The site is adjacent to the village hall/community centre and football fields and new residents will complain about noise from people leaving the neighbouring uses.	NO CHANGE – COT/03 was screened out due to flood risk, landscape and heritage constraints. The most appropriate sites across the Local Service Centres that met the requirement set out were allocated.
H1	20110480	RC197 , Philip Davies	A 25% buffer is excessive and will result in overdevelopment and exaggerates the housing need in Rutland. The OAN (independent needs assessment) showed that Rutland needs 127 dwellings per annum but RCC have identified 160 dwellings per annum. Windfall numbers in Rutland have been historically around 50 per annum but the Local Plan only includes 20 per annum. The requirement of 1905 dwellings can be realised if windfall numbers are taken at 50 dwellings per annum (totalling 750 dwellings) and the 650 at Stamford North are included for Rutland, then 600 are required for Rutland which can be accommodated in the towns and local service centres.	NO CHANGE - Evidence in the SHMA identifies that the need is appropriate at 160 dwellings per annum. The windfall amount is based on an updated 2020 Windfall Study. Agreement with SKDC is in place regarding Quarry Farm with the issue being accepted through SKDC Local Plan examination.

H1	20110507	RC296 , Christopher Renner, Normanton Parish Meeting	A 25% buffer is excessive and will result in overdevelopment and exaggerates the housing need in Rutland. The OAN (independent needs assessment) showed that Rutland needs 127 dwellings per annum but RCC have identified 160 dwellings per annum. Windfall numbers in Rutland have been historically around 50 per annum but the Local Plan only includes 20 per annum. The requirement of 1905 dwellings can be realised if windfall numbers are taken at 50 dwellings per annum (totalling 750 dwellings) and the 650 at Stamford North are included for Rutland, then 600 are required for Rutland which can be accommodated in the towns and local service centres.	NO CHANGE - Evidence in the SHMA identifies that the need is appropriate at 160 dwellings per annum. The windfall amount is based on an updated 2020 Windfall Study. Agreement with SKDC is in place regarding Quarry Farm with the issue being accepted through SKDC Local Plan examination.
H1	20110519	RC277 , Helen Duckering, Market Overton Parish Council	Market Overton Parish Council have given support to planning application 2020/0056/MAO to construct 22 dwellings across sites MAR/04a and MAR/04b. The density calculated in the Local Plan for 27 dwellings on H1.14 (MAR/04a) and 27 MAR/04b which is not allocated but could be identified in the future would equate to a large increase in village population and would have an impact on infrastructure such as local schools, transport, doctors surgery and traffic conditions. Construction traffic that would have to access MAR/04b in the future would have a detrimental impact on the occupiers of H1.14 (MAR/04a).	NO CHANGE – Site assessment is robust and the splitting of the initial site into two was to respond to previous concerns from the Parish Council about the scale of development of the wider site. If the site boundary is amended, it would mean a larger scale development could take place.
H1	11706403	RC288 , Paul Boggust	No justification provided for the size of the development proposed at the Officers Mess site. The site is opposite the conservation area and within a few metres of listed buildings and other designated assets. The indicative capacity has not been reduced in the same way that the site in Ketton (H1.11) has due to heritage constraints.	NO CHANGE – Indicative capacity has already been reduced to allow for an appropriate landscaping scheme. Heritage is identified in the site specific policy as a key principle in developing a design for the site.
H1	11706530	RC229 , June Bartlett	H1.2 Land off Uppingham Road, Oakham - No comments provided.	NO CHANGE - Support for the legal compliance and soundness of the Plan in relation to H1.2 noted.
H1	11699709	RC148 , Laurence Howard	H1.18 South lodge Farm, Whissendine: This land is a heritage site with mediaeval ridge and furrow. It is included on both the Natural England and historic Environment registers.	NO CHANGE - Site assessment is robust
H1	11706787	RC318 , Stewart Patience, Anglian Water Services Ltd	Anglian Water is sewerage undertaker for Oakham, Barleythorpe, Uppingham, Cottesmore, Edith Weston, Empingham, Ketton and Ryhall and have raised no objection to the principle of residential development on the allocated sites H1.1 – H1.5, H1.7 – H1.13 and H1.15 – H1.16. They also raise no objection to the scale of housing development to be identified in the Neighbourhood Plan for Uppingham.	SUPPORT WELCOMED

H1	11702485	RC258 , Les Allen, Edith Weston Recreation Ground	H1.8 Officers Mess, Edith Weston: No justification provided for the size of the development proposed. Children living at the site will use the closest playground, Tommy's' Close. They will have to cross the busy Manton Road to use it. A safe walking connection will be very difficult to create. The traffic situation is exacerbated by a busy roundabout junction at the intersection of Normanton, Manton and Edith Weston roads which is busy with articulated trucks accessing the storage park at the top of Welland Drive (subject to retrospective planning application 2019/0736/FUL). Provision of alternative playground space at St Georges Garden Community will not resolve this as residents of the Officers Mess site will need to cross Edith Weston Road to get to it.	NO CHANGE - Consultation with technical stakeholders carried out as part of the site assessment process. Site specific policies set out in Chapter 10 identify key principle relating to safe connections and provision of an on-site play space.
H1	20110531	RC220 , Gale Waller	There is no evidence to justify the 160 dwellings per annum. Rutland's SHA is 127 dwellings per annum. It is assumed that the 25% buffer is to ensure development can happen at St George's. The plan is therefore not based on objective evidence but to enable the MOD to develop St George's. It is not clear why Woolfox was rejected whilst St George's was accepted. They are both former airfields, both include current development on part of the site and both are or were until recently farmed.	NO CHANGE - Evidence in the SHMA identifies that the need is appropriate at 160 dwellings per annum. The site assessment process screened out Woolfox on landscape impact grounds through the SHELAA.

H1	20110549	RC267 , Mark Harris, Bidwells on Behalf of Taylor Wimpey	<p>Lack of consistency between the various stages of the site assessment process and lack of evidence for decision making and lack of consistency with settlement hierarchy. Whilst not seeking to promote an omission site, we use our client's site (OAK/04, South of Brooke Road, Oakham) as an example of the issues with the process. The site was a proposed allocation in the Draft Local Plan issued for consultation in 2017. At this point the site was considered to be suitable for development, with the Local Plan Review Site Appraisals document (July 2017) identifying it as one of the most suitable locations for growth in Oakham. Within this same assessment, OAK/16, which is now proposed for allocation. In this reassessment, despite being a preferred site and no new evidence being prepared to support the Plan (at least not published) OAK/04 is classed as 'unsuitable for development' in the SHLAA. The reason stated is that there is a 'detrimental highway impact'. It also suggests a red RAG rating for landscape – despite the previous assessment stating the site was in one of the least sensitive landscape areas around Oakham. The same rationale applies to OAK/16 which the initial assessment work concluded as being unsuitable on landscape grounds, a position which changes in the subsequent assessment work. Lack of proper assessment of OAK/04 (and other sites) within the site assessment process means that all reasonable alternatives have not been properly. Whilst OAK/04 has been ruled out at the SHLAA stage due to detrimental impact on highways, there are sites within areas assessed as being highly sensitive landscapes (a significant constraint) which have made it through to the next stage of the assessment, where mitigation of the issue has been considered. Why has that not been the case with all sites and issues identified? Despite allocations in the town being greater than other existing settlements, the allocations process gives undue emphasis to St Georges Barracks, which will actually be the focus of development over the Plan period.</p>	NO CHANGE – The site assessment is robust and based on the most up to date evidence available. The site assessment methodology was followed.
H1	11707553	RC255 , Kenneth Bool	<p>A range of reasonable alternatives have not been considered. A sustainability appraisal did not accompany the Development Plan document in July 2018. Significant opposition to the July 2018 consultation on St George's Barracks. The spatial strategy is not appropriate for Rutland and should have proportionate growth and investment spread more evenly across the county. The current strategy has chosen to place a considerable emphasis on a location that is not accessible and doesn't support the viability or the economy of the existing town centres and the larger villages.</p>	NO CHANGE - Site assessment evidence has identified the St George's site as a suitable site to provide a new garden community. The SA report considers a wide range of alternative approaches for the distribution and scale of development.

H1	20110552	RC221 , Gordon smith, Matrix Planning Ltd - On behalf of Richardson Surveyors	<p>As no additional sites for Uppingham are allocated within this draft Plan there will be an extended period of uncertainty whilst RCC wait for the Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan (UNP) review to 'catch up'. This considerable uncertainty could undermine the continuity of housing land supply by excluding a site that has already been shown to be acceptable in principle.</p> <p>The site promoted here has already been identified as a result of an extensive site appraisals process, which included appraisal against sustainability objectives. The deliverability of this site is now adversely affected as it must wait for yet a further process of re-evaluation through the emerging Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	NO CHANGE – Agreement is in place with Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan group so that they can allocate sites within the UNP review.
H1	20110563	RC188 , Carole Brown, Braunston-in-Rutland Parish Council	A 25% buffer is excessive and will result in overdevelopment and exaggerates the housing need in Rutland. The OAN (independent needs assessment) showed that Rutland needs 127 dwellings per annum but RCC have identified 160 dwellings per annum. Windfall numbers in Rutland have been historically around 50 per annum but the Local Plan only includes 20 per annum. The requirement of 1905 dwellings can be realised if windfall numbers are taken at 50 dwellings per annum (totalling 750 dwellings) and the 650 at Stamford North are included for Rutland, then 600 are required for Rutland which can be accommodated in the towns and local service centres. A new settlement is not required.	NO CHANGE - Evidence in the SHMA identifies that the need is appropriate at 160 dwellings per annum. The windfall amount is based on an updated 2020 Windfall Study. Agreement with SKDC is in place regarding Quarry Farm with the issue being accepted through SKDC Local Plan examination.
H1	11581795	RC203 , Richard Drabble, Drabble + List of Rutland Supporters (Attached)	<p>Failure to protect well-preserved Medieval ridge and furrow earthworks of rare quality and form in Whissendine due to the allocation of site H1.18. There are other alternative sites available in Rutland.</p> <p>650 houses proposed at Quarry Farm are being counted towards SKDC supply and not RCC's. This will lead to an overdevelopment of Rutland.</p>	NO CHANGE - Site assessment is robust. – Agreement with SKDC is in place regarding Quarry Farm with the issue being accepted through SKDC Local Plan examination.
H1	11707006	RC316 , Sharon Ashworth	There is no need to add a 25% buffer to the housing need, a 5% or 10% buffer is all that is required. When adding in the 650 dwellings for Quarry Farm, adding the additional windfall numbers and reducing the buffer the plan should only identify 1330 dwellings. Windfall allowance should be increased to at least 35 dwellings per annum. A third town on St George's Barracks is not needed.	NO CHANGE – Evidence in the SHMA identifies that the 25% buffer is appropriate. The windfall amount is based on an updated 2020 Windfall Study.
H1	11708977	RC263 , Nicola Farr, Environment Agency	There is sufficient capacity at the Oakham water recycling capacity for the 382 dwellings allocated across Oakham with Barleythorpe. Five improvement schemes are scheduled by Anglian Water's Asset Management Plan covering 2020-2025 and Anglian Water have confirmed their commitment to these schemes. No objections are raised to the other allocations in Policy H1.	SUPPORT WELCOMED

H1	20110603	RC253 , Kate Wood, Eddisons on behalf of Balfour Beatty Homes	Support for the allocation of H1.11. Land adjacent to Chater House, Ketton: The site is identified as having an indicative capacity of 15 dwellings. This represents a site density of 12 dwellings per hectare. Concern about the use of an indicative figure which is contrary to Policy H5 which seeks a minimum density of 25 dwellings per hectare. Concern that by naming a specific number, even with the reference to it being indicative, there is an implied expectation that this number is set stone, or is a maximum.	SUPPORT WELCOMED for allocation of H1.11. NO CHANGE - the indicative capacity follows the standard methodology to provide a consistent approach across the site assessment process.
H1	20110604	RC253 , Kate Wood, Eddisons on behalf of Balfour Beatty Homes	Support for the allocation of H1.12. The Crescent, Ketton: The site is identified as having an indicative capacity of 35 dwellings. This represents a site density of 26 dwellings per hectare. This is roughly in line with Policy H5 which seeks a minimum density of 25 dwellings per hectare. The Council's suggested 25dph is much lower than the long-established standard minimum density which is 30dph, with 40dph where possible. For this 1.31ha site, 30dph would result in 39 dwellings, 40dph would result in 52 dwellings. Concern that by naming a specific number, even with the reference to it being indicative, there is an implied expectation that this number is set stone, or is a maximum.	SUPPORT WELCOMED for allocation of H1.12. NO CHANGE - the indicative capacity follows the standard methodology to provide a consistent approach across the site assessment process.
H1	20110615	RC287 , Paul Belton , CARTER JONAS on behalf of Pigeon Capital Management Ltd.	Objection raised to the housing requirement being quoted as 130 dwellings per annum and 2340 over the plan period. These figures do not represent the full housing requirement identified through the Local Plan's evidence base. These figures should not be used to determine the housing requirement or the 5 year housing and supply target. While paragraph 5.10 does not quote what the Local Housing Need Figure is, this is defined elsewhere (paragraph 5.1) as being 127 dwellings. Paragraph 5.10 is therefore by association, unsound.	NO CHANGE – The SHMA evidences the provision of a 25% buffer on top of the Local Housing Need Standard Calculation of 127 dwellings per annum (rounded to 130) set out by Central Government. This buffer provides an increase in supply which provides flexibility and addresses issues of affordability.
H1	20110616	RC287 , Paul Belton , CARTER JONAS on behalf of Pigeon Capital Management Ltd.	Support for the allocation of H1.3 Land off Burley Road, Oakham for an indicative capacity of 200 dwellings.	SUPPORT WELCOMED

H1	20110633	RC256 , Kenneth Siddle, Wing Parish Council	<p>The Plan proposes a 25% oversupply which is not justified or consistent with national policy. The attempted obfuscation related to seeking to improve affordability through oversupply is an argument that is not substantiated by evidencing an exceptional case and is not therefore supported by current data.</p> <p>It is not clear on what basis the plan assumes a windfall allowance of 20 units per annum. The Council's draft Windfall Study (2017) considered this and identified a cautious 34 dwellings per annum. Background papers show that a combination of windfall development and overall buffer have been used as a form of reconciliation to shoe-horn the late entry of St George's Barracks in.</p>	NO CHANGE - Evidence in the SHMA identifies that the 25% buffer is appropriate. The windfall amount is based on an updated 2020 Windfall Study.
H1	20110638	RC212 , Paul Boggust, Edith Weston Parish Council	The 25% buffer is not justified and the evidence is lacking to demonstrate that it would address affordability issues. The standard method already takes account of affordability. If any deliverability issues arose about specific sites, these could be dealt with through a review of the plan, therefore a 5-10% buffer is more appropriate. The oversupply is significantly over the 25% increase due to the underestimation of windfalls, the failure to count Quarry Farm in the supply and the failure to count new military houses coming onto the market at Edith Weston. The windfall allowance could be even higher due to the Government's recent changes to Permitted Development rights.	NO CHANGE - Evidence in the SHMA identifies that the need is appropriate at 160 dwellings per annum. The windfall amount is based on an updated 2020 Windfall Study. Agreement with SKDC is in place regarding Quarry Farm with the issue being accepted through SKDC Local Plan examination. There is no scope for counting the homes being sold off by the MOD in housing supply calculations set out by the NPPG.
H1	20110641	RC212 , Paul Boggust, Edith Weston Parish Council	Allocation of H1.8 Officers Mess. Edith Weston is unsound because of an unacceptable impact on heritage assets. No evidence is provided as to viability or achievability. Cumulative impact of St Georges Garden Community and Officers Mess is not identified. The size of the allocation is an unsustainable increase to the size of Edith Weston. Traffic impacts have not been properly assessed.	NO CHANGE - Consultation with technical stakeholders carried out as part of the site assessment process. Site specific policies set out in Chapter 10 identify key principles for the development of a scheme.
H1	20110653	RC205 , Ed Rehill, Savills on behalf of The Society of Merchant Venturers	Representation submitted on behalf of Society of Merchant Venturers who promoted site OAK/08a through the SHELAA process. Policy RLP12 of the 2017 consultation draft of the Local Plan proposed to allocate four sites in Oakham including OAK/08a for 80 dwellings. The inclusion in this Local Plan Review of St George's Garden Community has reduced the number of proposed allocations in Oakham from 757 dwellings to 382 and OAK/08a is no longer identified as an allocation. Reference is made to comparing OAK/08a to sites H1.3 and H1.4 in relation to landscape sensitivity and that it scores better in this regard. With regard to H1.4 it is identified that there is an overhead line constraint that needs to be considered and that the indicative capacity may not be achievable.	NO CHANGE – Site assessment is robust. Delivery is identified in the trajectory based on discussions with the site promoters

H1	20110661	RC336 , Janet Hughes	H1.1 Land south of Brooke Road (former allotments), Oakham: Access to the site would be better from Uppingham Road, not Brooke Road to reduce the impact on traffic congestion and the level crossing.	NO CHANGE - Planning permission granted under 2019/1228/OUT for 40 dwellings.
H1	11709134	RC191 , Julia Collins	Site H1.2 - Land off Uppingham Road: Objection raised due to concerns that the infrastructure in Oakham cannot sustain the amount of new development which in turn impacts on the wellbeing of existing residents.	NO CHANGE –Technical stakeholders have been consulted through the site assessment process and have not objected to the level of development for Oakham on lack of infrastructure grounds.
H1	20110670	RC205 , Ed Rehill, Savills on behalf of The Society of Merchant Venturers	Representation submitted on behalf of Society of Merchant Venturers who promoted site OAK/08b through the SHELAA process. Further technical assessment has been carried out which identifies that site OAK/08b could accommodate in the region of 80 dwellings. The evidence does not robustly justify why sites OAK/13a and OAK/13c have been proposed for allocation over OAK/08b and OAK/08a. With regard to OAK/13a and OAK/13c the Council have been mindful of the benefits of a combination of sites. The same assessment of the combination of OAK/05, OAK/08a and OAK/08b has not taken place. The allocation of OAK/08b in tandem with proposed allocation H1.2 would provide benefits to walking linkages, cycleways, potential provision of new facilities and green space network enhancements.	NO CHANGE – Site assessment is robust. Delivery is identified in the trajectory based on discussions with the site promoters
H1	20110682	RC242 , J C M Ball	A 25% buffer is excessive and will result in overdevelopment and exaggerates the housing need in Rutland. The OAN (independent needs assessment) showed that Rutland needs 127 dwellings per annum but RCC have identified 160 dwellings per annum. Windfall numbers in Rutland have been historically around 50 per annum but the Local Plan only includes 20 per annum. The requirement of 1905 dwellings can be realised if windfall numbers are taken at 50 dwellings per annum (totalling 750 dwellings) and the 650 at Stamford North are included for Rutland, then 600 are required for Rutland which can be accommodated in the towns and local service centres. A new community is not required.	NO CHANGE - Evidence in the SHMA identifies that the need is appropriate at 160 dwellings per annum. The windfall amount is based on an updated 2020 Windfall Study. Agreement with SKDC is in place regarding Quarry Farm with the issue being accepted through SKDC Local Plan examination.
H1	11709030	RC192 , Norman Milne, Fight 4 Rutland Ltd	A range of reasonable alternatives have not been considered. A sustainability appraisal did not accompany the Development Plan document in July 2018. Significant opposition to the July 2018 consultation on St George's Barracks. The spatial strategy is not appropriate for Rutland and should have proportionate growth and investment spread more evenly across the county. The current strategy has chosen to place a considerable emphasis on a location that is not accessible and doesn't support the viability or the economy of the existing town centres and the larger villages.	NO CHANGE - Site assessment evidence has identified the St George's site as a suitable site to provide a new garden community. The SA report considers a wide range of alternative approaches for the distribution and scale of development.

H1	20110691	RC332 , Tom Murie, Tixover Parish Meeting	A 25% buffer is excessive and will result in overdevelopment and exaggerates the housing need in Rutland. The OAN (independent needs assessment) showed that Rutland needs 127 dwellings per annum but RCC have identified 160 dwellings per annum. Windfall numbers in Rutland have been historically around 50 per annum but the Local Plan only includes 20 per annum. The requirement of 1905 dwellings can be realised if windfall numbers are taken at 50 dwellings per annum (totalling 750 dwellings) and the 650 at Stamford North are included for Rutland, then 600 are required for Rutland which can be accommodated in the towns and local service centres. A new community is not required.	NO CHANGE - Evidence in the SHMA identifies that the need is appropriate at 160 dwellings per annum. The windfall amount is based on an updated 2020 Windfall Study. Agreement with SKDC is in place regarding Quarry Farm with the issue being accepted through SKDC Local Plan examination.
H1	11709051	RC192 , Norman Milne, Fight 4 Rutland Ltd	A 25% buffer is excessive and will result in overdevelopment and exaggerates the housing need in Rutland. The OAN (independent needs assessment) showed that Rutland needs 127 dwellings per annum but RCC have identified 160 dwellings per annum. Windfall numbers in Rutland have been historically around 50 per annum but the Local Plan only includes 20 per annum. The requirement of 1905 dwellings can be realised if windfall numbers are taken at 50 dwellings per annum (totalling 750 dwellings) and the 650 at Stamford North are included for Rutland, then 600 are required for Rutland which can be accommodated in the towns and local service centres. A new community is not required.	NO CHANGE - Evidence in the SHMA identifies that the need is appropriate at 160 dwellings per annum. The windfall amount is based on an updated 2020 Windfall Study. Agreement with SKDC is in place regarding Quarry Farm with the issue being accepted through SKDC Local Plan examination.
H1	11709177	RC243 , Joanna Bonser	H1.8 Officers Mess Edith Weston: Quantity/density of dwellings on H1.8 is disproportionate to most other sites.	NO CHANGE – Indicative capacity has already been reduced to allow for an appropriate landscaping scheme.
H1	11709193	RC299 , Richard Bonser	The allocation of sites and the relative size of each one is significantly disproportionate to the current dwellings of the county.	NO CHANGE - The sites have been subject to a thorough site appraisal process.
H1	11707701	RC168 , Alex Miller, Miller Motorsport	Development in Local Service Centres has been dramatically reduced in favour of a single large development at Ste Georges Garden Community, stifling growth in Local Service Centres.	NO CHANGE – 12 sites are allocated across the Local Service Centres.
H1	201106104	RC202 , WJ & PJ Cross	A 25% buffer is excessive and will result in overdevelopment and exaggerates the housing need in Rutland. The OAN (independent needs assessment) showed that Rutland needs 127 dwellings per annum but RCC have identified 160 dwellings per annum. Windfall numbers in Rutland have been historically around 50 per annum but the Local Plan only includes 20 per annum. The requirement of 1905 dwellings can be realised if windfall numbers are taken at 50 dwellings per annum (totalling 750 dwellings) and the 650 at Stamford North are included for Rutland, then 600 are required for Rutland which can be accommodated in the towns and local service centres. A new community is not required.	NO CHANGE - Evidence in the SHMA identifies that the need is appropriate at 160 dwellings per annum. The windfall amount is based on an updated 2020 Windfall Study. Agreement with SKDC is in place regarding Quarry Farm with the issue being accepted through SKDC Local Plan examination.

H1	11707241	RC175 , Chris Rowlands	H1.4 - Land south of Braunston Road, Oakham: Site cannot accommodate the indicative capacity of 61 dwellings without the dwellings having very small gardens.	NO CHANGE - Support received from site promoter regarding capacity of site H1.4.
H1	201106116	RC223 , Geoff Armstrong, Armstrong Rigg Planning on behalf of Manor Oak Homes	The strategy for Local Service Centres (LSC) is unjustified and therefore unsound as it is not an appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternative of allocating more land in the most sustainable Local Service Centres. There is little correlation between the most sustainable LSC's and the number of proposed dwellings. The allocation of a greater (both actual and proportionally) number of dwellings to some of the less sustainable LSC's conflicts with Strategic Objective 1 (Sustainable Locations for Development) of the emerging Local Plan Review which seeks to identify locations and sites suitable to accommodate development sustainably, providing an opportunity to access services and facilities locally, maintaining the need to minimise travel and reduce carbon emissions. Edith Weston and Market Overton which sit at the lower end of the rankings will increase by 18% and 13%, respectively, while Ketton and Ryhall will only increase by 7.3% and 5.5%, respectively, despite being the most sustainable LSC's and having received extremely limited growth since 2006. If sustainable patterns of development are to be achieved that sustain the role and function of villages then it is paramount that an adequate supply of deliverable sites are allocated in the most sustainable LSCs. The proposed allocation of St. George's Barracks has resulted in a lower level of growth being directed to the Local Service Centres.	NO CHANGE – Site assessment is robust and the sites allocated meet the requirement set out. A range of alternative approaches were assessed.
H1	201106117	RC223 , Geoff Armstrong, Armstrong Rigg Planning on behalf of Manor Oak Homes	Concerns raised about the deliverability of H1.10. Southview Farm Empingham. The site has been allocated for six years with no progress to date. The SHELAA identifies that the earliest point that it will be available will be in 5-10 years' time.	NO CHANGE - Deliverability information provided by agent through the site assessment process.

H1	201106118	RC223 , Geoff Armstrong, Armstrong Rigg Planning on behalf of Manor Oak Homes	Concerns raised about the deliverability of H1.11. Adjacent to Chater House, Ketton: The site was allocated for 34 dwellings in the Site Allocations Development Plan Document 2014. It is now identified with an indicative capacity of 15 in recognition of heritage constraints. The Site Allocation Assessment states that the development would have no impact on trees protected by TPO as there are no TPOs on or adjacent the site. This is incorrect, the site frontage is the subject of TPO and trees both adjacent to and opposite the site are also subject to protection. The Parish Council have concerns about the change to the street scene in the conservation area and ecological and biodiversity appraisals were requested but never submitted under an application for the access into the site only (2018/0359/FUL) which was later withdrawn.	NO CHANGE – Current planning application being considered. Deliverability information provided by site promoter as part of site assessment process.
H1	201106119	RC223 , Geoff Armstrong, Armstrong Rigg Planning on behalf of Manor Oak Homes	Concerns raised about the deliverability of H1.13. Home Farm Ketton: The site was allocated for 19 dwellings in the Site Allocations Development Plan Document 2014. It is now identified with an indicative capacity of 10 in recognition of heritage constraints. There are constraints including heritage assets, landscape sensitivity, public right of way across the site and highway access limitations that impact on the delivery of this site.	NO CHANGE - Current planning application being considered. Deliverability information provided by site promoter as part of site assessment process.
H1	201106129	RC331 , TJ & EVR Boone	A 25% buffer is excessive and will result in overdevelopment and exaggerates the housing need in Rutland. The OAN (independent needs assessment) showed that Rutland needs 127 dwellings per annum but RCC have identified 160 dwellings per annum. Windfall numbers in Rutland have been historically around 50 per annum but the Local Plan only includes 20 per annum. The requirement of 1905 dwellings can be realised if windfall numbers are taken at 50 dwellings per annum (totalling 750 dwellings) and the 650 at Stamford North are included for Rutland, then 600 are required for Rutland which can be accommodated in the towns and local service centres. A new community is not required.	NO CHANGE - Evidence in the SHMA identifies that the need is appropriate at 160 dwellings per annum. The windfall amount is based on an updated 2020 Windfall Study. Agreement with SKDC is in place regarding Quarry Farm with the issue being accepted through SKDC Local Plan examination.
H1	11709261	RC300 , Robert Grace	Consultation with residents on site selection has not taken place, in particular because neighbouring properties to site H1.2 were still being completed and were not occupied.	NO CHANGE – The community has been consulted.
H1	11709330	RC204 , Karen Davies	The proposal to site the majority of housing development at St George's Barracks ignores the development needs of existing towns and villages. No other site was considered even though Woolfox has many advantages including excellent access to the A1 and proximity to Stamford.	NO CHANGE - Site assessment evidence has identified the St George's site as a suitable site to provide a new garden community. The SA report considers a wide range of alternative approaches for the distribution and scale of development. The Woolfox site was assessed alongside St George's.

H1	201106157	RC207, Billy Lloyd, DLP Planning Ltd. On behalf of Bowbridge Land Limited	Scoring methodology is not available for Site Appraisal Assessment.	CONSIDER CHANGE– Site Assessment methodology to be published. It should be noted that as a result of this representation, it has been identified that the quantitative scoring that formed part of an initial approach has not been removed from the site assessment documents, after the decision was taken not to use the quantitative scoring for the allocation of sites, but rather a qualitative assessment approach as identified at paragraph 2.11 of the Methodology for Assessing Potential Sites Update December 2019. Site Allocations Assessment therefore should be updated with the removal of reference to the previous scoring approach. It should be reiterated that the quantitative scoring was not used in assessing the most appropriate sites for allocation, this was done through a qualitative assessment as identified in the published methodology.
H1	201106162	RC226, Guy Longley, Pegasus group on behalf of Davidsons Developments Limited.	The allocation of H1.2 Land off Uppingham Road, Oakham is supported. An illustrative masterplan has been prepared and a planning application is due to be submitted in the next few months. The indicative capacity identified in the site assessment process equates to 73 dwellings, however Davidsons Developments have prepared a masterplan showing the provision of 90 dwellings.	SUPPORT WELCOMED - regarding allocation of H1.2. NO CHANGE - the indicative capacity follows the standard methodology to provide a consistent approach across the site assessment process.
H1	201106173	RC335 , Guy Longley , Pegasus group on behalf of Vistry	Land at Timbergate Road (KET/03a) was included in the Draft Plan in 2017. Ketton is the most sustainable Local Service Centre and needs development to be sustained. Site SHELAA/KET/03a should be allocated.	NO CHANGE - Site assessment is robust.

H1	201106181	RC171 , Andrew Gore, Marrons Planning on behalf of Jeakins Weir Ltd	Site OAK/02 should not have a red RAG rating for landscape. Landscape and Visual Statement submitted with representation. A sympathetically designed public footpath can be provided. The RAG rating in relation to heritage for OAK/02 should be green. OAK/02. Heritage assessment differs between H1.2 and OAK/02 resulting in a green score for H1.2 and a red score for OAK/02. Heritage appraisal submitted by Cotswold Archaeology. OAK/02 scores an amber rating for flood risk. RPS Flood Risk Appraisal submitted with representation. The site is not at risk of flooding. Accepted that neighbouring land to the north is in the flood zone but this doesn't form part of the site. The RAG rating for OAK/02 in relation to flood risk should be green. Discrepancy between the way in which the highway impact has been considered between OAK/02 and H1.2. The RAG rating for highways in respect of OAK/02 should be amber, not red. With regard to agricultural land, H1.2 originally had a red score but this has been reduced to amber following soil testing. OAK/02 should also be amended on this basis due to its proximity to H1.2. It is unclear why H1.2 scores green in BAP priority habitat category whilst OAK/02 scores red.	NO CHANGE – Site assessment process is robust and based on assessment of technical consultees. Therefore no change to the allocations. CHANGE – Agree following further consultation with Highways Officer that Lead Flood Authority Flood Risk comment for OAK/02 in the SHELAA should be green, low risk, not amber. This does not impact on the overall site assessment as the site was not ruled out on flood risk grounds.
H1	11708201	RC120 , Will Atkinson	The 25% buffer feels high, particularly as windfall sites are forecast below the current level. The current windfall rates along with the Stamford North plans could deliver a significant proportion of the housing amount with smaller scale developments, as envisaged in the 2017 plan.	NO CHANGE - Evidence in the SHMA identifies that the 25% buffer is appropriate. Site assessment evidence has identified the St George's site as a suitable site to provide a new garden community. The SA report considers a wide range of alternative approaches for the distribution and scale of development. The windfall amount is based on robust evidence in the updated 2020 Windfall Study. Agreement with SKDC is in place regarding Quarry Farm with the issue being accepted through SKDC Local Plan examination.
H1	11708086	RC120 , Will Atkinson	A county wide approach to housing including affordable housing that supports and hopefully enhances the existing towns like previous local plans should be the focus. This would drive investment across the county rather than in one location. The opportunity at St George's should not override long lasting local plan core principles that protect and promote the sustainability of Rutland for all residents in the long term.	NO CHANGE - Site assessment evidence has identified the St George's site as a suitable site to provide a new garden community. The SA report considers a wide range of alternative approaches for the distribution and scale of development. The plan proposes some growth in both towns and the large villages to ensure the vitality of these communities are maintained.

H1	2011061952	RC321 , Sue Green, House Builders Federation	Housing delivery is optimised where a wide mix of sites is provided, therefore strategic sites should be complimented by smaller non-strategic sites. As set out in the 2019 NPPF at least 10% of the housing requirement should be accommodated on sites no larger than one hectare or else demonstrate strong reasons for not achieving this target (para 68a). For Rutland, 10% of the minimum LHN is 234 dwellings, 10% of the residual minimum LHN is 159 dwellings, 10% of SHMA housing need is 288 dwellings and 10% residual SHMA housing need is 207 dwellings. Policy H1 only allocates seven sites (H1.5, H1.9, H1.10, H1.14, H1.15, H1.16 and H1.17) of less than one hectare for circa 94 dwellings. The Council should ensure that the Local Plan is consistent with 2019 NPPF. The Council expects the St. Georges Garden Community to deliver 1,000 dwellings (100 dwellings per annum) from 2025/26 up to 2036. This delivery rate projection is based on industry norms rather than County based evidence. It is noted that the ongoing HIF bid process is material to the deliverability of this development. If the HIF bid is successful, then funds will be available for the infrastructure requirements to deliver this site. Without funding, the Council will struggle to demonstrate a viably deliverable development.	NO CHANGE – The number identified in the Plan through Policy H1 allocations and including the contribution from St George’s (under Policy H3 a) iii)) are considered to be sufficient to meet the NPPF requirement. RCC and DIO agree that the delivery timescales for development at St George’s.
H1	201106203	RC180, Billy Lloyd, DLP Planning Ltd. On behalf of Hereward Homes	Policy H1 is inconsistent with Strategic Objective 1 and part c) of Policy SD1 which seeks to utilise the most productive use of previously developed land in sustainable locations. In previous iterations of the Local Plan, the Local Service Centre of Greetham had been allocated a proportion of residential development. It is now allocated no residential development, despite having brownfield opportunities available including our Client’s site at the former quarry. 200 dwellings at Uppingham are not allocated and therefore will take longer to be delivered as they are subject to the UNP review process. There is no evidence provided by the Council which demonstrates St. George’s will deliver in the years 2025/26. The delivery of St. George’s may be delayed which would severely impact on the soundness of the Local Plan and settlement hierarchy. Other sites, such as that at Greetham Quarry, are available for development now.	NO CHANGE - Site assessment is robust.

H1	201106222	RC291 , Philip Rawle, PDR Planning on behalf of Greenlight Developments	Site H1.17 Land off Melton Road. Whissendine: boundary does not reflect the discussions between Greenlight, Historic England and the Council's Conservation Officer held in 2018. The larger site is not allocated, only the smaller site on Melton Road. The site can be acceptably increased from 0.48 hectares to 0.79 hectares with an indicative capacity of 21 dwellings. Unclear how the indicative capacity has been calculated for site SHELAA/WHI/12. A lower capacity has been identified through design work of 47 dwellings. Scoring needs correcting in site assessment. The site assessment document states the site is not suitable but the SHELAA identifies the site as being suitable. Distance to bus stops has a red RAG rating but Manual for Streets states that walkable neighbourhoods have a range of facilities within 800m. If both sites are developed a footpath can be provided between the two which would improve pedestrian accessibility.	NO CHANGE – the boundary of H1.17 is not identified to be changed as the current boundary shown reflects the existing southern boundary along Melton Road and is considered to be appropriate. CHANGE – Agree that the scoring in the Full Site Assessment for SHELAA/WHI/12 differs between the full site assessment sheets in Appendix C. Site assessment methodology to be published. It should be noted that as a result of this representation, it has been identified that the quantitative scoring that formed part of an initial approach has not been removed from the site assessment documents, after the decision was taken not to utilise the quantitative scoring for the allocation of sites, but rather a qualitative assessment approach as identified at paragraph 2.11 of the Methodology for Assessing Potential Sites Update December 2019. Site Allocations Assessment therefore should be updated with the removal of reference to the previous scoring approach. It should be reiterated that the quantitative scoring was not used in assessing the most appropriate sites for allocation, this was done through a qualitative assessment as identified in the published methodology.
H1	201106226	RC162, Adam Murray, Andrew Granger & Co. Ltd. On behalf of Mr PJSR Hill and Pikerace Limited	Under provision raised under response to SD2. Proposed changes in the standard methodology would increase need to 307 dpa. Delivery timescales set out for St George's is not realistic. The allocation of St George's should be reduced to a capacity of 350 dwellings to be supported by existing infrastructure. Woolfox site could contribute 1470 dwellings in the plan period.	NO CHANGE - Site assessment is robust. - Evidence in the SHMA identifies that the 25% buffer is appropriate. RCC and the DIO have discussed and agreed the delivery timescales for St George's.

H1	201106239	RC279 , Malcom Touchin , CPRE Rutland	<p>Failure to consider whether combined sites could overcome identified constraints that screened them out through the SHELA process, and in combination deliver Sustainable Urban Extensions to the existing main towns and surrounding settlements is identified as a major flaw in how the SHELA was undertaken.Site Allocations Assessment (Rutland CC Dec 19) is effectively a “Policy On” study, screening out sites to meet allocated housing requirement per settlement. Hence otherwise acceptable options for settlement growth are screened out at this stage, bearing in mind, one must remember, that a considerable number of sites had already been screened out at SHELA stage 1 due to impacts on designated assets, peripherality and isolation, etc.Figures for housing supply options for Growth used in the SA do not accord with those derived from the Site Allocations Assessment, i.e., where are High (532) and Low (382) figures for Oakham derived from? Where is High figure for Uppingham (312) derived from? Where is High (775) figure for “Rest” derived from? It must be noted that it is clear that these High figures could meet the housing requirement without any need to consider a new settlement at either the Woolfox or SGB sites.Local Plan Supply table (Table 2) again uses a different figure total supply figure to the SA for Uppingham (319), Oakham (890) and “Rest”, (433). The total supply indicated demonstrably meets the housing requirement of 1529 without apparent need to concentrate the majority of growth at a new settlement.It must also be noted that the allocation for Uppingham is capped at 200 dwellings, and delegated to the Neighbourhood Plan to allocate (is this 200 dwellings on top of the 183 allocated in the NP or only an additional 17 dwellings from 2026 to 2036!). The adopted Neighbourhood Plan was never the vehicle to have considered strategic matters such as appraising SUE options etc., so simply carrying forward the NP is not robust, and has not been agreed with the Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan Group. Neither has the 200 dwelling cap.There are many flaws in the site selection process, all of which would appear to have been skewed in terms of supporting the allocation of St George’s Barracks while commensurately suppressing sites coming forward elsewhere.</p>	NO CHANGE - Evidence in the SHMA identifies that the requirement is appropriate at 160 dwellings per annum (including a 25% buffer). The SA tests a range of different alternative strategies.
----	-----------	---------------------------------------	--	--

H1	201106246	RC338 , Kate Wood, Eddisons on behalf of Beeson Wright Ltd.	Support for the allocation of H1.13. Home Farm Ketton. The site is identified as having an indicative capacity of 10 dwellings. This represents a site density of 9 dwellings per hectare. Concern about the use of an indicative figure which is contrary to Policy H5 which seeks a minimum density of 25 dwellings per hectare. Concern that by naming a specific number, even with the reference to it being indicative, there is an implied expectation that this number is set stone, or is a maximum. The site involves the conversion of traditional buildings and it is important to understand the contribution of the new build element to ensure viability.	SUPPORT WELCOMED for allocation of H1.13.NO CHANGE - the indicative capacity follows the standard methodology to provide a consistent approach across the site assessment process. However this site has heritage constraints which have reduced indicative site capacity.
H1	201106248	RC193 , Charlotte Bailey, DLP Planning Limited on behalf of Larkfleet	Housing need standard calculation is identified to set requirement, despite the SHMA identifying a higher requirement. Proposed methodology for calculating standard housing need calculation would result in 307 dpa. The Council should set a housing requirement of at least 169 dpa. Based on affordability Rutland should adopt a housing target of 232dpa. Leaving the allocation of sites in Uppingham to the UNP review will delay delivery. Scoring methodology is not published. Sites are not allocated for Uppingham which will cause a delay in them being delivered. OAK/13a & c, OAK/05 and OAK/16 will take around 4.8-5.3 years to progress through the planning system. Not enough sites are allocated in urban locations. Deliverability of 1000 dwellings within the plan period starting in 2025/26 at St George's is identified which could be delayed impacting on the soundness of the plan. Land at Ayston Road, Uppingham and Burley Park Way, Oakham are available for development now.	NO CHANGE – The SHMA evidences the provision of a 25% buffer on top of the Local Housing Need Standard Calculation of 127 dwellings per annum (rounded to 130) set out by Central Government. This buffer provides an increase in supply which provides flexibility and addresses issues of affordability. CHANGE – Site assessment methodology to be published. It should be noted that as a result of this representation, it has been identified that the quantitative scoring that formed part of an initial approach has not been removed from the site assessment documents, after the decision was taken not to utilise the quantitative scoring for the allocation of sites, but rather a qualitative assessment approach as identified at paragraph 2.11 of the Methodology for Assessing Potential Sites Update December 2019. Site Allocations Assessment therefore should be updated with the removal of reference to the previous scoring approach. It should be reiterated that the quantitative scoring was not used in assessing the most appropriate sites for allocation, this was done through a qualitative assessment as identified in the published methodology.
H1	201106252	RC264 , Lydia Voyias, Savills on behalf of Manor Oak Homes	Land to the south of Meadow Lane and north of Belmesthorpe Road, Ryhall (SHELAA/RYP/06a) was previously identified in draft policy RLP12 of the Regulation 18 Consultation Draft Local Plan 2017 for 82 dwellings. It has now been removed as an allocation due to the inclusion of the St George's Barracks site. A reduction from 82 dwellings to 36 for Ryhall is now identified. There is no technical justification for not allocating the site. Concerns raised about the deliverability of the two sites identified in Ryhall (H1.15 and H1.16). Other sites in Local Service Centres that have been previously allocated have not delivered including H1.10 and H1.11.	NO CHANGE – Site is not required in order to fulfil the housing need requirement.

H1	201106257	RC292 , Paul Browne	H1.2 Uppingham Road, Oakham. Why has the agricultural land quality been re-classified to a lesser grade, which has enabled the land at H1.2 now to be credited with a RAG rating of 26? Should this be the case, then is it Council practice to accept such a recent report without further objective scrutiny. It is noted that OAK/08a is Grade 3 and should therefore be preferred to H1.2. With regard to landscape, H1.2 is recorded as overlapping with medium landscaped sensitivity does not bear comparison with adjacent sites rated as overlapping with high landscape sensitivity. In comparison to H1.2, OAK/02 would not exhibit any further significant intrusion. OAK/02 is 7.17ha, which is substantially more than H1.2 (4.13ha) development of the same could readily incorporate and provide protection for the existing mature specimen trees and woodlands, which are identified in the RAG rating for BAP priority habit. Whilst OAK/02 falls within Oakham Conservation Area and OAK/08A adjoins that Conservation Area, there is however no Conservation Area Appraisal published. Accordingly, there is no method of assessing the special items of interest of that Conservation Site in respect of OAK/02 and OAK/08A. Both are otherwise open agricultural land.	NO CHANGE – Site assessment is robust.
H1	20111811	RC86 , Stanley Maldon	The reduction in capacity has not been applied consistently across the two sites H1.8 and H1.7 (COT/01). Reduce the housing density of officers mess H1.8 (EDI/03) allocation in line with conservation, wildlife protection and green boundary considerations which have to be made for the COT/01 allocation. On this basis the indicative number of houses on EDI/03 would be 26.	NO CHANGE – A consistent indicative capacity calculation is carried out as a starting point. Any amendments made to the indicative capacity are done on a case by case basis, based on specific constraints.
H1	20110520	RC217 , Gordon Smith, Matrix Planning Ltd - On behalf of T.P.Scott and Son	As no additional sites for Uppingham are allocated within this draft Plan there will be an extended period of uncertainty whilst RCC wait for the Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan (UNP) review to 'catch up'. This considerable uncertainty could undermine the continuity of housing land supply by excluding a site that has already been shown to be acceptable in principle. The site promoted here at The Beeches has already been identified as a result of an extensive site appraisals process, which included appraisal against sustainability objectives. The deliverability of this site is now adversely affected as it must wait for yet a further process of re-evaluation through the emerging Neighbourhood Plan.	NO CHANGE – Agreement is in place with Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan group so that they can allocate sites within the UNP review.

