

Cottesmore Neighbourhood Plan Decision Statement

1. Summary

- 1.1 Following an independent Examination of written representations, Rutland County Council now confirms that the Cottesmore Neighbourhood Plan will proceed to a Neighbourhood Planning Referendum.
- 1.2 In accordance with the Examiner's recommendation, the Cottesmore Neighbourhood Plan will proceed to a Referendum based on the whole Parish.
- 1.3 As well as being posted on Rutland County Council's web site, this Decision Statement may be inspected on the Rutland Mobile Library and at the following places and times:
 - Rutland County Council Offices, Catmose, Oakham, Rutland, LE15 6HP
Monday to Thursday 8.30am – 4.45pm, Tuesday 9.00 – 4.45pm & Friday 9.00 – 4.15pm
 - Oakham Library, Catmose Street, Oakham, Rutland, LE15 6HW
Monday to Friday 9.30am – 5pm & Saturday 9.30am – 4pm

2. Background

- 2.1 In February 2014, Cottesmore Parish Council, as the qualifying body, submitted proposals to Rutland County Council to designate the boundary of the Cottesmore Neighbourhood Plan Area.
- 2.2 The plan area designated covers the entire Parish comprising the village of Cottesmore, surrounding agricultural land and land owned by the MoD which is contained behind security fencing.
- 2.3 The Neighbourhood Area application was approved by Rutland County Council (the Council) in April 2014 in accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations (2012).

- 2.4 Following the submission of the Cottesmore Neighbourhood Plan to the Council, the Plan was publicised and representations were invited. The consultation period closed on 28th March 2015.
- 2.5 Rutland County Council, with the agreement of Cottesmore Parish Council, appointed an independent Examiner, Mr Angus Kennedy, to review whether the Plan met the “Basic Conditions” required by legislation and that the plan should proceed to referendum.
- 2.6 The Examiner’s report concludes that, subject to making the modifications recommended by the Examiner, the Neighbourhood Plan meets the Basic Conditions set out in the legislation and should proceed to a Neighbourhood Planning referendum.

3. Recommendations, Decision and Reasons

- 3.1 Under agreed delegation arrangements, the Council’s Director of Places, in consultation with the Council’s Portfolio holder for Places (Development, Planning, Housing and Economy) has determined that the modifications set out in the Appendix are in accordance with the Examiner’s recommendations and ensure that the Plan meets the Basic Conditions.
- 3.2 The Appendix sets out the Examiner’s recommended modifications and the action taken in respect of each of them.
- 3.3 The Examiner has concluded that, with the specified Modifications, the Plan meets the Basic Conditions and other relevant legal requirements. The Council concurs with this view. Therefore, to meet the requirements of the Localism Act 2011, a referendum will be held in the Parish of Cottesmore which poses the question:

“Do you want Rutland County Council to use the Neighbourhood Plan for Cottesmore to help it decide planning applications in the neighbourhood area?”

This Statement is dated Monday 22nd February 2016

Appendix 1 - Modifications made to the Cottesmore NP to meet NP Examiner's recommended changes.

Policy or Section in the Neighbourhood Plan	Examiner's Recommended Amendment	Reason	Amended Wording
Basic Conditions Statement			
	That a table is produced for the Conditions Statement that identifies each core principle and how the Plan contributes to it.	Ease of reference	Amended as Recommended
	A section should be included in the Basic Conditions Statement that outlines how the Plan demonstrates that it meets the basic condition of providing sustainable development	For clarity	Amended as Recommended
	The basic Conditions statement should have a section that confirms and demonstrates how that the Plan has been prepared in general conformity with RCC's strategic policies.	For clarity	Amended as Recommended
Consultation Notes 2014-2015			
	This document should be re-titled 'Cottesmore NP Consultation Statement' and the date published stated.	For clarity	Amended as Recommended
Whole document			
	The inclusion of paragraph numbers throughout the document	Ease of reference	Amended as Recommended
	That the contents page and the sections should be amended and re ordered to separate the Planning Policies from the Parish Proposals	Ease of reference	Amended as Recommended
	That the Policies and Parish Proposals are in separate sections.	Ease of reference	Amended as Recommended
Contents page, section 8	The title should be Vision, Aims and Objectives.	For clarity	Amended as Recommended
Page 4, Summary of the Report			
Line 1,	Add the word 'are' after Plans.	For clarity	Amended as Recommended
Line 4	Add "an approved" after where.	For clarity	Amended as

			Recommended
Paragraph 2	Delete 'present consultation document' replace with 'Plan' and delete 'there is further consultation to follow'. Delete the last sentence.		Amended as Recommended
Paragraph 3	Delete 'at this stage' in line 2.	For clarity	Amended as Recommended
Section 1. What is a Neighbourhood Plan?,			
Paragraph 2	Delete '2026' and replace with '2031'.	For clarity	Amended as Recommended
Paragraph 5	After Plan add 'subject to confirmation in a referendum'		Amended as Recommended
Section 2. Designated Area			Amended as Recommended
Paragraph 2	Delete 'page 34' and replace with 'page 35'	For clarity	Amended as Recommended
Section 4. What was the Purpose of this Consultation			
Section heading	Change 'this' to 'the'	For clarity	Amended as Recommended
Paragraph 2	Delete 'and continue to seek'	For clarity	Amended as Recommended
Section 5. The Consultation Process and Plan Development			
Paragraph 9, 2 nd sentence	After 'plan' insert 'subject to confirmation by an independent Examiner that the Plan meets the Basic Conditions'.	For clarity	Amended as Recommended
Section 6, Monitoring and Review			Amended as Recommended
Policy COT MR 1	Delete 'continuously' and replace with 'every 3 – 5 years in line with Local Plan Reviews'.	For clarity	Amended as Recommended
Section 7. The Village Overview			

Kendrew Barracks	That MoD amendments in their letter of 2 nd September 2015 are incorporated into the Plan.	For clarity	Amended as Recommended
Section 8. Aims and Objectives			
	The Section should be titled 'Vision, Aims and Objectives.	For clarity	Amended as Recommended
Paragraph 1, 1 st Sentence	Delete the word 'emerging' from the first sentence and insert in line one after for Cottesmore 'by 2031'.	For clarity	Amended as Recommended
End of Paragraph 1	Insert additional sentence to read 'Cottesmore will be a thriving community delivering greater access to local facilities for a growing population while maintaining its rural village character.	For clarity	Amended as Recommended
Section 9. Environment and Character			
Policy COT E & C 1- Built Form	That the first line of this Policy should read 'All developments within the Conservation Area'.	For clarity	Amended as Recommended
Policy/Parish Proposal COT E & C 2 – Landscape	The Parish Proposal should be identified separately and the Parish aspiration that the feasibility of additional tree planting should be investigated should be set out and separated from Policy E & C 2.	Ease of reference	Amended as Recommended
Biodiversity and Nature Conservation Heading 2 nd bullet point remaining parkland of the former Cottesmore Hall, off Rogues Lane.	Rogues Lane, which leads from the village to Kendrew barracks, it would be helpful for this to be added to the Plans.	Ease of reference	Amended as Recommended
Section 10. Energy Efficiency of New Developments			
Paragraph 3	Delete 3 rd paragraph as the Code for Sustainable Homes was abolished in March 2015	For clarity	Amended as Recommended
Policy COT EN 1 – Energy