H1	201106311	RC287 , Paul Belton, CARTER JONAS on behalf of Pigeon Capital Management Ltd.	There are a couple of minor corrections that are required but should be read in conjunction with support representations above. Criteria f) of Policy H1.3 appears to suggest that as part of the planned development of the land around the Co-op site, any future application will also need to improve the pedestrian and cycle environment within the Co-op site. The Co-op site is in separate ownership to allocation area H1.3. Pigeon fully support the requirement to deliver new cycle and pedestrian routes up to the site boundary of the Co-op site. Each landowner can only however be required to deliver connections upon land they control and therefore up to the site boundary. If a similar policy requirement is attached to both policy areas, the required cycle and pedestrian connections will then be able to be delivered. Also, A site area of 14.21 hectares has been identified on the Oakham and Barleythorpe Inset Map (map 38). Additional land is however available for inclusion in the allocation site, namely an area of paddock land located due east of Oakham Veterinary Hospital. Pigeon are not proposing that the area of paddock land be developed but instead the land is to remain open and shall be used as allotments and public open space, to ensure an appropriate landscape scheme is brought forward, additional policy wording could be added to Policy H1.3 to require that landscaping and open space be provided in the north western part of the site to limit any potential impacts that might otherwise arise through the provision of built development on this part of the site. There is no public or landscape benefit to the land remaining as private paddocks. The benefits associated with this land being given over to public use and provided as allotment land are however both clear and extensive. The total site area of the land included within Pigeon's illustrative masterplan amounts to 16.5ha.	NO CHANGE
H1, EN15, EN16, Inset Maps	201106183	RC171 , Andrew Gore, Marrons Planning on behalf of Jeakins Weir Ltd	Scoring discrepancy relating to landscape impact between H1.3 and SHELAA/OAK/02. OAK/13c part of site H1.3 has a red RAG rating for landscape as does OAK/02 but they are treated differently. The SHELAA assessment states there are no public rights of way connected with site H1.3 and has a green RAG rating, however Public Footpath E203/1/Oakham forming part of the Hereward Way is alongside the southern boundary. Views from this footpath would be impacted on by the development of H1.3.	NO CHANGE - Site assessment process is robust and based on assessment of technical consultees.
H1, Appendix 5	11665954	RC64 , Elspeth Speirs	H1.18 South lodge Farm, Whissendine: It is not justified to turn around the historical record which is so valued and necessary for a few houses that can go in another location that is not at risk.	NO CHANGE - The ridge and furrow on its own is not sufficient reason to refuse a small scale development as allocated.

H1, Dev Principle H1.1	20102933	RC103 , Frances Cunningham , Network Rail	Policy H1.1 Land South of Brooke Road, Oakham: Site is in close proximity to a Level Crossing and has potential to impact upon the Level Crossing. A transport assessment is required to assess the impact of the development and its associated traffic alongside an assessment of the site entrance and its impacts which should be shared with Network Rail.	NO CHANGE TO POLICY BUT CONSIDER CHANGE TO “for information” section under the policy can be extended to include reference to the TA including an assessment of the impacts on the level crossing
H1, Dev principle H1.1	11709042	RC263 , Nicola Farr, Environment Agency	H1.1 - Former allotments on Brooke Road, Oakham (OAK/12) Note the requirement to avoid development of the small area of land in flood zone 2. However the extent of flood zone 2 will increase with climate change and this point should be strengthened. The site will require a flood risk assessment as all applications including Flood Zone 2 should be accompanied by one.	CONSIDER CHANGE TO bullet point j) of policy H1.1
H1, Dev Principle H1.15	11709045	RC263 , Nicola Farr, Environment Agency	Site Specific Policy H1.15 - River Gwash Trout Farm, Belmesthorpe Lane, Ryhall (RYH/04 & RYH/08) Note the requirement to avoid development of the small area of land in flood zone 2. However the extent of flood zone 2 will increase with climate change and this point should be strengthened. The site will require a flood risk assessment as all applications including Flood Zone 2 should be accompanied by one.	CONSIDER CHANGE TO bullet point e) of policy H1.15
H1, Dev Principle H1.16	11709049	RC263 , Nicola Farr, Environment Agency	Site Specific Policy H1.16 - Land to the southwest of Belmesthorpe Lane, Ryhall (RYH/09) Note the requirement to avoid development of the small area of land in flood zone 2. However the extent of flood zone 2 will increase with climate change and this point should be strengthened. The site will require a flood risk assessment as all applications including Flood Zone 2 should be accompanied by one.	CONSIDER CHANGE TO bullet point e) of policy H1.16
H1, Dev Principle H1.2	11686771	RC94 , Zena Deayton	H1.2 site mentions under points a) and b) ensuring sensitivity to development on the boundary with the outlook preserved and continuing the line of mature trees fronting the Uppingham Road. Firstly it will be impossible to preserve the outlook and secondly there are not currently mature trees fronting Uppingham Road beyond Spinney Hill. If developed this development will be openly seen from Uppingham Road as the approach into the Town for many years to come. Site selection does not prioritise lower grade agricultural land classification and brownfield land. Consultation with residents on site selection has not taken place, in particular because neighbouring properties to site H1.2 were still being completed and were not occupied.	NO CHANGE
H1, Dev Principle H1.2	20102934	RC103 , Frances Cunningham , Network Rail	H1.1 - Former allotments on Brooke Road, Oakham. The site has potential to impact upon the local railway infrastructure, therefore we would require that a fully transport assessment is undertaken for the site which includes an assessment of the impacts of the development upon nearby level crossings.	NO CHANGE TO POLICY BUT ADD SUGGESTED WORDING to the “For Information” section below the policy

H1, Dev Principle H1.2	11693026	RC177 , William Deayton	<p>H1.2 Land off Uppingham Road, Oakham. The plan indicates that H1.2 will not detract from the southerly rural views of the properties to the immediate north. As a resident of a property to the immediate north I can see that development of the field to the south will destroy the view. Site selection is not robust. Consultation with residents on site selection has not taken place, in particular because future neighbours to site H1.2 were not consulted. Allocation of H1.2 contradicts the plan objectives and would be prominent visually at the entrance to Oakham. It is on high grade agricultural land. Impact on GP services in Oakham. Previously developed land should be prioritised.</p> <p>The plan seeks to protect the approach to the town and the development of H1.2 would not do this. Inclusion of H1.2 is therefore in contradiction to plan objectives.</p>	NO CHANGE – The community has been consulted. Site assessment process is robust.
H1, Dev Principle H1.2	201106163	RC226, Guy Longley, Pegasus group on behalf of Davidsons Developments Limited.	H1.2 Land off Uppingham Road, Oakham. The site can accommodate some 90 dwellings rather than the indicative figure of 73 dwellings identified in the plan. The NPPF encourages planning policies and decisions to support development that makes efficient use of land (paragraph 122). Paragraph 123 further advises that where there is an existing or anticipated shortage of housing land for meeting housing needs, it is especially important that planning policies and decision avoid homes being built at low densities, and ensure that developments make optimal use of the potential of each site. The provision of some 90 dwellings on the site is therefore wholly consistent with this guidance. The policy should therefore be amended to refer to an indicative capacity of 90 dwellings with 27 affordable homes and 63 market homes.	NO CHANGE
H1, Dev Principle H1.3	20110617	RC287 , Paul Belton, CARTER JONAS on behalf of Pigeon Capital Management Ltd.	The allocation of H1.3 land off Burley Road, Oakham is supported. A Vision and Delivery Statement and illustrative masterplan are both submitted with the representation. Site area should be amended to allow for green infrastructure to be included within the site boundary. Support allocation of the site, but the identified area of the allocation has, incorrectly excluded an area of paddock land which is located due east of the Oakham Veterinary Hospital. Site area should be amended to read 16.5ha. While no built development is proposed on the paddock land, the land is shown as open space and allotment land. The inclusion of this land will provide greater flexibility, enabling effective use of the allocation area to be made. It will also allow for the provision of a high quality landscape-led scheme with significant areas of open space created, allowing the development to be fully integrated into the existing built up area located to the west and south.	<p>CONSIDER CHANGE – Site boundary updated and the site area identified in Policy H1 for site H1.3 updated to reflect the change. Reasonable amendment to allow for the allotments and green infrastructure identified on the masterplan to be included in the overall site area.</p> <p>CONSIDER CHANGE TO site area to include paddock to rear of the veterinary hospital. Corresponding change will be made to the Policies Map and to policy H1. Add following bullet point to H1.3: a) Provide a landscape-led design solution which includes significant areas of open space and ensures that the development integrates into the existing landscape and with the existing built up area to the south and west.</p>

H1, Dev Principle H1.3	20110627	RC287 , Paul Belton, CARTER JONAS on behalf of Pigeon Capital Management Ltd.	H1.2 Land off Uppingham Road, Oakham. The site is deliverable with no overriding constraints which would prevent it being brought forward for development. Pigeon estimate that the delivery of new homes on this land could occur from 2023/4 onwards with a conservative 5 year build out program set out. The masterplan requirements in H1.3 are able to be accommodated on the site together with the delivery of circa 220 new homes. The indicative capacity of 200 dwellings, is therefore found to be both robust and deliverable. The delivery of more new homes than specified by the indicative site capacity will clearly be appropriate where justified by the masterplan and the technical reports which support any planning application.	SUPPORT WELCOMED
H1, Dev Principle H1.3	20110631	RC287 , Paul Belton, CARTER JONAS on behalf of Pigeon Capital Management Ltd.	H1.3 Land off Uppingham Road, Oakham. Supporting text of the Policy – requirement for a badger survey (bullet point 1). Pigeon is not aware of any technical evidence which justifies why a badger survey will be required for this allocation area. Pigeon has undertaken its own Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (Appendix 1) which confirms that there is no evidence of badgers on the site and badgers are therefore concluded to be absent with badger surveys not required. If evidence were later to emerge which suggests that a badger survey is required, this would be secured through the validation checklist of a planning application.	NO CHANGE
H1, Dev Principle H1.4	201106122	RC166, Steve Lewis-Roberts, PEGASUS GROUP on behalf of Rosconn Strategic land.	Support for the allocation of H1.4. Land south of Braunston Road, Oakham. The aims of Policy H1.4 are considered to be generally appropriate and reflects the technical evidence published to date, however, minor modifications are requested in relation criteria f) – highways which is too specific and prescriptive and criteria i) – overhead power cables which should be amended to provide flexibility whilst undergrounding cables is explored with Weston Power. In addition, the supporting policy text seeks Great Crested Newt and Phase 1 Habitat Survey to accompany a planning application submission. An Ecological Assessment of the site has confirmed that the site is unsuitable for great crested newts. Therefore for clarity it is suggested that reference to Great Crested Newt is deleted.	SUPPORT WELCOMED

H1, EN15, EN16, Inset Maps	201106182	RC171 , Andrew Gore, Marrons Planning on behalf of Jeakins Weir Ltd	H1.2 Land off Uppingham Road, Oakham. It could be argued that site H1.2 should have an amber rating for flood risk. Discrepancy between the way in which the highway impact has been considered between OAK/02 and H1.2. The accesses are 100m from one another and would result in similar number of vehicle trips on the same stretch of road. With regard to agricultural land, H1.2 originally had a red score but this has been reduced to amber following soil testing. OAK/02 should also be amended on this basis due to its proximity to H1.2. It is unclear why H1.2 scores green in BAP priority habitat category whilst OAK/02 scores red. There is no justification for scoring H1.2 as amber in landscape sensitivity terms whilst scoring OAK/02 as red. Heritage assessment differs between H1.2 and OAK/02 resulting in a green score for H1.2 and a red score for OAK/02. Heritage appraisal submitted with representation.	NO CHANGE – Site assessment process is robust and based on assessment of technical consultees. Therefore no change to the allocations.CHANGE – Agree following further consultation with Highways Officer that Lead Flood Authority Flood Risk comment for OAK/02 in the SHELAA should be green, low risk, not amber. This does not impact on the overall site assessment as the site was not ruled out on flood risk grounds.
H1, H1.2	11709382	RC176 , Jad Edgson	H1.2 Land off Uppingham Road, Oakham. Opinions of the neighbouring residents to this site were not sought as only 10% of the properties were built and occupied. Neither I nor my solicitor were contacted regarding this proposed favoured development thus this statement is totally untrue. Furthermore it is a greenfield site. There are Brownfield sites available which in my opinion should be considered before building on valuable agricultural land.	NO CHANGE- site assessment is robust
H1, H2	20110204	RC122 , Josh Plant, Gladman Developments	Support for 25% buffer. Clarity required because paragraph 5.2 suggests a figure of 2,925 dwellings whilst Table 2 states a total supply of 2,942 dwellings with an identified capacity within the Local Plan of 2,131 dwellings, yet only 1,831 new dwellings will be delivered through the housing allocations detailed in Policy H1.Over reliance on the delivery of St George's Garden Community and there is need for the allocation of additional small and medium sized sites across a range of locations to support a five year housing land supply and to protect from any slippage in the delivery of St George's Garden Community.	SUPPORT WELCOMED for 25% buffer. NO CHANGE to amount of sites allocated. Sufficient sites are allocated to meet the requirement and delivery timescales for St Georges have been discussed and agreed with DIO.

H1, H2	201106180	RC171 , Andrew Gore, Marrons Planning on behalf of Jeakins Weir Ltd	Marrons Planning: Plan not sound as reliance on SGB to detriment of vitality and viability of existing settlements; potential for later vacation of site by MOD meaning that delivery of dwellings not until 2030. SGB not constitutes sustainable development due to lack of public transport and car dependency; site is reliable on public funding from HIF and viability will be impacted on by current financial climate so is not developable. Minerals would be sterilised by SGB and allocation includes a Local Wildlife Site. Other sites around Oakham should be allocated - SHELAA/OAK/02 - field east of Uppingham Road. The St George's site identified as H2 in Policy H1 is not sustainable development due to a strong emphasis on public transport, which is unlikely to provide for an attractive and convenient level of service in the long term. Dependence on private car. Level of self-containment is questioned. The delivery of the site is reliant upon significant external funding. The HIF money secured is based on land value assumptions in the winter of 2019/20 prior to the current financial climate. Viability and therefore deliverability of the site questioned. Other sites could fulfil the housing requirement.	NO CHANGE - Site assessment evidence has identified the St George's site as a suitable site to provide a new garden community. The SA report considers a wide range of alternative approaches for the distribution and scale of development. The viability work has been published on the Council's website and is considered to be sufficient and appropriate to support the allocation of St George's.
H1, H2, H3	20110302	RC137 , Clifford Bacon, Clipsham Parish	Plan not sound as development of SGB not sustainable, contrary to national policy. Site out of scale, remote, served by poor roads and there is a lack of employment opportunities. Doubt over viability and HIF funding. Site should be reduced to 350 dwellings and spatial strategy revert to approach taken in 2017 Plan. The Plan assumes 20 windfall dwellings per annum when the last few years have seen nearer 50 per year. If windfall numbers are taken at 50 dwellings per annum and the 650 at Stamford North are included for Rutland as they should be, new homes in Rutland by 2036 will be over 4000, about 90% more than the OAN for Rutland. This excessive oversupply cannot be justified on the grounds of sustainability as required by national policy. The capacity of sites are underestimated.	NO CHANGE - Evidence in the SHMA identifies that the 25% buffer is appropriate. The windfall amount is based on an updated 2020 Windfall Study. Agreement with SKDC is in place regarding Quarry Farm with the issue being accepted through SKDC Local Plan examination. Indicative site capacity follows consistent methodology set out below Policy H1.

H1, H2, H3	20110465	RC328 , Robert Harrison	St George's Garden Community will be 1 & ½ times bigger than Uppingham and completely out of context with Rutland. Roads A1, A606, A47 and A6003 will become rat runs and destroy the ambience of local villages they run through. If allowed the development will have irreversible and long term damaging effects on Oakham, Uppingham and the large and not so large villages. In 2018 the Council consulted on St George's and 95% opposed it. RCC should listen to residents. Rutland has a requirement of 127 dwellings per annum. St George's is non-sustainable due to site being car dependent with a lack of public transport and employment opportunities. Site should be removed and Local Plan revert to 2017 spatial strategy. St George's is not needed to meet this requirement. Windfall developments and the 650 dwellings at Quarry Farm mean that St George's is not required.	NO CHANGE - Evidence in the SHMA identifies that the need is appropriate at 160 dwellings per annum. The windfall amount is based on an updated 2020 Windfall Study. Agreement with SKDC is in place regarding Quarry Farm with the issue being accepted through SKDC Local Plan examination.
H1, H2, H3	20110666	RC246 , Victor Pheasant , Chairman Empingham Parish Council	Rutland can meet its assessed need for housing by sites put forward in 2016/7. This would continue the proven record of successful integrated limited development in and close to the two towns and larger villages. By changing its approach to concentrate development at the SGB alienates traditionallandowners to the detriment of the long term interests of Rutland.	NO CHANGE – THE SHMA 2019 provides the justification for the 25% buffer and how it will address affordability. Robust evidence base to support the inclusion of SGB and the other allocations identified. SGB will form a new community with services and facilities. Agreement with SKDC is in place regarding Quarry Farm with the issue being accepted through SKDC Local Plan examination.
H1, H2, H3	201106191	RC329 , Tim Collins	The viability report underestimates the funding required for infrastructure and is not sound based on identifying the whole site as brownfield. £15 million required for clean-up costs of HIF funding will be inadequate. Infrastructure is required to ensure the site is not car dependent. Little consideration given to the impact of HGV vehicles required for the construction works and the proposed quarry. Employment of 14ha is aspirational with no firm evidence. Work from home rates are not evidenced. 25% buffer is excessive. It will take 20 years to build out which is a long time to reach a critical mass to support community infrastructure and retail.	NO CHANGE - Evidence in the SHMA identifies that the 25% buffer is appropriate. Site assessment evidence has identified the St George's site as a suitable site to provide a new garden community. The SA report considers a wide range of alternative approaches for the distribution and scale of development. The viability work has been published on the Council's website and is considered to be sufficient and appropriate to support the allocation of St George's.
H1, H2, H3	20110473	RC195 , David Duffin	RCC is not following the NPPF requirement of 127 dwellings per annum. The 25% buffer is to support St George's not to provide choice and contingency and address issues of affordability. Families requiring affordable housing would be better located on the outskirts of Oakham and Uppingham rather than at St George's. Just because St George's is brownfield does not mean it has to be developed.	NO CHANGE – THE SHMA 2019 provides the justification for the 25% buffer and how it will address affordability. Robust evidence base to support the inclusion of SGB and the other allocations identified. SGB will form a new community with services and facilities. It is recognised that the use of brownfield land has to be considered along with a wide range of other factors. Full assessment completed.

H1, H2, H3,	11687430	RC187 , Susan Painter	RCC is not following the NPPF requirement of 127 dwellings per annum. The 25% buffer is to support St George's not to provide choice and contingency and address issues of affordability. Housing figures driven by MOD's requirements at SGB which has led to over provision in the LP. Over reliance on SGB to provide affordable housing for the county. Being brownfield does not fully justify SGB.	NO CHANGE – THE SHMA 2019 provides the justification for the 25% and how it will address affordability. Robust evidence base to support the inclusion of SGB.
H1, H2, H3, E1, SD2, SD6, Sustainability Appraisal	20092801	RC41 , Kate Parker	Insufficient evidence to justify allocation at SGB and approach taken in Spatial Strategy. Plan not deliverable as 77% housing and 25% employment needs must be at SGB and SGB only viable with public subsidy. SA/SEA inadequately assess impact of SGB on Rutland Water. Plan therefore unsound and not justified. SA conflicts with Edith Weston Neighbourhood Plan. The draft Plan rests upon the delivery of St George. Too many of that project's key criteria are in conflict or inadequately appraised. The majority of the material available on St George and from comparable projects being examined at Inquiry, suggest the proposed St George delivery is some £100-150 million short of the necessary benchmark. The deliverability of the Plan's linchpin needs further and more considered assessment, even accepting such remains at a 'strategic level'. No evidence to demonstrate that 14ha employment land here is deliverable or feasible. Without employment on the site it will become a dormitory settlement. The SA assumes the St George's Barracks is "wholly brownfield". Whilst 'not farmed', it is rich calcareous grassland (Finnie Assoc 'St George's Barracks Ecological Appraisal' April 2018) with a high biodiversity. The SA needs revision to properly take into account the impact of the proposal on both Rutland Water and the site's actual biodiversity. The SA is unconvincing. It obviously conflicts with, for example, the Revised SA Edith Weston Neighbourhood Plan. Sustainability Appraisal/ Strategic Environmental Assessment & Habitat Regulations Assessment Screening Report 2013 and conflicts with the draft policy in 6.28 para and Policy E6. The SA options scoring matrix is equally implausible. Woolfox, for example, lies adjacent to the AI whilst St George lies up some way up country lanes. A more considered assessment of alternatives sites to meet identified needs is required.	NO CHANGE
H1, H2, H3, H4	11709162	RC240 , James White	I strongly support the comments made by Empingham Parish Council.	NO CHANGE – See comments identified under representation number 20110453.
H1, H2, H3, H4, H6	11706613	RC276 , Peter White	I strongly support the comments made by Empingham Parish Council.	NO CHANGE – See comments identified under representation number 20110453.

H1, H4	11701621	RC131 , J Corby	There has been no use of the government methodology to calculate housing needs.	NO CHANGE – THE SHMA 2019 provides the justification for the 25% buffer and how it will address affordability. Robust evidence base to support the inclusion of SGB and the other allocations identified.
H1, H4	20110453	RC181 , Rowan Scholtz, Empingham Parish Council	The government methodology when calculating housing needs requires 127 dwellings per annum. Questions why the 25% buffer has been chosen over other options and whether it has been chosen to support the inclusion of St George's. Windfall study in 2017 showed 34dpa allowance, actual figures recently have been 50dpa, so why is 20 dpa used. Including the 650 dwellings that have been given to SKDC would reduce the number of houses needing to be planned for in Rutland.	NO CHANGE – THE SHMA 2019 provides the justification for the 25% buffer and how it will address affordability. The windfall amount is based on an updated 2020 Windfall Study. Robust evidence base to support the inclusion of SGB and the other allocations identified. Agreement with SKDC is in place regarding Quarry Farm with the issue being accepted through SKDC Local Plan examination.
H1, H4	201106256	RC292 , Paul Browne	There is no explanation of the basis for attributing that annual delivery of 100 dwellings per annum for St George's. Viability questioned due to level of infrastructure that needs to be provided. The plan appears to have excluded by virtue of Policy H4 (relating to Cross Boundary Development) and cl.4.12, the likely effect on Rutland of the 650 units being erected within RCC boundaries, which have been allocated, to South Kesteven DC. The Plan appears to have excluded Woolfox Garden Town. Uppingham criteria is arbitrarily guessed at 200 units, and indeed the figures provide are only until 2026. The availability of Oakham's medical facilities are generally acknowledged as currently in a parlous states. The proposed dwellings in Oakham, have not resulted in any existing expansion of medical practitioners within the only medical practice in Oakham dispensing Primary Medical Care.	NO CHANGE – RCC and DIO have agreed the delivery timescales are achievable. Woolfox has been through the site assessment process and a significant amount of work has been carried out to assess both new settlement options. UNP are to set out the allocations for Uppingham. Health infrastructure is identified in the infrastructure Delivery Plan, including specifically new and expanded GP services. The distribution of housing supply at Stamford North was agreed between SKDC and RCC and through the SKDC Local Plan examination process. It can be demonstrated that there have been continuous and ongoing discussion with SKDC about the site.
H1, Inset Maps	20110517	RC200 , David Amies, Ryhall Parish Council	Ryhall Parish Council endorse the two proposed development sites in Ryhall, H1.15 and H1.16. The Parish Council feel that the affordable homes ratio should be increased on both sites. There are concerns that the indicative capacity on both sites is unrealistic and would not reflect the character of adjacent developments or the adjoining conservation area.	NO CHANGE - An affordable housing target for each allocated housing site is set out in the Development Principles in Chapter Ten which reflect the conclusions of the whole plan viability report. The indicative capacities are based on a standard calculation for consistency.
H1, SD2	11548421	RC1 , Bruce Lawrie	Plan not legally compliant. Questions evidence behind building 60-80 extra houses (Whissendine) in an already under-resourced village that will increase population by 20-25% when it is already full to capacity and why villages such as Thorpe by Water do not have planned development. Comment states that 60% of children attending the village school come from elsewhere and that flooding in the centre of the village occurs due to land drains being perpetually blocked.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation

H1, SD2, SC1	20110674	RC301 , Robert Grafton , Grafton Spaces on behalf of Sally Udale	The way that housing growth has been appointed to Local Service Centres does not follow a methodology that considers accessibility, and scale and nature of facilities and amenities in determining the level of growth that should be applied and appears to follow an opportunist approach based on availability of sites preferred by the Council. Promotion of land off Exton Road, Empingham (SHELAA/EMP/04). Land off Exton Road Empingham has not been through the site assessment process even though it was submitted in response to the Call for Sites in June 2016 and in response to consultation on the Consultation Draft August 2017. The omission of the Exton Road site from assessment suggests the necessary robustness and comprehensive approach required has not been achieved.	NO CHANGE – This site was assessed and screened out at stage 1 of the SHELAA.
H1, H1.18	2011061211	RC223 , Geoff Armstrong, Armstrong Rigg Planning on behalf of Manor Oak Homes	Concerns raised about the viability and deliverability of H1.18 South Lodge Farm Whissendine. The site was allocated for 28 dwellings in the Draft 2017 Local Plan. It is now identified with an indicative capacity of 25 dwellings. The site is subject to a planning application for 66 dwellings which suggests there are viability issues with a lower capacity. The Parish Council have objected to this planning application because it is considerably larger than the 25 dwellings allocated and due to concerns about the ancient ridge and furrow on site.	NO CHANGE – Deliverability of site identified through consultation with site promoter during site assessment. The ridge and furrow on its own is not sufficient reason to refuse a small-scale development as allocated.
H1, H1.8	201106120	RC223 , Geoff Armstrong, Armstrong Rigg Planning on behalf of Manor Oak Homes	The allocation of St George's Barracks has resulted in a lower level of growth being directed to the Local Services Centre.	NO CHANGE – The most appropriate sites across the Local Service Centres that met the requirement set out were allocated.
H2	11602355	RC28 , Deborah Frearson, Rutland Local History and Record Society	The desk-based Archaeological Assessment on the SGB website, submitted very late in the Local Plan process, shows the site has considerable archaeological potential. Many of the buildings on site are of national historic interest and must be assessed, and; appropriate building materials, such as local stone, for the development should be used. The major heritage potential of the site must be evaluated prior to development and form a significant proportion of pre-site consultation and costing.	NO CHANGE - H2 and H3 require all heritage assets on site to be properly evaluated.
H2	11613686	RC37 , Michael Burton, East Northamptonshire Council	RCC has actively engaged with East Northamptonshire Council (ENC) through the Duty to Cooperate including discussions about SGB. ENC and North Northamptonshire Joint Planning and Delivery Unit (NNJPDU) offered support and guidance to RCC taking into account own experience in promoting Tresham Garden Village. ENC assume that evidence base to support site selection of SGB provides sufficient justification for proposals in Policy H2 and masterplan.	SUPPORT WELCOMED

H2	20092908	RC43 , Chris Bramley, Severn Trent	Supportive of principles in Policy H2 on water efficiency and sustainable water management, and enhancement of biodiversity and green infrastructure. Stress importance of utilising good SuDS design.	SUPPORT WELCOMED
H2	20100301	RC51 , Sally Harnett, Ashwell Parish Council	: Question the viability of the Plan because it is dependent on SGB and the all the associated infrastructure. SGB isolated from service centres in Oakham and Uppingham and access to site on narrow roads.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2	20101404	RC60 , Sarah Legge, Melton Borough Council	Welcome proposed use of brownfield site but concern over weight given to the SGB development (55% of the dwellings expected to be delivered during the Plan period) and, while would not have cross-boundary impact on MBC, any lack of delivery could have an impact. Further robust evidence required to give assurance SGB can be delivered.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2	11634233	RC66 , Eleanor Stanton	Lack of support for SGB from residents in RCC. Growth should take place in Oakham rather than developing new town at SGB remote from services and employment opportunities. Impact of pollution to environment from construction and traffic. SGB should be developed for 350 houses with the rest of housing sites spread across the county.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2	20101902	RC67 , Frank Brett	Dependence on SGB for new housing and no account taken of local concern during consultations in 2018 over scale. SGB should be removed entirely from Local Plan or reduced to 500 units. Mitigation for increased traffic by use of multiple modes of transport, particularly public transport, unlikely to be achievable. If necessary, RCC should seek to commission and find funding for improvements to public transport.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2	11574210	RC72 , Nigel Cooper	A Design Guide is required alongside the masterplan prior to planning permission being granted for development at SGB to ensure the required high standard of design is delivered. Design Guide should address details such as surface materials and street furniture. A Development Delivery and Phasing Strategy is required and any changes to it or the Design Guide subject to approval by RCC under the terms of an s106 agreement.	CONSIDER CHANGE to include need for design code with masterplan
H2	11687372	RC187 , Susan Painter	SGB contrary to NPPF due to lack of local support and is out of character with local area and Plan not consistent with Government's climate change agenda as residents would be totally car dependent. 605 houses at Stamford North site within RCC should form part of Rutland's housing allocation.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2	11697256	RC117 , Kathleen Robinson	Virtually all of respondents in 2018 consultation on SGB opposed to the development so Local Plan does not have community support contrary to NPPF.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2	11697384	RC118 , Helen Jacobsen	SGB out of character and scale with historic character of Edith Weston. SGB is non-sustainable and there is a lack of employment for the residents.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation

H2	11697383	RC119 , Tarn Dearden	2018 Local Plan not formally consulted on, does not have local support and is limited to SGB which is not sustainable, lacks employment opportunities and is too large. 350/400 houses would be justified. Other potential sites (e.g. Woolfox) not sufficiently considered.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2	20110205	RC122 , Josh Plant, Gladman Developments	No objection to SGB but over reliance on strategic site means need for allocation of further small/medium sized sites in case of slow, and further uncertainty in timeframe for, delivery of SGB. Delivery rate of 100 dpa not justified and outdated by evidence for delivery on strategic sites published in 2020. Significant infrastructure requirements may further delay delivery of housing and due to proximity to internationally important Rutland Water an EIA is likely to be required causing further delays.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2	11698689	RC123 , Monica Stark, Oakham South & West Action Group	Allocation at SGB means lack of allocations in other villages and Uppingham. However, we would like to state that we are extremely pleased to see that the original potential development site Oak4 (Land off Brooke Road) has not been included in the Pre-Plan Submission.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2	20110213	RC124 , Michael Nyss	Lack of consultation over Local Plan with Empingham and other parish councils and objections to SGB ignored. SGB unsympathetic to local character, inconsistent with climate change agenda due to lack of public transport and other sites not considered. Transport Assessment inadequate.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2	11699706	RC128 , Mark Johnson	Lack of assessment of health and safety implications of former nuclear weapon base.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2	11701622	RC133 , Martin Debenham	SGB inconsistent with sustainable development, unsympathetic to local character and no consideration of reasonable alternatives.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2	11673749	RC134 , Christopher Renner	Decision on St Georges Garden Village made before the necessary Community Consultation, Sustainability Appraisal, Habitats Regulation Assessment, and Traffic impacts etc. were available. The housing numbers are fudged to try and justify St Georges with many sites withdrawn from the 2017 Local Plan and the gift of approx. 650 houses to South Kesteven and a reduction of likely windfall sites withdrawn. The plan was not positively prepared as it ignored the local community involvement as required in NPPF	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2	11702721	RC140 , Tim Smith, North Luffenham Parish Council	Viability Assessment underestimates funding required for infrastructure over Local Plan period. Lack of certainty over delivery of employment land and without employment site will be car dependent. Lack of consideration on HGV movements from mineral site and construction. 25% buffer of housing land too large. Reduce SGB to 350 units and adopt spatial strategy set out in Reg 18 Plan.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation

H2	11702699	RC143 , Nicholas Healey	Lack of consideration by RCC of objections to SGB in 2018. Scale of SGB too large and local road network would not cope with increased traffic. Development should be reduced to 350 units.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2	11702778	RC145 , Jonathon Healey	Lack of consideration by RCC of objections to SGB in 2018. Development should be reduced in size so that roads can cope with additional traffic.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2	11700411	RC146 , Juliet Healey	SGB not required to meet RCC's housing need and will cause congestion. Due to pandemic residents have not been able to focus on plan and to make proper objections.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2	11699612	RC129 , Amanda Healey	SGB does not meet sustainable development needs as not popular with residents (para 16 NPPF); is not in keeping with local area (para 127 NPPF), and; would be contrary to climate change agenda. SGB should be reduced to 350 houses and 2017 spatial strategy adopted.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2	11703107	RC149 , Simon Boston	Plan not positively prepared as no evidenced need for SGB and Policy H2 no longer in line with masterplan.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2	11703762	RC154 , Jeffrey Dale	SGB does not meet sustainable development needs as not popular with residents (para 16 NPPF); is not in keeping with local area (para 127 NPPF), and; would be contrary to climate change agenda as residents would be car dependent. Alternative uses for SGB should be investigated.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2	11703766	RC158 , Jane Milne	Plan unsound as H2 too vaguely worded to determine future masterplan and planning permission for SGB. SGB not a sustainable location for new garden village and reliance on TCPA principles for garden community not appropriate. SGB should be removed from Local Plan.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2	11703829	RC158 , Jane Milne	Scale of SGB would overwhelm setting and identity of Edith Weston village. SGB should be scaled back to a small village and approach taken in 2017 spatial strategy adopted instead.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2	11699946	RC160 , Norman Milne	Plan not sound as SGB not fully justified in terms of availability and deliverability due to uncertainty over vacation by MOD and high costs of contamination remediation.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2	20110436	RC210 , Emilie Carr, Historic England	Criteria 6) Policy H2 should be reworded to stress importance of very particular national heritage importance of SGB.	CONSIDER CHANGES to H2 set out in SoCG with HE.
H2	20110451	RC181 , Rowan Scholtz, Empingham Parish Council	Empingham Parish Council on behalf of 161 residents: Plan not positively prepared as SGB lacks local support; Plan does not consider alternatives to take account of 650 houses at North Stamford which are excluded to justify SGB; SGB least sustainable site as residents would car dependent contrary to national climate change policies, and; TAs are flawed.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2	20110452	RC181 , Rowan Scholtz, Empingham Parish Council	Empingham Parish Council on behalf of 161 residents: Plan not positively prepared as SGB lacks local support; Plan does not consider alternatives to take account of 650 houses at North Stamford which are excluded to justify SGB; SGB least sustainable site as residents would car dependent contrary to national climate change policies, and; TAs are flawed.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation

H2	11700002	RC312 , Sheena Law	SGB unsustainable, so contrary to national policy on climate change, due to lack of local employment for number of houses proposed and site being car dependent. Entire housing need of 160 dpa would be on SGB and site unlikely to be viable. Existing infrastructure able to accommodate 350 houses.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2	11702523	RC148 , Laurence Howard	Cost of infrastructure for SGB and impact on RCC's finances; affordable houses should be located in Oakham and Uppingham. Justification for SGB means the Plan is sound.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2	11704195	RC313 , Frank Law	SGB contrary to Government's policy of sustainability and climate change as site is remote from employment opportunities. SGB will take up entire housing quota for Rutland. 350 houses would be more appropriate in scale for the site.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2	11704435	RC278 , Richard Gray	Plan failed to: consider other uses for SGB, to protect the environment and to consider amenity of residents in Edith Weston and surrounding area.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2	11705156	RC196 , Dominic Bath	Lack of certainty that required level of health provision can be provided for residents of SGB with provision early on reliant on currently overstretched local provision. A Statement of Common Ground from Clinical Commissioning Group should have been completed prior to Reg 19 Plan.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2	11706256	RC216 , Gerald Robinson	SGB lacks local support and is non-sustainable remote from services, including public transport, leading to car dependency. No consideration given to impact on tourism associated with Rutland Water. A smaller (500 houses) development should be built at SGB with water bodies and woodland planting after quarrying finished, and; 650 dwellings at Stamford North should form part of RCC's housing allocation.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2	11706429	RC314 , Sarah Thorpe	SGB lacks local support and local roads would not cope with additional traffic, and; impact on tourism.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2	20110521	RC324 , Susannah Fish	SGB does not achieve sustainable development of transport contrary to NPPF and other more sustainable options have not been considered; lack of assessment of impact of SGB on highway safety or on cumulative impacts on road network; development will result in high levels of car dependency with most residents commuting outside county for work, and; insufficient funding for infrastructure. Housing allocation should be relocated where connectivity for transport is viable, deliverable and sustainable, or reduce SGB to 350 houses with other sites in sustainable locations.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2	11706589	RC276 , Peter White	Support comments made by Empingham Parish Council (RC181 - 20110452).	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation

H2	20110527	RC311 , Samuel Humphries, North Northamptonshire Joint Planning and Delivery Unit	RCC have actively engaged with the JPDU alongside Corby and East Northamptonshire Councils in accordance with Duty to Cooperate. The phasing of development and infrastructure set out in criteria 10) of H2 should allow cross-boundary impacts to be managed and mitigated.	SUPPORT WELCOMED
H2	11706801	RC318 , Stewart Patience, Anglian Water Services Ltd	Support Policy H2 and welcome reference to SGB meeting the highest standards of water efficiency.	SUPPORT WELCOMED
H2	11706851	RC302 , Robert Grafton	Local Plan not sound as SGB lacks local support and is least sustainable site considered in SA due to lack of public transport and being car dependent. Renewed public consultation required after sustainability and evidential deficiencies have been remedied.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2	11706899	RC231 , John Haddon	Provision of basic transport links and modern infrastructure such as rail, including railway station close to SGB.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2	11706802	RC159 , Timothy Smith	Without employment and homeworking on site SGB will be largely car dependent. 25% buffer for housing needs not required. No account of construction traffic and adjacent quarry will affect viability. Revert to 2017 spatial strategy and reduce site to 350 houses.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2	20110532	RC220 , Gale Waller	Plan unsound as current infrastructure at SGB would sustain 350 homes and uncertainties over funding would mean development of 2300 houses (including 30% affordable) not viable. Without HIF SGB is non-deliverable. Plan unsound as delays caused by access road construction and MOD vacating site both mean that target of 1000 homes by 2036 will not be met.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2	20110540	RC232 , Jon Bradburn, Montagu Evans on behalf of Secretary of State for Defence	Defence Infrastructure Organisation: Plan is sound on basis of strategy preparation being robust and consistent with national policy. Suggest minor changes to wording of Policy H2 so that masterplan forms part of planning application thus allowing it to be accompanied by additional detail including Design Code and phasing plans. As approved documents these would ensure site is delivered in appropriate and timely manner.	Consider change to include design code
H2	11707355	RC257 , Lelia O'Connell	Opening line of Policy H2 ('A new garden community will be developed...') does not allow argument to the contrary. SGB not sustainable development due to remote location and lack of public transport. A new Reg 18 Plan should be prepared to allow for more effective community consultation.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2	11707386	RC233 , Jonathan Griffin	SGB least sustainable of sites considered and would be car dependent, and; it lacks local support. Opening line of Policy H2 ('A new garden community will be developed...') does not allow argument to the contrary. Reduce SGB to 350 houses and revert back to 2017 spatial strategy.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation

H2	11706238	RC234 , Jon Allen, Shiso Ltd	Reliance in Local Plan on employment at SGB that would not be viable; adjacent quarry detrimental to health of residents; impact on Rutland Water, and; impact on existing villages due to lack of green buffer.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2	11707741	RC237 , Juliet Stuttard	Lack of justification for scale of SGB particularly in view of current pandemic. Size should be reduced to 500 houses to better reflect scale of nearby villages.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2	11708984	RC263 , Nicola Farr, Environment Agency	Support Policy H2 as masterplan includes requirement for wastewater strategy with infrastructure in place before occupation of development. IDP states that existing Water Recycling Centre has capacity to serve an additional 1200 dwellings and water supply for 250 dwellings but for entire community to be sustainable all phases of development to contribute equally to delivery of wastewater infrastructure scheme.	SUPPORT NOTED
H2	20110634	RC256 , Kenneth Siddle, Wing Parish Council	Plan not justified or consistent with national policy as SGB not viable or sustainable and alternatives not considered; lack of evidence in TA that sustainable transport opportunities will be delivered and site will become car dependent, and; harm to important wildlife site. SGB should be deleted from Plan.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2	11709027	RC309 , Sally Mullins	SGB not sustainable due to lack of secondary education provision.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2	11709058	RC309 , Sally Mullins	Reliance on SGB for majority of affordable housing will impact on provision elsewhere. Site is remote leading to reliance on private car.	NO CHANGE - Affordable housing is required on all allocated sites
H2	11709020	RC310 , Sally Mullins, Whitwell Parish Meeting	Lack of consideration given to primary care provision for SGB.	NO CHANGE - Healthcare requirements set out in IDP
H2	11708983	RC310 , Sally Mullins, Whitwell Parish Meeting	Lack of financial allowance for highway improvements on A606 and A606/A1 junction. No statement of common ground with Highways England.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2	20110662	RC336 , Janet Hughes,	SGB is non-sustainable development: lack of local support; lack of evidence that employment and infrastructure will be provided; only viable with HIF funding more than half of which is allocated for decontamination, and; site is not entirely brownfield.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2	11709105	RC299 , Richard Bonser	Fewer houses with more green space should be provided at SGB. Mineral extraction will delay provision of country park.	NO CHANGE - approximately 2/3rds of the sites will be open space
H2	20110665	RC246 , Victor Pheasant , Chairman Empingham Parish Council	Plan not sound. Support Empingham Parish Council comments. SGB not viable due to high cost of infrastructure.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2	11709159	RC240 , James White	Support comments made by Empingham Parish Council (RC181 - 20110452).	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation

H2	11709237	RC168 , Alex Miller, Miller Motorsport	Plan not sound as heavy reliance on SGB and site is not fully justified in terms of availability and deliverability due to uncertainty over vacation by MOD. Reinstate sites from 2017 Plan as alternative to SGB.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2	11601010	RC325 , Susan Walling	Masterplan is aspirational. Coalescence of Edith Weston and SGB will take place due to proposed narrow village green/playing fields. Strategic gap required.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2	11709398	RC271 , Marilyn Clayton	SGB out of scale with existing settlements; impact on local road network, and; impact on enjoyment of Rutland Water. Reduce number of houses at SGB and/or consider retirement village for older persons.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2	11709442	RC334 , Trevor Gibson	Viability assessment underestimates funding required for infrastructure over Local Plan period. Lack of assessment of impact on viability of: pandemic and state of economy; mineral extraction; brownfield classification, and; potential contamination.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2	11709557	RC334 , Trevor Gibson	650 dwellings at Quarry Farm should form part of RCC's housing allocation thereby reducing need for scale of development at SGB. No consideration of cumulative impacts of traffic from SGB and Quarry Farm on A1 junctions.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2	201106204	RC180, Billy Lloyd, DLP Planning Ltd. On behalf of Hereward Homes	Whilst we do not necessarily object to the principles of the master planning process for St. George's, there are concerns on the delivery and timing of the site. Policy H2 is titled 'St. George's garden community development and delivery principles', however, there is only a single reference to delivery which is to be done by a phase of development and infrastructure both on-site and off-site and that it will include a mechanism for securing the establishment of appropriate and sustainable long term governance and stewardship arrangements for community assets including green space, public realm, community and other relevant facilities.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2	201106227	RC162, Adam Murray, Andrew Granger & Co. Ltd. On behalf of Mr PJSR Hill and Pikerace Limited	Scale of SGB not sound as: not sustainable or viable and delivery rates unlikely to be met, and; no comparative assessment of transport and accessibility issues between SGB and Woolfox.	NO CHANGE - comparative assessment of SGB and Woolfox was undertaken and published on website
H2	11709638	RC334 , Trevor Gibson	Recommendations in masterplan for additional assessments not been actioned and so evidence base for allocation of SGB incomplete and Reg 19 consultation premature.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation

H2	201106249	RC193 , Charlotte Bailey, DLP Planning Limited on behalf of Larkfleet	No objection in principle to inclusion of SGB but concern over delivery and timing due to: dependence on MOD vacating site by 2022, reliance on funding to make site viable and, requirement for decontamination resulting in first completions in 2029/30 and only 600 dwellings by 2036. Plan therefore unsound and Policy H2 should assume delivery of no more than 600 dwellings in plan period. As sufficient housing is not allocated then additional sites required (Ayston Road, Uppingham and land off Burley Park Way, Oakham).	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2	20111808	RC88 , M K Palmer	Inappropriateness of location of SGB as a new settlement due to lack of local support or infrastructure; sterilisation of mineral reserves, and; impact on local environment.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2	20111809	RC274 , M & C Bradbury , Cloisters	Lack of evidence for settlement size of SGB; impact on Edith Weston and North Luffenham; harm to Rutland Water, and; proximity of housing to future mineral extraction.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2	20103013	RC339, Claude Burton	Rutland is a small county and should stay as such. Another 1500 – 3000 houses in madness alongside this Quarry farm is excluded from numbers. Local people do not approve of the scale of St George’s Barracks, the surrounding road network is not suitable and there is limited public transport. Major concerns over increased traffic in Empingham. Develop houses in other locations to prevent villages surrounding MOD base being ruined.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2, H3	11548492	RC4 , Martin Ball	Building 1,000 housing units (as a precursor to a total of 2,215 housing units) in such a remote area is not required for the Local Plan to meet its quota of house building as set out by central government. Inclusion of any housing at SGB is not justified and so Local Plan is not sound.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2, H3	11550685	RC5 , Robert Purves	Due to lack of employment opportunities within Rutland, residents will have to commute to the larger towns of Leicester, Northampton and Peterborough for work. No account has been taken of the roads and supporting infrastructure currently in the county and how the roads will take the increase in traffic flow from the development at SGB. It is fool hardy to agree a massive house build when you do not have the supporting infrastructure in place before you start to build houses.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation

H2, H3	20091102	RC24 , Peter Hitchcox	The Local Plan is a fair and measured document that will assist the Council in planning for the future in a sensitive way. The development at SGB will preclude undue over-development in other rural villages although it should be developed sensitively for its future residents. The idea of a 'model' village just off the A1 near Pickworth and Stretton will not be viable.	SUPPORT NOTED
H2, H3	20101302	RC59 , Sue Lammin, Whissendine Parish Council	No requirement for services and facilities to be provided in tandem with housing so that the earliest residents of SGB have access to sufficient community services, transport, health, educational and shopping opportunities, contrary to NPPF. Evidence that without such timing constraints developers will prioritise income-generating housing development over community facilities. SGB not deliverable over plan period. No joint working on cross-boundary strategic transport issues has taken place or appropriate assessment of traffic impacts within RCC given most residents would be car-dependent. Policies H2 and H3 should be removed from the Local Plan, or, if retained, include requirement for phasing of development.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2, H3	20102001	RC68 , Rosalyn Mayho	Development of SGB contrary to Policy SD1 and impact on climate change has not been assessed; high dependency on car use by residents, and; harmful impact on birds. The SGB site should be developed for a maximum of 320 eco-friendly units including existing buildings being redeveloped and remainder of site rewilded.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2, H3	11673801	RC69 , Mervyn A Walker	Excessive housing need to justify development of SGB with potential cost implications for site not to be delivered. Traffic generated would contribute to climate change. The Plan should revert to the spatial strategy agreed in 2017 based on further development in the existing towns and larger villages.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2, H3	20102602	RC80 , Steven Wilby, Belton Parish Council	Development of SGB is unsustainable due to poor road infrastructure and lack of public transport. A sustainable transport strategy must be developed and delivered. No details given of additional demand for waste water treatment or drinking water and query whether local water companies have been consulted.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2, H3	11692273	RC99 , Stephen Makey	Scale of SGB similar to a small town on greenfield land in open countryside next to a SSSI with limited infrastructure and no alternatives considered. RCC have traded 650 housing allocations to SKDC at Stamford North. 20 year building programme will harm Edith Weston, the development of SGB will dwarf the village and impact on tourism due to increased traffic.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation

H2, H3	11692360	RC337 , Tracy Makey	Scale of SGB similar to a small town that would harm the character of Rutland and lead to increased traffic and parking problems. The development should be reduced in size.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2, H3	20102913	RC101 , David Lewis	Lack of effective engagement between RCC and local community, contrary to NPPF, on development of SGB due to site being added late in process in 2018. SGB not justified because of long time scale for development and effect on local communities. Further round of public consultation on SGB required and, in meantime, development scaled back or removed from Local Plan. Priority to be given to employment development on site.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2, H3	11696322	RC108 Vivian Anthony	Lack of employment opportunities at SGB means that residents will commute to large towns outside of RCC resulting in traffic problems. Lack of services on the site will put pressure on facilities and services elsewhere. Better strategy would be small scale additions to existing towns and villages.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2, H3	11696699	RC112 , Christopher Sworn, Preston Village Meeting	Need for a Garden Community of this scale not justified and strategy should be to focus new development in Oakham and Uppingham to protect and enhance services and facilities in these settlements.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2, H3	11697334	RC118 , Helen Jacobsen	There is no justification for such a large number of houses to be built. There is very little unemployment in the area and no obvious job creation with this proposal. National Policy looks for houses to be built where there is a need. Local plans and spatial development strategies should be informed throughout their preparation by a sustainability appraisal that meets the relevant legal requirements.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2, H3	20110307	RC138 , Richard Camp, Manton Parish Council and Manton residents	Manton Parish Council and 147 Manton residents: Plan unsound due to: lack of justification for scale and location of SGB; size of SGB should include development beyond 2036 and adjoining sites; lack of evidence that employment businesses would be attracted to SGB; transport assessments deficient and site would become a car-dependent commuter town; viability not assured due to dependence on HIF funding; allocation includes greenfield land; lack of clarity about Minerals Safeguarding Area. Modification to reduce SGB to 350 dwellings.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2, H3	20110425	RC194 , David Maher, Barton Willmore on behalf of de Merke Estates	Local Plan heavily reliant on SGB and contingency plans should be put in place should SGB not deliver 100 dpa.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2, H3	20110471	RC195 , David Duffin	Plan unsound as there is a lack of local support for SGB. It is non-sustainable due to site being car dependent with a lack of public transport and poor road network. Inappropriate location for affordable housing due to lack of employment opportunities.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation

H2, H3	20110512	RC298 , Ruth Renner	The development of SGB runs counter to the intention of RCC to commit to a reduction in greenhouse emissions and to develop a strategy to create a sustainable environment in Rutland and runs against the RCC's Policy SD1. There is no evidence in this plan that Rutland is committed to a Biodiversity strategy. A large development at SGB building over 2000 houses will destroy the nesting site of birds on the red list of conservation concern. This runs counter to the RCC's stated aim to take a proactive approach towards sustaining biodiversity within Rutland. SGB will harm biodiversity of site including causing harm to birds and bats that should be protected as part of any development proposal. Number of houses should be reduced to 320, and amount of woodland increased, and; houses gifted to SKDC returned to RCC.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2, H3	20110550	RC267 , Mark Harris, Bidwells on Behalf of Taylor Wimpey	Lack of evidence that SGB will deliver 1000 homes by 2036. Updated Start to Finish (2020) document shows sites of over 2000 take on average 3 years from grant of outline consent to completion of first dwellings with brownfield sites having slower delivery rates. First completion at SGB likely to be end 2030, leaving 5 years for completions to end of plan period at rate of 100 dpa meaning land for 450 dwellings needs to be found in other parts of county.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2, H3	20110568	RC306 , Jackie Rutherford,	Local Plan not sound as not all of SGB is brownfield as area to be developed includes disused golf course and airfield and is compared to other potential housing sites as brownfield.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2, H3	11709016	RC252 , Karen Fletcher	SGB site is not sustainable and Policies H2 and H3 do not make it sustainable. No provision for a secondary school and appraisal of site refers to schooling at Great Casterton meeting the need whereas SGB in catchment for Uppingham Community College which as constraints regarding expansion. Further evidence to demonstrate Great Castleton has capacity. Policies H2 and H3 unsound until sufficient evidence to support SGB in terms of secondary education.	NO CHANGE - Education requirements set out in IDP
H2, H3	20110644	RC184 , P Gover	Lack of justification for SGB given over supply of housing and allocation of 650 houses at Quarry Farm to SKDC; impact on local highway network.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2, H3	20110654	RC205 , Ed Rehill, Savills on behalf of The Society of Merchant Venturers	Plan not sound as reliance on SGB for housing allocation and 1000 dwellings cannot be delivered within the Plan period due to: delay in lead-in period; fluctuations in delivery rates below 100 dpa, and; infrastructure requirements, dependent upon HIF which the Council has not yet agreed to accept. Further allocation required at Stamford Road, Oakham.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation

H2, H3	20110671	RC205 , Ed Rehill, Savills on behalf of The Society of Merchant Venturers	Plan not sound as reliance on SGB for housing allocation and 1000 dwellings cannot be delivered within the Plan period due to: delay in lead-in period; fluctuations in delivery rates below 100 dpa, and; infrastructure requirements, dependent upon HIF which the Council has not yet agreed to accept. Further allocations/reserve site required at Stamford Road and Uppingham Road, Oakham.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2, H3	11690431	RC326 , Andrew Walling,	Questions viability of SGB given cost of highway improvements and small HIF grant. No SCG with Highways England. TA requires more work. Allocation at SGB should be removed.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2, H3	201106196	RC163 , Nigel Simpkin, Highgate Land & Development, on behalf of Fight4Rutland	Review of viability evidence documents: question whether SGB has been appraised in sufficient detail by HDH, and concludes that viability position likely to be worse than anticipated by Local Plan viability evidence base undertaken by HDH.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2, H3	201106241	RC279 , Malcom Touchin , CPRE Rutland	HRA Screening document 2017, which remains most recent official report, does not include SGB: no protected species surveys undertaken or flight path assessments that should form part of ecological appraisal of SGB due to its proximity to Rutland Water (Natura 2000 site), and; a recreational study of SGB to forecast numbers of additional visitors to Natura 2000 area. Wood 2020 recommends rewording of Policy H2 due to potential impact on Rutland Water: e.g. waste water discharge, recreational pressure - H2 should include requirement for AA. H2 should take account of biodiversity net gain, usage of natural capital assessments, compensation and covenants.	NO CHANGE -HRA published with pre-submission plan includes an AA of policies H2 and H3
H2, H3	20111805	RC260 , Hugh Palmer, Cheney Wood	Lack of local support for SGB and SGB justified by reducing housing allocations in other settlements. HIF inadequate and SGB unlikely to deliver 1000 homes by 2036 and so plan is unsound. SGB would sterilise mineral resources and there would be conflict between mineral extraction and new housing due to air borne pollution. Loss of self-containment of Edith Weston and North Luffenham. Contrary to Government's climate change agenda. If 2300+ houses are required then Woolfox should be allocated in place of SGB. Adverse impact on internationally protected Rutland Water. SGB should be removed from the plan.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2, H3	20111807	RC265 , Malcom Earnshaw	Requirement for SGB not proven; no account taken of Edith Weston Neighbourhood Plan; no assessment of impact on Rutland Water; sterilisation of mineral reserves should take priority; reliance on HIF funding that is not yet agreed, and; site in elevated position where building would take place for 30 years.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation

H2, H3 and Transport Assessment	20110539	RC323 , Sue Millar	SGB lacks local support; it does not reflect local character or landscape; is not in accordance with Government's policy on climate change as it would result in car dependency, and; the Transport Assessment is inadequate.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2, H3, E1	20110529	RC219 , Caroline Pegg	Reliance on SGB for majority of housing and employment needs is non-sustainable as site is remote from services and not served by public transport and would be contrary to climate change agenda. An overprovision of 5 ha of employment land is made in this rural location with no evidence to support it. Remove SGB from Plan and revert to 2017 spatial strategy.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2, H3, E1, E2, E3	20110637	RC212 , Paul Boggust, Edith Weston Parish Council	Over provision of employment land results in policies E1, E2 and E3 being unsound. No consideration has been given to over provision outside the county which is of commutable distance and no viability testing has been undertaken to show that employment land at SGB site is deliverable. Location is unsustainable and no policy in the plan would ensure that workers on the site could commute by public transport.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2, H3, H4	20110484	RC319 , Stella Law, Group submission by 11 people: Stella Law, Ruth Renner, Rosalyn Mayho, Tony Law, Jill Martin, Sue Appleton, Sarah Rawson, Chris Renner, Xanthe Wells, Johanna Short, Samuel Asplin	SGB contrary to Government's policy of sustainability and climate change as site is remote from employment opportunities and would increase car dependency. Quarry Farm more sustainable site than SGB and housing allocation should be returned to Rutland. Reduce SGB to 350 eco-friendly houses and remainder of site grassland/agriculture/tree planting. South Kesteven District Council has 117 village settlements plus 4 sizable towns within which to absorb the Quarry Farm allocation. This would be approximately 5 properties per settlement. Rutland however has two small market towns and 22 villages.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2, SD2	11628820	RC48 , Ian Smith	Question soundness of Policies SD2 and H2. A considerable reduction in size of SGB should take place.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2, SD2	20110505	RC296 , Christopher Renner, Normanton Parish Meeting	Plan not sound as lack of evidence for SGB and spatial strategy changed without engagement or support of local residents. Growth and investment should be spread more evenly across the county and SGB will bring into question viability of towns and larger service centres. Plan should be started again so as to ensure all stakeholders are involved in process as required by NPPF.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation

H2, SD2	20110561	RC188 , Carole Brown, Braunston-in-Rutland Parish Council	Plan not sound as lack of evidence for SGB and spatial strategy changed without engagement or support of local residents. Growth and investment should be spread more evenly across the county and SGB will bring into question viability of towns and larger service centres. Plan should be started again so as to ensure all stakeholders are involved in process as required by NPPF.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2,H3	11559250	RC12 , Ann Kanter	SGB is in excess of housing requirements for Rutland which stands at 160 annually. 30% of low income housing required by developers more suited to existing sites in and close to the towns of Oakham and Uppingham. Density too high to meet national conservation requirements and development should reflect character of existing settlements in terms of green space and woodland. Requirements of national policy for conservation will not be met with the density of housing planned.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2,H3	11567570	RC14 , Zoe Purves	As a resident of North Luffenham, concern expressed over impact of additional traffic on local road network. No consideration given to upgrading links to A1 and A47. Site more suited to wind and solar farm.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2,H3	11602919	RC38 , Tim Shaw	Lack of consideration given to construction and residential traffic and their effect on surrounding area and villages: due to lack of employment and retail opportunities in Rutland residents will travel to work/shop in larger towns outside the County leading to increase of approx. 6000 car journeys/day. Overloading of services would take place in Oakham and Uppingham. The SGB development must be reduced in size and priority given to highway improvements beyond as well as within the site.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2,H3	20110515	RC215 , George Renner	No consideration of financial viability of SGB; affordable housing will prejudice needs elsewhere; lack of a sustainability framework; outstanding landscaping and transport issues, particularly infrastructure; impact on vitality and viability of Oakham and Uppingham; affordable housing provision elsewhere; alternative uses for SGB; a sustainability framework for SGB, and; unresolved landscape and transport issues.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H2,H3	20110554	RC192 , Norman Milne, Fight 4 Rutland Ltd	Suitability of SGB to be allocated unsustainable – not compliant with para 108 NPPF. Fight for Rutland Review of Transport Submissions document (Bancroft Consulting) – TAs present over simplistic approach to sustainable travel with no clear strategy as to how site will be served by public transport services.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H3	20090902	RC18 , Ian McAlpine	160 dpa represents oversupply of housing. SGB contrary to b) and c) SD6 as would not protect/enhance landscape and would overwhelm Edith Weston and North Luffenham.	NO CHANGE – Policy SD6 does not apply to SGB. Evidence supports the allocation
H3	20092909	RC43 , Chris Bramley, Severn Trent	Supportive of principles in Policy H3 and in particular reference to network of green corridors in criteria h). Suggest amending h) to Green Blue Corridors to highlight need to incorporate watercourses and SuDs.	CONSIDER CHANGE to reference blue/green corridors

H3	20101903	RC67 , Frank Brett	Requirement for planning applications to be consistent with masterplan open to interpretation particularly if multiple applications made. Wording should be firmer in stating development will embody the principles of the masterplan.	NO CHANGE –Wording is unambiguous
H3	11658011	RC72 , Nigel Cooper	Need shown in RCC's Draft Housing and Homelessness Strategy 2017-2022 for more than 50% of affordable housing being affordable/social rented and this should be reflected at SGB in criteria a)i) of Policy H3.	NO CHANGE
H3	20102204	RC75 , John Pearce, on behalf of Muller Property Group	Alternative small and medium sized housing sites, such as MPG's additional land at Stapleford Road, Whissendine, should be allocated to provide a buffer in case of any delay to the delivery of new housing at SGB.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H3	11702487	RC140 , Tim Smith, North Luffenham Parish Council	Viability of SGB based on it being a greenfield site but as a brownfield site viability assessment underestimates actual development costs. As viability not proven then legality, effectiveness and deliverability of Policy H3 not sound.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H3	11702608	RC142 , Pamela Hartwell	Lack of local support for SGB and, due to pandemic, more time must be given for consideration of SGB by residents. Reduce size of SGB.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation. Consultation was extended to 10 weeks and its start delayed by 5 months
H3	11702960	RC112 , Christopher Sworn, Preston Village Meeting	Reliance on SGB for provision of affordable housing and provision should be made throughout the county particularly where employment opportunities.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H3	11703846	RC160 , Norman Milne	Spatial strategy not justified as insufficient consideration given to proximity of Edith Weston to SGB site and impact on village's character. SGB should be considered as extension to village if built development limited to PDL. Lack of definition of green gap in Policy H2. Mineral extraction will reduce area available for housing.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H3	20110437	RC210 , Emilie Carr, Historic England	Criteria e) of Policy H3 does not sufficiently conserve and enhance heritage assets at SGB, particularly taking into account their national significance. Reword e) to take out 'where appropriate and possible'.	NO CHANGE - Refer to changes in SoCG with HE.
H3	20110522	RC324 , Susannah Fish	SGB does not achieve sustainable development of transport contrary to NPPF and other more sustainable options have not been considered; lack of assessment of impact of SGB on highway safety or on cumulative impacts on road network; development will result in high levels of car dependency with most residents commuting outside county for work, and; insufficient funding for infrastructure. Housing allocation should be relocated where connectivity for transport is viable, deliverable and sustainable, or reduce SGB to 350 houses with other sites in sustainable locations.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation

H3	11706463	RC159 , Timothy Smith	Evidence base for Local Plan flawed as viability assessment based on site being greenfield where development costs lower but site is PDL and half of HIF is for remediation of the site leaving inadequate funding for infrastructure.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H3	11706898	RC228 , Hilary Smith	Evidence base for Local Plan flawed as: viability assessment based on site being greenfield where development costs lower but site is PDL and half of HIF is for remediation of the site leaving inadequate funding for infrastructure; effects of pandemic not taken into account; potential for contamination, and; proximity of mineral extraction to housing.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H3	20110533	RC220 , Gale Waller	Plan not sound as reliance on SGB for affordable housing provision in remote area with demand for social rented housing high.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H3	20110541	RC232 , Jon Bradburn, Montagu Evans on behalf of Secretary of State for Defence	Defence Infrastructure Organisation: wording of Policy H3 is 'around 2215 homes' gives a specific number preceded by a vague preposition. As site capacity may change suggest modifying wording to: 'a minimum of 2200 homes' which provides clear master planning benchmark against which to assess future applications? Use Classes in criteria c) to include Classes E and F.	CONSIDER CHANGES - to wording H3 to 'about 2200' but not appropriate to use word "minimum"
H3	11707677	RC317 , Simon Fisher, National Farmers Union	Plan not sound as issues raised by NFU have an impact on local business, environment and the social quality of life. Concerns raised by 2 local farmers about access to SGB in construction phase as roads used by slow moving farm traffic. Suggested modifications to 2018 policy document to include reference to farm businesses and recreational users. Greater use will be made of local network of public rights of way so criteria g) H3 should recognise this - to add in 'Strengthened countryside management measures will be introduced to ensure that any local footpath problems and pinch points are managed to ensure that the integrity of the network and farmers whose land the rights of way cross are protected.'	CONSIDER CHANGE to criterion g)
H3	11708191	RC315 , Steven Gill	Lack of regard by RCC over representations made on Local Plan and RCC have not worked cooperatively with local bodies such as Parish Councils. RCC should actively engage with local bodies, 650 dwellings at Quarry Farm should be returned to RCC and SGB reduced to 350 dwellings.	NO CHANGE - consultation undertaken in accordance with SCI and Regulations
H3	11708238	RC315 , Steven Gill	Historic character of Edith Weston and North Luffenham will be overwhelmed by scale of development at SGB. SGB should be reduced to 350 houses and Quarry Farm housing allocation returned to RCC.	NO CHANGE - proposal is for a new standalone village separate from both villages

H3	11708986	RC263 , Nicola Farr, Environment Agency	Support criteria g), h), m), n) and r) of Policy H3. Suggest rewording criteria n) to: Provides improvements to the management of foul and surface water to comply with the requirements of the Water Framework Directive, and additional point: Demonstrates through a preliminary risk assessment (Phase I or desk top study) as a minimum, that any risks to ground and surface water from existing contamination at the site can be suitably managed.	CONSIDER CHANGE - to wording H3 as suggested
H3	11709104	RC238 , Hilary Kingston	Lack of regard by RCC over representations made on Local Plan and RCC have not worked cooperatively with local bodies such as Parish Councils. Lack of assessment of impact of RGB on internationally important Rutland Water. RCC should actively engage with local bodies and 650 dwellings at Quarry Farm should be returned to RCC and SGB reduced to 350 dwellings.	NO CHANGE - consultation undertaken in accordance with SCI and Regulations
H3	11709122	RC238 , Hilary Kingston	Historic character of Edith Weston and North Luffenham will be overwhelmed by scale of development at SGB. Lack of assessment of impact of RGB on internationally important Rutland Water. SGB should be reduced to 350 houses and Quarry Farm housing allocation returned to RCC.	NO CHANGE - proposal is for a new standalone village separate from both villages
H3	11709153	RC238 , Hilary Kingston	Lack of consideration given to impact of new settlement adjacent to Rutland Water.	NO CHANGE - consultation undertaken in accordance with SCI and Regulations
H3	201106134	RC320 , Stuart Garnett, Inspired Villages	Lack of detail in H2/H3 how SGB will meet needs of older person's (extra care) housing. Plan unsound as will not deliver homes needed for older persons over the plan period.	NO CHANGE
H3	11709372	RC249 , Christopher French, Welland Rivers Trust	Criteria n) H3 should seek stronger protection for water environment and masterplan should ensure that SuDs, swales and attenuation ponds are installed as standard practice.	CONSIDER CHANGES - See response to Environment Agency RC262 (11708986)
H3	201106205	RC180, Billy Lloyd, DLP Planning Ltd. On behalf of Hereward Homes	Objections to policies H1 and H2, we have concerns as to the amount of housing and practical issues of delivery to the extent relied upon by the Plan in relation to the allocation of St. George's within the Plan period. As identified within the accompanying Housing Need and Supply Assessment, research undertaken by Lichfield (Start to Finish, second edition), identifies that the average length of time for sites of 2,000 plus to start delivering from validation of first application to first completions is 8.4 years. There is no evidence supplied by the Council which demonstrates how and why St. George's will delivery quicker than this, yet the latest housing trajectory indicates completions in the year 2025/26.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation

H3	201106228	RC162, Adam Murray, Andrew Granger & Co. Ltd. On behalf of Mr PJSR Hill and Pikerace Limited	SPRU: promotion of Woolfox as alternative to SGB. For reasons set out in objection to Policy SD2, Policy H3 amended to refer to Woolfox Market Town - to comprise around 7500 homes, of which at least 2,025 will be delivered by 2036, 39 hectares of employment land...	NO CHANGE - comparative assessment of Woolfox undertaken as part of plan making
H3	201106250	RC193 , Charlotte Bailey, DLP Planning Limited on behalf of Larkfleet	Larkfleet Homes: no objection in principle to inclusion of SGB but concern over delivery and timing due to: dependence on MOD vacating site by 2022, reliance on funding to make site viable and, requirement for decontamination resulting in first completions in 2029/30 and only 600 dwellings by 2036. Plan therefore unsound and Policy H2 should assume delivery of no more than 600 dwellings in plan period. As sufficient housing is not allocated then additional sites required (Ayston Road, Uppingham and land off Burley Park Way, Oakham).	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H4	20092926	RC44 , Margaret Bradshaw	Policy H4 should include a definite requirement for a Country Park and without this requirement the policy is unsound. There should be an accessible country park to reduce habitat fragmentation in this Local Wildlife Area.	CONSIDER CHANGE – Amend policy wording so that the country park is a requirement rather than an expectation.
H4	11652170	RC51 , Sally Harnett, Ashwell Parish Council	H4 appears to be unsound as it gifts the development of 650 houses on Quarry Farm (Rutland) land to South Kesteven District Council. The South Kesteven Local Plan allows an 18% housing buffer to its housing needs and these 650 houses could have been absorbed in that calculation, rather than imposing an additional burden of 650 houses to be built in Rutland. Statements of Common Ground were not shared publicly.	NO CHANGE - The distribution of housing supply at Stamford North was agreed between SKDC and RCC and through the SKDC Local Plan examination process.
H4	11687399	RC187 , Susan Painter	RCC have gifted 650 dwellings to SKDC. This site would have provided much of the anticipated housing need in Rutland in a sustainable environment close to the amenities of a market town. Non-existent Statement of Common Ground to justify this transfer.	NO CHANGE - The distribution of housing supply at Stamford North was agreed between SKDC and RCC and through the SKDC Local Plan examination process.
H4	20102701	RC84 , Sarah Gresty , Essendine Parish Council	Concerns raised about the Stamford North development including the Quarry Farm site due to impact on traffic flow and highway safety, access to medical services and the impact on parking in Stamford town centre and Stamford Railway Station.	NO CHANGE - Stamford North has been allocated through the adoption of the South Kesteven Local Plan in January 2020. The Quarry Farm site forms part of the wider scheme.
H4	20102712	RC89 , Richard Drabble	650 houses which are proposed to be built within Rutland at Quarry Farm, are proposed to be counted by the neighbouring authority as part of their Local Plan count. It is important to note that the resultant effect will be a moderation of the remaining development proposed throughout Rutland, including the withdrawal of unsound developments spoiling Rutland villages and a further scaling-down of development proposals at St Georges Barracks/North Luffenham airfield. The Statement of Common Ground should have been published.	NO CHANGE - The distribution of housing supply at Stamford North was agreed between SKDC and RCC and through the SKDC Local Plan examination process. The Statement of Common Ground part of Duty to Co-operate statement. It can be demonstrated that there have been continuous and ongoing discussion with SKDC about the site.

H4	11692805	RC95 , Kerry Nimmons, Cottesmore Parish Council	Objection to gifting 650 dwellings to SKDC. SKDC is physically 2.5 times larger in area than Rutland and already has, as evidenced through its EIP, sufficient housing land to meet its needs, including an 18% buffer and without requiring of 650 units gifted to it. Statements of Common Ground (SoCG) should be made publicly available throughout the plan-making process to provide transparency. This hasn't happened in this case. This makes the SGB proposal look both more necessary and viable than in reality it is.	NO CHANGE - The distribution of housing supply at Stamford North was agreed between SKDC and RCC and through the SKDC Local Plan examination process.
H4	20110106	RC114 , Andrew Brown	RCC should terminate the current Statement of Common Ground with LCC and SKDC, include the 650 housing allocation at Quarry farm within RCC's housing allocation, negotiate with SKDC a sensible fixed contribution from RCC's CIL allocation to the cost of the Stamford North road development; and delay approving a Regulation 19 consultation until this is done to give RCC enough future housing stock to satisfy legislation for the next 5 years whilst not hampering South Kesteven in their desire for a new roadSouth Kesteven already had sufficient housing land to meet its needs without the 650 from RCC. The Statement of Common Ground should be made publicly available, and as far as I am aware has never been ratified by full RCC.	NO CHANGE - The distribution of housing supply at Stamford North was agreed between SKDC and RCC and through the SKDC Local Plan examination process.
H4	20110215	RC124 , Michael Nyss	605 dwellings to be built in Rutland have been gifted to South Kesteven. This has to have been to accommodate the housing numbers dictated by the MOD. If these were included in the numbers for Rutland, then RCC would be over providing dwellings by 55%! Statement of Common Ground not published.	NO CHANGE - The distribution of housing supply at Stamford North was agreed between SKDC and RCC and through the SKDC Local Plan examination process. The Statement of Common Ground part of Duty to Co-operate statement. It can be demonstrated that there have been continuous and ongoing discussion with SKDC about the site.
H4	20110217	RC126 , M E Jeal	650 houses which are proposed to be built within Rutland at Quarry Farm, are proposed to be counted by the neighbouring authority as part of their Local Plan count. It is important to note that the resultant effect will be a moderation of the remaining development proposed throughout Rutland, including the withdrawal of unsound developments spoiling Rutland villages and a further scaling-down of development proposals at St Georges Barracks/North Luffenham airfield.The Statement of Common Ground should have been published.	NO CHANGE - The distribution of housing supply at Stamford North was agreed between SKDC and RCC and through the SKDC Local Plan examination process. The Statement of Common Ground part of Duty to Co-operate statement. It can be demonstrated that there have been continuous and ongoing discussion with SKDC about the site.

H4	20110303	RC137 , Clifford Bacon, Clipsham Parish	There was no Statement of Common Ground developed for the “gifting” of a 650 house allocation from Rutland to South Kesteven. This is fundamental to the figures used in the RCC proposed Local Plan. This was done in a somewhat covert way and without the proper legal documentation and therefore public knowledge.	NO CHANGE - The distribution of housing supply at Stamford North was agreed between SKDC and RCC and through the SKDC Local Plan examination process. The Statement of Common Ground part of Duty to Co-operate statement. It can be demonstrated that there have been continuous and ongoing discussion with SKDC about the site.
H4	20110314	RC141 , Andrew Johnson, Morcott Parish Council	Objection to gifting 650 dwellings to SKDC. SKDC is physically 2.5 times larger in area than Rutland and already has, as evidenced through its EiP, sufficient housing land to meet its needs, including an 18% buffer and without requiring of 650 units gifted to it. Statements of Common Ground (SoCG) should be made publicly available throughout the plan-making process to provide transparency. This hasn’t happened in this case. This makes the SGB proposal look both more necessary and viable than in reality it is.	NO CHANGE - The distribution of housing supply at Stamford North was agreed between SKDC and RCC and through the SKDC Local Plan examination process. The Statement of Common Ground part of Duty to Co-operate statement. It can be demonstrated that there have been continuous and ongoing discussion with SKDC about the site.
H4	11702642	RC140 , Tim Smith, North Luffenham Parish Council	Stamford is a Town Council, local housing need is not measured at this level. To argue that South Kesteven, a rural area at least three times the size of Rutland, needs Rutland to gift it 650 dwellings is illogical. The recently approved South Kesteven Local Plan has an 18 % buffer to their local housing need calculation. In addition the transport Assessments do not mention how the proposed allocation for Land North of Stamford will affect delivery of the St Georges Barracks. Both schemes will clearly place a heavy demand on the two local junctions with the A1.	NO CHANGE - The distribution of housing supply at Stamford North was agreed between SKDC and RCC and through the SKDC Local Plan examination process. Transport assessments have been prepared by RCC and SKDC to identify the mitigation schemes required which will be part of the masterplan for the wider scheme.
H4	20110411	RC156 , Victor Bacon, South Luffenham Parish Council	To suggest that SKDC a rural area three times the area of Rutland needs Rutland to gift 650 dwelling id illogical. The recently approved SKDC Local Plan has an approximately 18% buffer to their housing need. It is understood that there is no statement of Common Ground, SKDC considered a draft which has as yet to be put to RCC, transparency was not done with either council so there is no Statement of Common Ground.	NO CHANGE - The distribution of housing supply at Stamford North was agreed between SKDC and RCC and through the SKDC Local Plan examination process. The Statement of Common Ground part of Duty to Co-operate statement. It can be demonstrated that there have been continuous and ongoing discussion with SKDC about the site.
H4	11647756	RC157 , Rosemary Powell	<p>No current Statement of Common Ground (SoGC) for Stamford North between South Kesteven District Council, Lincolnshire County Council and Rutland County Council. The 650 homes at Quarry Farm are not necessary to the delivery of sufficient land at South Kesteven and the plan has not been positively prepared.</p> <p>Giving the 650 dwellings to SK is setting a precedent for such developments on Rutland land not be included in Rutland’s allocation is completely out of proportion, thereby making the plan unjustified.</p>	NO CHANGE - The distribution of housing supply at Stamford North was agreed between SKDC and RCC through the SKDC Local Plan examination process.

H4	20110438	RC210 , Emilie Carr, Historic England	There is no reference within paragraph 5.24 to the scheduled monument at Great Casterton. A criteria should be added to policy H4. The development will be harmful to the setting of the scheduled monument at Great Casterton (reference 1005067). The Scheduled Monument is a Roman town and fort, located on a crossroads and on the river valley. Control over landscape, including the views across an over the river valley – are part of the form, function and placement of this site. It is understood that the area of objection would be a country park (with no built development) in a future scheme coming forward, which would overcome Historic England concerns. This should be included within a policy criteria, as has been done for biodiversity, and shown on the allocation plan (as a 'heritage buffer' for example)	CONSIDER CHANGE - Add an additional criteria to incorporate the appropriate mitigation of potential harm of the scheduled monument at Great Casterton.
H4	20110454	RC181 , Rowan Scholtz, Empingham Parish Council	Although there is reference to a SoCG with respect to Stamford North, it is not in existence, not available to the public and not endorsed by the Council. It is also our contention that given the impact on the A1 junctions and the local road network a SoCG should have been in existence with Highways England. The gifting of the dwellings to be built at Stamford north to count in South Kesteven D.C. housing numbers fails the test of soundness by the failure to consider all reasonable alternatives. Stamford is a town Council, not a housing authority it does not have a housing need, and SKDC is a very large authority which does not need the numbers. The issue of where to count the numbers is purely a Rutland decision and the gift is simply because that counting the numbers in Rutland obviates any necessity for a large new settlement at SGB.	NO CHANGE - The distribution of housing supply at Stamford North was agreed between SKDC and RCC and through the SKDC Local Plan examination process. The Statement of Common Ground part of Duty to Co-operate statement. It can be demonstrated that there have been continuous and ongoing discussion with SKDC about the site. Transport assessments have been prepared by RCC and SKDC to identify the mitigation schemes required which will be part of the masterplan for the wider scheme.
H4	20110463	RC283 , Neil Johnson	The Policy provides for up to 650 dwellings on land in Rutland adjacent to Stamford at Quarry Farm. However, none of this will be set, in whole or in part, against the Rutland Housing requirement.	NO CHANGE - The distribution of housing supply at Stamford North was agreed between SKDC and RCC and through the SKDC Local Plan examination process.
H4	20110466	RC328 , Robert Harrison	The gifting of 650 dwellings to SKDC is unnecessary. SKDC has adequate land to meet its projected housing needs. RCC have not provided any statements of common ground to address this gifting of 650 houses to SKDC.	NO CHANGE - The distribution of housing supply at Stamford North was agreed between SKDC and RCC and through the SKDC Local Plan examination process. The Statement of Common Ground part of Duty to Co-operate statement. It can be demonstrated that there have been continuous and ongoing discussion with SKDC about the site.
H4	20110474	RC195 , David Duffin	Stamford N. in housing numbers is not considered as a reasonable alternative – which it may well be. RCC have decided to gift 605 dwellings to be built in Rutland to count in SKDC's housing numbers. Again the only reason can be to accommodate the numbers dictated by the MOD for SGB. If these numbers were included RCC would be over providing houses by an astonishing 55%.	NO CHANGE - The distribution of housing supply at Stamford North was agreed between SKDC and RCC and through the SKDC Local Plan examination process.

H4	20110508	RC296 , Christopher Renner, Normanton Parish Meeting	Land at Quarry Farm do not count towards housing numbers in Rutland, but count towards those of neighbouring South Kesteven DC. SKDC is physically 2.5 times larger in area than Rutland and already has, as evidenced through its EiP, sufficient housing land to meet its needs, including an 18% buffer and without requiring of 650 units gifted to it. Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) documenting the cross boundary matters being addressed have not been made publicly available throughout the plan making process to provide transparency. Dampens the numbers generally available in Rutland to make, in particular, the SGB proposal look both more necessary and viable than in reality it is.	NO CHANGE - The distribution of housing supply at Stamford North was agreed between SKDC and RCC and through the SKDC Local Plan examination process. The Statement of Common Ground part of Duty to Co-operate statement. It can be demonstrated that there have been continuous and ongoing discussion with SKDC about the site.
H4	20110514	RC215 , George Renner	While the Duty to Cooperate statement maintains that discussions have been held with neighbouring authorities, the only clear evidence in the plan concerns the proposed development at Quarry Farm/Stamford North, supporting South Kesteven District Council, and the only reason for that is to attempt to manufacture a need for the St George's Barracks housing development. There are clear implications of developments in other areas, in particular around Leicester and Corby, with concomitant impact on transport requirements; evidence of the draw of retail opportunities, particularly towards Leicester, does not seem to have been taken into account.	NO CHANGE - The distribution of housing supply at Stamford North was agreed between SKDC and RCC and through the SKDC Local Plan examination process. The Statement of Common Ground part of Duty to Co-operate statement. It can be demonstrated that there have been continuous and ongoing discussion with SKDC about the site. Transport assessments have been prepared by RCC and SKDC to identify the mitigation schemes required which will be part of the masterplan for the wider scheme.
H4	11706625	RC276 , Peter White	I strongly support the comments made by Empingham Parish Council. (Parish Council comments are: Although there is reference to a SoCG with respect to Stamford North, it is not in existence, not available to the public and not endorsed by the Council. It is also our contention that given the impact on the A1 junctions and the local road network a SoCG should have been in existence with Highways England. The gifting of the dwellings to be built at Stamford north to count in South Kesteven D.C. housing numbers fails the test of soundness by the failure to consider all reasonable alternatives. Stamford is a town Council, not a housing authority it does not have a housing need, and SKDC is a very large authority which does not need the numbers. The issue of where to count the numbers is purely a Rutland decision and the gift is simply because that counting the numbers in Rutland obviates any necessity for a large new settlement at SGB.)	NO CHANGE - The distribution of housing supply at Stamford North was agreed between SKDC and RCC and through the SKDC Local Plan examination process. The Statement of Common Ground part of Duty to Co-operate statement. It can be demonstrated that there have been continuous and ongoing discussion with SKDC about the site. Transport assessments have been prepared by RCC and SKDC to identify the mitigation schemes required which will be part of the masterplan for the wider scheme.
H4	20110526	RC284 , Neil Johannessen	Objection to the gifting of 650 dwellings to SKDC. There is no justification provided.	NO CHANGE - The distribution of housing supply at Stamford North was agreed between SKDC and RCC and through the SKDC Local Plan examination process.

H4	11707013	RC159 , Timothy Smith	The gifting of 650 houses to neighbouring South Kesteven appears to be inexplicable. It does not need this gift as they have an approved Local Plan that has an 18 % buffer to their local housing calculation. These houses should be counted towards Rutland's housing supply and represent four years of that supply. By reducing numbers available in Rutland it makes the St. George's Barracks appear more necessary and viable than in reality it is.	NO CHANGE - The distribution of housing supply at Stamford North was agreed between SKDC and RCC and through the SKDC Local Plan examination process.
H4	20110534	RC220 , Gale Waller	Objection to gifting 650 houses within Rutland to SKDC. The "Duty to Co-Operate" does not require a council to allocate housing numbers to another Council. As no explanation as to why this has happened has been offered, I can only conclude it is to accommodate 1,000 houses at SGB and therefore the decision is unsound. There is no agreed Statement of Common Ground between RCC and South Kesteven District Council.	NO CHANGE - The distribution of housing supply at Stamford North was agreed between SKDC and RCC and through the SKDC Local Plan examination process. The Statement of Common Ground part of Duty to Co-operate statement. It can be demonstrated that there have been continuous and ongoing discussion with SKDC about the site.
H4	11707227	RC280 , Nick Davenport	Objection to gifting 650 dwellings to SKDC. SKDC is physically 2.5 times larger in area than Rutland and already has, as evidenced through its EiP, sufficient housing land to meet its needs, including an 18% buffer and without requiring of 650 units gifted to it. Statements of Common Ground (SoCG) should be made publicly available throughout the plan-making process to provide transparency. This hasn't happened in this case. This makes the SGB proposal look both more necessary and viable than in reality it is.	NO CHANGE - The distribution of housing supply at Stamford North was agreed between SKDC and RCC and through the SKDC Local Plan examination process.
H4	11707214	RC186 , Catherine Davenport	Objection to gifting 650 dwellings to SKDC. SKDC is physically 2.5 times larger in area than Rutland and already has, as evidenced through its EiP, sufficient housing land to meet its needs, including an 18% buffer and without requiring of 650 units gifted to it. Statements of Common Ground (SoCG) should be made publicly available throughout the plan-making process to provide transparency. This hasn't happened in this case. This makes the SGB proposal look both more necessary and viable than in reality it is.	NO CHANGE - The distribution of housing supply at Stamford North was agreed between SKDC and RCC and through the SKDC Local Plan examination process.
H4	11707587	RC255 , Kenneth Bool	Objection to gifting 650 dwellings to SKDC. SKDC is physically 2.5 times larger in area than Rutland and already has, as evidenced through its EiP, sufficient housing land to meet its needs, including an 18% buffer and without requiring of 650 units gifted to it. Statements of Common Ground (SoCG) should be made publicly available throughout the plan-making process to provide transparency. This hasn't happened in this case. This makes the SGB proposal look both more necessary and viable than in reality it is.	NO CHANGE - The distribution of housing supply at Stamford North was agreed between SKDC and RCC and through the SKDC Local Plan examination process.

H4	20110564	RC188 , Carole Brown, Braunston-in-Rutland Parish Council	Land at Quarry Farm do not count towards housing numbers in Rutland, but count towards those of neighbouring South Kesteven DC. SKDC is physically 2.5 times larger in area than Rutland and already has, as evidenced through its EiP, sufficient housing land to meet its needs, including an 18% buffer and without requiring of 650 units gifted to it. Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) documenting the cross boundary matters being addressed have not been made publicly available throughout the plan making process to provide transparency. Dampens the numbers generally available in Rutland to make, in particular, the SGB proposal look both more necessary and viable than in reality it is.	NO CHANGE - The distribution of housing supply at Stamford North was agreed between SKDC and RCC and through the SKDC Local Plan examination process. The Statement of Common Ground part of Duty to Co-operate statement. It can be demonstrated that there have been continuous and ongoing discussion with SKDC about the site.
H4	11707735	RC289 , Peter Burrows	<p>Although there is reference to an RCC SoCG with respect to Stamford N., it has not been prepared, not available to the public and not endorsed by the Council.</p> <p>The failure to consider incorporating the Stamford North site and the 605 dwellings to be built in Rutland, as a reasonable alternative to meet Rutland's housing needs, means that the Plan fails the soundness test of "justified taking into account reasonable alternatives". Stamford does not have a Local Housing Need and Kesteven does not need Quarry Farm to meet its LHN.</p>	NO CHANGE - The distribution of housing supply at Stamford North was agreed between SKDC and RCC and through the SKDC Local Plan examination process.
H4	11707968	RC257 , Lelia O'Connell	Land at Quarry Farm do not count towards housing numbers in Rutland, but count towards those of neighbouring South Kesteven DC. SKDC is physically 2.5 times larger in area than Rutland and already has, as evidenced through its EiP, sufficient housing land to meet its needs, including an 18% buffer and without requiring of 650 units gifted to it. Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) documenting the cross boundary matters being addressed have not been made publicly available throughout the plan making process to provide transparency. Dampens the numbers generally available in Rutland to make, in particular, the SGB proposal look both more necessary and viable than in reality it is.	NO CHANGE - The distribution of housing supply at Stamford North was agreed between SKDC and RCC and through the SKDC Local Plan examination process.
H4	11707687	RC315 , Steven Gill	To give away 650 homes to another council to assist them in meeting their housing needs, when it could assist with solving Rutland's future housing allocation until 2036, is incomprehensible and unjustifiable. It makes the draft Local Plan unsound because there is a complete lack of consideration of an alternative route to meet Rutland's housing demand by including the Quarry Farm development in the housing numbers, which would also be in accordance with the wishes of the residents of Rutland.	NO CHANGE - The distribution of housing supply at Stamford North was agreed between SKDC and RCC and through the SKDC Local Plan examination process.

H4	11708018	RC233 , Jonathan Griffin	Land at Quarry Farm do not count towards housing numbers in Rutland, but count towards those of neighbouring South Kesteven DC. SKDC is physically 2.5 times larger in area than Rutland and already has, as evidenced through its EiP, sufficient housing land to meet its needs, including an 18% buffer and without requiring of 650 units gifted to it. Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) documenting the cross boundary matters being addressed have not been made publicly available throughout the plan making process to provide transparency. Dampens the numbers generally available in Rutland to make, in particular, the SGB proposal look both more necessary and viable than in reality it is.	NO CHANGE - The distribution of housing supply at Stamford North was agreed between SKDC and RCC and through the SKDC Local Plan examination process.
H4	11708087	RC315 , Steven Gill	The inclusion of 650 homes in another local authority's housing allocation is not justifiable. Rutland has a number of issues with meeting its housing demand and to "give away" 650 homes when Rutland County Council are intent on then pursuing a very unpopular large development of St George's Barracks is not sound.	NO CHANGE - The distribution of housing supply at Stamford North was agreed between SKDC and RCC and through the SKDC Local Plan examination process.
H4	20110601	RC266 , Mark Bassett, Freeths LLP on behalf of Larkfleet Homes at Larkfleet House, Falcon Way, Bourne, PE100FF	Larkfleet Homes supports Policy H4 and the allocation of Quarry Farm in principle. It is critical to the wider delivery of the Stamford North SUE and the housing requirements of SKDC. However, despite support for the development of Quarry Farm, Larkfleet Homes strongly OBJECTS to the inclusion of the requirement of 'a single comprehensive planning application for the whole of Stamford North development area.' Larkfleet Homes has been engaged with RCC, SKDC, Burghley House Preservation Trust ("BHPT") (the promoters of SKDC's portion of Stamford North) and other stakeholders for approximately 3.5 years. The requirement for a single planning application would result in a significant volume of abortive work by both promoters at a very large financial and time cost. It is not necessary to achieve a comprehensive development across the Stamford North site as a whole. This can be achieved through compliance with the Development Brief. The Development Brief will be a comprehensive adopted SPD which contains detailed guidance on master planning, urban design, local centre/community/employment uses and infrastructure requirements and delivery. In addition to the above, we would suggest that the capacity for the site is altered to 'approximately 650 dwellings' to offer flexibility.	NO CHANGE - Quarry Farm is allocated as it forms fundamental part of delivery of Stamford north. It would not have been allocated on its own therefore must come forward as part of a comprehensive proposal

H4	20110635	RC256 , Kenneth Siddle, Wing Parish Council	The allocation of Quarry Farm which lies in RCC's administrative area, however, WPC strongly object to the Plan's proposal that the allocation would solely meet the housing requirement of neighbouring South Kesteven District Council (SKDC).SKDC has a recently adopted Local Plan which fully meets its own needs and includes an over provision of 18% it is therefore not justified.Quarry Farm has been excluded from the spatial strategy assessments in order to facilitate the proposal of the unsustainable development at SGB. Representations also submitted relating to the settlement hierarchy.	NO CHANGE - The distribution of housing supply at Stamford North was agreed between SKDC and RCC and through the SKDC Local Plan examination process.
H4	20110646	RC303 , Robin King	Although there is reference to an RCC SoCG with respect to Stamford N., it has not been prepared, not available to the public and not endorsed by the Council. The failure to consider incorporating the Stamford North site and the 605 dwellings to be built in Rutland, as a reasonable alternative to meet Rutland's housing needs, means that the Plan fails the soundness test of "justified taking into account reasonable alternatives".	NO CHANGE - The distribution of housing supply at Stamford North was agreed between SKDC and RCC and through the SKDC Local Plan examination process. The Statement of Common Ground part of Duty to Co-operate statement. It can be demonstrated that there have been continuous and ongoing discussion with SKDC about the site.
H4	11709036	RC238 , Hilary Kingston	The 650 homes should count towards the housing allocation for Rutland and not South Kesteven District Council (SKDC). This is especially the case when considered in light of Rutland County Council (RCC) supporting a large development at St George's Barracks (SGB). If the 650 homes had been kept in the Rutland housing allocation, this would leave only 879 homes that need to be developed over a 16 year period, which is only 54.9 homes per annum and could be accommodated through the extension of the existing county town conurbations of Oakham and Rutland. Lack of consideration of a viable alternative route to meet Rutland's housing demand by including the Quarry Farm.	NO CHANGE - The distribution of housing supply at Stamford North was agreed between SKDC and RCC and through the SKDC Local Plan examination process.
H4	11709077	RC239 , Julie Gray	Nowhere in NPP does it state if you work together in cross boundary needs then you must GIFT the housing allocation away from your county. This policy is inadequate as it fails to consider the broader implications and sustainability issues in relation the impacts of this development of almost 2000 houses within 5 miles of the proposed development of 2315 houses at St George's Barracks.	NO CHANGE - The distribution of housing supply at Stamford North was agreed between SKDC and RCC and through the SKDC Local Plan examination process. The suitability of the site was assessed through the SKDC Local Plan examination. The SA tests alternative strategies and the cumulative impacts are taken into account in the wider assessment.
H4	11709071	RC238 , Hilary Kingston	These 650 homes should be included in the Rutland housing allocation and the draft Local Plan needs to be completely re-drafted in order to consider and alter its strategy. It needs to have a much more reduced development at St George's Barracks, due to the inclusion of the 650 houses from the Quarry Farm Development.	NO CHANGE - The distribution of housing supply at Stamford North was agreed between SKDC and RCC and through the SKDC Local Plan examination process.

H4	11709163	RC240 , James White	I strongly support the comments made by Empingham Parish Council. (Parish Council comments are: Although there is reference to a SoCG with respect to Stamford North, it is not in existence, not available to the public and not endorsed by the Council.It is also our contention that given the impact on the A1 junctions and the local road network a SoCG should have been in existence with Highways England.The gifting of the dwellings to be built at Stamford north to count in South Kesteven D.C. housing numbers fails the test of soundness by the failure to consider all reasonable alternatives. Stamford is a town Council, not a housing authority it does not have a housing need, and SKDC is a very large authority which does not need the numbers. The issue of where to count the numbers is purely a Rutland decision and the gift is simply because that counting the numbers in Rutland obviates any necessity for a large new settlement at SGB.)	NO CHANGE - The distribution of housing supply at Stamford North was agreed between SKDC and RCC and through the SKDC Local Plan examination process. The Statement of Common Ground part of Duty to Co-operate statement. It can be demonstrated that there have been continuous and ongoing discussion with SKDC about the site. Transport assessments have been prepared by RCC and SKDC to identify the mitigation schemes required which will be part of the masterplan for the wider scheme.
H4	20110676	RC241 , Jessica Dewar, South Kesteven District Council	There has been continued joint working between the authorities and H4 could be strengthened in terms of the wording of the policy to greater reflect the development principles set out in STM1-H1. Currently there are limited references within H4 to the wider SUE and infrastructure provision identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan for both South Kesteven Local Plan and the evidence supporting the Rutland Local Plan to ensure that a comprehensive sustainable development is delivered. In terms of effectiveness minor modifications are proposed which relate to the site wide infrastructure to ensure the site is deliverable.As currently drafted Policy H4 requires a comprehensive planning application for the site whilst the wording of STM1-H1 requires a masterplan. This potentially creates a difference in policy requirements for the site and creates ambiguity if there are differences in policy requirements for the decision maker. To ensure the site is deliverable and policies are clearly written a number of minor modifications are proposed.	See Statement of Common Ground - CONSIDER CHANGES to reflect the development principles including in policy STM1-H1 of the SK Local Plan.
H4	20110683	RC242 , J C M Ball	Land at Quarry Farm do not count towards housing numbers in Rutland, but count towards those of neighbouring South Kesteven DC. SKDC is physically 2.5 times larger in area than Rutland and already has, as evidenced through its EiP, sufficient housing land to meet its needs, including an 18% buffer and without requiring of 650 units gifted to it.Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) documenting the cross boundary matters being addressed have not been made publicly available throughout the plan making process to provide transparency. Dampens the numbers generally available in Rutland to make, in particular, the SGB proposal look both more necessary and viable than in reality it is.	NO CHANGE - The distribution of housing supply at Stamford North was agreed between SKDC and RCC and through the SKDC Local Plan examination process. The Statement of Common Ground included in Duty to Co-operate Statement. It can be demonstrated that there have been continuous and ongoing discussion with SKDC about the site.

H4	20110692	RC332 , Tom Murie, Tixover Parish Meeting	<p>Land at Quarry Farm do not count towards housing numbers in Rutland, but count towards those of neighbouring South Kesteven DC. SKDC is physically 2.5 times larger in area than Rutland and already has, as evidenced through its EiP, sufficient housing land to meet its needs, including an 18% buffer and without requiring of 650 units gifted to it.</p> <p>Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) documenting the cross boundary matters being addressed have not been made publicly available throughout the plan making process to provide transparency.</p> <p>Dampens the numbers generally available in Rutland to make, in particular, the SGB proposal look both more necessary and viable than in reality it is.</p>	NO CHANGE - The distribution of housing supply at Stamford North was agreed between SKDC and RCC and through the SKDC Local Plan examination process. The Statement of Common Ground included in Duty to Co-operate Statement. It can be demonstrated that there have been continuous and ongoing discussion with SKDC about the site.
H4	11709056	RC192 , Norman Milne, Fight 4 Rutland Ltd	<p>Objection to gifting 650 dwellings to SKDC. SKDC is physically 2.5 times larger in area than Rutland and already has, as evidenced through its EiP, sufficient housing land to meet its needs, including an 18% buffer and without requiring of 650 units gifted to it. Statements of Common Ground (SoCG) should be made publicly available throughout the plan-making process to provide transparency. This hasn't happened in this case. This makes the SGB proposal look both more necessary and viable than in reality it is.</p>	NO CHANGE - The distribution of housing supply at Stamford North was agreed between SKDC and RCC and through the SKDC Local Plan examination process.
H4	201106105	RC202 , WJ & PJ Cross	<p>Land at Quarry Farm do not count towards housing numbers in Rutland, but count towards those of neighbouring South Kesteven DC. SKDC is physically 2.5 times larger in area than Rutland and already has, as evidenced through its EiP, sufficient housing land to meet its needs, including an 18% buffer and without requiring of 650 units gifted to it.</p> <p>Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) documenting the cross boundary matters being addressed have not been made publicly available throughout the plan making process to provide transparency.</p> <p>Dampens the numbers generally available in Rutland to make, in particular, the SGB proposal look both more necessary and viable than in reality it is.</p>	NO CHANGE - The distribution of housing supply at Stamford North was agreed between SKDC and RCC and through the SKDC Local Plan examination process. The Statement of Common Ground included in Duty to Co-operate Statement It can be demonstrated that there have been continuous and ongoing discussion with SKDC about the site.

H4	2011061092	RC261 , Linda Burrows	<p>Although there is reference to an RCC SoCG with respect to Stamford N., it has not been prepared, not available to the public and not endorsed by the Council. The failure to consider incorporating the Stamford North site and the 605 dwellings to be built in Rutland, as a reasonable alternative to meet Rutland's housing needs, means that the Plan fails the soundness test of "justified taking into account reasonable alternatives". Stamford does not have a Local Housing Need and Kesteven does not need Quarry Farm to meet its LHN.</p>	NO CHANGE - The distribution of housing supply at Stamford North was agreed between SKDC and RCC and through the SKDC Local Plan examination process.
H4	201106130	RC331 , TJ & EVR Boone	<p>Land at Quarry Farm do not count towards housing numbers in Rutland, but count towards those of neighbouring South Kesteven DC. SKDC is physically 2.5 times larger in area than Rutland and already has, as evidenced through its EiP, sufficient housing land to meet its needs, including an 18% buffer and without requiring of 650 units gifted to it.</p> <p>Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) documenting the cross boundary matters being addressed have not been made publicly available throughout the plan making process to provide transparency.</p> <p>Dampens the numbers generally available in Rutland to make, in particular, the SGB proposal look both more necessary and viable than in reality it is.</p>	NO CHANGE - The distribution of housing supply at Stamford North was agreed between SKDC and RCC and through the SKDC Local Plan examination process. The Statement of Common Ground included in Duty to Co-operate Statement It can be demonstrated that there have been continuous and ongoing discussion with SKDC about the site.
H4	201106138	RC290 , Peter Dawson	<p>Although there is reference to an RCC SoCG with respect to Stamford N., it has not been prepared, not available to the public and not endorsed by the Council. The failure to consider incorporating the Stamford North site and the 605 dwellings to be built in Rutland, as a reasonable alternative to meet Rutland's housing needs, means that the Plan fails the soundness test of "justified taking into account reasonable alternatives". Stamford does not have a Local Housing Need and Kesteven does not need Quarry Farm to meet its LHN.</p>	NO CHANGE - The distribution of housing supply at Stamford North was agreed between SKDC and RCC and through the SKDC Local Plan examination process. The Statement of Common Ground included in Duty to Co-operate Statement. It can be demonstrated that there have been continuous and ongoing discussion with SKDC about the site.
H4	201106147	RC307 , Charles Whittaker	<p>Although there is reference to an RCC SoCG with respect to Stamford N., it has not been prepared, not available to the public and not endorsed by the Council.</p> <p>The failure to consider incorporating the Stamford North site and the 605 dwellings to be built in Rutland, as a reasonable alternative to meet Rutland's housing needs, means that the Plan fails the soundness test of "justified taking into account reasonable alternatives". Stamford does not have a Local Housing Need and Kesteven does not need Quarry Farm to meet its LHN.</p>	NO CHANGE - The distribution of housing supply at Stamford North was agreed between SKDC and RCC and through the SKDC Local Plan examination process. The Statement of Common Ground included in Duty to Co-operate Statement. It can be demonstrated that there have been continuous and ongoing discussion with SKDC about the site.

H4	201106152	RC308 , Janet Whittaker	Although there is reference to an RCC SoCG with respect to Stamford N., it has not been prepared, not available to the public and not endorsed by the Council. The failure to consider incorporating the Stamford North site and the 605 dwellings to be built in Rutland, as a reasonable alternative to meet Rutland's housing needs, means that the Plan fails the soundness test of "justified taking into account reasonable alternatives". Stamford does not have a Local Housing Need and Kesteven does not need Quarry Farm to meet its LHN.	NO CHANGE - The distribution of housing supply at Stamford North was agreed between SKDC and RCC and through the SKDC Local Plan examination process. The Statement of Common Ground included in Duty to Co-operate Statement. It can be demonstrated that there have been continuous and ongoing discussion with SKDC about the site.
H4	201106168	RC209 , David Henry , Savills on behalf of David Henry of Savills (UK) Ltd on behalf of Burghley House	Strong support is given to the allocation of Land at Quarry Farm to form part of the mixed use development at Stamford North. Focused objection is directed to the following aspect of the proposed policy wording (as underlined): "A proposal for the development of the Quarry Farm site will only be supported where it is in accordance with an agreed Development Brief (to be adopted as SPD) and as part of a single comprehensive planning application for the whole of Stamford North development area". The Council is not justified in its approach to specify the extent of the future planning application relating to the Stamford North site as the wording of the policy does not allow for reasonable alternatives, namely various applications submitted in accordance with the overarching masterplan and supporting Development Brief. Furthermore the single application approach proposed by RCC is inconsistent with the policy requirements of the adopted South Kesteven Local Plan (2020). For reference, the adopted SKDC Policy STM1-H1 requires: "A high level masterplan, supported by a detailed development brief, appropriate full transport assessment and phasing plan, is required for the entire site (to include for the land extending into Quarry Farm, Rutland with an additional capacity of 650 dwellings)."	NO CHANGE - Quarry Farm is allocated as it forms fundamental part of delivery of Stamford north. It would not have been allocated on its own therefore must come forward as part of a comprehensive proposal
H4	11709397	RC121 , Leslie Wilson	The construction of 650 homes on land situated in Rutland should count towards the housing allocation for Rutland and not South Kesteven District Council (SKDC). This is especially the case when considered in light of Rutland County Council (RCC) supporting a large development at St George's Barracks (SGB). If the 650 homes were included in the Rutland housing allocation, this would leave only 879 homes that need to be developed over a 16 year period, which is only 54.9 homes per annum and could be accommodated through the extension of the existing county town conurbations of Oakham and Uppingham	NO CHANGE - The distribution of housing supply at Stamford North was agreed between SKDC and RCC and through the SKDC Local Plan examination process.

H4	11709151	RC262 , Liz Parsons	It would seem that RCC has made the unusual decision to gift the proposed 650 units at Stamford North to the neighbouring South Kesteven DC. Given that SKDC already has sufficient housing requirements to meet its needs, Rutland's housing requirement is integral to making this scheme viable.	NO CHANGE - The distribution of housing supply at Stamford North was agreed between SKDC and RCC and through the SKDC Local Plan examination process.
H4	201106186	RC322 , Sue Churchill	<p>Although there is reference to an RCC SoCG with respect to Stamford N., it has not been prepared, not available to the public and not endorsed by the Council.</p> <p>The failure to consider incorporating the Stamford North site and the 605 dwellings to be built in Rutland, as a reasonable alternative to meet Rutland's housing needs, means that the Plan fails the soundness test of "justified taking into account reasonable alternatives". Stamford does not have a Local Housing Need and Kesteven does not need Quarry Farm to meet its LHN.</p>	NO CHANGE - The distribution of housing supply at Stamford North was agreed between SKDC and RCC and through the SKDC Local Plan examination process. The Statement of Common Ground is included in the Duty to Co-operate Statement. It can be demonstrated that there have been continuous and ongoing discussion with SKDC about the site.
H4	11708239	RC120 , Will Atkinson	All houses built in Rutland should be fully disclosed and be part of the new Local Plan. As I understand it 650 houses to be built at Stamford North are not included in the supply calculations.	NO CHANGE - The distribution of housing supply at Stamford North was agreed between SKDC and RCC and through the SKDC Local Plan examination process.
H4, Inset Maps	20100701	RC53 , John Deag	H4 does not meet the need for public space for recreation and exercise because the Country Park mentioned in paragraph (c) is only 'expected' to be included (first sentence of paragraph 3 "The masterplan/planning application is expected to include :"). As this is merely expected and not required, this leaves open the very real possibility that the Country Park will not be provided and hence the need not be met. The Sustainability Appraisal must assess the plan as it is. The Sustainability Appraisal was devised and checked on the basis that a Country Park is included in H4. As it is not definitely included the conclusions of the Sustainability Appraisal do not hold. Enhancing green infrastructure is omitted from item c). This should be included particularly as part of the site is a candidate Local Wildlife Site. Sections of the latter will be destroyed during the development and mitigation is required, making it essential to emphasize green infrastructure in H4 rather than leaving it to later stages of the planning process. There should be no ambiguity. Indeed exactly this has been done in Policies H2 and H3 (St George's garden community development. Why should these points concerning green infrastructure, habitat, green corridors, etc. be specified for H2 & H3 but not H4? Both developments are covered by Strategic Objectives 6 & 13, and Policies EN9 & EN10. Both should be treated in the same way.	CONSIDER CHANGE – Amend policy wording so that the country park is a requirement rather than an expectation. CONSIDER CHANGE – Add an additional criteria to require the enhancement of green infrastructure. NO CHANGE – current e) is considered sufficient in relation to community infrastructure. NO CHANGE to Inset Map 48

H5	20110206	RC122 , Josh Plant, Gladman Developments	Gladman support Policy H5 which does not apply a 'one size fits all' density requirement approach. A blanket requirement is unlikely to be appropriate and does not allow for site-specific circumstances including constraints, differing localities and character of sites.	NO CHANGE
H5	20110618	RC287 , Paul Belton, CARTER JONAS on behalf of Pigeon Capital Management Ltd.	Pigeon support Policy H5 and the associated focus it provides on ensuring effective use of land is made, as is required by the NPPF. As well as having regard to the local character, context and distinctiveness, Pigeon agree that it is also important for new developments, particularly those located within and adjacent to sustainable built up areas such as Oakham, to make efficient use of land and to ensure that future residents can make full use of the high quality connections to jobs, services and sustainable transport networks that the identified locations for growth offer.	NO CHANGE
H5	201106207	RC180, Billy Lloyd, DLP Planning Ltd. On behalf of Hereward Homes	We are supportive of the wording as set out within Policy H5 and agree that sites should make the most efficient use of land whilst responding to local character, context and distinctiveness. We also agree that residential densities will vary across the County and that they should be no less than 25 dwellings per hectare. This policy is reflective of the provisions of Section 11 of the NPPF which promotes the effective use of land in meeting the need for homes and other uses.	NO CHANGE
H6	20102002	RC68 , Rosalyn Mayho	A stipulation against the use of leasehold arrangements is made in Policy H9 'Affordable Housing', as follows: 'f. homes for ownership, other than flats, should be available on a freehold basis and not subject to leasehold arrangements. This stipulation should be made to all housing, as all residents of Rutland should be free of the uncertainties and potential restrictions resulting from the use of leasehold arrangements. This is necessary not least because lower income households do not only live in houses officially classified as 'affordable'.	NO CHANGE
H6	20110619	RC287 , Paul Belton , CARTER JONAS on behalf of Pigeon Capital Management Ltd.	Pigeon would request that Criteria (d) of Policy H6 be amended to read as follows: “(d) Increase choice in the housing market, [Delete- including] through the provision of forms of housing such as new build private sector rented accommodation (Build to Rent) and discount to market products including Starter/First Homes, as defined in the NPPF, across both rural and urban parts of the County.”	NO CHANGE
H6	201106135	RC320 , Stuart Garnett, Inspired Villages	An update report should be commissioned by the Council to produce a proper evidence based position on the housing needs for older people over the plan period. The recommendations set out in our Local Plan representation document (p17) should be incorporated into the policy.	CONSIDER CHANGE - include a definition of specialist housing within the glossary in line with national guidance.

H6	201106174	RC335 , Guy Longley , Pegasus group on behalf of Vistry	Whilst the provision of mix of housing on sites is supported, any policy needs to recognise that particular site issues and issues of viability may justify a different mix to be provided. The policy needs to be applied flexibly and should be clear that site specific circumstances and issues of viability may justify the provision of an alternative mix of housing. The provision of specialist housing for the elderly on every site is not justified and there is no evidence to demonstrate that the level of need is sufficient to justify the policy requirement.	NO CHANGE
H6	201106208	RC180, Billy Lloyd, DLP Planning Ltd. On behalf of Hereward Homes	Whilst we are generally supportive of this policy, in respect of point a) no definition of 'specialist housing' is defined in the Glossary. In order to be effective the Local Plan should define what it intends by the term 'specialist housing'. The definition of such housing is particularly important and clarification on this matter is required. The policy does also not specify the amount to be provided on-sites however it is noted that 'appropriate accommodation, including extra care and other forms of supported housing is required'. In absence of any assessment of the need for specialist housing its provision cannot readily be assured and such provision as may be made cannot be monitored in absence of any understanding of the level of requirement	CONSIDER CHANGE - include a definition of specialist housing within the glossary in line with national guidance.
H6	201106164	RC226, Guy Longley, Pegasus group on behalf of Davidsons Developments Limited.	Whilst the provision of mix of housing on sites is supported, any policy needs to recognise that particular site issues and issues of viability may justify a different mix to be provided. The policy needs to be applied flexibly and should be clear that site specific circumstances and issues of viability may justify the provision of an alternative mix of housing. The provision of specialist housing for the elderly on every site is not justified and there is no evidence to demonstrate that the level of need is sufficient to justify the policy requirement.	NO CHANGE -The policy is supported by evidence
H7	20110207	RC122 , Josh Plant, Gladman Developments	This policy is both inconsistent and unjustified in the context of national planning policy. Whilst it is recognised that the needs of the population have to be planned for, as set out within paragraph 5.38, accessible and adaptable dwellings and wheelchair user dwellings are optional standards and would only be needed and viable in certain local circumstances otherwise they would have been made mandatory in Building Regulations across the Country. The enhanced standards were introduced on a 'need to have' rather than a 'nice to have basis'.	NO CHANGE -The policy is supported by evidence

H7	20110407	RC155 , Matthew Harmsworth, Persimmon Homes	The accessibility standards study currently included within the evidence base for the Regulation 19 consultation cites the SHMA 2014 Chapter 9 Table 69 estimates for residents in Rutland with mobility problems. It is from this data that the conclusions are drawn that there should be the requirements for M4(2) and M4(3) provision across new developments. However a more recent SHMA has been done across the county providing an update to these figures – the SHMA 2019 update report, therefore the Accessibility Standards Study is outdated and should be reviewed and the requirements assessed against the most up to date data.	NO CHANGE -The policy is supported by evidence
H7	20110620	RC287 , Paul Belton, CARTER JONAS on behalf of Pigeon Capital Management Ltd.	While Pigeon does not object to the objectives of Policy H7 it is considered that the policy, as drafted lacks flexibility. There may, on certain sites, be practical difficulties with delivering M4(2) housing. Such difficulties could arise because of the topography of the site/development plot, or because of the type of accommodation being delivered – flats and apartments are often less able to comply with M4(2) standards. There may also be viability implications associated with the delivery of M4(2) accommodation, particularly on smaller sites.	NO CHANGE -The policy is supported by evidence
H7	201106209	RC180, Billy Lloyd, DLP Planning Ltd. On behalf of Hereward Homes	This policy is both inconsistent and unjustified in the context of national planning policy. Whilst it is recognised that the needs of the population have to be planned for, as set out within paragraph 5.38, accessible and adaptable dwellings and wheelchair user dwellings are optional standards and would only be needed and viable in certain local circumstances otherwise they would have been made mandatory in Building Regulations across the Country. The enhanced standards were introduced on a 'need to have' rather than a 'nice to have basis'.	NO CHANGE -The policy is supported by evidence
H7	201106165	RC226, Guy Longley, Pegasus group on behalf of Davidsons Developments Limited.	The proposed policy would require the provision of some 1,065 dwellings to the M4(2) standard over the period to 2036. On the basis of the evidence presented, we consider that the requirement to provide 50% of units on sites as M4(2) accessible homes has not been adequately justified and the plan is therefore unsound.	NO CHANGE -The policy is supported by evidence
H7	201106175	RC335 , Guy Longley , Pegasus group on behalf of Vistry	The proposed policy would require the provision of some 1,065 dwellings to the M4(2) standard over the period to 2036. On the basis of the evidence presented, we consider that the requirement to provide 50% of units on sites as M4(2) accessible homes has not been adequately justified and the plan is therefore unsound.	NO CHANGE -The policy is supported by evidence

H7	2011061955	RC321 , Sue Green, House Builders Federation	Policy H7 requires all specialist housing for older people & people with disabilities and at least 50% of all new residential development on sites of 10 or more dwellings to be adaptable and accessible homes as defined in Part M4(2) of the Building Regulations. On sites of 100 or more dwellings, a minimum of 3% of affordable rented dwellings is required to meet Part M4(3) of the Building Regulations. If the Council wishes to adopt the optional standards for accessible & adaptable dwellings, then this should only be done in accordance with the 2019 NPPF (para 127f & Footnote 46) and the NPPG. Footnote 46 states “that planning policies for housing should make use of the Government’s optional technical standards for accessible and adaptable housing where this would address an identified need for such properties”.	NO CHANGE -The policy is supported by evidence
H8	20091504	RC25 , Kirstie Clifton, Define Planning for William David Homes	It is acknowledged that self-build and custom housebuilding is an element of the Government’s housing strategy. However, there is limited evidence of need or demand for such plots within major housing sites as is proposed under this policy. Furthermore, segregation of individual plots as part of such large-scale development can have additional impacts on deliverability and health and safety during construction.	NO CHANGE
H8	20110543	RC232 , Jon Bradburn, Montagu Evans on behalf of Secretary of State for Defence	As drafted, the Policy is considered to be ineffective as its sole approach for larger schemes is to offer serviced plots for sale for a period of 12 months. Need to recognize role of MMC and how customization can fulfil self-build requirement and not focus solely on plots for sale. This approach focuses solely on the self-build approach, rather than also allowing for the need to be delivered through a resident’s customisation of a developer’s product.	NO CHANGE
H8	20110621	RC287 , Paul Belton , CARTER JONAS on behalf of Pigeon Capital Management Ltd.	While Pigeon does not object to the objectives of Policy H8, it does object to the review mechanism set out within the final paragraph of the policy. As drafted Policy H8 states that if there is no interest in self-build plots that have been set aside and reserved on larger sites, and if this lack of interest has been proven by means of a 12 month marketing exercise, the Council “will consider whether the plot(s) may be built out as conventional market housing by the developer”. This review mechanism lacks any precision or certainty. It does not therefore represent an appropriate strategy and is, as drafted, unsound.	NO CHANGE

H8	2011061956	RC321 , Sue Green, House Builders Federation	The HBF is not supportive of policy requirements for the inclusion of at least 2% self & custom build housing on residential development sites of 50 or more dwellings. The Council should not seek to burden developers with responsibility for delivery of self & custom build plots contrary to national guidance, which outlines that the Council should engage with landowners and encourage them to consider self & custom build. The Council's policy approach should not move beyond encouragement by seeking provision of self & custom build plots as part of the housing mix on new housing development. As set out in the 2019 NPPF, all policies should be underpinned by relevant and up to date evidence which should be adequate, proportionate and focussed tightly on supporting and justifying the policies concerned (para 31). Therefore, the provision of self & custom build serviced plots must be justified by credible and robust evidence	NO CHANGE
H8	201106210	RC180, Billy Lloyd, DLP Planning Ltd. On behalf of Hereward Homes	The Local Plan is unclear as to how the requirement for 2% of sites of over 50 has been calculated and what it therefore considers either to be the future demand or the potential capacity of plots likely to be delivered. Moreover, we consider that the requirement in clause 2 of the policy is unlikely to reflect the type of location attractive to those interested in self-building. Specifically, the incorporation of self-build plots within larger development sites are likely to be constrained in plot size and moreover in the type of development likely to be acceptable which is consistent with the overall design objectives and criteria applying to that development.	NO CHANGE
H8	20103004	RC106 , Nick Grace, Grace Machin on behalf of Tony Wray	We consider that Policy H8 would not be effective or justified. It is considered too restrictive to restrict new self-build projects to land within planned limits to development.	NO CHANGE
H8	20110208	RC122 , Josh Plant, Gladman Developments	Gladman welcome flexibility within Policy H8 whereby once a plot considered by the Council to be built out as conventional market housing.	NO CHANGE

H8	20110408	RC155 , Matthew Harmsworth, Persimmon Homes	<p>Persimmon Homes are strongly of the view that the Council do not have an evidence base to support this policy and the policy is unjustified. Evidence in the 2018 – 2019 Monitoring Report indicates sufficient self-build/ custom build plots are coming forward to meet the need without such a mandatory policy being in place. Whilst Local Planning Authorities have a duty to promote self-build housing there are other ways that this can be done. Paragraph 57-025 of the PPG sets out a variety of approaches that need to be considered in addition to developing policies in the local plan including the use of their own available land; should engage with landowners who own sites suitable and encourage them to consider self-build/ custom build and work with custom build developers to maximise opportunities for self-build and custom build. We cannot find any evidence that the Council has considered these other reasonable approaches to providing self-build/ custom build as set out above. Without such consideration it appears the Council is seeking to place the burden for delivery of self-build/ custom plots on house-builders without looking sufficiently at other delivery mechanisms. These options need to be fully explored, as required by the NPPG, before a mandatory requirement is imposed on house builders.</p>	NO CHANGE
H9	20100302	RC51 , Sally Harnett, Ashwell Parish Council	The issue of social housing is important. Where are the sites of social/affordable housing in Rutland? There should be clear evidence provided of where funds from Policy H9, (in-lieu contributions) are spent.	NO CHANGE
H9	11663300	RC61 , Lance Wiggins, Landmark Planning	Remove threshold of 6 in designated rural areas so all areas has threshold of 10. Government is proposing an increase in the affordable housing threshold.	NO CHANGE -The policy is supported by evidence
H9	11657610	RC72 , Nigel Cooper	<p>1. Policy H9 should state: 50% of the affordable housing requirement is to be social rented. Any overall under provision will be required to be made up on major sites such as St Georges.</p> <p>2. Policy H9 should state: The delivery of affordable housing shall be incorporated throughout the progression of a development.</p>	CONSIDER CHANGE - to supporting text and policy H9 to say that one-third of affordable housing will normally be affordable home ownership and the remaining two-thirds will be affordable housing for rent, both within the definition in Annex 2 of the NPPF.

H9	11692819	RC95 , Kerry Nimmons, Cottesmore Parish Council	Affordable housing aspirations are to be welcomed, but they need to be provided right across the county, as people with an affordable housing requirement live in settlements across the whole spatial hierarchy. The concentration of so many of the larger development sites, up to 2036, at one location, SGB, means that affordable housing too is going to be over-concentrated and skewing its availability for against those living elsewhere in Rutland, where the need is just as significant. Due to Thresholds for on-site affordable housing, affordable housing will be concentrated in too few places and not in other places like Cottesmore that need it. There should be a mixture of social rented and affordable rented housing.	NO CHANGE
H9	11573591	RC111 , Andrew Robinson	Affordable housing aspirations are to be welcomed, but they need to be provided right across the county, as people with an affordable housing requirement live in settlements across the whole spatial hierarchy. The concentration of so many of the larger development sites, up to 2036, at one location, SGB, means that affordable housing too is going to be over-concentrated - "the vast majority" - and skewing its availability for against those living elsewhere in Rutland.	NO CHANGE
H9	20103106	RC113 , Brian Grady	Affordable housing aspirations are to be welcomed, but they need to be provided right across the county, as people with an affordable housing requirement live in settlements across the whole spatial hierarchy. The concentration of so many of the larger development sites, up to 2036, at one location, SGB, means that the "vast majority" of affordable housing too is going to be over-concentrated and skewing its availability for against those living elsewhere in Rutland, where the need is just as significant.	NO CHANGE
H9	20110107	RC114 , Andrew Brown	The Plan states that any development of more than 10 houses should have 30% affordable homes. Having such a large development at St Georges will concentrate a large amount of those affordable homes in one place. Affordable housing needs to be close to where people work, near schools, health facilities and shops. They also need to have excellent public transport facilities.	NO CHANGE
H9	20110315	RC141 , Andrew Johnson, Morcott Parish Council	The Plan states that any development of more than 10 houses should have 30% affordable homes. Having such a large development at St Georges will concentrate a large amount of those affordable homes in one place and not sustainable. There should also be a mix of social and affordable rented housing.	NO CHANGE
H9	20110481	RC197 , Philip Davies	The Plan states that any development of more than 10 houses should have 30% affordable homes. Having such a large development at St Georges will concentrate a large amount of those affordable homes in one place and not sustainable. There should also be a mix of social and affordable rented housing.	NO CHANGE

H9	20110509	RC296 , Christopher Renner, Normanton Parish Meeting	The Plan states that any development of more than 10 houses should have 30% affordable homes. Having such a large development at St Georges will concentrate a large amount of those affordable homes in one place and not sustainable. There should also be a mix of social and affordable rented housing.	NO CHANGE
H9	11707151	RC159 , Timothy Smith	The Plan states that any development of more than 10 houses should have 30% affordable homes. Having such a large development at St Georges will concentrate a large amount of those affordable homes in one place and not sustainable.	NO CHANGE
H9	11707596	RC255 , Kenneth Bool	The Plan states that any development of more than 10 houses should have 30% affordable homes. Having such a large development at St Georges will concentrate a large amount of those affordable homes in one place and not sustainable. There should also be a mix of social and affordable rented housing.	NO CHANGE
H9	20110565	RC188 , Carole Brown, Braunston-in-Rutland Parish Council	The Plan states that any development of more than 10 houses should have 30% affordable homes. Having such a large development at St Georges will concentrate a large amount of those affordable homes in one place and not sustainable. There should also be a mix of social and affordable rented housing.	NO CHANGE
H9	20110602	RC190 , Jamie Roberts, Tetlow King Planning c/o Agent for Rentplus UK Ltd	Rent Plus is an effective way of meeting housing need. Policy H9 should include a reference to a minimum 10% of housing as affordable home ownership products, subject to certain exemptions.	NO CHANGE
H9	20110622	RC287 , Paul Belton , CARTER JONAS on behalf of Pigeon Capital Management Ltd.	Policy H9 (e) should be more flexible with the "pepper-potting" of affordable housing in large sites, with the maximum of 10 being an aspiration.	NO CHANGE
H9	11709083	RC239 , Julie Gray	Need for affordable housing led to 50% of Rutland's housing at SGB. Where is evidence of this need? Should be fixed definition for Rutland of affordable and where it is needed. Policy wording of H9 should be clearer to withstand viability challenges. No reference to different types of affordable housing that should be available, such as social housing, sheltered housing and extra care.	CONSIDER CHANGE - to supporting text and Policy H9 to say that one-third of affordable housing will normally be affordable home ownership and the remaining two-thirds will be affordable housing for rent, both within the definition in Annex 2 of the NPPF.
H9	20110684	RC242 , J C M Ball	The Plan states that any development of more than 10 houses should have 30% affordable homes. Having such a large development at St Georges will concentrate a large amount of those affordable homes in one place and not sustainable. There should also be a mix of social and affordable rented housing.	NO CHANGE

H9	20110693	RC332 , Tom Murie, Tixover Parish Meeting	The Plan states that any development of more than 10 houses should have 30% affordable homes. Having such a large development at St Georges will concentrate a large amount of those affordable homes in one place and not sustainable. There should also be a mix of social and affordable rented housing.	NO CHANGE
H9	11709054	RC192 , Norman Milne, Fight 4 Rutland Ltd	The Plan states that any development of more than 10 houses should have 30% affordable homes. Having such a large development at St Georges will concentrate a large amount of those affordable homes in one place and not sustainable. There should also be a mix of social and affordable rented housing.	NO CHANGE
H9	201106106	RC202 , WJ & PJ Cross	The Plan states that any development of more than 10 houses should have 30% affordable homes. Having such a large development at St Georges will concentrate a large amount of those affordable homes in one place and not sustainable. There should also be a mix of social and affordable rented housing.	NO CHANGE
H9	201106131	RC331 , TJ & EVR Boone	The Plan states that any development of more than 10 houses should have 30% affordable homes. Having such a large development at St Georges will concentrate a large amount of those affordable homes in one place and not sustainable. There should also be a mix of social and affordable rented housing.	NO CHANGE
H9	201106136	RC320 , Stuart Garnett, Inspired Villages	Viability Study must be updated to accurately assess a Retirement Community (extra care) of 60-250 units. Updated evidence base would conclude non-viability for C2 extra care towards Affordable Housing provision and this must be reflected in policy and supporting text – see Inspired Villages recommendation 8 in attached document (p17).Policy H9 should be clear that affordable housing only applies to C3 dwelling houses and not C2 extra care housing (and once based on an actual evidence based approach).Council should engage with Inspired Villages to discuss the provision of affordable housing on C2 vs C3 developments and recognise the additional costs associated with extra care above and beyond C3 housing to understand these factors	NO CHANGE
H9	11708262	RC120 , Will Atkinson	Having such a large development at St Georges will concentrate a large amount of those affordable homes in one place and not sustainable. The development risks land banking.	NO CHANGE
H9	201106176	RC335 , Guy Longley , Pegasus group on behalf of Vistry	Policy H9 sets out the requirements for 30% affordable housing provision which the proposed development would meet. (Comments made regarding accessibility are relevant to Policy H7.)	NOTED regarding Policy H9

H9	2011061957	RC321 , Sue Green, House Builders Federation	The overall housing requirement could be increased to allow additional affordable homes. Policy H9 considers that all development proposals will be viable. Viability work should take into account a wide range of factors and be included in the Local Plan - brownfield and specialist housing for the elderly are unviable. The HBF Local Plan Viability Guide is attached (it includes a statement that the viability study should make allowance for taxes often levied on the original landowner such as CGT). No stakeholder involvement in viability assessment since 2017. Council's approach to 10% affordable home ownership not set out in Policy H9.	CONSIDER CHANGE - to supporting text and policy H9 to say that one-third of affordable housing will normally be affordable home ownership and the remaining two-thirds will be affordable housing for rent, both within the definition in Annex 2 of the NPPF.
H9	201106211	RC180, Billy Lloyd, DLP Planning Ltd. On behalf of Hereward Homes	(1) Allocations in villages should be increased to provide sufficient affordable housing in those locations. Plan needs a clear strategy how some sites could be used to meet affordable housing requirements from other sites. (2) No mechanism in Plan for how affordable housing commuted sums are spent. Not clear if commuted sums can be obtained from small allocated sites where affordable housing is specified. Policy H9 needs amending regarding these issues. (3) Compared with villages, there is a higher threshold in urban areas where the need is greatest which appears perverse. (4) Vital that a scheme is still viable after affordable housing and other policy requirements are allowed for and Policy should firmly reiterate this.	NO CHANGE
H9	201106166	RC226, Guy Longley, Pegasus group on behalf of Davidsons Developments Limited.	Policy H9 sets out the requirements for affordable housing provision, requiring the provision of 30% affordable housing on sites in the rural parishes. The proposals by Davidsons Developments for development of land west of Uppingham Road, Oakham, includes the provision of 30% affordable housing in accordance with this proposed policy.	SUPPORT WELCOMED
H10	20110209	RC122 , Josh Plant, Gladman Developments	Gladman propose that this approach may not be the most appropriate tool if it would preclude otherwise sustainable developments from coming forward to bolster the supply of housing. Indeed, Policy H10 and the use of 'planned limits of development' are likely to arbitrarily restrict such development from coming forward; this does not accord with the positive approach to growth required within the Framework	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation
H11	11645329	RC55 , Tess Nelson, Harborough District Council	Harborough District Council support the inclusion of Gypsy and Traveller provision as part of new community allocation. It is important that all local authorities play their part in helping to meet this need. HDC support meeting the needs of this community in a plan-led way through the allocation of sites for permanent, transit, and temporary pitches. We have found this to be an effective way of helping to address unauthorised encampments.	SUPPORT WELCOMED

H11	20110439	RC210 , Emilie Carr, Historic England	Policy H11 Criteria c) is welcomed. Are there site allocations for gypsy and traveller sites?	SUPPORT WELCOMED
H11, H3	20110542	RC232 , Jon Bradburn, Montagu Evans on behalf of Secretary of State for Defence	The St Georges Garden Village presents a once in a generation opportunity to deliver a new village for Rutland, and the responsibility to positively plan for the future needs of all members of the community is not taken lightly. It should be noted that the proposed modifications are not made in a bid for this element of housing mix to be removed from the garden village site, but rather to ensure the soundness of the plan. This change is proposed as it maintains the requirement for pitches to be delivered as part of the community, but for the need to be delivered through the expansion of existing sites first in respond to the changing circumstances of the existing traveller, gypsy and show people communities as supported by the evidence.	CONSIDER CHANGE to policies H11 and H3
E1	20100103	RC49 , Simon Pease, Ancer Spa Ltd on behalf of Lynton Developments Ltd	To ensure viability of employment development on some sites there may need to be some enabling development such as residential or retail development. Uppingham Gate (site E1.1) has proved difficult to deliver because of poor viability. Suggest it is allocated for a mixed use development recognising that employment development is likely to require cross subsidy by other development such as market housing, specialist housing and a food retail store. A well designed mixed use scheme would provide a “gateway” to the town	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation of site. NB some changes to policy may be required to address changes to the UCO
E1	20101403	RC60 , Sarah Legge, Melton Borough Council	The allocation of 5 ha of the County’s employment land need at St George’s means a third of the County’s provision is to be delivered via the St George’s development, if development proves to be unviable the county could see itself fall a third below the overall employment land provision target. There is no mention of home-working in the plan and the provision of incorporating that into the design of new homes. In a post-covid era this may become an issue?	NO CHANGE- plan makes provision for more employment land than the minimum need
E1	11692659	RC92 , Christopher Jordan	Unapproved application for open B8 storage on the airfield will have significant impact on local road network arising from HGV movements. And it will only employ 2 people. The permission criteria for St George’s industrial and office development should be as laid out on Page 69 (policy E1) of the local plan, and be of a scale, use and nature appropriate to their location.	NO CHANGE – comment relates to a planning application
E1	11697355	RC118 , Helen Jacobsen	There is no justification for building this many new houses somewhere where there are no opportunities for job creation being developed at the same time.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation of site

E1	11704391	RC172 , Andrew Gray	Over provision of employment land at SGB by 5 ha. Should be 9 ha only. There is no justified need to increase it for choice and flexibility. The location is not sustainable and will generate an increased number of car journeys. SGB is not currently well connected via public transport and would need to be connected to all of Rutland not just the towns. The number of jobs likely to be created on site is 650, the evidence from business community is that there is not the workforce within Rutland to meet this. Effect of Covid on working landscape should be taken into account.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation of site
E1	11706815	RC318 , Stewart Patience, Anglian Water Services Ltd	Support policy E1. We have no objection to the principle of sites E1.1 to E1.3. Comments re St George's Barracks made to Policy H3.	SUPPORT WELCOMED
E1	20110535	RC220 , Gale Waller	Uncertainty of funding for employment land (through the LEP, since RCC left the C&GPLEP and joined the GLLEP) makes site unsustainable and therefore unsound. Delivery is programmed beyond the period of the current Economic Strategy which is to 2021. The aspiration of 1 job per house is optimistic. No indication of how the resulting increase in road traffic on rural roads will be managed	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports policy. Some change to text may be appropriate to reflect GLLEP strategy to address impacts of Covid
E1	11694975	RC258 , Les Allen, Strategic HR Support Ltd	Local Plan fails to meet para 81a) of NPPF about setting out a clear economic vision for sustainable growth. Policy does not provide any incentive for new businesses to move into the area. St Georges' is secluded rural environment and new businesses will need transport access provision to be attracted to it. 1 job per house will not be achieved without significant changes. E1 is not sustainable. The employment provisions within this Local Plan are ineffective or non-existent. SGB risks being a commuter town for residents who cannot find Rutland jobs and who will commute back to their larger conurbation employment closer to city and larger town centres. The environmental consequences of this and the risk to the County's rural, green and wildlife credentials and contribution to the UK's climate change programme make it imperative that this Local Plan is not adopted. Business case for the employment zone and the viability of this together with the contamination issues on site mean the employment zone cannot be delivered.	NO CHANGE – evidence supports development of the site as proposed.
E1	11707783	RC237 , Juliet Stuttard	No new office space is needed due to Covid. A better mixed use site where rural business can start up and survive is needed	NO CHANGE - policy already allows for range of uses. NB Some minor change may be necessary to reflect changes to UCO

E1	11707195	RC333 , Toni Wilkin	There is no evidence that there is a need for so many jobs and certainly no evidence that there are employers willing to locate their businesses at SGB where transport will be an issue. The current road system is totally unsuitable for heavy vehicles and there is scant provision to improve this.	NO CHANGE – evidence supports development of the site as proposed.
E1	201106212	RC180, Billy Lloyd, DLP Planning Ltd. On behalf of Hereward Homes	Employment land is under provided – the evidence does not take account of changes to the logistics sector and wider regional demand for warehouse floorspace. Need to consider the wider context of the commercial market indicators. 14 ha of the County requirement is located at SGB which is excessive for the needs of that development and will not make a material contribution during this plan period 11.5 ha of supply is double counted – consider the county needs a minimum of 44.8 ha employment land to meet the county’s needs to 2026. Plan fails to make specific provision for logistics use where there is a demonstrable demand. Land at former Greetham Quarry can meet this shortfall.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports allocations made
E1	201106229	RC162, Adam Murray, Andrew Granger & Co. Ltd. On behalf of Mr PJSR Hill and Pikerace Limited	Timing and delivery of 14ha employment land at SGB is uncertain. The allocated site in E1 do not meet the identified need in terms of scale and suitability for B8 uses. Alternative proposal at Woolfox meets these requirements in both scale and location and would be commercially more attractive	NO CHANGE
E1	20111802	RC269 , Martin Seldon , Highways England	A few employment sites have been allocated including land at St George’s (14ha), as part of the new settlement. We would welcome engagement with the Council as these sites progress to determine the impacts on the A1.	SUPPORT WELCOMED.
E1, E5	20100201	RC50 , Rod Powell	Not enough space and thought given to business facilities to support the amount of housing proposed. A science park would not go amiss, and as we are a recreational county extra facilities such as a hotel to support this would be welcomed.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation of site
E3	11703265	RC98 , Janice Patient	Oakham Enterprise Park is under occupied and poorly presented and maintained. This site should be improved and expanded before public money is spent on new sites	NO CHANGE See also response to para 10.7-10.9
E3	201106213	RC180, Billy Lloyd, DLP Planning Ltd. On behalf of Hereward Homes	Recent change to the Use Classes Order means that B1 office space which is being safeguarded through policy E3 can now be altered without planning permission to use A1/2/3.	CONSIDER CHANGE - Agree changes to policy needed to address new Use Class E

E4	11548593	RC2 , Helen Duckering, Langham Parish Council	Policy is more permissive than current policy and supports large business development on edge of Local Service Centre. Langham is under pressure from development north of the Oakham bypass.	NO CHANGE – Criteria in E4 will control scale of development
E4	11663408	RC61 , Lance Wiggins, Landmark Planning	Policy sets out a different approach to proposals within or on the edge of Local Service Centres and smaller villages. Village shops or similar essential rural services support the vitality of rural communities and support for these uses should be included within this policy	NO CHANGE – consider change to policy to reflect new E class
E5	11645343	RC55 , Tess Nelson, Harborough District Council	Support this policy which seeks to retain tourist accommodation and enable new provisions. Our evidence suggests a growing need for tourism accommodation and facilities in Rutland would enable people to visit attractions in Harborough District.	SUPPORT WELCOMED
E5	11707607	RC255 , Kenneth Bool	Policy states the importance of tourism development being of an appropriate scale, but the plan has not paid sufficient attention to the pressures on tourism arising from the level of growth in the surrounding counties. The position is further exacerbated by the proposals at SGB for a large new settlement, parts of which are within the Rutland Water Area and the rest of it is in very close proximity to it. Policy need more emphasis on how the potential negative impacts of future development in the sub-region can be mitigated, particularly as they relate to Rutland Water. welcome recognition of Rutland Water as 'jewel in Rutland's crown' but due to amount of housing proposed in surrounding counties Rutland Water will come under considerable pressure as one of the key leisure destinations in East Midlands. More emphasis needed in Policies E5 and E6 about how negative impacts of development in sub-region can be mitigated particularly in relation to Rutland Water in terms of ecology and tourism.	NO CHANGE- appropriate mitigation measures have been included in policy
E5	11708335	RC120 , Will Atkinson	The further development of Rutland Water as the significant attraction and local amenity is very welcomed. As a result it should be further protected to ensure it keeps it long last appeal. It is a SSS site and home to wide range of wildlife. The protected zone should be widened to keep Rutland's best attraction appealing to both local and regional visitors. Review what is required to safe guard this asset for the long term.	NO CHANGE - evidence supports boundary to the RWA
E5	11709169	RC262 , Liz Parsons	The Plan rightly recognises the importance of protecting Rutland Water, 'The jewel in Rutland's crown'. To ensure protection it emphasises the importance of development being 'carefully located' and limited to small-scale development. It would follow that any proposals should follow this in order to be sound.	COMMENT NOTED

E5	201106242	RC279 , Malcom Touchin , CPRE Rutland	The approach in policy in E5 is not justified as the supporting evidence to this policy - Rutland Tourism Vision 2016 -2019 is out of date, and the Discover Rutland Tourism Strategy 2020 – 2025 (not put forward within the Rutland Local Plan Evidence Base) does not explore the spatial delivery of the primary objectives of this strategy, particularly as policies on Rutland Water and the Eyebrook Reservoir are clearly outlined as being for tourism development in that this would undermine the delivery of the Local Plan spatial strategy.	NO CHANGE
E5, E6	11692908	RC95 , Kerry Nimmons, Cottesmore Parish Council	Policy states the importance of tourism development being of an appropriate scale, but the plan has not paid sufficient attention to the pressures on tourism arising from the level of growth in the surrounding counties. The position is further exacerbated by the proposals at SGB for a large new settlement, parts of which are within the Rutland Water Area and the rest of it is in very close proximity to it. Policy need more emphasis on how the potential negative impacts of future development in the sub-region can be mitigated, particularly as they relate to Rutland Water. Policy E6 is setting out a clear regime for protecting and enhancing the future of Rutland Water. It cites the importance of development being 'carefully located' and the limited to small-scale (within the Recreation areas). Yet, on the other hand and almost as if this is consistent with these policies, the plan's sub-regional context is given little regard and RCC's own policies will make delivering Policy E6 aspirations increasingly challenging and thus the plan is not sound on this point	NO CHANGE - St George's site is not within the Rutland Water Area
E5, E6	20103107	RC113 , Brian Grady,	The SGB is very close to Rutland Water, which is inconsistent with the objective of policies for the Rutland Water Area where in the past development has been tightly constrained outside of the identified recreational areas. With the development of this site and the combined number of new homes regionally (98,000) it will be important to ensure that the direct and indirect impacts on this internationally important site are kept to an absolute minimum. The presence of a very large number of new dwellings so close to the reservoir is bound to have a very large impact its use for recreation and threaten the delicate balance between its recreational use and its importance as a habitat for water fowl. Rutland Water is already an important tourist destination so the combined impact of the regional increase in housing and the development at SGB is bound to have a serious impact on Rutland Water as a habitat.	NO CHANGE - St George's site is not within the Rutland Water Area

E5, E6	20110316	RC141 , Andrew Johnson, Morcott Parish Council	Policy states the importance of tourism development being of an appropriate scale, but the plan has not paid sufficient attention to the pressures on tourism arising from the level of growth in the surrounding counties. The position is further exacerbated by the proposals at SGB for a large new settlement, parts of which are within the Rutland Water Area and the rest of it is in very close proximity to it. Policy need more emphasis on how the potential negative impacts of future development in the sub-region can be mitigated, particularly as they relate to Rutland Water. welcome recognition of Rutland Water as 'jewel in Rutland's crown' but due to amount of housing proposed in surrounding counties Rutland Water will come under considerable pressure as one of the key leisure destinations in East Midlands. More emphasis needed in Policies E5 and E6 about how negative impacts of development in sub-region can be mitigated particularly in relation to Rutland Water in terms of ecology and tourism.	NO CHANGE - St George's site is not within the Rutland Water Area
E5, E6	20110482	RC197 , Philip Davies	The SGB is very close to Rutland Water, with the development of this site and the combined number of new homes regionally (98,000) it will be important to ensure that the direct and indirect impacts on this internationally important site are kept to an absolute minimum. The presence of a very large number of new dwellings so close to the reservoir is bound to have a very large impact its use for recreation and threaten the delicate balance between its recreational use and its importance as a habitat for water fowl. welcome recognition of Rutland Water as 'jewel in Rutland's crown' but due to amount of housing proposed in surrounding counties Rutland Water will come under considerable pressure as one of the key leisure destinations in East Midlands. More emphasis needed in Policies E5 and E6 about how negative impacts of development in sub-region can be mitigated particularly in relation to Rutland Water in terms of ecology and tourism.	NO CHANGE - St George's site is not within the Rutland Water Area

E5, E6	20110510	RC296 , Christopher Renner, Normanton Parish Meeting	<p>Policy states the importance of tourism development being of an appropriate scale, but the plan has not paid sufficient attention to the pressures on tourism arising from the level of growth in the surrounding counties. The position is further exacerbated by the proposals at SGB for a large new settlement, parts of which are within the Rutland Water Area and the rest of it is in very close proximity to it. Policy need more emphasis on how the potential negative impacts of future development in the sub-region can be mitigated, particularly as they relate to Rutland Water. Welcome recognition of Rutland Water as 'jewel in Rutland's crown' but due to amount of housing proposed in surrounding counties Rutland Water will come under considerable pressure as one of the key leisure destinations in East Midlands. More emphasis needed in Policies E5 and E6 about how negative impacts of development in sub-region can be mitigated particularly in relation to Rutland Water in terms of ecology and tourism. Policy E6 is setting out a clear regime for protecting and enhancing the future of Rutland Water. It cites the importance of development being 'carefully located' and the limited to small-scale (within the Recreation areas). Yet, on the other hand and almost as if this is consistent with these policies, the plan's sub-regional context is given little regard and RCC's own policies will make delivering E6 aspirations increasingly challenging and thus the plan is not sound on this point.</p>	NO CHANGE - St George's site is not within the Rutland Water Area
--------	----------	--	---	---

E5, E6	20110566	RC188 , Carole Brown, Braunston-in-Rutland Parish Council	<p>Policy states the importance of tourism development being of an appropriate scale, but the plan has not paid sufficient attention to the pressures on tourism arising from the level of growth in the surrounding counties. The position is further exacerbated by the proposals at SGB for a large new settlement, parts of which are within the Rutland Water Area and the rest of it is in very close proximity to it. Policy need more emphasis on how the potential negative impacts of future development in the sub-region can be mitigated, particularly as they relate to Rutland Water. welcome recognition of Rutland Water as 'jewel in Rutland's crown' but due to amount of housing proposed in surrounding counties Rutland Water will come under considerable pressure as one of the key leisure destinations in East Midlands. More emphasis needed in Policies E5 and E6 about how negative impacts of development in sub-region can be mitigated particularly in relation to Rutland Water in terms of ecology and tourism. Policy E6 is setting out a clear regime for protecting and enhancing the future of Rutland Water. It cites the importance of development being 'carefully located' and the limited to small-scale (within the Recreation areas). Yet, on the other hand and almost as if this is consistent with these policies, the plan's sub-regional context is given little regard and RCC's own policies will make delivering E6 aspirations increasingly challenging and thus the plan is not sound on this point.</p>	NO CHANGE - St George's site is not within the Rutland Water Area
--------	----------	---	---	---

E5, E6	20110685	RC242 , J C M Ball	Policy states the importance of tourism development being of an appropriate scale, but the plan has not paid sufficient attention to the pressures on tourism arising from the level of growth in the surrounding counties. The position is further exacerbated by the proposals at SGB for a large new settlement, parts of which are within the Rutland Water Area and the rest of it is in very close proximity to it. Policy need more emphasis on how the potential negative impacts of future development in the sub-region can be mitigated, particularly as they relate to Rutland Water. welcome recognition of Rutland Water as 'jewel in Rutland's crown' but due to amount of housing proposed in surrounding counties Rutland Water will come under considerable pressure as one of the key leisure destinations in East Midlands. More emphasis needed in Policies E5 and E6 about how negative impacts of development in sub-region can be mitigated particularly in relation to Rutland Water in terms of ecology and tourism. Policy E6 is setting out a clear regime for protecting and enhancing the future of Rutland Water. It cites the importance of development being 'carefully located' and the limited to small-scale (within the Recreation areas). The plan's sub-regional context is given little regard and RCC's own policies will make delivering E6 aspirations increasingly challenging and thus the plan is not sound on this point.	NO CHANGE - St George's site is not within the Rutland Water Area
E5, E6	20110694	RC332 , Tom Murie, Tixover Parish Meeting	Policy states the importance of tourism development being of an appropriate scale, but the plan has not paid sufficient attention to the pressures on tourism arising from the level of growth in the surrounding counties. The position is further exacerbated by the proposals at SGB for a large new settlement, parts of which are within the Rutland Water Area and the rest of it is in very close proximity to it. Policy need more emphasis on how the potential negative impacts of future development in the sub-region can be mitigated, particularly as they relate to Rutland Water. welcome recognition of Rutland Water as 'jewel in Rutland's crown' but due to amount of housing proposed in surrounding counties Rutland Water will come under considerable pressure as one of the key leisure destinations in East Midlands. More emphasis needed in Policies E5 and E6 about how negative impacts of development in sub-region can be mitigated particularly in relation to Rutland Water in terms of ecology and tourism. Policy E6 is setting out a clear regime for protecting and enhancing the future of Rutland Water. It cites the importance of development being 'carefully located' and the limited to small-scale (within the Recreation areas). The plan's sub-regional context is given little regard and RCC's own policies will make delivering E6 aspirations increasingly challenging and thus the plan is not sound on this point.	NO CHANGE - St George's site is not within the Rutland Water Area

E5, E6	11709063	RC192 , Norman Milne, Fight 4 Rutland Ltd	Policy states the importance of tourism development being of an appropriate scale, but the plan has not paid sufficient attention to the pressures on tourism arising from the level of growth in the surrounding counties. The position is further exacerbated by the proposals at SGB for a large new settlement, parts of which are within the Rutland Water Area and the rest of it is in very close proximity to it. Policy need more emphasis on how the potential negative impacts of future development in the sub-region can be mitigated, particularly as they relate to Rutland Water. welcome recognition of Rutland Water as 'jewel in Rutland's crown' but due to amount of housing proposed in surrounding counties Rutland Water will come under considerable pressure as one of the key leisure destinations in East Midlands. More emphasis needed in Policies E5 and E6 about how negative impacts of development in sub-region can be mitigated particularly in relation to Rutland Water in terms of ecology and tourism. Policy E6 is setting out a clear regime for protecting and enhancing the future of Rutland Water. It cites the importance of development being 'carefully located' and the limited to small-scale (within the Recreation areas). The plan's sub-regional context is given little regard and RCC's own policies will make delivering E6 aspirations increasingly challenging and thus the plan is not sound on this point.	NO CHANGE - St George's site is not within the Rutland Water Area
E5, E6	201106107	RC202 , WJ & PJ Cross	Policy states the importance of tourism development being of an appropriate scale, but the plan has not paid sufficient attention to the pressures on tourism arising from the level of growth in the surrounding counties. The position is further exacerbated by the proposals at SGB for a large new settlement, parts of which are within the Rutland Water Area and the rest of it is in very close proximity to it. Policy need more emphasis on how the potential negative impacts of future development in the sub-region can be mitigated, particularly as they relate to Rutland Water. welcome recognition of Rutland Water as 'jewel in Rutland's crown' but due to amount of housing proposed in surrounding counties Rutland Water will come under considerable pressure as one of the key leisure destinations in East Midlands. More emphasis needed in Policies E5 and E6 about how negative impacts of development in sub-region can be mitigated particularly in relation to Rutland Water in terms of ecology and tourism. Policy E6 is setting out a clear regime for protecting and enhancing the future of Rutland Water. It cites the importance of development being 'carefully located' and the limited to small-scale (within the Recreation areas). The plan's sub-regional context is given little regard and RCC's own policies will make delivering E6 aspirations increasingly challenging and thus the plan is not sound on this point.	NO CHANGE - St George's site is not within the Rutland Water Area

E5, E6	201106132	RC331 , TJ & EVR Boone	Policy states the importance of tourism development being of an appropriate scale, but the plan has not paid sufficient attention to the pressures on tourism arising from the level of growth in the surrounding counties. The position is further exacerbated by the proposals at SGB for a large new settlement, parts of which are within the Rutland Water Area and the rest of it is in very close proximity to it. Policy need more emphasis on how the potential negative impacts of future development in the sub-region can be mitigated, particularly as they relate to Rutland Water. welcome recognition of Rutland Water as 'jewel in Rutland's crown' but due to amount of housing proposed in surrounding counties Rutland Water will come under considerable pressure as one of the key leisure destinations in East Midlands. More emphasis needed in Policies E5 and E6 about how negative impacts of development in sub-region can be mitigated particularly in relation to Rutland Water in terms of ecology and tourism. Policy E6 is setting out a clear regime for protecting and enhancing the future of Rutland Water. It cites the importance of development being 'carefully located' and the limited to small-scale (within the Recreation areas). The plan's sub-regional context is given little regard and RCC's own policies will make delivering E6 aspirations increasingly challenging and thus the plan is not sound on this point.	NO CHANGE - St George's site is not within the Rutland Water Area
E6	20110440	RC210 , Emilie Carr, Historic England	Support the inclusion of reference to 'architectural or historic interest' in the policy	SUPPORT WELCOMED
E6	11708991	RC263 , Nicola Farr, Environment Agency	We support the inclusion of this policy to protect the conservation features of this internationally important site and its role in water supply.	SUPPORT WELCOMED
E6	11707547	RC310 , Sally Mullins, Whitwell Parish Meeting	Policy E6 sets out clear guidance for protecting the future of Rutland Water and cites the importance of the development being carefully located - the regulation 19 plan however, gives little importance to other recreational areas at the SGB (the recreational areas are small scale for the size of the development) so policy E6 will be difficult to achieve in regards to maintaining the Water as we know it and so the plan can be challenged on this point. Concern must be given to the significant impact the development at SGB will have on the Water as it is in very close proximity to the proposed 'new town'.	NO CHANGE

E6	11709118	RC318 , Stewart Patience, Anglian Water Services Ltd	<p>Policy E6 is unduly restrictive and seeks to limit both operational development and the development of outdoor and recreational facilities based upon insufficient evidence. Reference is made to small scale recreational tourism and leisure uses within the designated recreation areas. However, this is not consistent with the text in point a) which suggests appropriate in scale rather than it should be limited to small scale only. The policy as drafted appears to tighten up the requirements for proposals outside of the defined recreation areas. It is not clear that there is evidence to justify this revised approach. The Council's Landscape Review which has been used to inform Policy E6 is focused on the extent of Rutland Water Area and recreation areas only and does specifically not consider the uses which are appropriate within the Rutland Water policy. We consider that the Oakham WRC site is not a 'valued landscape' as defined in the NPPF and related case law. It is our view that the inclusion of Oakham WRC, has not been justified in the Council's evidence and it should be removed from the proposed Rutland Water policy area.</p> <p>Whitwell Recreation Area: in our previous comments we had asked for the designated recreation area at Whitwell to be extended to include an established camping site which has been in use for a considerable number of years. However, the boundary of Whitwell Recreation Area as proposed is unchanged. As such there is no justification to exclude the area of land identified by Anglian Water from the designated recreation area.</p>	<p>CONSIDER CHANGE TO POLICY - Consider change to the second and third paragraph of Policy E6 for clarity and any consequential changes to the supporting text to read: "The Council will support proposals which include essential water and water recycling infrastructure that involve the function and operation of Rutland Water Reservoir, its treatment works, associated networks and supporting infrastructure within the defined Rutland Water Area. New development will be limited to appropriate scale recreation, outdoor sport and tourist uses or essential for Anglian Water operational requirements within the five defined Recreation Areas only subject to the criteria below:". Outside the five defined recreation areas, new development will be only be acceptable where it is demonstrated that it is essential for nature conservation or fishing or essential to the operational requirements of existing facilities, subject to it being appropriate in terms of location, scale, design and impact on the landscape.</p>
E6, E4	11592239	RC32 , Tom Griffin	<p>The policy for land within the Rutland Water area but outside of any of the 5 designated recreational areas contradicts national planning policies on farm diversification, and Rutland's own policies on tourism means that landowners are unable to diversify to allow business to evolve. The policy also seems to contradict Local Plan policies regarding local amenities when considering sites for camping, lodges or caravans.</p>	NO CHANGE
E7	20100601	RC52 , Gareth Barton, Turley on behalf of Tata Steel UK LTD	<p>As currently worded, the Policy allows what are in effect ancillary uses (recreation, sport and tourist), rather than referring specifically to the underlying operational use as a reservoir. The supporting text of draft Policy E7 indicates that the Policy has been drafted primarily with a nature conservation objective given the reservoir's status as a SSSI.</p>	<p>CONSIDER CHANGE - Include the following paragraph: "The Council will support proposals which involve the function and operation of Eyebrook Reservoir, its treatment works, associated networks and supporting infrastructure."</p>

E8	11708995	RC263 , Nicola Farr, Environment Agency	Suggest an additional point to alert developers to consider flood risk: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • planning practice guidance relating to flood risk is followed, including applying the sequential approach, and the development complies with Policy EN6 or <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • they are in Flood Zone 1 or, for sites in Flood Zones 2 or 3, a site specific flood risk assessment and warning and evacuation plan have demonstrated that safety can be managed adequately 	NO CHANGE
E8	11709605	RC289 , Peter Burrows	There is no supporting evidence or background information on this policy regarding condition a - "they are well related to an existing tourism attraction or recreation facility" to advice on why it is in place. It seems to conflict with policy E4 on the Rural Economy, and Policy E5 Local Visitor Economy	NO CHANGE
E8	201106115	RC261 , Linda Burrows	There is no evidence for this policy on how it meets and objectively assessed need, or is justified. There is no supporting evidence or background information on this policy to advice on why it is in place. It seems to conflict with policies on Rural Economy relating to diversification of Farms etc. and has no real basis	NO CHANGE
E9	20100104	RC49 , Simon Pease, Ancer Spa Ltd on behalf of Lynton Developments Ltd	Paragraph 6.52 concerning retail development opportunities in Uppingham states that any such development opportunities should be 'relatively small scale'. This term is undefined, unnecessarily constraining and could hinder an appropriate project. Paragraph 6.68 which explains that the Convenience Goods Floorspace Requirement for Uppingham would benefit from clarification that the Neighbourhood Plan should be the appropriate vehicle for identifying a suitable site for a new convenience goods store	NO CHANGE
E9	20110557	RC304 , Ron Simpson, Uppingham First	Uppingham First contends that local studies (subsequent to the outdated 2016 Retail Capacity Study underpinning the plan), including shopper surveys and till analysis, confirm that Uppingham serves the whole county of Rutland not just its hinterland due to the specialist nature of some of its high street shops and it being a tourism destination. Uppingham First suggests that there is an inconsistency in this policy in that clearly Uppingham is not being allowed to compete on a fair and equal basis in Para 6.50 and 6.52 yet Para 6.57 (NPF) clearly states that competition and customer choice should be encouraged.	NO CHANGE

E9, Inset Map 59	20102102	RC70 , Debbie Bettles, Uppingham Town Council	Town centre areas and primary shopping areas. Paragraph 6.57 and the map at Insert 59 are incompatible with paragraph 6.56 which states “In assessing development that will impact on the shop fronts in Rutland, the Council will have regard to the Council’s SPD (March 2015) on shop fronts including signs and shop security, the Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan and any subsequent updated guidance on this issue. The Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan clearly sets out different areas as Primary Shopping from that in this Local Plan and it is very clear that the Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan should take precedence, given that it reflects local community views and is referenced in 6.56	NO CHANGE- retail evidence regarding primary shopping areas is being updated
E10	201106243	RC279 , Malcom Touchin, CPRE Rutland	Supporting evidence to this topic, Rutland Retail Capacity Assessment (2016 Update - “the Retail Study”) is out of date.The Retail Study also predates the proposal to allocate a new settlement at the St George’s Barracks (SGB) site, and hence no assessment has been carried out on the impacts of the SGB proposal on existing centres.A site at Burley Rd Oakham is allocated, which does not appear to derive from advice in the Retail Study. Therefore, how is the 4.700 sq. m net requirement for comparison goods retail floorspace to be met?Policy E10 is now out of date due to the Sept 2020 changes to the Use Classes Order. Policy E10 needs revising if the intention is to control loss of retail in primary frontages, the only likely solution being to specify frontages where it is intended to bring Article 4 directions into place to remove permitted development rights.For all these reasons the approach in policy in E10 is not justified in that this would undermine the delivery of the Local Plan spatial strategy.	CONSIDER CHANGE. Changes arising from UCO changes need to be addressed.
E11	20110623	RC287 , Paul Belton , CARTER JONAS on behalf of Pigeon Capital Management Ltd.	Pigeon support the identification of the Co-op site at Burley Road as a location for non-food retail with appropriate town centre or residential uses being provided at upper floors. In simply plan making terms it is considered that the policy wording for sites H1.3 and R1 should be considered collectively and should be consistent and complementary in terms of the place making objectives. With this in mind, we would suggest that Policy E11 be amended to include the following points of clarification.If both allocations are required to deliver connections up to the site boundary, the Council can ensure that these connections are able to be delivered at the detailed design stage.	CONSIDER CHANGE TO POLICY E11
EN1	20092910	RC43 , Chris Bramley, Severn Trent	Severn Trent is supportive of the principles outlined within Policy EN1 in particular the need to protect watercourses and ditches. These features are needed to convey water through the landscape and are essential for water needed for abstraction and to safely conveying surface water away from developments.	SUPPORT WELCOMED

EN1	11657667	RC72 , Nigel Cooper	Policy EN1 does not sit well with Policy E4.The former seeks to curtail development in the countryside; The latter seeks to permit it.	CONSIDER CHANGE to point 4 – replace “important” with "visual impact on both short and long views" CONSIDER CHANGE to third line of the paragraph after point 5, after "landscape setting;" ADD: "it should be well designed, discreet/unobtrusive, of materials appropriate to its location and setting , and be accompanied by landscaping which enhances the development in its setting".
EN1	20110441	RC210 , Emilie Carr, Historic England	Policy EN1 – the Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity study does not adequately address the historic landscape, as set out in relation to policy EN8.	CONSIDER CHANGE - See Response in EN8 for rep no. 20110443.
EN1	11706191	RC281 , Neil Farmer	There is no commentary regarding how these 3 separate character areas (Landscape Character Assessment of Rutland 2003) surrounding SGB would be welded to create separate identities to both villages. No alternative uses for SGB site seem to have been explored or impacts on Oakham and Uppingham. No apparent consideration of financial viability of proposal.	NO CHANGE
EN1	20110551	RC267 , Mark Harris, Bidwells on Behalf of Taylor Wimpey	As noted in response to H1, the robust evidence prepared by the council has not justified the final decision on the allocation of sites. Whilst the site-specific policies, particularly for site OAK/16 and OAK/13a, include a requirement for landscape mitigation, this does will not prevent impact on the landscape in areas which have been identified as having high sensitivity to development and limited landscape capacity. We would point out that the allocation of land in the areas most sensitive landscapes (as defined by the Council’s own evidence) is not consistent with the objective of conserving and where possible enhancing Rutland’s landscape, set out at the start of Policy EN1.	NO CHANGE – The site assessment is robust and based on the most up to date evidence available. The site assessment methodology was followed.
EN1, EN8	20102914	RC101 , David Lewis	The approach to wind turbines as set out in section 7.38 and policies EN1/EN8 is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) as Plan states that strategic areas may include existing settlements and built up areas where provisions of EN1 and EN8 usually prevent turbines being acceptable. This presumption against turbines not in line with NPPF that requires a positive strategy to promote energy from renewable sources and does not reflect urgency of climate emergency. Policy EN8 reworded so presumption in favour of wind turbines and include text that Rutland can play a part in tackling the climate emergency by generating its own local renewable energy.	NO CHANGE to EN1, CONSIDER CHANGE to EN8

EN2	20110536	RC220 , Gale Waller	<p>A complete heritage assessment has not been considered as part of the Sustainability Appraisal despite RCC's awareness of historical artefacts at SGB.</p> <p>The heritage assessment fails to mention much of what is recorded in the Historic Environment Record (https://www.leicestershire.gov.uk/leisure-and-community/history-andheritage/historic-environment-record) or the Early Medieval Cemetery near the SGB main entrance, the full extent of which is currently unknown.</p>	NO CHANGE
EN2, EN3	20110442	RC210 , Emilie Carr, Historic England	Policy EN2, criteria 1 and 9 are welcomed & Policy EN3 is welcomed	SUPPORT WELCOMED
EN3	20091104	RC24 , Peter Hitchcox	The comments regarding cycling and walking are very much appreciated though the provision of footpaths/cycle paths will need to be properly financed, soundly constructed to be user friendly and consistently maintained if they are to be widely used by the increasing numbers of walkers, cyclists and mobility scooter users.	SUPPORT WELCOMED
EN3	20092911	RC43 , Chris Bramley, Severn Trent	Severn Trent are supportive of the promotion of sustainable drainage; we would also recommend that the Drainage Hierarchy is promoted to ensure that surface water is directed to the most sustainable outfall.	SUPPORT WELCOMED - Consider change
EN3	20092912	RC43 , Chris Bramley, Severn Trent	Severn Trent are supportive of the general principles outlined within policy EN3. We would however highlight the need for development to incorporate sustainable design, We would therefore recommend that wording is included to highlight, protection of watercourses, Water Efficiency, SuDS and Drainage Hierarchy.	SUPPORT WELCOMED, CONSIDER CHANGE
EN3	20110656	RC305 , Roslyn Deeming, Natural England	<p>Paragraph 7.17 (EN3: Delivering Good Design)</p> <p>Natural England welcomes paragraph 7.17 which sets out the importance of incorporating ecologically sensitive designs within developments. However, we suggest that incorporating measures such as green roofs and wildlife corridors can offer nature-based solutions which build resilience to climate change. This should be included in this paragraph to reflect the guidance set out within paragraph 150 (a) of the National Planning Policy Framework which states,</p> <p>".... care should be taken to ensure that risks can be managed through suitable adaptation measures, including through the planning of green infrastructure;"</p>	CONSIDER CHANGE - Amendment to para 7.17

EN3	2011061958	RC321 , Sue Green, House Builders Federation	The HBF is supportive of the use of best practice guidance. The Council should signpost such guidance in its supporting text however the use of guidance should remain voluntary rather than becoming a mandatory policy requirement. The Council should note that Building for Life 12 has been superseded by Building for a Healthy Life. References to guidance and the Design SPD in Policy EN3 should not be interpreted by Development Management Officers as conveying the weight of a Development Plan Document onto guidance, which has not been subject to examination and does not form part of the Local Plan.	CONSIDER CHANGE/NO CHANGE
EN3	201106214	RC180, Billy Lloyd, DLP Planning Ltd. On behalf of Hereward Homes	<p>Whilst the general principles of this policy are supported, clarification is required in respect of 1c) which refers to provision of sufficient private amenity space, suitable to the type and amount of development proposed. 1d) also refers to requirements of the Design SPD however this is not available for review or comment.</p> <p>The Policy should be rephrased to reflect a commitment to prepare an SPD and to address the tests of amenity until such time as it has been.</p>	NO CHANGE
EN4	20091505	RC25 , Kirstie Clifton, Define Planning for William David Homes	The use and implementation of Electric Vehicle Charging Points (EVCP) is complex. No standardised format is currently available. Until a viable solution to this issue has been established any emerging Policy should allow for flexibility for developers to install EVCP "where suitable"; or alternatively the policy seek provision of a dedicated electric spur to be conveniently located for future EVCP provision by the occupier. The Department of Transport (DfT) undertook a consultation setting out the Government's intentions to standardise EVCP within the building regulations. This is expected to come into force beyond the adoption date of the PRLP, therefore any Local Policy shift in advancement of this may immediately become outdated and considered unfeasible or unviable.	NO CHANGE
EN4	20092913	RC43 , Chris Bramley, Severn Trent	Protection of water resources: To ensure that existing and proposed development can reliably be supplied with a clean water for consumption it is vital that new development does not adversely impact on water quality such that abstraction could be adversely impacted. The following wording is provided to help interpret this request within the plan: "All new development must demonstrate that development: will not result in adverse impacts on the quality of waterbodies, groundwater and surface water, will not prevent waterbodies or groundwater from achieving a good status in the future contributes positively to the environment and ecology. Where development has the potential to indirectly pollute groundwater then a groundwater risk assessment will be needed to support a planning application".	NO CHANGE - covered by policy EN5

EN4	20092914	RC43 , Chris Bramley, Severn Trent	Water Efficiency Target Whilst the protection of sources of water is important it is also important that new development considered how water will be utilised within the home. By reducing the amount of water utilised development can reduce its impact on the sewerage network, reduce the quantity of water needing treatment for consumption and reduce the quantity of wastewater requiring treat. This will have positive impacts on the environment and result in more sustainable development that is more resilient to the impacts of climate change. Building regulations already highlight the need for water efficient design. To ensure that the design element is considered from the outset of design it is recommended that Policy RO4 specifies water efficiency. Some example wording is provided below to assist with implementation of our request.	NO CHANGE
EN4	20092916	RC43 , Chris Bramley, Severn Trent	Severn Trent are supportive of the principles within paragraph 7.22 but would note that Severn Trent provide water to some parts of Rutland.	CONSIDER CHANGE
EN4	20092917	RC43 , Chris Bramley, Severn Trent	Severn Trent support the approach highlighted within Policy EN4 to promote water efficiency as detailed within our response to policy EN3 we are supportive of the need to incorporate the optional water efficiency target, and water reuse technology.	SUPPORT WELCOMED
EN4	20110404	RC155 , Matthew Harmsworth, Persimmon Homes	The requirement to provide a charging point to every dwelling is not supported by suitable evidence and therefore Policy EN4 has not been positively prepared and is not justified. It is recognised that technology may develop, the costs of purchasing an electric vehicle may decrease at some point in the future, and that the provision of electric vehicle charging infrastructure could provide a positive impact on air quality outcomes in the future. Therefore it is considered that a more suitable requirement within the policy would be for there to be the 'capacity' for electric vehicle charging points to be provided across residential schemes within Rutland through the provision of passive wiring. This would also enable occupiers to choose their own type of charging point thus helping to also take into account innovations in technology over the coming years. The following re-wording of the policy is proposed: Houses – Houses to be provided with passive wiring to allow future charging point connection. Such designs should demonstrably enable the safe, accessible and convenient charging of electric vehicles.	NO CHANGE CONSIDER referencing Government proposals for this to be included in Building Regulations in para 7.23

EN4	11706810	RC318 , Stewart Patience, Anglian Water Services Ltd	Support Policy EN4 which refers to new development seeking to achieve a 'water neutral position' which is fully supported. With residential developments being required to minimise water consumption by meeting the optional requirement of 110 litres/per person/per day. Anglian Water, the Environment Agency and Natural England has issued advice to local planning authorities (copy attached) stating that there is evidence to demonstrate a need for optional water efficiency standard to be applied in the Anglian Water supply area. As such we fully support the inclusion of this standard in the policy.	SUPPORT WELCOMED
EN4	11706827	RC231 , John Haddon,	Energy & fuel for Housing and commercial property heating and lighting – their production and use are big contributors to the greenhouse. Policy should include promoting electrification of energy for commercial and domestic buildings and promoting solar and wind capture for electricity at local level.	NO CHANGE
EN4	11708998	RC263 , Nicola Farr, Environment Agency	We welcome the energy and water resources policies, in particular the setting of the building regulations optional requirement target of 110l/h/d for all new housing and the expectation for non-domestic buildings to reach 'very good' BREEAM status.	SUPPORT WELCOMED
EN4	2011061959	RC321 , Sue Green, House Builders Federation	Policy EN4 Bullet Point 1 The UK has set in law a target to bring all its greenhouse gas emission to net zero by 2050. New and existing homes account for 20% of emissions. There are additional costs associated with achieving zero carbon homes, which should be accounted for (see HBF representation to Deliverability & Viability above). It is also noted that the Council propose connection to available heat and power networks. The Council should be aware that some heat network consumers do not have comparable levels of satisfaction as consumers on gas and electricity networks, and they pay a higher price.The Council's policy approach in Policy EN4 Bullet Points 1 & 3 are unnecessary because of the Government's proposals to change Building Regulations. Bullet Points 1, 2, & 3 should be deleted from Policy EN4.	NO CHANGE - consider impact of proposed changes to Building regulations on policy and plan viability

EN4	2011061962	RC321 , Sue Green, House Builders Federation	Policy EN4 Bullet Point 2It is noted that the Council's Water Study is dated 2011 and relates to the adopted Local Plan period up to 2026 rather than 2036. As set out in the 2019 NPPF, all policies should be underpinned by relevant and up to date evidence which should be adequate, proportionate and focussed tightly on supporting and justifying the policies concerned (para 31).If the Council wishes to adopt the optional standard for water efficiency of 110 litres per person per day, then the Council should justify doing so by applying the criteria set out in the NPPG (ID 56-013-20150327 to 56-017-20150327). The water efficiency requirement set out in Bullet Point 2 is notJustified by supporting evidence. Bullet Points 1, 2, & 3 should be deleted from Policy EN4.	NO CHANGE - Anglian Water and Environment Agency have provided evidence of the need to this requirement
EN4	2011061963	RC321 , Sue Green, House Builders Federation	Policy EN4 Bullet Point 3The inclusion of EVCP requirements within the Building Regulations 2010 will introduce a standardised consistent approach to EVCPs in new buildings across the country.The physical installation of fixed EVCPs is not necessary. The evolution of this automotive technology is moving quickly therefore a cable and duct approach is a more sensible and future proofed solution, which negates the potential for obsolete technology being experienced by householders. A cable and duct only approach means that the householder can later arrange and install a physical EVCP suitable for their vehicle and in line with the latest technologies.The Council's policy approach in Policy EN4 Bullet Points 1 & 3 are unnecessary because of the Government's proposals to change Building Regulations. Bullet Points 1, 2, & 3 should be deleted fromPolicy EN4.	NO CHANGE
EN4	201106215	RC180, Billy Lloyd, DLP Planning Ltd. On behalf of Hereward Homes	Supportive of the policy principles however, the policy fails to provide any mechanism whereby targets for energy consumption or water resource management can be established to demonstrate that the specified targets can be achieved. Part 3 of this policy requires that one dedicated electric vehicle charging point per house with garage or driveway should be provided. However, this is not justified or likely to be effective. Such a blanket requirement has no regard to the available capacity of local grid networks to support multiple vehicle charging at high rates.	NO CHANGE - to Policy EN4 although reference to the need for submission of energy statement to accompany a planning application should be considered
EN5	20092915	RC43, Chris Bramley, Severn Trent	Severn Trent are supportive of the approach to ensure that infrastructure is provided in time to meet development need, however to enable this to happen utility providers need to receive sufficient confidence that development will occur and an appropriate lead in time to deliver any necessary network improvements.	SUPPORT WELCOMED and COMMENT NOTED

EN5	20092918	RC43, Chris Bramley, Severn Trent	Severn Trent is supportive of the approach to ensure that infrastructure is provided in time to meet development need, however to enable this to happen utility providers need to receive sufficient confidence that development will occur and an appropriate lead in time to deliver any necessary network improvements.	SUPPORT WELCOMED and COMMENT NOTED
EN5	20092919	RC43, Chris Bramley, Severn Trent	Severn Trent is supportive of the approach to manage surface water through the promotion of SuDS, and the drainage Hierarchy, along with the need to incorporate these features within Green Blue Corridors that enhance biodiversity and amenity for the environment and end users of the development.	SUPPORT WELCOMED
EN5	20092920	RC43, Chris Bramley, Severn Trent	Severn Trent are supportive of the principles within policy EN5, and the need to manage water appropriately throughout the system	SUPPORT WELCOMED
EN5	11706860	RC318, Stewart Patience, Anglian Water Services Ltd	Policy EN5 – Surface water management, water supply, foul drainage and Sustainable Drainage Systems - SUPPORT Anglian Water is supportive of Policy EN5 as it requires that planning permission will only be granted where it can be demonstrated that foul water treatment or disposal already exists or can be provided in time to serve the development. We also support the requirement to use SuDs and that the disposal of surface water to sewerage network will only be made in exceptional circumstances. This is consistent with the surface water hierarchy and would help to ensure that new development does not increase the risk of surface water and sewer flooding.	SUPPORT WELCOMED/NO CHANGE

EN5	11709000	RC263, Nicola Farr, Environment Agency	We welcome the requirement for development proposals to demonstrate that water is available to serve the development and adequate foul water treatment and disposal already exists or can be provided in time to serve the development. This reflects our advice at an earlier stage in the local plan process. However, there is no reference to the 'hierarchy' of foul water treatment – the first presumption being disposal to the mains foul sewer – or the information (e.g. a 'foul drainage strategy') required to demonstrate capacity, or justify an alternative means of disposal. (PPG Reference ID: 34-020-20140306). This is in contrast to the amount of detail on surface water management. We also welcome the policy on SuDS, including reference to green infrastructure (taken to include 'blue/green') and biodiversity enhancements. Some text is needed to complete the following sentence: 'Supporting documentation to accompany planning applications for major developments which explain how contaminated water arising during the construction process will be addressed. Suggestion: 'Supporting documentation SHOULD accompany planning applications for major developments which explains how contaminated water arising during the construction process will be addressed. '	CONSIDER CHANGE - to 'Supporting documentation SHOULD accompany planning applications for major developments which explains how contaminated water arising during the construction process will be addressed. 'Agree to make reference to the 'hierarchy' of foul water treatment.
EN5	20110624	RC287 , Paul Belton, CARTER JONAS on behalf of Pigeon Capital Management Ltd.	Pigeon has no objection to the majority of Policy EN5 but considers that the reference made in paragraph 3 that surface water connections to the sewerage network will only be made in exceptional circumstance does not follow the guidance provided within the SuDs Manual and lacks flexibility.	CONSIDER CHANGE

EN5	20110659	RC305 , Roslyn Deeming, Natural England	<p>Natural England welcomes this Policy EN5 but advises that it could be strengthened with respect to protecting the water quality of designated sites. We support the encouragement set out within this Policy to use Sustainable Drainage Schemes (SuDS) in all but exceptional circumstances and for those SuDS to be designed to achieve multiple benefits including biodiversity enhancements. However we recommend additional policy wording to ensure that where there is potential for surface water to discharge to a designated site, the SuDS must be designed for the highest protection of water quality to ensure no impacts arise as a result of harmful discharges entering the designated site. Natural England advises that revised wording should be added to Policy EN5 as follows: In the explanatory text: We suggest an additional paragraph should be added: "In areas where non-mains foul drainage solutions are necessary, such as septic tanks and package treatment plants, which may impact Rutland Water or other designated sites, they must be designed and sited appropriately to ensure no impacts to the conservation objectives of the designated site." In the Policy wording: Natural England suggests that the fourth paragraph of Policy EN5 should include the following additional wording: "Surface water management should be undertaken, wherever practicable through the utilisation of appropriate SuDS techniques which mimic natural drainage patterns, and where appropriate achieve net gains for nature through the creation of ponds and wetlands onsite or within close proximity. Where there is potential for surface water run-off into a water sensitive designated site the SuDS must provide the highest level of water quality protection as described within the CIRIA SuDS Manual (2015) C753."</p>	CONSIDER CHANGES
EN5	11709386	RC249 , Christopher French, Welland Rivers Trust	<p>Policy EN5 would benefit from clearer wording. Policy EN5 and paragraphs 7.26 and 7.27 are positively worded but would benefit from additional clauses to make commitments to the water environment more progressive. 7.26: "Good statement – but should include "net gains for nature and restoration of natural process and habitat in natural watercourses adjacent to development" 7.27 "Welland Rivers Trust and partners in the Welland Valley Partnership (RCC is a member) wish to be consulted on development that involves the water environment. Tailored advice and project guidance can be accessed for a range of scenarios from flood risk management, water treatment and restoration of water related habitats." EN5: "major development proposals should seek to restore historic damage to the water environment and recreate lost in-channel and riparian habitat."</p>	CONSIDER CHANGES

EN5	20110649	RC303 , Robin King	The policy proposed by RCC has set a lower threshold for the damaging impacts of development proposals than that required by the law.	NO CHANGE
EN5, EN6	20101303	RC59 , Sue Lammin, Whissendine Parish Council	Whissendine Parish Council would contend that Policies EN5 (p93) and EN6 (p94) are inadequate to ensure mitigation of flooding from some new developments without increasing the risk of flooding elsewhere and as such the omissions are not justified and the current policy is inconsistent with National Planning Policy.	NO CHANGE (see however response to 11709005)
EN5, EN6	11706861	RC179 , Robert Baker	Local plan has not taken account the current circumstances in Whissendine (Main street and Cow Lane) and if it does not deal with the existing issues which will become worse if there is a proposal for more dwellings that will feed in to the drainage of water.	NO CHANGE (see however response to 11709005)

EN6	11709005	RC263 , Nicola Farr, Environment Agency	<p>You may wish to add to point 7.29 to show that in developing this Plan you have successfully avoided allocating sites at high risk. (e.g. 'The Plan applies a risk-based approach...by 'allocating no sites for housing with a significant area within Flood Zones 2 or 3'.)We would expect to see reference to the latest Rutland SFRA in the text and/or policy, as a source of information for developers. Policy EN6 'Development should be located in the lowest areas of flood risk in line with areas defined by the Environment Agency.' Although the intention is clear, 'the lowest areas of flood risk' should be 'the areas of lowest flood risk'. 'As defined by the Environment Agency' is also not very precise. Is the intention 'the Environment Agency Flood Map for Planning'? Or including other mapping? We suggest: 'Development should be located in the lowest areas of flood risk in line with areas defined by the Environment Agency Flood Map for Planning and with reference to the Rutland Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. Flood risk assessment requirement: Reservoir flood risk is not mentioned; for sources outside Flood Zone 2/3, the policy only requires a FRA for sites 'known to have EXPERIENCED flood problems'. Sites partly in FZ2/3 will also need FRAs (as recognised in your site specific policies). We suggest: 'A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) will be required for all development on sites in, or partly in, Flood Zones 2 or 3, sites greater than 1 hectare in Flood Zone 1, sites at risk of reservoir flooding and sites located in an area known to have experienced flood problems from any flood source, including critical drainage.' Climate change allowances are referenced for runoff but not fluvial risk. We suggest the addition of the following after the paragraph above: 'For sites containing areas in flood zones 2 or 3, the FRA should ensure that current climate change allowances are considered with regard to fluvial flood risk to ensure development remains safe for its lifetime. The current peak rainfall allowances in 'Flood risk assessments: climate change allowances' should be used by developers". We request the following addition to the policy or supporting text: 'Where development will involve works close to a watercourse classified as 'main river', advice should be sought from the Environment Agency at an early opportunity regarding permit and design requirements.' - with the following be added as a footnote: 'Under the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016, permission must be obtained from the Environment Agency for any proposed flood risk activities which will take place: •in, over, under or within 8 metres of a main river (16 metres if tidal) •on or within 8 metres of a flood defence structure or culvert (16 metres if tidal) •on or within 16 metres of a sea defence •within 16 metres of any main river, flood</p>	CONSIDER CHANGES. Note the SFRA update has been republished as part of the submission process to reflect changes made in discussion with the Environment Agency
-----	----------	---	--	---

			defence (including a remote defence) or culvert for quarrying or excavation •in a flood plain more than 8 metres from the river bank, culvert or flood defence structure (16 metres if tidal) if planning permission has not already been granted for the works For further guidance and advice please visit: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-activities-environmental-permits Final paragraph (b) 'Where development takes place in Flood Zones 2 and 3, opportunities should be sought to.... (b) Relocate existing development to land in zones with a lower probability of flooding;We are not sure if the intention of point (b). Is it envisaged that existing development in FZ2 and 3 will be moved to a lower probability zone and replaced with new development?	
EN7	20092921	RC43 , Chris Bramley, Severn Trent	Severn Trent are generally supportive of the principles outlined within policy EN7 and are working with the Environment Agency to delivery WFD improvements across the Severn Trent region.	SUPPORT WELCOMED
EN7	11706869	RC318 , Stewart Patience, Anglian Water Services Ltd	Policy EN7 has been amended to clarify that new development that would adversely affect the continued operation of established uses will not be permitted which is supported.	SUPPORT WELCOMED
EN7	11709017	RC263 , Nicola Farr, Environment Agency	<p>We support this policy.</p> <p>However, we ask that you add reference to our guidance 'Land Contamination: Risk Management' in the policy or supporting text: this is available at see https://www.gov.uk/guidance/land-contamination-how-to-manage-the-risks. This replaces CLR11 Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, which is due to be withdrawn soon. We also request that the following is added to (or after) the penultimate paragraph of EN7: 'Development proposals on every site on brownfield land will require a Preliminary Risk Assessment as the first stage of assessing potential risk posed by contamination.'</p> <p>The following guidance on protecting aquifers and groundwater in sensitive locations by preventing potentially polluting activities being located in the most sensitive locations for groundwater, may be helpful here or in the minerals or waste section:</p> <p>https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/692989/Envirnment-Agency-approach-to-groundwater-protection.pdf</p>	CONSIDER CHANGES / SUPPORT WELCOMED
EN8	20102702	RC84 , Sarah Gresty , Essendine Parish Council	Essendine Parish Council: in RLSaCS (Wind Turbines) Essendine lies within LCA Diii (Gwash Valley) and omissions in Study of certain features. Essendine within Area 2 for turbines but other LCAs with similar medium capacity (Aii and B) not included in Area 1 or 2. Inset maps of Ryhall/Pickworth have areas excluded from designation for turbines while Essendine/Belmesthorpe blanket marked.	NO CHANGE

EN8	20110443	RC210 , Emilie Carr, Historic England	Approach taken towards identifying potential areas for wind energy developments not based on sufficiently robust evidence and areas identified may result in harm to a number of Rutland's most important heritage assets, making Policy EN8 contrary to para 185 NPPF. Areas identified should be removed from proposals map and policy reworded to reflect PPG: great care should be taken to ensure heritage assets are conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, including impact on views important to their setting.	CONSIDER CHANGE IN PART
EN9	11706880	RC318 , Stewart Patience, Anglian Water Services Ltd	Support Policy EN9 and welcomes reference to biodiversity net gain having followed the mitigation hierarchy.	SUPPORT WELCOMED
EN9	11708914	RC289 , Peter Burrows,	Policy not legally compliant as Para 5 of EN9 not legally compliant as does not comply with requirements of The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regs 2017. Policy has set a lower threshold for damaging impacts of development proposals than required by law. Policy should be reworded to reflect correct legal interpretation.	CONSIDER CHANGE
EN9	11709021	RC263 , Nicola Farr, Environment Agency	Support Policy EN9 as meets requirements of NPPF, in particular reference to biodiversity net gain and local nature recovery networks. Use of the Defra Metric should be encouraged.	SUPPORT WELCOMED
EN9	11709019	RC282 , Nick Sandford, The Woodland Trust	Policy EN9 provides inadequate protection for ancient woodland and ancient/veteran trees. As irreplaceable habitats they should be given strongest possible protection in line with updated para 175c NPPF.	CONSIDER CHANGE
EN9	20110658	RC305 , Roslyn Deeming, Natural England	Welcomes para 7.49 but should include identification of potential sites for biodiversity net gain off-setting: linking to enhance the Nature Recovery Network, one of the government's 25 year Environment Plan.	CONSIDER CHANGE
EN9	11709523	RC249 , Christopher French, Welland Rivers Trust	Strengthen wording of Policy EN9 to include reference to protect and restore the function of natural watercourses.	NO CHANGE
EN9	201106192	RC329 , Tim Collins	EN9 para 5) not legally compliant as does not comply with Habitats and Species Regs 2017. Para 6) does not include reference to other protected species legislation such as the Badger Act 1992 and legislation does not set test of 'significant impact' on protected species/habitats: better wording in part c) EN9. Lack of reference to urban species dependent on buildings (e.g. swifts and bats). Lack of reference to Rutland Limestone in Local Plan which is of high value for wildlife as set out in the BAP.	CONSIDER CHANGE IN PART
EN9	20102935	RC103 , Frances Cunningham , Network Rail	Request details of Local Wildlife Site near railway at Essendine shown under Policy EN9 on the Policies Map.	NOT LOCAL PLAN REPRESENTATION- site map has been provided

EN9	11702784	RC140 , Tim Smith, North Luffenham Parish Council	Plan not legally compliant as Para 5 of EN9 not legally compliant as does not comply with requirements of The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regs 2017. Policy has set a lower threshold for damaging impacts of development proposals than required by law. Policy should be reworded to reflect correct legal interpretation.	CONSIDER CHANGE
EN9	20110405	RC155 , Matthew Harmsworth, Persimmon Homes	Strongly objects to EN9 part a) Deliver measurable net biodiversity gains ...if not on site within the immediate area. Policy over restrictive and conflicts with NPPF/NPPG by restricting net biodiversity gains to on site or the immediate area. NPPF states enhancements should establish coherent ecological networks and NPPG enhancements should contribute to habitat connectivity in the wider area. Policy would stifle development, opportunities for enhancement missed and no definition of 'immediate area'. Modification - 'if not, on an identified area off site in a manner consistent with national planning policy.'	CONSIDER CHANGE
EN9	20110657	RC305 , Roslyn Deeming, Natural England	Welcomes Policy EN9 as provides useful framework for protection of designated sites/species and guidance on biodiversity net gain (BNG). Reference should be made to the Defra Biodiversity Metric 2.0; consideration to setting target for BNG (evidence based), and; District Level Licensing Project for great crested newts.	CONSIDER CHANGE
EN9	20110697	RC247 , John Clarkson , LRWT	Welcome Policy EN9 but parts d) and k) not consistent with national policy (paras 170 and 175 of NPPF). Suggesting deleting d)...except where the need for and benefits of the development in the location clearly outweigh the loss, and; k) ...unless it is demonstrated that the trees and hedgerows are dead, dying, diseased or dangerous, and; Part h) BAP should not have capital letters as likely to be superseded by a Local Nature Recovery Strategy as part of any forthcoming Environment Act.	CONSIDER CHANGE
EN9	201106216	RC180, Billy Lloyd, DLP Planning Ltd. On behalf of Hereward Homes	Support desirability of achieving BNG arising from development and welcome the Council's approach not to seek an arbitrary minimum requirement.	SUPPORT WELCOMED
EN9	201106230	RC162, Adam Murray, Andrew Granger & Co. Ltd. On behalf of Mr PJSR Hill and Pikerace Limited	Woolfox: Policy EN9 unsound as unclear as to which areas it applies to and protection of candidate LWSs not supported by proportionate evidence base. The habitat surveys undertaken in 2009 as part of evidence base are out of date. Suggested modifications: to delete reference to cLWS in para 7.47 and 'sites which meet the designation criteria for Local Sites' in part 8) EN9 and remove cLWS designations from the Policies Map.	NO CHANGE in relation to CWS (although see other suggested changes to policy)
EN9	20111806	RC260 , Hugh Palmer, Cheney Wood	Protection of Rutland's biodiversity inadequately addressed in the Local Plan.	CONSIDER CHANGE (see other suggested changes to policy)

EN9	201106110	RC261 , Linda Burrows	The policy proposed by RCC has set a lower threshold for the damaging impacts of development proposals than that required by the law.	NO CHANGE
EN9	201106141	RC290 , Peter Dawson	The policy proposed by RCC has set a lower threshold for the damaging impacts of development proposals than that required by the law.	NO CHANGE
EN9	201106150	RC307 , Charles Whittaker	The policy proposed by RCC has set a lower threshold for the damaging impacts of development proposals than that required by the law.	NO CHANGE
EN9	201106155	RC308 , Janet Whittaker	The policy proposed by RCC has set a lower threshold for the damaging impacts of development proposals than that required by the law.	NO CHANGE
EN9	201106189	RC322 , Sue Churchill	The policy proposed by RCC has set a lower threshold for the damaging impacts of development proposals than that required by the law.	NO CHANGE
EN9, Viability	2011061960	RC321 , Sue Green, House Builders Federation	Local Plan should not deviate from government's proposals on biodiversity gain of 10% as a mandatory national requirement using Defra Biodiversity Metric and BNG should be included in viability assessment.	NOTED - Viability evidence will be revisited to take account of change to national policy on net biodiversity gain and policy changes suggested as part of the examination.
EN10	11613723	RC37 , Michael Burton, East Northamptonshire Council	It is noted that Policy EN10 and supporting text highlight the importance of blue and green infrastructure. Policy EN10 is supported by additional local policy direction within the Barrowden and Wakerley Neighbourhood Plan, which should support enhancements to the Welland Valley as an important green infrastructure corridor.	SUPPORT WELCOMED
EN10	11620391	RC42 , Steve Beard, Sport England	Sport England contends that evidence which was completed in 2015 based on data gathered earlier is not robust and up to date as required by paragraph 96 of NPPF. If the evidence is out of date how can the authority plan positively as required by para 92 of NPPF.	NO CHANGE
EN10	11620519	RC42 , Steve Beard, Sport England	Policy is not clear how it meets para 97 NPPF, should the wording regarding playing field protection or replacement follow NPPF.	NO CHANGE
EN10	20092922	RC43 , Chris Bramley, Severn Trent	Severn Trent are supportive of the principles outlined within Policy EN10 and the need to create multifunctional space as part of blue and green infrastructure, integrating drainage features back into the environment and delivering multiple benefits.	SUPPORT WELCOMED
EN10	11706915	RC231 , John Haddon	The facts of our agricultural economy and the desirably unbuilt landscape do not insulate us from the problem of Climate Change, indeed they give us more opportunity than many places for taking mitigating action. Suggest additional bullet point for EN10 committing to significant tree planting in the county.	NO CHANGE
EN10	11709029	RC263 , Nicola Farr, Environment Agency	We support this policy and are pleased that 'blue' infrastructure is given prominence. We are aware of the following guidance and (optional) accreditation scheme, which sounds very promising: Building with Nature (https://www.buildingwithnature.org.uk/) We encourage you to consider recommending it to developers in this section.	SUPPORT WELCOMED

EN11	11696349	RC294 , Catherine Gwilliam	<p>It has NOT been clearly demonstrated that there are no other sites in the area that are more sustainable. The needs for development are NOT sufficient to override the need to protect Best and Most Versatile agricultural land.</p> <p>It is NOT in line with national policy regarding biodiversity. The need to develop "Best and Most Versatile agricultural land" and not just protect what we already have, HAS NOT BEEN CONSIDERED. Promotes the need for small scale farming units including promoting the development of a Utilised agricultural area (UAA) at St Georges barracks</p>	NO CHANGE - policy meets NPPF
EN12	20092923	RC43 , Chris Bramley, Severn Trent	<p>Severn Trent understand the need for Important Open Space and the need for them to be protected, however Important Open Spaces can provide suitable locations for schemes like flood alleviation to be delivered without adversely impacting on the primary function of the open space.</p> <p>Add the following point to EN12</p> <p>Development of flood resilience schemes within Important Open Spaces will be supported provided the schemes do not adversely impact the primary function of the green space.</p>	NO CHANGE
EN12	20110444	RC210 , Emilie Carr, Historic England	Policy EN12 is welcomed. Paragraphs 7.60 7.90. Paragraph 7.77 - It would be helpful to also reference the area's Scheduled Monuments.	SUPPORT WELCOMED - scheduled ancient monuments and non-designated heritage assets are covered in Policies EN15 and EN16
EN13	20092924	RC43 , Chris Bramley, Severn Trent	Severn Trent understand the need for Local Green Spaces and the need for them to be protected, however Local Green Spaces can provide suitable locations for schemes like flood alleviation to be delivered without adversely impacting on the primary function of the open space.	NO CHANGE
EN14	20092925	RC43 , Chris Bramley, Severn Trent	Severn Trent area aware of the need for new open spaces to be allocated, however parks, and amenity green space can incorporate SuDS without adverse impacts where the right SuDS are provided. Severn Trent would therefore recommend that this bullet point is removed from policy EN14.	NO CHANGE

EN14	20110406	RC155 , Matthew Harmsworth, Persimmon Homes	<p>EN14 (Provision of New Open Space) lays out requirements for open space provision at a rate solely based on the anticipated population generated from a development.</p> <p>Persimmon consider that this policy needs to provide for flexibility, for example not all developments will be suitable for the provision of all types of open space provision. Smaller residential developments for example would not necessarily be suitable for the provision of allotments on site when a more appropriate form of open space may be appropriate.</p> <p>Therefore a more effective form of open space provision would be to include scope for the local authority to exercise discretion over the most appropriate forms of open space provision so that the most desirable forms of open space for that site can be achieved.</p> <p>For these reasons it is considered that Policy EN14 is not justified.</p>	NO CHANGE
EN14	20110625	RC287 , Paul Belton , CARTER JONAS on behalf of Pigeon Capital Management Ltd.	<p>While no fundamental objection is raised to the content of Policy EN14 or Appendix 6, it is not clear from the policy, from the supporting text or from Appendix 6 how the population of a proposed residential development should be calculated in the context of the standards quoted. As drafted Policy EN14 states that new residential development will be required to provide or contribute towards playing pitches. A policy requirement is not however provided against which the required quantum of provision can be calculated.</p>	NO CHANGE - intend to prepare SPD to clarify this issue
EN14	201106217	RC180, Billy Lloyd, DLP Planning Ltd. On behalf of Hereward Homes	<p>Whilst we do not object to this policy, we do question the inclusion of this information within the Local Plan. Our view is that this would be better suited within a Supplementary Planning Document, submitted alongside the Local Plan process.</p>	NO CHANGE - Also intend to prepare SPD on this issue
EN15	11548598	RC2 , Helen Duckering, Langham Parish Council	<p>EN15 merely request that developers have an understanding of the significance of an asset. Again this wording does not speak of control or enforcement by RCC, but of 'awareness' by developers. Langham is a conservation village in a rural setting which needs to be protected whilst it grows and develops (see Langham Neighbourhood Plan Cultural Heritage Section Policies CS1 and 2 which call for protection of Conservation Villages and of Sites of Historical Importance, in line with Government policies)</p>	NO CHANGE
EN15, EN16	20091105	RC24 , Peter Hitchcox	<p>The County Council Planners need to be sensitive and aware of historical sites when planning new developments. So easily much can be lost if care and proper research is not undertaken before planning is granted.</p>	NOTED
EN15, EN16, EN17	20110445	RC210 , Emilie Carr, Historic England	<p>These policies are welcomed</p>	SUPPORT WELCOMED

SC1	20101401	RC60 , Sarah Legge, Melton Borough Council	Using the term 'All development proposals should demonstrate how they help make safe and healthy communities' the word 'All' may not be appropriate, specifically when this may include 1 dwelling developments or extensions.	NO CHANGESee also response to para 10.7-10.9
SC1	11703680	RC140 , Tim Smith, North Luffenham Parish Council	North Luffenham has been downgraded from a "local service centre" in the current, adopted LP to a Smaller Village in the LP Reg 19. NLPC were not aware of this change in status as it was not consulted or notified until it appeared in the S19 LP. Will have a negative impact on ability of village to attract local services.	NO CHANGE - See ALSO response to policy SD2
SC1	11708933	RC289 , Peter Burrows	North Luffenham has been downgraded from a "local service centre" in the current, adopted LP to a Smaller Village in the LP Reg 19.	NO CHANGE - See ALSO response to policy SD2
SC1	20110696	RC244 , Jason Allen	North Luffenham has been downgraded from a "local service centre" in the current, adopted LP to a Smaller Village in the LP Reg 19. SO2: Reg 19 Plan totally different to Reg 18 Plan and local residents unable to challenge inclusion of SGB in Reg 19 Plan. SGB in inaccessible location, not located where housing need, does not support vitality of other centres, and places too strong emphasis on PDL. Revert to Draft Local Plan for full Reg 18 consultation.	NO CHANGE - See ALSO response to policy SD2
SC1	201106111	RC261 , Linda Burrows	North Luffenham has been downgraded from a "local service centre" in the current, adopted LP to a Smaller Village in the LP Reg 19.	NO CHANGE - See ALSO response to policy SD2
SC1	201106142	RC290 , Peter Dawson	North Luffenham has been downgraded from a "local service centre" in the current, adopted LP to a Smaller Village in the LP Reg 19.	NO CHANGE - See ALSO response to policy SD2
SC2	20101402	RC60 , Sarah Legge, Melton Borough Council	Para 8.8: welcomes the acknowledgements that cross boundary collaboration on improving transport connectivity, especially due to the close proximity of both districts.	SUPPORT WELCOMED
SC2	20102101	RC70 , Debbie Bettles, Uppingham Town Council	We believe that the Plan needs to set out balanced proposals to deal with additional traffic volumes travelling throughout both Uppingham and the rest of Rutland as a consequence of concentrating 47% of future housing capacity in one location rather than spreading it throughout the County. This may include the need for a North/South relief road for Uppingham	NO CHANGE
SC2	11681817	RC78 , Robert Willars	Plan not sound as Policy SC2 deficient in relation to its (SGB) negative impact on Empingham and its residents. Number of specific comments made about existing highways issues in Empingham and suggests that reference made in SC2 to construction traffic being made to take main road routes to and from SGB and avoiding 'rat runs' through village such as Empingham.	NO CHANGE - SC2 requires major developments to provide a TA that would consider impact on road network and is a county-wide policy

SC2	11683297	RC81 , Kate Neal	Inadequate consultation resulted in inability of Empingham PC to contact residents to seek their views resulting in 800 residents unable to make their concerns known before this stage of the consultation. Rep relates primarily to H2 and raises specific concerns about effect of SGB on Empingham in terms of traffic, and; SGB will result in car dependency meaning the sustainability of SGB not in line with national policy. Access to the A1 should be prevented through Empingham.	NO CHANGE -Due process regarding consultation under Reg 18 and Reg 19 followed.
SC2	11687417	RC187 , Susan Painter	Plan not sound as TA for SGB inadequate in assessment of impact on Empingham and local road network. There are no mitigation measures that could be introduced that would make the Plan sound. LP should be paused until technical detail of required junction improvements can be challenged.	NO CHANGE - SC2 requires major developments to provide a TA that would consider impact on road network and is a county-wide policy
SC2	20102721	RC90 , David Ainslie, Limes, Firs, and Spurs Residents Association	The County Council should undertake a full impact assessment of traffic levels (particularly HGVs) that SGB proposal will create with particular reference to the impact on Uppingham also taking into account the planned significant development at the other end of the A6003 in Corby. We suggest that this should specifically include funding and undertaking a feasibility study for a by-pass/ relief road for Uppingham.	NO CHANGE - SC2 requires major developments to provide a TA that would consider impact on road network and is a county-wide policy
SC2	11689899	RC93 , Nicholas Meyrick	More detailed assessment (TA?) came out after last of LP consultations meaning that those affected had no chance to comment on TA at a critical stage. For sites such as SGB residents and PCs should be given time to consider transport implications. Traffic from SGB heading for A1 north will be directed onto A606 and down Main Street, Empingham causing serious traffic problems.	NO CHANGE - SC2 requires major developments to provide a TA that would consider impact on road network and is a county-wide policy
SC2	11689683	RC96 , Caroline Meyrick	Latest TA of November 2018 available after last of Reg 18 consultations. Remainder of rep relates to H2 including car dependency of SGB contrary to government policy; local road network not capable of accommodating traffic from SGB, and; specific impacts of traffic from SGB on Empingham. TA should be redone.	NO CHANGE - SC2 requires major developments to provide a TA that would consider impact on road network and is a county-wide policy
SC2	11692921	RC95 , Kerry Nimmons, Cottesmore Parish Council	Paras 8.5 - 8.17: laudable objectives to deliver sustainable transport are undermined by locating significant proportions of new development in non-sustainable locations. No commitment in SC2 to integrating different elements of public transport such as bus services and railway station at Oakham.	NO CHANGE
SC2	20102932	RC103 , Frances Cunningham , Network Rail	Policy SC2 should include an additional policy in relation to level crossings.	NO CHANGE - The potential impact of development on the safety and operation of level crossings and any appropriate mitigation measures would be addressed through Transport Assessments.

SC2	11692751	RC104 , John Cave	Policy SC2 fails to comply with para 108 NPPF. Lack of practical measures in SGB masterplan to improve road infrastructure, public transport and encouragement of cycling and walking. SGB will increase traffic and no assessment of this on village road network. SGB will be car dependent and lack of detail in TA over public transport provision.	NO CHANGE - SC2 requires major developments to provide a TA that would consider impact on road network and is a county-wide policy
SC2	11694617	RC105 , John Haward	Plan must include sustainable way of directing traffic to A1 north to avoid passing through Empingham village. New town built at Woolfox in place of SGB.	NO CHANGE - SC2 requires major developments to provide a TA that would consider impact on road network and is a county-wide policy
SC2	20103108	RC113 , Brian Grady	Paras 8.5 - 8.17: laudable objectives to deliver sustainable transport are undermined by locating significant proportions of new development in non-sustainable locations. No commitment in SC2 to integrating different elements of public transport such as bus services and railway station at Oakham.	NO CHANGE - SC2 requires major developments to provide a TA that would consider impact on road network and is a county-wide policy
SC2	20110108	RC114 , Andrew Brown	Paras 8.5 - 8.17: concentrating new development in remote location will not reduce use of private cars and puts at risk achieving sustainable transport priorities set out in Policy SC2. Development should be concentrated on areas with already established public transport and access to services.	NO CHANGE - SC2 requires major developments to provide a TA that would consider impact on road network and is a county-wide policy
SC2	11696307	RC115 , Keith Townsend	Rep relates primarily to Policy H2/H3. Views of local residents have been taken into account and acted on. TA fails to take account of holiday traffic and use of Main Street, Empingham for access to A1 north.	NO CHANGE - SC2 requires major developments to provide a TA that would consider impact on road network and is a county-wide policy
SC2	11689312	RC119 , Tarn Dearden	Rep relates primarily to Policy H2/H3: concern over increased traffic through Empingham. Greater consideration should be given to Woolfox proposal.	NO CHANGE - SC2 requires major developments to provide a TA that would consider impact on road network and is a county-wide policy
SC2	20110214	RC124 , Michael Nyss	Rep relates primarily to Policy H2/H3: TA to justify SGB inadequate as local roads not capable of accommodating traffic generated by demolition, construction and occupation; impact on Main Street, Empingham not considered as TA carried out on single day without tourist traffic; HE wary of impact on A1 junctions, and; reduced bus services following closure of depot at Melton.	NO CHANGE - SC2 requires major developments to provide a TA that would consider impact on road network and is a county-wide policy
SC2	11686583	RC127 , Michael Thwaites	Views of local residents being ignored. Rep relates primarily to Policy H2/H3. No account has been taken of impact of traffic from SGB on Church Street and Main Street, Empingham. Plan should be withdrawn.	NO CHANGE - SC2 requires major developments to provide a TA that would consider impact on road network and is a county-wide policy

SC2	20110301	RC130 , Grant Butterworth, Leicester City Council	Plan recognises that joint working may be required for transport infrastructure to be provided across the County boundary. Leicester provides services for some of Rutland's residents and para 2.17 mentions high levels of commuting with Leicester one of the destinations. Suggest Policy SC2 includes mentioning working with partners to deliver a sustainable transport network with Leicester mentioned specifically as a destination to improve bus routes and bus services to. Typo in para 8.13 - should read 'Department for Transport'.	CONSIDER CHANGE - Changes to para 8.13
SC2	11701586	RC131 , J Corby	Plan does not accord with NPPF which requires assessment as to whether plan proposals will promote sustainable transport system, provide a safe access and mitigate against any significant impacts on local transport network. A more thorough TA is required.	NO CHANGE - SC2 requires major developments to provide a TA that would consider impact on road network and is a county-wide policy
SC2	11686466	RC296 , Christopher Renner, Normanton Parish Meeting	SCI flawed as relied on online responses that many older people were excluded from. Decision on SGB made before Traffic Impacts were available so policy not justified by evidence. Para 108 NPPF requires a safe and suitable access to the site by all users as part of sustainable development. Access to SGB off single track roads totally unsuitable for amount of traffic that will be generated. TA done outside holiday period. Access will share route used by walkers and cyclists and is a local bus route. Access roads would be across land not in RCC's or MOD's ownership. Concentrating development at SGB will challenge ability to deliver more sustainable transport. More aspirations required for more integrated and efficient public transport system.	NO CHANGE - SC2 requires major developments to provide a TA that would consider impact on road network and is a county-wide policy
SC2	11702427	RC140 , Tim Smith, North Luffenham Parish Council	Plan legally compliant as TA for SGB but TA dated April 2018 and inadequate for development of this nature. Later TA dated November 2018 published after Reg 18 consultation so stakeholders denied adequate TA at most relevant consultation stage for LP. SC2 fails to comply with para 108 NPPF and policy relies on Campbell Reith TA (Nov 2018) which is deficient as fails to: meet requirements of Local Transport Plan; promote a range of transport choices; minimise distance for accessing services; no mitigating transport measures; support integrated walking and cycling network. RCC should review TA and viability of SGB.	NO CHANGE - SC2 requires major developments to provide a TA that would consider impact on road network and is a county-wide policy
SC2	20110317	RC141 , Andrew Johnson, Morcott Parish Council	Paras 8.5 - 8.17: laudable objectives to deliver sustainable transport are undermined by locating significant proportions of new development in non-sustainable locations. No commitment in SC2 to integrating different elements of public transport such as bus services and railway station at Oakham.	NO CHANGE - SC2 requires major developments to provide a TA that would consider impact on road network and is a county-wide policy

SC2	20110318	RC147 , Elizabeth Gay Griffin	Plan legally compliant as TA for SGB but TA dated April 2018 and inadequate for development of this nature. Later TA dated November 2018 published after Reg 18 consultation. Plan not sound as safe and suitable access to SGB cannot be achieved contrary to Section 9 NPPF: rural road links to Rutland's main through roads not capable of supporting traffic generated by SGB.	NO CHANGE - SC2 requires major developments to provide a TA that would consider impact on road network and is a county-wide policy
SC2	11703873	RC228 , Hilary Smith	Incorrect assumption in TA that SGB residents will use sustainable transport options. SGB should be reduced to 350 houses as this could be absorbed into the local country roads.	NO CHANGE - SC2 requires major developments to provide a TA that would consider impact on road network and is a county-wide policy
SC2	11592309	RC159 , Timothy Smith	Plan legally compliant as TA for SGB but TA dated April 2018 and inadequate for development of this nature. Later TA dated November 2018 published after Reg 18 consultation so stakeholders denied adequate TA at most relevant consultation stage for LP. SC2 fails to comply with para 108 NPPF and policy relies on Campbell Reith TA (Nov 2018) which is deficient as fails to: meet requirements of Local Transport Plan; promote a range of transport choices; minimise distance for accessing services; no mitigating transport measures; support integrated walking and cycling network. RCC should review TA and viability of SGB.	NO CHANGE - SC2 requires major developments to provide a TA that would consider impact on road network and is a county-wide policy
SC2	11699732	RC148 , Laurence Howard	Homes and industry should be sited where they are sustainable in terms of transport. Remote location of SGB means that it is not legally compliant.	NO CHANGE - SC2 requires major developments to provide a TA that would consider impact on road network and is a county-wide policy
SC2	20110472	RC195 , David Duffin	Policy SC2 not sound as TA inadequate due to lack of capacity of surrounding roads to accommodate SGB traffic; traffic count not carried out in summer months, and; vague details on public transport.	NO CHANGE - SC2 requires major developments to provide a TA that would consider impact on road network and is a county-wide policy
SC2	20110483	RC197 , Philip Davies	Paras 8.5 - 8.17: laudable objectives to deliver sustainable transport are undermined by locating significant proportions of new development in non-sustainable locations. No commitment in SC2 to integrating different elements of public transport such as bus services and railway station at Oakham.	NO CHANGE - SC2 requires major developments to provide a TA that would consider impact on road network and is a county-wide policy
SC2	20110511	RC296 , Christopher Renner, Normanton Parish Meeting	Paras 8.5 - 8.17: laudable objectives to deliver sustainable transport are undermined by locating significant proportions of new development in non-sustainable locations. No commitment in SC2 to integrating different elements of public transport such as bus services and railway station at Oakham.	NO CHANGE - SC2 requires major developments to provide a TA that would consider impact on road network and is a county-wide policy

SC2	11698517	RC295 , Paul Gwilliam	Plan not sound as little commitment to improving current transport infrastructure and no effort in improving local road network to take extra capacity generated by new development remote from services such as SGB. TA for SGB does not assess impact on single track lanes and no account taken in TA of holiday traffic. No commitment to integrating different forms of public transport such as buses from villages not going to Oakham railway station.	NO CHANGE - SC2 requires major developments to provide a TA that would consider impact on road network and is a county-wide policy
SC2	11706479	RC276 , Peter White	Strongly support comments made by Empingham Parish Council.	NO CHANGE
SC2	20110523	RC324 , Susannah Fish	Policy SC2 not sound as: transport not considered in Equality Impact Assessment; Policy SC2 fails to explore range of alternatives with no integration across transport modes; question over viability of delivering sustainable transport for SGB, and; is not consistent with NPPF. No mention of climate emergency in Policy SC2 and policy concentrates on mitigating impacts of SGB rather than considering alternative modes of transport. TA does not consider holiday traffic. Lack of mechanisms in SC2 for providing public transport, cycling and walking routes and integrated public transport. For SGB, new railway station not affordable or viable; new bus service unlikely to be viable; walking and cycling opportunities limited. SGB should be removed from the plan or reduced to 350 houses.	NO CHANGE - SC2 requires major developments to provide a TA that would consider impact on road network and is a county-wide policy
SC2	20110525	RC284 , Neil Johannessen	Plan not legally compliant or sound. Plan wrongly assumes that SGB will be self-contained but, in reality, it will become car dependent. TAs therefore flawed.	NO CHANGE - Evidence base considered robust
SC2	11706803	RC302 , Robert Grafton	SC2 fails to comply with para 108 NPPF as requires assessment as to whether plan proposals will promote sustainable transport system, provide a safe access and mitigate against any significant impacts on local transport network. Initial TA for SGB is flawed as fails to properly consider impact on Empingham. Second TA produced after Reg 18 consultation finished.	NO CHANGE - SC2 requires major developments to provide a TA that would consider impact on road network and is a county-wide policy
SC2	11707010	RC280 , Nick Davenport	April 2018 TA for SGB inadequate and TA dated November 2018 came out after Reg 18 consultation. Policy SC2 not sound as TA does not demonstrate how SGB will promote a range of transport choices including cycling and walking; minimise distance people need to travel; lack of travel plans; provision of transport infrastructure, and; integrated public transport provision.	NO CHANGE - SC2 requires major developments to provide a TA that would consider impact on road network and is a county-wide policy
SC2	11706515	RC186 , Catherine Davenport	April 2018 TA for SGB inadequate and TA dated November 2018 came out after Reg 18 consultation. Policy SC2 not sound as TA does not demonstrate how SGB will promote a range of transport choices including cycling and walking; minimise distance people need to travel; lack of travel plans; provision of transport infrastructure, and; integrated public transport provision.	NO CHANGE - SC2 requires major developments to provide a TA that would consider impact on road network and is a county-wide policy

SC2	20110537	RC220 , Gale Waller	Plan not sound. TAs for SGB carried out outside holiday and harvest seasons. Impact of SGB on local roads not set out in LP and inadequate mitigation measures in SGB masterplan. Bus service for SGB unlikely to be viable and SGB will be car dependent.	NO CHANGE - SC2 requires major developments to provide a TA that would consider impact on road network and is a county-wide policy
SC2	11707304	RC257 , Lelia O'Connell	April 2018 TA for SGB inadequate and TA dated November 2018 came out after Reg 18 consultation. Plan contrary to para 108 NPPF. TAs flawed as local road network, including links to A1, A606, A47 and A6063, inadequate to take SGB traffic and funding for infrastructure improvements inadequate. TAs do not take account of holiday traffic. SGB should be reduced to 350 houses. Lack of information in LP about alternative modes of transport to private car. There should be a SofCG with Highways England at this stage of the LP. Plan should be paused to at least allow A606/A1 junction issue to be resolved.	NO CHANGE - SC2 requires major developments to provide a TA that would consider impact on road network and is a county-wide policy
SC2	11707296	RC233 , Jonathan Griffin	April 2018 TA for SGB inadequate and TA dated November 2018 came out after Reg 18 consultation. Plan contrary to para 108 NPPF. TAs flawed as local road network, including links to A1, A606, A47 and A6063, inadequate to take SGB traffic and funding for infrastructure improvements inadequate. TAs do not take account of holiday traffic. SGB should be reduced to 350 houses. Lack of information in LP about alternative modes of transport to private car. There should be a SofCG with Highways England at this stage of the LP. Plan should be paused to at least allow A606/A1 junction issue to be resolved.	NO CHANGE - SC2 requires major developments to provide a TA that would consider impact on road network and is a county-wide policy
SC2	11707617	RC255 , Kenneth Bool	Laudable objectives to deliver sustainable transport are undermined by locating significant proportions of new development in non-sustainable locations. No commitment in SC2 to integrating different elements of public transport such as bus services and railway station at Oakham.	NO CHANGE - SC2 requires major developments to provide a TA that would consider impact on road network and is a county-wide policy
SC2	20110556	RC304 , Ron Simpson, Uppingham First	The proposed new development at St Georges Barracks of 1,000 + homes will add to traffic volumes using the A6003 which passes through Uppingham. The Local Plan does not do enough to address this potential issue. Lack of detailed mitigation policies for the traffic problem arising from the St George's proposal and the development committed in Corby. There has not been appropriate cross-boundary working with Corby on this matter, which has not been dealt with and is therefore de facto deferred.	NO CHANGE - SC2 requires major developments to provide a TA that would consider impact on road network and is a county-wide policy
SC2	20110567	RC188 , Carole Brown, Braunston-in-Rutland Parish Council	Laudable objectives to deliver sustainable transport are undermined by locating significant proportions of new development in non-sustainable locations. No commitment in SC2 to integrating different elements of public transport such as bus services and railway station at Oakham.	NO CHANGE - SC2 requires major developments to provide a TA that would consider impact on road network and is a county-wide policy

SC2	11705008	RC273 , Melanie Mansell	Plan not sound as not consistent with part 9 NPPF as growth directed towards SGB in preference to other sustainable alternatives. Lack of evidence on viability of bus services for SGB and SGB will be car dependent.	NO CHANGE - SC2 requires major developments to provide a TA that would consider impact on road network and is a county-wide policy
SC2	11707797	RC310 , Sally Mullins, Whitwell Parish Meeting	Plan not legally compliant or sound as location of SGB makes Policy SC2 unviable. Lack of commitment in Plan to integrating public transport such as bus services linking villages to Oakham do not go near railway station.	NO CHANGE - Duty to co-operate statement provides evidence of cross boundary co-operation. SC2 requires major developments to provide a TA that would consider impact on road network and is a county-wide policy
SC2	20110664	RC246 , Victor Pheasant , Chairman Empingham Parish Council	Policy SC2 not sound as not compliant with Section 9 NPPF. No indication of co-operation and co-ordination with other authorities about impact on transport as a result of the LP. TAs are of limited value and ignore basis information readily available. Proper TA required before proceeding further.	NO CHANGE - Duty to co-operate statement provides evidence of cross boundary co-operation. SC2 requires major developments to provide a TA that would consider impact on road network and is a county-wide policy
SC2	11709155	RC240 , James White	Support comments made by Empingham Parish Council.	NO CHANGE
SC2	20110686	RC242 , J C M Ball	Laudable objectives to deliver sustainable transport are undermined by locating significant proportions of new development in non-sustainable locations. No commitment in SC2 to integrating different elements of public transport such as bus services and railway station at Oakham.	NO CHANGE - SC2 requires major developments to provide a TA that would consider impact on road network and is a county-wide policy
SC2	20110695	RC332 , Tom Murie, Tixover Parish Meeting	Laudable objectives to deliver sustainable transport are undermined by locating significant proportions of new development in non-sustainable locations. No commitment in SC2 to integrating different elements of public transport such as bus services and railway station at Oakham.	NO CHANGE - SC2 requires major developments to provide a TA that would consider impact on road network and is a county-wide policy
SC2	11709067	RC192 , Norman Milne, Fight 4 Rutland Ltd	Laudable objectives to deliver sustainable transport are undermined by locating significant proportions of new development in non-sustainable locations. No commitment in SC2 to integrating different elements of public transport such as bus services and railway station at Oakham.	NO CHANGE - SC2 requires major developments to provide a TA that would consider impact on road network and is a county-wide policy
SC2	201106108	RC202 , WJ & PJ Cross	Laudable objectives to deliver sustainable transport are undermined by locating significant proportions of new development in non-sustainable locations. No commitment in SC2 to integrating different elements of public transport such as bus services and railway station at Oakham.	NO CHANGE - SC2 requires major developments to provide a TA that would consider impact on road network and is a county-wide policy
SC2	201106133	RC331 , TJ & EVR Boone	Laudable objectives to deliver sustainable transport are undermined by locating significant proportions of new development in non-sustainable locations. No commitment in SC2 to integrating different elements of public transport such as bus services and railway station at Oakham.	NO CHANGE - SC2 requires major developments to provide a TA that would consider impact on road network and is a county-wide policy
SC2	11708426	RC120 , Will Atkinson	Paras 8.5 - 8.17 not sound as new settlements should be sustainably located with access to public transport but SGB would be totally car dependent. The aspirations of the LP should be aligned with new settlement proposals.	NO CHANGE Policy H2 4) requires this

SC2	11709378	RC262 , Liz Parsons	Paras 8.5 - 8.17: Plan not sound as majority of new development should be located nearby main transport hubs, e.g. Oakham train station, and SGB located where there are not adequate transport links	NO CHANGE - SC2 requires major developments to provide a TA that would consider impact on road network and is a county-wide policy
SC2	201106218	RC180, Billy Lloyd, DLP Planning Ltd. On behalf of Hereward Homes	Part 7) of Policy SC2 makes reference to RCC's Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan which is 'anticipated to be published in late 2019'. This document should be available for review as part of the LP process. A new clause in Policy SC2 to encourage the transition to electric vehicles should be added: 'Where car travel remains appropriate, ensure that provision is made to encourage and support a switch to fully electric vehicles.'	CONSIDER CHANGE supporting transition to electric vehicles with reference to Table 6 of Appendix 4.
SC2	11651755	RC56 , Adam Burn	Lack of detail in the local traffic planning for consideration in the volume of traffic to increase as a direct result of construction and then the settlement at the new St Georges Barracks site. Concerns about lack of detail in LP about effect of increased construction and future residents' traffic as a result of SGB particularly in relation to Main Street, Empingham.	NO CHANGE - SC2 requires major developments to provide a TA that would consider impact on road network and is a county-wide policy
SC2, H2	11626946	RC46 , Lee Dooley	No support for SGB in Empingham due to increase in traffic through village on narrow roads potentially damaging historic buildings. Traffic survey did not consider higher level of traffic in summer heading to Rutland Water.	NO CHANGE - SC2 requires major developments to provide a TA that would consider impact on road network and is a county-wide policy
SC2, H2	20110410	RC156 , Victor Bacon, South Luffenham Parish Council	Plan not sound as: no account taken of objections at Reg 18 stage; too many dwellings provided as a result of 25% buffer and SGB not sustainable as site remote; will result in high car dependency and contrary to climate change objectives; transport assessments flawed as do not take account of tourist traffic and SGB would lead to heavy traffic through North and South Luffenham; lack of assessment on impact of SGB on Rutland Water, and; adverse effect of quarrying and loss of country park area due to mineral extraction. 650 dwellings at Stamford North should form part of RCC housing allocation and plan revert to 2017 spatial strategy with SGB reduced to 350/400 houses. Plan unsound as SGB will compromise securing sustainable transport due to flawed TAs that do not take into account impact of traffic generated by SGB on local highway network, including impact on other users, or of extra visitor traffic in the summer months.	NO CHANGE Allocation supported by robust evidence
SC2, H2	20110475	RC183 , Caroline Stuart-Robson	Plan unsound due to lack of local support for SGB and flawed Transport Assessment; does not fully assess impact on Empingham and did not take into account impact of holiday traffic. SGB is unsustainable and contrary to climate change policy due to its remote location and car dependency.	NO CHANGE - SC2 requires major developments to provide a TA that would consider impact on road network and is a county-wide policy
SC3	11645356	RC55 , Tess Nelson, Harborough District Council	Harborough District Council support requirement for broadband provision, particularly for new employment schemes, as HDC residents may work in Rutland.	SUPPORT WELCOMED

SC3	11703687	RC140 , Tim Smith, North Luffenham Parish Council	NLPC is supportive of the policy but is concerned that it is not deliverable in relation to developments in rural locations. This is particularly relevant to the proposed SGB development. The “exceptional circumstance” caveat in the policy might include the financial viability of developing a site. This would result in locking rural communities into substandard, “old generation”, connectivity, reducing the ability of rural dwellers to work from home and reducing the viability of new and existing rurally based businesses.	NO CHANGE policy is in accordance with national policy
SC3	11708955	RC289 , Peter Burrows	NLPC is supportive of the policy but is concerned that it is not deliverable in relation to developments in rural locations. This is particularly relevant to the proposed SGB development. The “exceptional circumstance” caveat in the policy might include the financial viability of developing a site. This would result in locking rural communities into substandard, “old generation”, connectivity, reducing the ability of rural dwellers to work from home and reducing the viability of new and existing rurally based businesses.	NO CHANGE policy is in accordance with national policy
SC3	201106112	RC261 , Linda Burrows	NLPC is supportive of the policy but is concerned that it is not deliverable in relation to developments in rural locations. This is particularly relevant to the proposed SGB development. The “exceptional circumstance” caveat in the policy might include the financial viability of developing a site. This would result in locking rural communities into substandard, “old generation”, connectivity, reducing the ability of rural dwellers to work from home and reducing the viability of new and existing rurally based businesses.	NO CHANGE policy is in accordance with national policy
SC3	201106143	RC290 , Peter Dawson	NLPC is supportive of the policy but is concerned that it is not deliverable in relation to developments in rural locations. This is particularly relevant to the proposed SGB development. The “exceptional circumstance” caveat in the policy might include the financial viability of developing a site. This would result in locking rural communities into substandard, “old generation”, connectivity, reducing the ability of rural dwellers to work from home and reducing the viability of new and existing rurally based businesses.	NO CHANGE policy is in accordance with national policy

SC3	2011061961	RC321 , Sue Green, House Builders Federation	<p>The Council should not impose new electronic communications requirements beyond the provision of infrastructure as set out in statutory Building Regulations. In March 2020 the Government confirmed future legislation to ensure that new build homes are built with gigabit-capable broadband. The Government will amend Part R “Physical Infrastructure for High Speed Electronic Communications Networks” of the Building Regulations 2010 to place obligations on housing developers to work with network operators to install gigabit broadband, where this can be done within a commercial cost cap. The new measures will place responsibilities on both developers and network operator</p> <p>The HBF note that these potentially costly policy requirements have been excluded from the Council’s baseline viability appraisal (see HBF representation to Deliverability & Viability above)</p>	NO CHANGE at this time as policy will bridge gap in current legislation – however if it becomes part of the Building Regulations before Examination policy can be deleted.
SC3	201106219	RC180, Billy Lloyd, DLP Planning Ltd. On behalf of Hereward Homes	Site at Greetham Quarry as set out in the attached Site-Specific report can address the policy requirements on site.	NO CHANGE
SC4	11708969	RC289 , Peter Burrows	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan forming part of the Evidence Base for the Draft Local Plan outlines the items of Infrastructure that will be funded from Developer Contributions (CIL and Section 106) and Neighbourhood Plans entitle the local Parish Council to 25% of CIL developer contributions (uncapped). The IDP makes no allowance for the Parish Councils potentially differing priorities and spending, seemingly allocated the entire CIL funding solely on their specific requirements.	NO CHANGE The Whole Plan Viability Study (Feb 2020) references CIL only in the context of it being a part of the development costs. The use of CIL to fund infrastructure is not considered within the WPVS.
SC4	11709032	RC263 , Nicola Farr, Environment Agency	“Infrastructure for Growth” p120 - heading is missing from this section. We have viewed the IDP and found it useful and will continue to work with the Council and service providers as appropriate.	SUPPORT WELCOMED – add header above paragraph 8.34
SC4	201106113	RC261 , Linda Burrows	The Infrastructure Delivery Plan forming part of the Evidence Base for the Draft Local Plan outlines the items of Infrastructure that will be funded from Developer Contributions (CIL and Section 106) and Neighbourhood Plans entitle the local Parish Council to 25% of CIL developer contributions (uncapped). The IDP makes no allowance for the Parish Councils potentially differing priorities and spending, seemingly allocated the entire CIL funding solely on their specific requirements.	NO CHANGE The Whole Plan Viability Study (Feb 2020) references CIL only in the context of it being a part of the development costs. The use of CIL to fund infrastructure is not considered within the WPVS.
SC4	201106144	RC290 , Peter Dawson	Neighbourhood Plans entitle the local Parish Council to 25% of CIL developer contributions (uncapped) the Infrastructure Delivery Plan has not allowed for the Parish Councils potentially differing priorities and spending, seemingly allocated the entire CIL funding solely on their specific requirements	NO CHANGE The Whole Plan Viability Study (Feb 2020) references CIL only in the context of it being a part of the development costs. The use of CIL to fund infrastructure is not considered within the WPVS.

SC4	2011061954	RC321 , Sue Green, House Builders Federation	HBF notes that not all development is viable. As set out in the Council's viability assessment brownfield sites are unviable and older persons housing schemes are unviable. The viability of St. Georges Garden Community is dependent on securing HIF monies. Furthermore the baseline appraisal is not an accurate assessment of the cumulative impact on viability of compliance with all policy requirements set out in the Local Plan. A more accurate baseline appraisal combining sensitivity testing scenarios in Table 10.4 with higher costs for M4(2) / M4(3), self & custom build, energy efficiency, EVCPs, water efficiency, biodiversity, etc. may result in marginally viable (amber) greenfield sites becoming unviable (red).	NO CHANGE - Viability study takes account of all policy requirements. Viability study will need to be updated to take account of national changes to Building regulations and Biodiversity Net gain
SC4	201106220	RC180, Billy Lloyd, DLP Planning Ltd. On behalf of Hereward Homes	Query the final paragraph in respect of viability. As currently drafted the Council does not have to give sufficient weight to the financial evidence when seeking to balance the application as part of the determination process. We believe that site by site viability should be considered as not every site is the same.	NO CHANGE - NPPF para 57 states that the weight to attribute to site specific viability reports is a matter for the decision maker
MIN1	11703699	RC140 , Tim Smith, North Luffenham Parish Council	Industry has confirmed that cement AoS in Policies MIN1 and MIN2 is sufficient for 15 years supply and preference will be given to extraction at SGB. More certainty required regarding viability and deliverability of SGB in light of likelihood of quarrying blighting development there. Financial modelling with reduction in house prices due to quarry has not been taken into account. Also concerned about impact of quarrying on listed Thor Missile complex as the quarry not compatible with the need to conserve these structures in 'their original military context' as set out in evolving SGB masterplan.	NO CHANGE
MIN1	20110446	RC210 , Emilie Carr, Historic England	Para 9.14 and 9.15: due to size of AoS (aggregate minerals) and sites not being allocated at this stage, HE cannot comment in detail and welcome third to last and last sentences whereby identification of sites within LABS AoS does not equate to planning permission and that LP policies would apply.	SUPPORT WELCOMED

MIN1	11706225	RC92 , Christopher Jordan	Industry has confirmed that cement AoS in Policies MIN1 and MIN2 is sufficient for 15 years supply and preference will be given to extraction at SGB. LP does not include information about 88.5ha extension to Grange Top Quarry granted on appeal in 2002 and allowing Ketton Cement to build haul road and extract limestone at Wytchley Warren Farm on eastern boundary of SGB: at appeal KC envisaged extension would allow access to SGB which has a limestone resource of 20m tonnes. Details and timescales for extension to approval to Ketton Quarry after it expires in 2026, including impact on Edith Weston, SGB and North Luffenham, should be included in LP. Quarry likely to blight SGB and local villages for 30 years which will have significant impact on viability of SGB and financial modelling for SGB has not taken this blight into account. LP does not identify listed Thor Missile site within mineral safeguarding area. Plan should be modified to show distance of proposed area of extraction to nearby villages and SGB; all extracted material transported on existing haul road at eastern edge of SGB, and; Grade II listed Thor Missile site and any protection area around it shown on Inset Map 64.	NO CHANGE - Viability work for the development is considered to be robust. Significant buffers and standoff areas proposed to protect heritage assets and development
MIN1	11703801	RC185 , Peter Coe	Plan unsound as no account taken of sterilisation of mineral resources at SGB. In exempting the minerals underlying SGB LP conflicts with NPPF and deprives future generations of a substantial resource.	NO CHANGE - mineral reserves are safeguarded by the Local Plan
MIN1	11706821	RC230 , Ian Briggs, Landesign on behalf of Hanson	LP not sound as inconsistent with national policy. Object to Policy MIN1 2nd para: 'Within the cement primary and secondary materials AoS...' RCC not considering whether mineral at SGB is best mineral for cement manufacture and there should be no hierarchy of area in the AoS. Due to constraints at SGB (thickness/volume of available minerals and presence of scheduled monument) SGB would not be focal point for scale of extension quarry will need in plan period. SGB would have to be combined with another area as does not hold a large enough reserve on its own. Delete from MIN1: 'Within the cement primary and secondary materials AoS preference would be given to proposals for extraction from that part of the cement AoS identified in the St. George's masterplan.'	CONSIDER CHANGE to MIN1
MIN1	11708980	RC289 , Peter Burrows	Industry has confirmed that cement AoS in Policies MIN1 and MIN2 is sufficient for 15 years supply and preference will be given to extraction at SGB. More certainty required regarding viability and deliverability of SGB in light of likelihood of quarrying blighting development there. Financial modelling with reduction in house prices due to quarry has not been taken into account. Also concerned about impact of quarrying on listed Thor Missile complex as the quarry not compatible with the need to conserve these structures in 'their original military context' as set out in evolving SGB masterplan.	NO CHANGE

MIN1	201106114	RC261 , Linda Burrows	Industry has confirmed that cement AoS in Policies MIN1 and MIN2 is sufficient for 15 years supply and preference will be given to extraction at SGB. More certainty required regarding viability and deliverability of SGB in light of likelihood of quarrying blighting development there. Financial modelling with reduction in house prices due to quarry has not been taken into account. Also concerned about impact of quarrying on listed Thor Missile complex as the quarry not compatible with the need to conserve these structures in 'their original military context' as set out in evolving SGB masterplan.	NO CHANGE
MIN1	201106145	RC290 , Peter Dawson	Industry has confirmed that cement AoS in Policies MIN1 and MIN2 is sufficient for 15 years supply and preference will be given to extraction at SGB. More certainty required regarding viability and deliverability of SGB in light of likelihood of quarrying blighting development there. Financial modelling with reduction in house prices due to quarry has not been taken into account. Also concerned about impact of quarrying on listed Thor Missile complex as the quarry not compatible with the need to conserve these structures in 'their original military context' as set out in evolving SGB masterplan.	NO CHANGE
MIN1	201106193	RC329 , Tim Collins	MIN1 unsound as not consistent with national policy. Industry has confirmed that cement AoS in Policies MIN1 and MIN2 is sufficient for 15 years supply and preference will be given to extraction at SGB. More certainty required regarding viability and deliverability of SGB in light of likelihood of quarrying blighting development there. Financial modelling with reduction in house prices due to quarry has not been taken into account. Also concerned about impact of quarrying on listed Thor Missile complex as the quarry not compatible with the need to conserve these structures in 'their original military context' as set out in evolving SGB masterplan.	NO CHANGE

MIN1, MIN2, MIN3	20110636	RC212 , Paul Boggust, Edith Weston Parish Council	<p>Policies MIN1, MIN2 and MIN3 not legally compliant: refer to EWPC's representation on Legal Compliance of the Whole Plan. Policies MIN1, MIN2 and MIN3 unsound as fail to safeguard development areas of SGB and Officer's Mess sites. Representation entitled 'Minerals' sets out EWPC's full representation: MIN1 AoS should include entire SGB and Officer's Mess sites; MIN2 AoS should include entire SGB and Officer's Mess sites, and; MIN3 SGB and Officer's Mess sites should be included within an MSA. Lack of evidence as to why SGB and Officer's Mess sites are removed from the safeguarding area and both housing sites should be deleted as allocations. Allocations will sterilise mineral reserves contrary to national policy and instead sites should be returned to greenfield after quarrying. Allocated sites should be chosen that do not sterilise minerals and RCC failed to assess impact of quarrying on amenity of residents at SGB, and; country park will exacerbate impacts on Rutland Water rather than mitigating recreational impacts from internationally important site, contrary to legislation for protection of European sites. Policies contrary to paras 203, 204 and 208 of NPPF that states planning policies should avoid sterilisation of minerals. LP gives 2 reasons for exempting SGB from AoS/MSA: SGB presents lower potential for sterilisation and already has large area designated as cement AoS: evidence for 1st reason as to why SGB exempted from MSA allegedly set out in 2018 report by Evolution Geology but this provides sufficient evidence for exemption of SGB in terms of unviability of extraction below SGB and does not include Officer's Mess site. 2nd reason contrary to para 204 NPPF.</p>	NO CHANGE - (However see response to representation number 11706597 which concludes that a mapping error means that the MSA are not shown on the policies maps and the areas which are shown are in fact the AoS. This will be corrected.)
MIN2	11706908	RC230 , Ian Briggs, Landesign on behalf of Hanson	<p>Policy MIN2 not sound and Hanson objects for 3 reasons: 1. Criteria b) refers to 'around 1.4m tonnes of cement production pa.' This could cause a potential impediment to investment to increase capacity without any clear justification. 2. Object to penultimate para: 'A stock of permitted reserves of at least 15 years for cement primary and secondary materials (limestone and clay) will be sought.' Due to large investments required for maintenance and new legislation requirements then a 25 year minimum supply of minerals is more appropriate. Add to end of penultimate para: ...'to maintain an existing plant, and at least 25 years where major investment is required for new plant or the maintenance and improvement of existing plant and equipment.' 3. MIN2 is indicated as meeting Strategic Objective 15 (now 12 in September 2020 amendment). Mineral Provision should be a standalone Strategic Objective in accordance with Section 17 NPPF as minerals are essential to the country's needs.</p>	CONSIDER CHANGE - to policy and text

MIN2, MIN4, WST2, MIN10	20110447	RC210 , Emilie Carr, Historic England	Plan is sound in relation to following: MIN2 criteria c) welcomed. Para 9.40 welcomed. Para 9.54 (protection of Windmill off Empingham Road, Ketton) welcomed. MIN4 criteria 2c) welcomed. WST2 criteria e) welcomed. Paras 9.100 and 9.101 and Policy MIN10 criteria d) welcomed.	SUPPORT WELCOMED
MIN4	11706953	RC230 , Ian Briggs, Landesign on behalf of Hanson	LP not sound as MIN4 inconsistent with national policy. Object as MIN4 2) refers to 'adopted provision rates' which is not defined in the LP and which is not consistent with paras 207 and 208 NPPF and PPG Minerals para 088. MIN4 should be amended to remove references to the 'adopted production rate'. Para 9.61 can still make reference to the current level of output but as background information only to demonstrate importance of the cement works.	NO CHANGE
MIN4	11707004	RC230 , Ian Briggs, Landesign on behalf of Hanson	Para 9.50 not sound and object to last 2 sentences in para 9.50. Preference for working the St George's site first is not justified as based not on production requirements but on promotion of SGB by RCC, ignoring mineral quality and viability at SGB compared to other parts of the (assumed) AoS. Hanson concerned over thinning of mineral westwards across SGB and presence of scheduled monument within AoS could potentially sterilise the land surrounding it. It is unreasonable to direct a mineral developer to prioritise this area. Para 9.50 seeks to restrict how much mineral should be released contrary to para 208 NPPF which requires a steady and adequate supply of minerals. Para 9.50 should be amended to remove preference for working SGB site and to treat whole AoS with equal weight, and; reword text to better reflect para 208 NPPF and PPG Minerals para 088.	CONSIDER CHANGE - to policy and text
MIN4	11707032	RC230 , Ian Briggs, Landesign on behalf of Hanson	Para 9.54 not sound and object to first bullet point of 9.54 as prioritises extraction from SGB from AoS effectively offloading requirements of MIN3 from developer of SGB to Hanson. This approach is unjustified and unreasonable and contradicts requirements of criteria a) - e) MIN3 as the non-mineral developer is required to address the safeguarded mineral resource. Para 9.54 should be amended by deletion of bullet point 1 as its approach conflicts with MIN3.	CONSIDER CHANGE - to policy and text

MIN4, EN7	11555922	RC7 , Steve Lloyd	<p>This probably fits in either EN2, EN12 or MIN5, but I am not sure exactly where such reference should be made.</p> <p>I believe the plan is incomplete as it merely focusses within the bounds of Rutland. Here I specifically refer to Wakerley quarry which is only visible from Rutland and has a dramatic impact on our environment in terms of dust, noise, light and visual pollution. However, it has almost zero impact on Northamptonshire residents. Hence, the Local Plan should look to make a statement on such cross border issues and seek to minimise them by acting in partnership with others and not seemingly being silent as if such challenges do not exist.</p>	NO CHANGE
MIN5	11613273	RC36 , Richard Creasey	<p>The local communities concerns with MIN 5 raised in the consultation have not been included in the plan. Thus although consultation has taken place the process is ongoing and incomplete. The MIN 5 policy is not justified by the Rutland aggregate supply of 0.19million tonnes/a</p>	NO CHANGE
MIN5	20103011	RC107 , Dennis Jeffrey	<p>MIN5 not required as part of landbank requirement for crushed rock (aggregate). The 1.1m tonnes is solely to meet a hypothetical shortfall to 2036 and can be recalculated to 0.48m tonnes taking into account current planning permissions (or less if account taken of unworked reserves at Woolfox and Clipsham. No evidence that Thistleton Quarry (para 9.58) will stay inactive through the LP period. Policy MIN5 is not consistent with MIN2, MIN4.2 (a) and 4.5. Allocated MIN5 site conflicts with Policies EN1, EN9, EN11, paras 7.74/7.80 and Policy SD5 (j). No requirement for allocation of MIN5 site as contrary to aims of sustainable developmentAllocation under Policy MIN5 should be deleted.Para 9.55 updated to take account of current permissions.Paras 9.56 and 9.57 should be deleted.Para 9.58: first sentence should be deleted; delete 'coupled with the allocation with'; insert 'part of' after 'of'; add after 'under provision' 'should the extraction rate at Clipsham/Woolfox extension not be increased.'Para 9.59: delete first sentence and the 'for these reasons' in sentence 2 removed so that monitoring concept is sound.</p>	NO CHANGE

MIN5	11706891	RC318 , Stewart Patience, Anglian Water Services Ltd	Object. LP unsound as Policy MIN5 not effective. Site allocated under MIN5 is located where Lincolnshire Limestone (a primary aquifer) is outcropping/close to the surface and site may lie within wider catchment of one or more of AW's sources providing raw water for onward treatment and as a clean water supply. Policy MIN5 should include a requirement for a Hydrogeological Risk Assessment as part of any mineral extraction application submission to identify potential impacts to groundwater users and appropriate mitigation measures. Suggest amending MIN5 to include: 'Planning applications for the above site should include a Hydrogeological Risk Assessment to identify any potential impacts on groundwater during both the extraction and restoration of the site, and identify appropriate mitigation to address any impacts.'	NO CHANGE
MIN6	11706926	RC318 , Stewart Patience, Anglian Water Services Ltd	Object. LP unsound as Policy MIN6 not effective. Site allocated under MIN6 is located where Lincolnshire Limestone (a primary aquifer) is outcropping/close to the surface and site may lie within wider catchment of one or more of AW's sources providing raw water for onward treatment and as a clean water supply. Policy MIN5 should include a requirement for a Hydrogeological Risk Assessment as part of any mineral extraction application submission to identify potential impacts to groundwater users and appropriate mitigation measures. Suggest amending MIN6 to include: 'Planning applications for the above site should include a Hydrogeological Risk Assessment to identify any potential impacts on groundwater during both the extraction and restoration of the site, and identify appropriate mitigation to address any impacts.'	NO CHANGE
MIN6	11708993	RC230 , Ian Briggs, Landesign on behalf of Hanson	Plan not sound. Object to Policy MIN6 which only refers to Hooby Lane Quarry. Hanson's Ketton site also takes small proportion of its limestone for a separate building stone operation at Ketton works and provision should be made in LP to enable this operation to continue. Ketton Quarry should be added to list of sites in MIN6.	CONSIDER CHANGE
MIN7	11709015	RC230 , Ian Briggs, Landesign on behalf of Hanson	Plan not sound. Object to para 9.61 which states that: 'In addition, any increased demand can be accommodated by the (expanded) cement AoS area within the St George's Garden Community'. This sentence should only refer to the AoS in its totality. Hanson would be willing to assist with the St George's project but it should not be forced into working mineral reserves that affect its financial performance. The words in para 9.61 set out above should be deleted.	CONSIDER CHANGE - Amendment to para 9.61 as suggested.

MIN7	11709025	RC230 , Ian Briggs, Landesign on behalf of Hanson on behalf of Hanson	Plan not sound. Object to criteria c) and d) Policy MIN7 as wording does not safeguard the main processing facilities at Ketton Cement Works. The criteria do not follow the safeguarding wording as para 204e NPPF and exclude the works, i.e. the kilns and factory buildings, from safeguarding. Hanson also concerned over proposals to extend a conservation area to include the main works access to the site. The works must be properly protected from all forms of inappropriate development and designations. Policy MIN7 should be amended to provide safeguarding for whole of Ketton Cement Works and consideration given to imposing a safeguarding zone to the existing works, sidings and mineral AoS in accordance with boundaries suggested in para 9.97, i.e. 500m. A separate inset map for the works defining a safeguarded zone would assist in clarifying the plan and meeting NPPF safeguarding policy.	CONSIDER CHANGE - to policy and text
MIN10	11707007	RC318 , Stewart Patience, Anglian Water Services Ltd	LP not sound as not effective. Suggest para 9.98 amended to cross refer to Policy SD1 as this policy safeguards existing waste management sites including STWs from incompatible development and accompanying text sets out the distance at which a site specific assessment will be required. Suggest first sentence of para 9.98 amended to: Safeguarding of existing waste and minerals related development is set out in Policies SD1 and MIN7.	CONSIDER CHANGES
MIN10	201106221	RC180, Billy Lloyd, DLP Planning Ltd. On behalf of Hereward Homes	Hereward Homes (Greetham) Ltd: mostly in agreement with Policy MIN10 which, in relation to SGB, acknowledges that proposed development overrides any existing restoration requirements, but policy should be extended to include all restoration schemes rather than just being for the betterment of 1 development. This will ensure consistency and that the policy is positively prepared. Recommend criteria f) MIN10 reworded to: 'Where the site forms part of the Garden Community or other site allocated in this Plan, restoration of residual areas should reflect the desired outcomes of the approved masterplan or allocation.'	NO CHANGE
WST1	11703717	RC140 , Tim Smith, North Luffenham Parish Council	Plan not sound as anticipated increase in total waste arising runs counter to national focus on waste prevention which is at top of internationally accepted Waste Hierarchy. Policy WST1 should recognise waste prevention focus and be flexible to avoid over-provision of waste treatment facilities.	NO CHANGE Waste arising's have been identified in accordance with NPPG, please refer to the WNA for further detail.
WST1	11706947	RC318 , Stewart Patience, Anglian Water Services Ltd	Object to Policy WST1 which should be worded to make it clear that development of new and existing STWs would be considered under Policy WST2 and other relevant LP policies. Suggest including in Policy WST1: 'Sewage Treatment Works: proposals relating to existing, new or extended sewage treatment works are supported in principle in Rutland subject to addressing the development criteria in Policy WST2.'	CONSIDER CHANGE - to Policy for clarification

WST1	11707319	RC271 , Marilyn Clayton	Plan not legally compliant or sound as there is a requirement in the plan to provide 2 civic amenity sites for each county so Cottesmore and North Luffenham should be operative.	NO CHANGE
WST2	11703720	RC140 , Tim Smith, North Luffenham Parish Council	Plan not sound. NLPC is broadly supportive of well-planned and appropriately located waste developments but wording of Policy WST2 implies some adverse environmental impacts are acceptable. Policy WST2 should be reworded to reflect no adverse impacts in relation to factors set out in criteria e) are acceptable.	NO CHANGE
WST2	11706960	RC318 , Stewart Patience, Anglian Water Services Ltd	Policy WST2 is not sufficiently positive in enabling continued operation and development of existing water recycling centres to enable AW to fulfil statutory obligations under Water Industry Act 1991. Suggested rewording of criteria g) WST2 to: Proposals for new sewage treatment capacity or proposals required for operational efficiency, whether on extensions to existing sewage treatment works (STWs) or elsewhere (with such proposals including the improvement or extension of existing STWs, new STWs, provision of supporting infrastructure including renewable energy or the co-location of STWs with other waste management facilities, will be supported in principle particularly where the increased capacity is required to support sustainable development identified in the Local Plan. Proposals for such development must demonstrate that operations would not have unacceptable impacts in accordance with other policies in this plan and the scale of development reflects the role of the location with respect to the settlement hierarchy.'	CONSIDER CHANGE - to Policy for clarification
WST2	11709035	RC263 , Nicola Farr, Environment Agency	LP needs to clarify relevance of wastewater treatment facilities in policies and text. WST2 includes specific criteria g) on sewage treatment works implying that other sections may also apply. On criteria g) WST2 extensions or new plants other than to support sustainable development may be required and so question the justification for this criterion.	CONSIDER CHANGE - to Policy for clarification
WST3	11707027	RC318 , Stewart Patience, Anglian Water Services Ltd	Object to Policy WST3 as 2 sites allocated for preliminary waste treatment facilities are located in area where Lincolnshire Limestone (a primary aquifer) is outcropping/close to the surface and it is important to ensure that there is no leaching of any contaminants into the ground. Suggested additional wording to Policy WST3 after WST-3.2 Greetham, Wood Lane: Planning applications for the above sites should include a Hydrogeological Risk Assessment to identify any potential impacts on groundwater from the proposed waste management use(s) and identify appropriate mitigation to address any impacts.'	NO CHANGE issue covered by Policy WST2 (e) and paragraph 9.90.

HRA, EN9	11702753	RC140 , Tim Smith, North Luffenham Parish Council	HRA should be reworked to identify all functional habitat associated with RW and look at actual use made by waterfowl of the reservoir margins. HRA needs to identify measures needed to reduce risk of disturbance associated with SGB redevelopment.	NO CHANGE - HRA meets Requirements
HRA, EN9	11696440	RC258 , Les Allen	Plan not positively prepared as HRA fails to consider impact of long term developments (SGB and Edith Weston Officers' Mess) on stability of wildlife reserves at Rutland Water.	NO CHANGE - HRA meets Requirements
HRA	201106194	RC329 , Tim Collins	The HRA needs to be reworked; this should include survey work to identify all functional habitat associated with the reservoir and to look at the actual use made by waterfowl of the reservoir margins. It also needs to identify the measures needed to reduce disturbance associated with the St. George's Barracks redevelopment and these measures need to be translated in to clear policy commitments within the Local Plan. The HRA needs to show that the attributes of the Rutland Water Compensation Scheme site are aligned with the conservation features of the SPA. If this is not the case this site should be evaluated separately	specialist advise sought
IMP1	20110210	RC122 , Josh Plant, Gladman Developments	Gladman agree with inclusion of a review mechanism where the delivery and monitoring information highlights that the Local Plan strategy is not been achieved or the needs of the County are not being met	SUPPORT WELCOMED
IMP1	11705077	RC174 , Anna Bath	<p>The Authority Monitoring Report is almost a year behind and 2019/20 not yet published. If monitoring is meant to be more than just an exercise, the evidence of this report would have been useful in the making and benchmarking of this plan. It would also provide this plan with more up to date figures. Housing figures will be 3 years old when plan is at Examination.</p> <p>The housing trajectory that is referred to has not been even given a table number</p>	<p>CONSIDER CHANGE TO :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Define "continuous monitoring" – as annual as this reflects publication of AMR and text included in paragraph 10.11 • add Figure number to the Housing trajectory table
IMP1	201106167	RC226, Guy Longley, Pegasus group on behalf of Davidsons Developments Limited.	Five year supply should be based on the 160 dwelling annual requirement and not the minimum figure of 130 dwellings a year. Policy IMP1 and Housing trajectory should therefore be amended to refer to the monitoring of 5-year land supply against the housing requirement of 160 dwellings a year. The suggestion of a phased approach to housing delivery is not justified and is not consistent with the NPPF's objective of significantly boosting the supply of housing. The proposed stepped approach is not explicitly set out in the proposed strategic housing policies and is not sufficiently justified. The Plan currently only includes a housing trajectory in graph form. For clarity, a spreadsheet should be included in	NO CHANGE

IMP1	201106177	RC335 , Guy Longley , Pegasus group on behalf of Vistry	<p>Five year supply should be based on the 160 dwelling annual requirement and not the minimum figure of 130 dwellings a year. Policy IMP1 and Housing trajectory should therefore be amended to refer to the monitoring of 5-year land supply against the housing requirement of 160 dwellings a year.</p> <p>The suggestion of a phased approach to housing delivery is not justified and is not consistent with the NPPF's objective of significantly boosting the supply of housing.</p> <p>The proposed stepped approach is not explicitly set out in the proposed strategic housing policies and is not sufficiently justified.</p> <p>The Plan currently only includes a housing trajectory in graph form. For clarity, a spreadsheet should be included in</p>	NO CHANGE
IMP2	20100304	RC51 , Sally Harnett, Ashwell Parish Council	Question how the Local plan will be effective in light of the Planning white Paper.	NO CHANGE
IMP2	11705210	RC174 , Anna Bath	Given the inclusion of a new sustainable town in H2 and H3, there should be specific reference to this site in reviewing this plan, as a failure of the MOD to leave their site would potentially leave RCC with a 5 years deficit in housing.	NO CHANGE
Monitoring	11709006	RC211 , Ian Fletcher	<p>Chapter 10 is confused and inadequate. There should be clarity over the definition of: Implementation, Monitoring, Targets, Monitoring Framework, and a restructure as to the purpose of this chapter and its aims.</p> <p>A plan is only as good as its results and the work that has gone into this plan deserved better monitoring and reviewing to ensure the outcomes are achieved.</p>	NOTED - consider adding definitions of terminology used
Monitoring Framework	11548584	RC2 , Helen Duckering, Langham Parish Council	Is there sufficient clarity for part 2 of the policy H7 in Monitoring Framework regarding sites of 100 + houses?	CONSIDER CHANGE - AGREE REQUIRES CLARIFICATION
Monitoring Framework	11548587	RC2 , Helen Duckering, Langham Parish Council	There is no section or policy for mobile homes and caravans – policy E8 does not deal with residential caravans	NO CHANGE Proposals for residential caravans will be treated the same as proposals for new houses. SEE RESPOSE to POLICY E8
Monitoring Framework	11645365	RC55 , Tess Nelson, Harborough District Council	Harborough District Council welcome the recognition that there may be some strategic cross-boundary issues which are significant enough to trigger the need for a review of this plan.	SUPPORT WELCOMED

Monitoring Framework	11692768	RC95 , Kerry Nimmons, Cottesmore Parish Council	It is neither sound nor justified to identify a PLD for Harrier Close, without a clear justification for doing so - what is the planning rationale for identifying a location previously viewed as not sustainable by, amongst others, an independent Inspector at an appeal. This is also contrary to the Cottesmore Neighbourhood Plan. Then compounding the position by not providing any guiding development principles, as has been done with other allocated sites.	NO CHANGE
Monitoring, Housing Trajectory	201106253	RC264 , Lydia Voyias, Savills on behalf of Manor Oak Homes	<p>The Local Plan should not plan for a stepped trajectory, instead it should plan to deliver a minimum of 130 dwellings per year across the plan period.</p> <p>To assist in boosting the supply in the short term, Land to the south Meadow Lane and north of Belmesthorpe Road, Ryhall should be allocated for residential development (74 dwellings) which can be delivered early within the plan period (2021/22)</p>	NO CHANGE See Response to Policy H1
Whole Plan	11548489	RC3 , Nick Wainwright	Preparation of the Local Plan has been flawed from the outset as inputs manipulated and do not represent the views of the population of Rutland whose responses have been ignored. Consultation should be undertaken properly, accurately recorded and conclusions based on results of consultation.	NO CHANGE
Whole Plan	11548606	RC2 , Helen Duckering, Langham Parish Council	Overall document very well written and reflects a more holistic approach to planning than in the past, which is to be welcomed. Concerns twofold: 1. Villages such as Langham at risk of being spoiled for sake of development -wording now 'we will allow development as long as' and developers no longer have to justify their plans leading to bias in favour of developers and PCs unqualified to scrutinise inappropriate applications in rural settings. 2. Lack of clarity over gypsy and traveller accommodation - removal of paras 5.78/5.79 from 2017 RLP re: assessing applications as for new dwellings. Existing sites should be expanded only within existing boundaries. Number of errata described.	ERRATA NOTED. NPPF requires policies to be positively prepared.
Whole Plan	11557707	RC10 , Susan Seed,	LP has been pushed through with hardly any consultation or recognition from the people of Rutland. Lots of complaints about this development (SGB?) and how it would harm the beauty of the County but complaints not documented. Proper sounding from people of Rutland and consultation to be less rushed.	NO CHANGE
Whole Plan	11558401	RC11 , Nick Bryant	Whole Plan legally compliant and sound. No modifications sought.	SUPPORT WELCOMED
Whole Plan	11585346	RC21 , June Titterton-Fox	Whole Plan legally compliant and sound. No modifications sought.	SUPPORT WELCOMED
Whole Plan	11588072	RC23 , Alison Last	Whole Plan legally compliant and sound. No modifications sought. . Thoroughly prepared with evidence of justification.	SUPPORT WELCOMED

Whole Plan	20091101	RC24 , Peter Hitchcox	It seems to be a fair and measured document which largely has followed the wishes of the public and stakeholders through its consultation process.	SUPPORT WELCOMED
Whole Plan	20091701	RC27 , Christopher Johnson, National Grid	We have reviewed the above document and can confirm that National Grid has no comments to make in response to this consultation.	SUPPORT WELCOMED
Whole Plan	11610568	RC33 , John Mawby	Oakham is a sad and tired county town with no Waitrose and too many charity shops. No more housing required in Uppingham or in the villages.	NO CHANGE
Whole Plan	11610762	RC34 , Carl Smith, Casterton College Rutland	Whole plan legally compliant and sound. No modifications sought.	SUPPORT WELCOMED
Whole Plan	11615936	RC39 , Michael Knight	Plan not legally compliant as due consideration not given to all parties; not positively prepared as stakeholders with negative viewpoint ignored; a new town (SGB) would not be in character with rest of Rutland; new housing should be proportionate and match its environment. Number of new houses reduced by 25%.	NO CHANGE
Whole Plan	11642684	RC54 , Susan Cliffe	Allocation of Quarry Farm to SKDC only brought about because of cross-boundary working regulations. Lack of consideration over impact on local services, employment prospects and traffic generation and used to justify SGB.	NO CHANGE
Whole Plan	11654681	RC58 , Ronald Sutton	Plan not shaped by early, proportionate and effective engagement between RCC and communities, noncompliance with Reg 18 and 19, failure to provide new SA and take account of Stamford North proposals. Structuring of evidence to justify SGB; reference to Empingham PC's representation on Policy SC2.	NO CHANGE
Whole Plan	11663389	RC63 , George Bretten	The resolution supporting the Pre-Submission Local Plan at Council on 10/02/20 is invalid as the Council were misled into believing that an agreement had been made with SKDC to allocate 650 houses at Quarry Farm for SKDC and that these could not be counted in the Rutland Local Plan thereby justifying allocation of SGB. Council were misled and should be given opportunity to reconsider the plan in light of this fact. LP should be reconsidered by RCC.	NO CHANGE - The distribution of housing supply at Stamford North was agreed between SKDC and RCC and through the SKDC Local Plan examination process.
Whole Plan	20101901	RC67 , Frank Brett	Plan not legally compliant as reliance on SGB and no account taken of representations made following 2 consultations undertaken in 2018. Number of dwellings increased from 500 to 1000 despite objections to 500. Entire Plan should be revisited with either 500 houses at SGB or site removed completely.	NO CHANGE

Whole Plan	11676300	RC71 , Sarah Ayling, Ketton Parish Council	Plan legally compliant and Duty to Co-operate has been demonstrated. Plan is sound and will provide a useful reference and tool in making effective planning recommendations and decisions. Significance of SGB recognised, including traffic implications for Ketton, but SGB could also bring many benefits to the Ketton and wider community.	SUPPORT WELCOMED
Whole Plan	11639789	RC74 , Mark Bush, Great Casterton Parish Council	Plan legally compliant and sound. It will safeguard the character and attractiveness of Rutland villages while meeting development needs. Note that Quarry Farm (H4) has potential to affect Great Casterton but rightly emphasises need for proper link road between Ryhall Road and A1/A606 junction.	SUPPORT WELCOMED
Whole Plan	11663780	RC187 , Susan Painter	Plan not sound or legally compliant as not developed with partners and stakeholders. Variety of vision statements not subject to consultation (Empingham PC no recollection of involvement with RCC's vision statement). 1700 objections to SGB ignored. Meaningful consultation over new town for Rutland required with new Reg 18 Plan and SA.	NO CHANGE
Whole Plan	11687597	RC83 , Louise Hewitt-Wall	Plan not legally compliant or sound as with 25% buffer provides more housing than government's assessed needs; affordable housing would be concentrated at SGB; SGB would be car dependent contrary to sustainable development and climate change; 20 year building site will affect health and well-being of residents, and; lack of services for SGB residents. 650 dwellings at Quarry Farm should be part of RCC's housing allocation. Revert to 2017 spatial strategy based on development in 2 towns and larger villages, and reduce SGB to 350 dwellings.	NO CHANGE
Whole Plan	11604483	RC85 , Robert Guthrie	Whole Plan legally compliant and sound. No modifications sought.	SUPPORT WELCOMED
Whole Plan	20102931	RC103 , Frances Cunningham , Network Rail	Generally supportive of Plan although improvement sought regarding recognition of need to manage impacts of new developments on NR's level crossings. New policy sought.	SUPPORT WELCOMED / NO CHANGE
Whole Plan	11696451	RC109, Robert G, Catmose Park Rd Residents Association	Catmose Park Road Residents' Association (16 members): Whole Plan legally compliant and sound. No modifications sought.	SUPPORT WELCOMED
Whole Plan	11697128	RC116 , Simon Moore	Plan not legally compliant or sound. Concern representation form is aimed at putting people off giving feedback. Raise concern over impact of development <i>SGB (?)</i> on infrastructure and traffic and pollution in Empingham village.	NO CHANGE

Whole Plan	11701966	RC135 , Michael Reid	Plan not legally compliant or sound as based on large expansion of Rutland's population without necessary consultation or consideration of alternatives such as parkland. To increase population by 7500 - 10,000 will destroy the uniqueness of Rutland. Plan should be consistent with plans of previous councils.	NO CHANGE
Whole Plan	11691371	RC136 , Sara Buck	Plan not legally compliant or sound as lack of local support for SGB and plan should be rethought. SGB will impact on local services and cause severe traffic problems in Empingham. None of inhabitants of Empingham have been consulted on proposals for SGB.	NO CHANGE
Whole Plan	11702171	RC139 , Juliet Reid	Plan not legally compliant or sound as housing figures out of date and Rutland can provide quota of housing without extra housing at SGB. Lack of parking and local services exacerbated by SGB. SGB would be suitable for woodland to improve biodiversity and act as attraction to visitors to Rutland Water.	NO CHANGE
Whole Plan	11703128	RC150 , Gill Boston	Plan not sound as unsustainable as relies on ED1/04 SGB (E1) as employment site and has not been positively prepared due to pre-determination when MOU signed. SGB should be removed from Plan	NO CHANGE
Whole Plan	11703316	RC98 , Janice Patient	Plan well written and researched and mostly legally compliant except for: Plan has unfortunately come to its final stages during pandemic and economic uncertainty. It should be paused as likely to be mass unemployment affecting employment land and public transport. Homeworking will become popular and increased use of gardens leading to a demand for lower density housing.	SUPPORT WELCOMED/NO CHANGE
Whole Plan	11703674	RC140 , Tim Smith, North Luffenham Parish Council	Plan not legally compliant as, following 2018 consultation, commitment by RCC to undertake significant work on the masterplan for SGB, such as additional TAs, how jobs will be brought about and new pollution analysis. Consultation on Reg19 Plan should be delayed as incomplete evidence base to justify SGB and Reg18 Plan resubmitted once evidence analysed to allow an informed discussion on impact of SGB.	CONSIDER CHANGE to text to set out evidence required to support planning application for St George's in same way as policies H1.1 - H1.18 have.
Whole Plan	11703764	RC153 , Michael Anker	Plan not sound or legally compliant as lack of local support (95%) for scale of SGB in 2018 consultation and views ignored in developing current LP. Reduce SGB to 350-500 dwellings and revert to 2017 Local Plan.	NO CHANGE
Whole Plan	20110409	RC156 , Victor Bacon, South Luffenham Parish Council	Plan unsound as at Reg 18 stage over 1500 objections to size of SGB made and these have been ignored. Plan, including the 25% buffer, provides for far more houses than assessed housing needs and SGB would be car dependent contrary to sustainable development principles. TAs flawed.	NO CHANGE

Whole Plan	11703826	RC153 , Michael Anker	Plan not legally compliant or sound as supporting documents not analysed further to check their accuracy. Housing figures up to 200 dpa used to justify SGB. SGB will set a precedence for approving part/all of Woolfox. Strategy for 300 homes at SGB and growth in Oakham and Uppingham most appropriate. Plan does not benefit the area economically or environmentally. Revert back to 2017 Local Plan.	NO CHANGE
Whole Plan	11703842	RC153 , Michael Anker	Plan to include SGB pre-empted by signing of MOU. Doubt over ownership of mineral rights over parts of SGB site and if rights are not wholly owned then complete plan is unsound.	NO CHANGE
Whole Plan	11703852	RC160 , Norman Milne	Plan legally compliant but not sound. Copy of response to 2018 consultation from Concerned Residents of Edith Weston (CREW) (Sept 2018) included with representation. This document did not appear with responses at the time and certain matters have been excluded from original response to the addition of SGB to the LP which is neither lawful nor fair. RCC continued to not listen to views of local community in drawing up Reg 19 Plan. Lack of effective and real engagement with 1500 responses summarised in a table, the majority of which had 'no action' written beside them. Inspector must be shown every response to Reg 19 Plan so public can be assured their voice has been heard.	NO CHANGE
Whole Plan	11703811	RC227 , Jacqueline MacLeod	Plan not legally compliant or sound as no formal consultation carried out on new LP. RCC should have carried out a full consultation on completely changed 2018 LP. SGB not justified or viable; 650 dwellings gifted to SKDC should be returned to RCC; reasonable alternatives for SGB not considered, and; 95% local response against SGB. Revert to 2017 LP with 350 houses at SGB.	NO CHANGE
Whole Plan	11703877	RC268 , Mark MacLeod	Plan not legally compliant or sound as no formal consultation carried out on new LP. RCC should have carried out a full consultation on completely changed 2018 LP. SGB not justified or viable; 650 dwellings gifted to SKDC should be returned to RCC; reasonable alternatives for SGB not considered, and; 95% local response against SGB. Revert to 2017 LP with 350 houses at SGB.	NO CHANGE
Whole Plan	11702401	RC272 , Michael Airey	Plan not legally compliant or sound as lack of fully integrated Reg 19 Plan following on from 2017 Plan.	NO CHANGE
Whole Plan	11704583	RC173 , Anthony Redmayne, Thorpe by Water Parish Meeting	Plan legally compliant and sound. Residents appreciative that area for development of Thorpe has not been expanded thus preserving its character as a small rural hamlet. No modifications sought.	SUPPORT WELCOMED

Whole Plan	11703822	RC198 , Dale Hemming-Tayler	Plan not legally compliant or sound as lack of fully integrated Reg 19 Plan following on from 2017 Plan. Objections to 2018 consultation to include SGB totally ignored and ignorance over spatial strategy and sustainability. Population projections flawed and housing needs do not include 650 units at Quarry Farm which should be returned to RCC. Lack of consideration given to service and infrastructure requirements as a result of the plan, or HGV traffic. Lack of consultation with Government departments. Revise development needs and calculate logistical requirements and traffic implications of the plan.	NO CHANGE
Whole Plan	11706218	RC254 , Catherine Hemming-Tayler	Plan not legally compliant or sound as lack of fully integrated Reg 19 Plan following on from 2017 Plan. Objections to 2018 consultation to include SGB totally ignored and ignorance over spatial strategy and sustainability. Population projections flawed and housing needs do not include 650 units at Quarry Farm which should be returned to RCC. Lack of consideration given to service and infrastructure requirements as a result of the plan, or HGV traffic. Lack of consultation with Government departments. Revise development needs and calculate logistical requirements and traffic implications of the plan.	NO CHANGE
Whole Plan	11706230	RC178 , Bob Sewell, North Luffenham Village Trust	Plan not legally compliant as NLVT retained mineral rights within SGB as did other landowners when land compulsory purchased by MOD. SGB cannot take place without purchase of retained mineral rights so the proposal within the LP is illegal. Plan not sound as cannot be effective as mineral rights cannot be developed on. Lack of community support totally ignored and plan should revert to 2017 version.	NO CHANGE
Whole Plan	11706211	RC199 , Michael Morgan	Plan not sound as over-reliance on, and scale of, SGB will change the character of Rutland without sufficient regard to infrastructure, transport, employment or socio-economic considerations. Garden Towns are a flawed concept that result in car dependency. SGB contrary to priorities set out in spatial portrait (Chapter 2) such as employment opportunities, public transport, affordable housing and highway safety. Viability in doubt due to Covid19. Lack of alternative plan if SGB unable to deliver.	NO CHANGE
Whole plan	20110513	RC215 , George Renner	Plan not sound as evidence base does not support it. Plan pre-determined and evidence base fitted around it including gifting of 650 dwellings to SKDC. Impact of SGB on established Service Centres ignored. Current plan not subject to consultation at Reg 18 stage so comment on overall spatial strategy denied.	NO CHANGE

Whole Plan	20110528	RC208 , William Cross	Plan not legally compliant or sound as no formal consultation carried out on new LP and current consultation limited in nature of possible responses. Lack of engagement with local residents over current plan; full costs and environmental implications have not been disclosed or taken into account; no justification for housing figures given gifting of 600 homes to SKDC, and; SGB not sustainable. A full environmental and sustainability impact study should be instigated.	NO CHANGE
Whole Plan	20110530	RC220 , Gale Waller	The Plan is not legally compliant because there was no valid Statement of Community Involvement (it should have been reviewed in 2019) when the Council approved Regulation 19 consultation in February 2020 to commence in March 2020. Whilst this did not happen till later in the year due to the disruption to Council activity as a result of Covid and the lockdown nevertheless the Local Plan was not produced lawfully. Cabinet approved a new Statement of Community Involvement in August 2020 but this document was written with Covid in mind and dealt with issues such as the inability to have public meetings. It was not a complete review which could deal with both a covid and non-covid environment. Further, it excluded a key consultation group, namely The Parish Council Forum which clearly limited the ability of parish councils to represent their parishes in planning policy matters. The inclusion or scope of the SGB site has not evolved as a result of public engagement. The 2017 consultation on the Local Plan was widely supported by Rutland residents and provided sufficient housing to meet RCC's assessed housing need. It described a settlement hierarchy whereby the majority of housing and employment land would be focussed on the two towns in Rutland (largely to support the viability of the town centres) with major service centres (defined by having a school and a shop) also seeing development and in-fill small scale development within village envelopes making up the rest of the housing requirement. The 2017 version of the Local Plan provided for 127 homes per year (SHA requirement). Should revert to the 2017 draft plan.	NO CHANGE
Whole Plan	20110544	RC232 , Jon Bradburn, Montagu Evans on behalf of Secretary of State for Defence	DIO: overall the Plan is sound and the due diligence and investigation that the Council has undertaken in preparing the strategy is robust and accords with national policy.	SUPPORT WELCOMED

Whole Plan	11707212	RC233 , Jonathan Griffin	Plan legally compliant but not sound. Focussed consultation on SGB in August 2018 introduced a fundamental shift in the proposed spatial strategy and should be treated as a new plan with accompanying SA. Housing figures manipulated (gifting of Quarry Farm to SKDC) to justify SGB. Plan not shaped by early, proportionate and effective engagement between plan makers and communities as required by NPPF.	NO CHANGE
Whole Plan	11707165	RC257 , Lelia O'Connell	Plan legally compliant but not sound. Focussed consultation on SGB in August 2018 introduced a fundamental shift in the proposed spatial strategy and should be treated as a new plan with accompanying SA. Housing figures manipulated (gifting of Quarry Farm to SKDC) to justify SGB. Plan not shaped by early, proportionate and effective engagement between plan makers and communities as required by NPPF.	NO CHANGE
Whole Plan	20110555	RC192 , Norman Milne, Fight 4 Rutland Ltd	Plan not legally compliant as evidence to substantiate viability of Reg 19 Plan is not sufficiently robust and cannot be relied upon. Viability Study by HDH critically reviewed by Highgate Land and Development.	NO CHANGE
Whole Plan	11707638	RC255 , Kenneth Bool	Plan not legally compliant or sound as 650 dwellings at Quarry Farm gifted to SKDC to justify SGB. SGB not viable without HIF grant and no consideration given to alternative uses for SGB to meet government's climate change agenda. Further investigation into Rutland's housing needs and a full environmental and sustainability impact study.	NO CHANGE
Whole Plan	11707517	RC236 , Jo Spiegl	Plan not legally compliant or sound as MoU signed and masterplan produced without consultation with local community. No justification for size of SGB and it will detract from other towns; impact on local road network; no consideration to effect of mineral extraction on desirability of site; HIF grant too small, and; 650 houses should be returned to RCC. Revert to 2017 plan.	NO CHANGE
Whole Plan	11611179	RC330 , Tracey Barsby	Plan not legally compliant or sound as views of local residents ignored, and in some cases not logged. Lack of studies on infrastructure requirements, impacts on villages, environment or employment made available. 650 houses should not have been gifted to SKDC and this needs to be justified. SGB is a greenfield site and is enjoyed by residents. SGB would become a commuter town which is car dependent contrary to climate change. Reduce to 350 houses and allow smaller developments elsewhere.	NO CHANGE

Whole Plan	11708958	RC189 , Caroline Canham	Plan not legally compliant or sound as new Reg 18 Plan should have been produced to include SGB. Responses to 2018 consultation largely ignored and there was not a SA alongside the Reg 19 Plan. Pandemic has affected consultation process and, while commending RCC on halting consultation, consultation still took place as soon as August - October. A new Reg 18 Plan should be produced. Questions over population projections and housing figures which do not include Quarry Farm. Population projections should be revised to more accurately reflect proposed scale of new build in LP so a shortfall in provision of key services does not take place.	NO CHANGE
Whole Plan	20110640	RC212 , Paul Boggust, Edith Weston Parish Council	The Whole Plan does not meet the tests of soundness or legal compliance - demonstrated in separate document which considered issues relating to SA, viability and deliverability and to community engagement in the process. This concludes that the plan is unsound. Many of these issues relate to the allocations at SGB and the Officer's Mess. Given the centrality of the SGB allocation to the RLPR the plan as a whole it is considered to be is unsound.	NO CHANGE
Whole Plan	11709223	RC167 , Alan Bray	Plan not legally compliant or sound as (allocated housing) (Assume refers to H1.2 (land off Uppingham Road, Oakham)) not on the search when property on Spinney Hill site purchased. Site also greenfield.	NO CHANGE
Whole Plan	11709190	RC270 , Martin Shewry	Plan not sound as local opinion on scale of development SGB ignored by RCC. Need for SGB justified by gifting 500 houses to SKDC and has resulted in removal of reasonable infill plans in other villages.	NO CHANGE
Whole Plan	11709200	RC248 , Rosemary Harris	Plan not legally compliant or sound as Draft Local Plan did not include SGB. A new LP should be prepared once new government legislation published.	NO CHANGE
Whole Plan	11709309	RC239 , Julie Gray	Plan not legally compliant or sound as fails to address Climate Change Act 2008. Plan not consistent with government's sustainable development goals and contrary to Chapter 14 NPPF that requires plan to take a proactive approach to mitigating and adapting to climate change and to ensure policies in line with objectives of 2008 Act. Chapter 7 of Local Plan should be revisited and policies evaluated and rewritten to be compliant with 2008 Act and NPPF.	NO CHANGE Climate change mitigation and adaptation measures are embedded in a number of LP Policies including SD1, SD7, H2, H3, EN4, EN8, SC2 and WST2.
Whole Plan	11709286	RC224 , Gareth Jones	Plan legally compliant but not sound as objections to SGB ignored in production of Reg 19 Plan. Plan has not been positively prepared as SGB would not be sustainable and is not driven by local needs. SGB could set a precedent that could see Cottesmore and Woolfox also developed. A proper consultation should take place after the pandemic with SGB reduced to 500 houses with employment opportunities and better transport links.	NO CHANGE

Whole Plan	11709307	RC225 , Georgina Gray	Plan legally compliant but not sound. Inspector found Uttlesford Local Plan, which included a garden village, unsound. Comparisons made between this and justification for SGB: Policies H2 and H3 must be more specific to ensure garden community principles will be met; date for vacating site must be agreed with MOD so that certainty in place for delivery of housing, including affordable housing; size of SGB reduced to 350 houses; SA did not include heritage impact assessment; lack of certainty over delivery of employment land; viability taking into account realistic infrastructure costs, including public transport costs.	NO CHANGE
Whole Plan	11709350	RC251 , Ian Taylor, Berrys on behalf of SOS Tech Holdings	Plan is legally compliant and sound and complies with the Duty to Co-operate.	SUPPORT WELCOMED
Whole Plan	11709447	RC170 , Amy Leverton	Plan not legally compliant as limited communication with neighbouring authorities and local input ignored. Not sound as consultation process flawed and no requirement for new houses or a new town. A new secondary school is needed instead. Traffic implications of SGB on Empingham which is a historic village.	NO CHANGE
Whole Plan	11709472	RC160 , Norman Milne	Plan legally compliant but not sound. Community engagement process flawed with difficulties using online forms during pandemic; viability dependent on HIF grant and assumptions made not sound; excess housing requirements bolstered by gifting of Quarry Farm to SKDC; Woolfox not allowed to feature in the plan; SGB poor location for affordable housing; flaws in TA; lack of consultation over vision; Duty to Co-operate has not included communication with Leicester; SGB non-sustainable; lack of employment opportunities; Edith Weston does not have capacity to serve SGB; loss of habitat; concern over quality of houses at SGB; lack of consideration of alternative uses for SGB; no assessment of impact on tourism or Rutland Water itself; site not brownfield; question over mineral rights; question over cost of energy supply to SGB. Revert back to Reg 18 Plan to allow community involvement over spatial strategy.	NO CHANGE
Whole Plan	11709465	RC121 , Leslie Wilson	Plan not legally compliant or sound. Plan not prepared on basis of housing need and lack of consideration given to Woolfox as compared to SGB. Unsubstantiated claims regarding benefits of SGB including employment opportunities and TA misleading. SGB would become car dependent contrary to Government's decarbonising agenda; would not solve housing problem; would impact on nature conservation importance of Rutland Water. SGB should be removed from the plan.	NO CHANGE

Whole Plan	11699407	RC279 , Malcolm Touchin, CPRE Rutland	Plan not legally compliant or sound as: inadequate community engagement regarding incorporation of SGB into spatial strategy; assessment of housing options flawed as growth options around Oakham and Uppingham ignored in favour of SGB; concentration of affordable housing at one site would constrain growth elsewhere; SA fails to meet regulations/directives; lack of co-operation with bordering authorities; plan lacks strategic vision in light of changes to environmental legislation and impact of pandemic. Suggested modifications set out in Policy specific responses.	NO CHANGE
Whole Plan	11709569	RC169 , Allan Arnott	Plan not legally compliant or sound. SGB not justified in terms of: housing needs, lack of consultation, viability as a greenfield site, environmental impact of mineral extraction, public transport or employment plans. Revert to 2017 Plan, conduct a full EA, review TA and provide sound economic assessment of job creation prospects.	NO CHANGE
Whole Plan	11709700	RC286 , Pamela Howarth	Plan not legally compliant or sound as illegally excluded Woolfox from plan and no justification for level of new housing proposed at SGB.	NO CHANGE
Whole Plan	20111810	RC87 , Christopher Payne	Plan unsound as after a preliminary consultation RCC promised there would be full consultation before Reg 19 put forward and this has not happened.	NO CHANGE
Whole Plan	20110401	RC151 , Ashley Poulton , Rutland Youth Council	Thank you Kerry for joining Rutland Youth Council meeting on 07/09/2020. Council members have discussed the new LP proposals and are happy with the plans that you put forward. RYC are able to support Rutland consultations from the start of development as this fits within their own remit as a group.	SUPPORT WELCOMED
Whole Plan	20110402	RC152 , John Herbert, Rutland Disabled Youth Forum & Youth Group/ care leavers	Ideas from the group include increased leisure provision, including dedicated provision for young people, and more affordable housing provision.	SUPPORT WELCOMED
Whole Plan	20110501	RC297 , Ruth Renner, Group Submission by a group of 12 senior citizens	Plan not legally compliant or sound as climate change not considered as central economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development. Policies in LP drawn up before SA carried out to support them. SA, HRA and Screening Report produced retrospectively so plan has not been shaped by early, proportionate and effective engagement as required by NPPF. Modifications should include return of 600+ houses gifted to SKDC, and for SGB: increased woodland cover and grassland maintained, and housing carbon neutral, truly affordable and sold freehold.	NO CHANGE SA and HRA have been developing alongside the plan throughout the 5 year plan making period.

Appendix 1: Strategic policies	11678958	RC76 , Damian Gorse	Traffic studies concerning St Georges underestimate sustainable transport use and are based from out of date data. No assessment into public transport to rural locations. Unsuitable location as St Georges becomes reliant on the motor vehicle which infrastructure incapable of coping. Needs a detailed traffic survey and to reduce the scale of the development.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation of site
Appendix 1: Strategic policies	11681057	RC77 , Adele McAlindon	Traffic studies concerning St Georges underestimate sustainable transport use and are based from out of date data. No assessment into public transport to rural locations. Unsuitable location as St Georges becomes reliant on the motor vehicle which infrastructure incapable of coping. Needs a detailed traffic survey and to reduce the scale of the development.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation of site
Appendix 2: List of replaced local plan policies	11709258	RC222 , Geraldine Bray	Farmers need to use their land to feed the nation not build houses. Concerns over building on greenfield land.	NO CHANGE – Evidence supports the allocation of sites within the Local Plan
Appendix 4	20102921	RC102 , Harold Dermott	Electric Vehicle charging points can be more sustainable and cost effective. Data used to calculate demand is out of date, the issue is of greater importance and implementation should be higher. Is essential the infrastructure for said charging points are installed with the development. The homeowners should then install EV chargers as they are eligible for government grants whereas developers are not and the charger for their specific car can be allocated instead of a general cheaper solution. The capacity of these chargers needs to be specified in the Local Plan. A 7 kW 230v AC single phase charger is the ideal charger for all home, workplace and public AC chargers (unless workplaces have their own fleets of EVs and specific requirements). For a 7kW 230v AC single phase charger, the infrastructure requirement in the Local Plan is a 32 amp, 230volt AC dedicated supply to each outlet required.	NO CHANGE - technical advice sought
Appendix 4	20110403	RC155 , Matthew Harmsworth, Persimmon Homes	Parking standards for residential development are excessive and promote a car dominated environment. Should be discouraging car dependency. Shared or communal spaces should be removed to encourage a balance of on and off street parking. This plan is contrary to NPPF para 110	NO CHANGE
Appendix 4	20110628	RC287 , Paul Belton , CARTER JONAS on behalf of Pigeon Capital Management Ltd.	Parking standards should be based upon the number of bedrooms per dwelling rather than the number of 'rooms' to prevent over allocation. Parking requirements for residential developments are excessive. Table 1 is also not clear. Neither the table nor the supporting text explain if the minimum parking standard requires both the shared/communal parking spaces and the allocated parking spaces to be provided for each dwelling.	NOTED - clarification to be sought from Transportation team

Appendix 6	20110626	RC287 , Paul Belton , CARTER JONAS on behalf of Pigeon Capital Management Ltd.	It is not clear whether population of a proposed residential development should be calculated in the context of the standards quoted. EN14 or its supporting text needs to confirm how the population of a development is to be calculated. The formula to be adopted also needs to be justified. Appendix 6 needs to set out the formula for calculating the quantum of sport and recreation facilities including playing pitches expected to be delivered by new development.	NO CHANGE
Deliverability	2011061953	RC321 , Sue Green, House Builders Federation	Viability is inseparable from the deliverability of development. Viability assessment should not be conducted on the margins of viability. This will be particularly important in the aftermath of uncertainties caused by the Covid-19 pandemic and Brexit. It is also noted that there has been no stakeholder involvement in viability assessment since 2017. The viability of individual developments and plan policies should be tested at the plan making stage. The Council's viability testing should assess the cumulative impact of affordable housing provision (Policy H9), policy compliant standards, Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and any other contributions so that there is sufficient incentive for a landowner to bring forward land for development. The Council's latest viability assessment is set out in the Local Plan Pre-submission Viability Update by HDH Planning & Development dated February 2020. If the resultant Benchmark Land Value (BLV) is lower than the market value at which land will trade, then the delivery of housing targets will not be met. Viability assessment is highly sensitive to changes in its inputs whereby an adjustment or an error in any one assumption can have a significant impact on the viability of development. There are concerns that some standard inputs are below industry norms as set out in the Harman Report.	NOTED. Viability study conclusions have been followed in preparing the plan, however a PARTIAL UPDATE VIABILITY ASSESSMENT is necessary in advance of examination
Legal Compliance	11707065	RC280 , Nick Davenport	The Council have not published a full revised Regulation 18 plan to show the full effects of SGB on the local plan before publishing this final Regulation 19 Plan. The viability study uses greenfield land values to assess SGB whereas it is a brownfield site so values will be different. Infrastructure require to support the development has not been fully costed. If brownfield charges for the built up areas are used then the scale of proposed housing is non-viable. (See representation on Viability).	NO CHANGE - Due process has been followed. Evidence including viability study is robust
Legal Compliance	11706663	RC186 , Catherine Davenport	The Council have not published a full revised Regulation 18 plan to show the full effects of SGB on the local plan before publishing this final Regulation 19 Plan. The viability study uses greenfield land values to assess SGB whereas it is a brownfield site so values will be different. Infrastructure require to support the development has not been fully costed. If brownfield charges for the built up areas are used then the scale of proposed housing is non-viable. (See representation on Viability).	NO CHANGE - Due process has been followed. Evidence including viability study is robust

Legal Compliance	20110643	RC212 , Paul Boggust, Edith Weston Parish Council	<p>Consultation considering the implications of potential development of St George's within the local plan 13th Aug – 24th Sept 2018</p> <p>We believe that the consultation undertaken in 2018 under Regulation 18 was flawed in that the Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Failed to comply with its statement of community involvement - Failed to consult properly on relevant documents - Has incomplete evidence to support a regulation 18 consultation - Is procedurally unfair 	NO CHANGE - Due process under Reg 18 and Reg 19 followed.
Legal Compliance	11709072	RC239 , Julie Gray	<p>Fundamental Error in the Document – Strategic Objectives</p> <p>Given this error that was discovered 4 weeks into the Regulation 19 consultation with regards to the muddled strategic objectives underneath over 50% of the Policies, I question that the representations received in the first 4 weeks of this consultation, might have been compromised by this. Given the enormity of the error I believe the plan should have been fully restarted with a correct plan published and people given the option to revisit their representation</p>	NO CHANGE - specific issue was corrected in an Addendum which was published and consultation extended to ensure 6 week consultation period.
Legal Compliance	11601012	RC325 , Susan Walling	<p>Authority (Annual) Monitoring Report</p> <p>The Rutland Local Plan cannot be found sound as there are legal issues concerning their Authority Monitoring report and information being withheld from the public.</p> <p>Furthermore, RCC are relying on this information, which relates to activities with prescribed bodies and duty to cooperate, in their Summary of Duty to Cooperate Engagement and emerging Statements of Common Ground (Jan 2020).</p>	NO CHANGE - AMR has been published each year.
Viability	201106231	RC162, Adam Murray, Andrew Granger & Co. Ltd. On behalf of Mr PJSR Hill and Pikerace Limited	<p>There are serious shortcomings in the approach taken to the assessment of the whole plan viability, including the assessment of the viability of the SGB allocation, as well as reasonable alternatives. A full Viability and Deliverability Assessment (Document WF5) has been prepared, with the key findings</p>	NO CHANGE Viability study is robust and Justified. Woolfox was not discounted solely on grounds of viability
Sustainability Appraisal	20110422	RC194 , David Maher, Barton Willmore on behalf of de Merke Estates	<p>The SA fails to meet the legal requirements of the SEA Regulations 2004.1) The May 2020 SA is seeking to redress the failures of previous 2015 and 2017 SAs by assessing "reasonable alternatives" - an exercise which is not undertaken in earlier SAs.2) The May 2020 SA does not explain why higher levels of development at Oakham, Uppingham and Local Centres could not be achieved – as per "Option 9" rather than selecting Option 7. 3) The May 2020 SA has been conceived to respond to (or "fix") a pre-determined spatial strategy and has thus not properly assessed "reasonable alternatives".</p>	NO CHANGE - SA process and conclusions are robust

Sustainability Appraisal	20110516	RC215 , George Renner	Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment – not fit for purpose and to be biased towards St George's and Woolfox. Fail in many respects to meet relevant directives and regulations. There is no statement defining the baseline that would obtain without the plan update. Like for like comparison for housing distribution options not possible and options assessment deficient	NO CHANGE - SA process and conclusions are robust
Sustainability Appraisal	20110545	RC267 , Mark Harris, Bidwells on Behalf of Taylor Wimpey	SA should be imbedded in the plan making process from the outset and inform decisions taken throughout the plan's development. In this regard, we have concerns that the consideration of alternative options, particularly for the spatial strategy, has not been properly assessed through the SA process. At no point in the revised SA work does a direct comparison between the strategy in the July 2017 draft of the Local Plan and the revised options appear to have been made. We believe it is a fundamental flaw as it means that the sustainability of a strategy which increases growth at the main centre has not been compared to the sustainability of a new settlement. Knowing that increasing growth at Oakham was the most sustainable option from the earlier work, it is an error not to assess this as a comparison to the revised options. On this basis, we do not believe that the approach to the sustainability appraisal meets the legislative requirement (Section 39 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004)) which requires the authority to prepare a plan with the objective of achieving sustainable development.	NO CHANGE - SA process and conclusions are robust
Sustainability Appraisal	20110553	RC192 , Norman Milne, Fight 4 Rutland Ltd	Plan not legally compliant as SA flawed. Critical review undertaken by The Planning and Environment Studio. Fight for Rutland consider the RCC Sustainability Appraisal provided in support of the Regulation 19 Local Plan to be flawed. There are significant shortcomings. Please see the attached Critical Review undertaken by The Planning and Environment Studio	NO CHANGE - SA process and conclusions are robust

Sustainability Appraisal	201106237	RC279 , Malcom Touchin , CPRE Rutland	The SA/SEA lacks up to date baseline data to determine the local needs and issues as the information provided is for 2015-2017 at the latest. There is no understanding of the pressures and needs of neighbouring authorities within the SA/SEA. The SA/SEA does not provide a transparent analysis of the assessment process or outcomes to reasonably identify which are the most sustainable strategic growth or policy options. The SA/SEA does not provide recommendations for reasonable alternatives to be proposed (e.g. alternative sites for a garden village such as on the edges of the main towns). The evidence required to conduct a SA/SEA and identify significant impacts is lacking, and this is confirmed within the disclaimer within the SA/SEA itself. The SA/SEA Technical Annex, does not provide a cumulative impact assessment to identify the most sustainable sites.	NO CHANGE - SA process and conclusions are robust
Sustainability Appraisal	201106238	RC279 , Malcom Touchin , CPRE Rutland	HRA not sufficiently robust or evidenced and recommendations of the HRA have not been included in policy. Require a recreational study of St George's Barracks to forecast numbers of additional visitors to the Natura 2000 area in order to determine likely future pressures (including the effects of urbanisation – littering). Water quality maintenance is a key factor for the Natura site. The Wood 2020 report states that WwTW (waste water treatment works) may not have enough headroom to support development (incl North Luffenham WwTW). Development at St George's Barracks would increase this demand significantly. Surface water run off could also cause negative impacts; policy needs to address this at a site level (H3). The Wood 2020 HRA makes proposals for improvements to policy wording (Appendix A) which have not been included in policy	NO CHANGE - HRA is robust and evidenced. Recommended changes have been included in policy and the HRA includes an AA

Sustainability Appraisal	201106251	RC193 , Charlotte Bailey, DLP Planning Limited on behalf of Larkfleet	Scoring methodology is not available for Site Appraisal Assessment.	CHANGE – Site appraisal methodology to be published. It should be noted that as a result of this representation, it has been identified that the quantitative scoring that formed part of an initial approach has not been removed from the site assessment documents, after the decision was taken not to utilise the quantitative scoring for the allocation of sites, but rather a qualitative assessment approach as identified at paragraph 2.11 of the Methodology for Assessing Potential Sites Update December 2019. Site Allocations Assessment therefore should be updated with the removal of reference to the previous scoring approach. It should be reiterated that the quantitative scoring was not used in assessing the most appropriate sites for allocation, this was done through a qualitative assessment as identified in the published methodology.
Sustainability Appraisal	201106254	RC292 , Paul Browne	Objection based on the consideration of the factors identified in the methodology for the site assessment and criteria used as contained in the Rutland Local Plan (hereafter referred to as “the Plan”) Sustainability Appraisal Technical Annex. It is understood that these factors are generally understood to normally include two steps in respect of each considered site. Firstly, “constraints” and secondly “opportunities” (or possible mitigation).	CHANGE – Site appraisal methodology to be published. It should be noted that as a result of this representation, it has been identified that the quantitative scoring that formed part of an initial approach has not been removed from the site assessment documents, after the decision was taken not to utilise the quantitative scoring for the allocation of sites, but rather a qualitative assessment approach as identified at paragraph 2.11 of the Methodology for Assessing Potential Sites Update December 2019. Site Allocations Assessment therefore should be updated with the removal of reference to the previous scoring approach. It should be reiterated that the quantitative scoring was not used in assessing the most appropriate sites for allocation, this was done through a qualitative assessment as identified in the published methodology.NO CHANGE - The discussion of each constraint in the tabular form is considered helpful in organising the significant amount of information identified for each site and shall remain as it is for consistency purposes.NO CHANGE - The discussion of each constraint in the tabular form is considered helpful in organising the significant amount of information identified for each site and shall remain as it is for consistency purposes.

Sustainability Appraisal	201106156	RC207, Billy Lloyd, DLP Planning Ltd. On behalf of Bowbridge Land Limited	The Site Appraisal Assessment Report Appendices 14.01.20, provides an assessment of the proposed allocations using the RAG rating and provides a total score for each of the sites. Whilst the Sustainability Appraisal Report Technical Annex sets out the RAG evaluation process, the methodology does not set out the scoring criteria and how the scores identified within the Site Appraisal Assessment have been arrived at. On this basis, the Sustainability Appraisal is incomplete and ineffective as it is not possible to calculate an accurate scoring assessment of alternative sites being promoted as the scoring methodology is unavailable. There are also a number of incidences where the assessment relied upon by the Council is demonstrably wrong as set out in our accompanying representations.	CHANGE – Site appraisal methodology to be published. It should be noted that as a result of this representation, it has been identified that the quantitative scoring that formed part of an initial approach has not been removed from the site assessment documents, after the decision was taken not to utilise the quantitative scoring for the allocation of sites, but rather a qualitative assessment approach as identified at paragraph 2.11 of the Methodology for Assessing Potential Sites Update December 2019. Site Allocations Assessment therefore should be updated with the removal of reference to the previous scoring approach. It should be reiterated that the quantitative scoring was not used in assessing the most appropriate sites for allocation, this was done through a qualitative assessment as identified in the published methodology. NO CHANGE - The discussion of each constraint in the tabular form is considered helpful in organising the significant amount of information identified for each site and shall remain as it is for consistency purposes. NO CHANGE - The discussion of each constraint in the tabular form is considered helpful in organising the significant amount of information identified for each site and shall remain as it is for consistency purposes.
Sustainability Appraisal	201106206	RC180, Billy Lloyd, DLP Planning Ltd. On behalf of Hereward Homes	Scoring methodology is not available for Site Appraisal Assessment.	CONSIDER CHANGE – Site appraisal methodology to be published. It should be noted that as a result of this review of the scoring, it has been identified that the scoring has not been updated to include all criteria, after the decision was taken not to utilise the quantitative scoring for the allocation of sites, but rather a qualitative assessment approach was taken, as identified at paragraph 2.11 of the Methodology for Assessing Potential Sites Update December 2019. Site Allocations Assessment therefore should be updated with the correct scores including the full range of criteria, but reiterated that the quantitative scoring was not used in assessing the most appropriate sites for allocation, this was done through a qualitative assessment as identified in the published methodology.

Sustainability Appraisal	201106232	RC162, Adam Murray, Andrew Granger & Co. Ltd. On behalf of Mr PJSR Hill and Pikerace Limited	There are serious shortcomings in the approach taken to the assessment of the plan including the assessment of reasonable alternatives. In particular, the assessment of the alternative scheme at Woolfox was seriously flawed. There are a number of significant procedural and legal deficiencies with the current Regulation 19 SA which has resulted in a flawed process for the selection, assessment and rejection of a new community scale development at Woolfox. The assessment of the different spatial strategy options by the SA has revealed that the substitution of SGB with Woolfox creates a more sustainable spatial strategy (Option 8) than the preferred Option 7. This demonstrates that the process for the assessment, selection and rejection of reasonable alternatives for a new settlement in Rutland was flawed, unsound and in breach of The SEA Regulations. It is clear that SGB does not constitute a reasonable alternative for the delivery of a strategic scale new community in Rutland. It is also clear that Woolfox is both deliverable and viable and represents the only reasonable alternative for a new community with the Rutland Local Plan.	NO CHANGE to spatial strategy proposed.
Sustainability Appraisal, Strategic Environmental Assessment	201106236	RC279, Malcom Touchin, CPRE Rutland	The SA/SEA lacks up to date baseline data to determine the local needs and issues as the information provided is for 2015-2017 at the latest. There is no understanding of the pressures and needs of neighbouring authorities within the SA/SEA. The SA/SEA does not provide a transparent analysis of the assessment process or outcomes to reasonably identify which are the most sustainable strategic growth or policy options. The SA/SEA does not provide recommendations for reasonable alternatives to be proposed (e.g. alternative sites for a garden village such as on the edges of the main towns). The evidence required to conduct a SA/SEA and identify significant impacts is lacking, and this is confirmed within the disclaimer within the SA/SEA itself. The SA/SEA Technical Annex, does not provide a cumulative impact assessment to identify the most sustainable sites.	NO CHANGE - SA process and conclusions are robust
Glossary	20110630	RC287, Paul Belton, CARTER JONAS on behalf of Pigeon Capital Management Ltd.	The definition of Affordable Housing includes reference to "intermediate housing". The glossary states "see below". There does not however appear to be a later reference to Intermediate Housing in the Glossary. Also, in Policies H6 and H7, reference is made to "specialist housing". Specialist housing is not however defined in the Glossary. Pigeon consider that it would be helpful if it were.	CONSIDER CHANGE TO add definition of both "intermediate housing" and "specialist Housing" to the Glossary
Inset Maps	11572903	RC15, Andrew Bussey,	We would like the planned limited of development for the village (Glaston) to be revised to include our garden behind our garage.	NO CHANGE

Inset Maps	11605004	RC29 , Russell Blandford	H1.1 Land south of Brooke Road, Oakham: I consider that the development may not be effective on the grounds that traffic access may be problematic. This section of Brooke Road (between the level crossing and Cricket Lawns) frequently becomes congested during the period when the crossing gates are closed and also after the gates are raised. Creating an additional access road to the proposed site will only exacerbate the growing problem.	NO CHANGE - Site has planning permission
Inset Maps	20100305	RC51 , Sally Harnett, Ashwell Parish Council	Delete the name "Ashwell South" and replace with more appropriate and relevant name	NO CHANGE
Inset Maps	11639700	RC73 , Reda Iskandar, Abbey Developments Ltd	Rutland Councils proposal to include the whole of Harrier Close within the 'planned limits of development' is welcomed however all seven parcels indicated on 'Inset 15 Cottesmore North' should be allocated for residential development for the reasons noted in the previous section 'Test of Soundness'.	NO CHANGE - plots within proposed PLD are too small to allocate
Inset maps	20102601	RC80 , Steven Wilby, Belton Parish Council	The area off Back Lane known as the Secret Garden has not been shown as a designated green space on this map. While an area that is a public footpath and access to private land has been designated a green space, I would suggest that this is an error. The area known as the Secret Garden contains the local allotments, children's play area, sports pitch and leisure garden this is clearly an omission and needs to be corrected	NO CHANGE
Inset maps	11698858	RC125 , David Howe	The site shown in Braunston Road marked H1.4 is crossed by a Electricity Transmission line part of the Nation Grid and consent should be sort before the inclusion of this site The site if approved will have a reduced development potential of about 50% in complying with National Grid guidelines	NO CHANGE See also response to para 10.7-10.9

Inset Maps	11706597	RC230 , Ian Briggs, Landesign on behalf of Hanson	<p>Objection: - Policy Inset Map 28 -Ketton does not show an Area of Search (AoS) for Limestone and Clay for Cement Purposes despite this being referred to Policies MIN1 and MIN2 b. Reason: - Policies Map Inset 28 shows the geographical area around Ketton Cement Works (The Works) but does not show an AoS referred to in Policies MIN1 and MIN2 b) of the Local Plan. The Inset Plan 28 does show a Mineral Safeguarding Area (the MSA) in reference to Policy MIN3 –which appears to correspond with (what Hanson expected to be) the AoS. This is shown on the plan with green / brown shading and edged with triangles of the same colour. However, there is no mention in the legend of the AoS. Discussions with RCC, indicate that the MSA was intended to be shown on the plan but the AoS reference was inadvertently omitted from the Policies Map Legend. Amending the legend would resolve part of the issue however, the MSA its self not depicted in a very user-friendly way on the Policies Map 28. On Policy Map Inset 28, the MSA extends beyond the limits of the map such that the MSA boundaries have to be inferred at best making it difficult to know whether a quarry extension accords with the AoS or not. Hanson welcomes the council’s intention to amend the Policies Maps to show the AoS but would like the Local Plan to make it much clearer what the AoS encompasses. Policies Main Map. The Main Policies Map does not show the AoS referred to in Policies MIN1 and MIN2 b) of the Local Plan. I understand from discussions with RCC, that the MSA was intended to be shown on the plan but the AoS reference was inadvertently omitted from the Policies Map Legend. Amending the legend would resolve part of the issue however, the MSA is not depicted in a user-friendly way on the Policies Map. On the Main Policy Map, the MSA is overprinted by various inset maps such that the MSA boundaries have to be inferred making it difficult to demonstrate whether a proposal accords with the local plan. Hanson welcomes the council’s intention to amend the Policies Map legend to show the AoS but would prefer to see the AoS depicted in a clearer way. Policies Maps 44 Rutland Water and St Georges These also cover the mineral areas and will need amending for the same reasons as above.</p>	<p>CONSIDER CHANGES - to inset maps 28, 44 & main policies map outlined above. • Show the Area of Search – Limestone for aggregates and building stone areas of search and Cement primary and secondary materials area of search relating to policy MIN1 on policy maps and add to legend. • Correct the mineral safeguarding areas relating to policy MIN3 on the policy maps. • Agree to create an additional inset that shows the extent of the AoS & MSA to effectively display these.</p>
------------	----------	---	---	--

Inset Maps	20110629	RC287 , Paul Belton , CARTER JONAS on behalf of Pigeon Capital Management Ltd.	In the case of Land off Burley Road Oakham (allocation H1.3), a site area of 14.21 hectares has been identified on the Oakham and Barleythorpe Inset Map (map 38). Additional land is however available for inclusion in the allocation site, namely an area of paddock land located due east of Oakham Veterinary Hospital. A copy of the site location plan identifying all of the available land that is being promoted by Pigeon is provided as Appendix 1. A copy of the illustrative masterplan for this land is provided as Appendix 2. Pigeon are not proposing that the area of paddock land be developed but instead the land is to remain open and shall be used as allotments and public open space. The inclusion of this paddock land within the allocation site area will provide flexibility in the design and layout of the development in the northern part of the site.	CONSIDER CHANGE - to site boundary updated and the site area identified in Policy H1 for site H1.3 updated to reflect the change. Reasonable amendment to allow for the allotments and green infrastructure identified on the masterplan to be included in the overall site area.
Inset Maps	20110673	RC301 , Robert Grafton , Grafton Spaces on behalf of Sally Udale	The site at Exton Road, Empingham was omitted from the Site Allocations Assessment conducted in late 2019 even though the Council was aware of the site.	NO CHANGE- This site was assessed and screened out at stage 1 of the SHELAA.
Policy Suggestion	201106244	RC279 , Malcom Touchin , CPRE Rutland	The Council might wish to consider including an additional Policy to address supported living and retirement living provision, the former which is now included within the new F2 use class as of September 2020.	NOTED - NO ADDITIONAL POLICY effects of new UCO will result in some minor policy changes across the plan
Policy Suggestion	201106245	RC279 , Malcom Touchin , CPRE Rutland	The plan could be innovative in terms of securing small autonomous eco housing clusters and consider an additional policy to this effect , perhaps based on the approach the Welsh Assembly have adopted in Welsh Tech Advice Note 6 "One Planet Developments".	NOTED - NO ADDITIONAL POLICY effects of new UCO will result in some minor policy changes across the plan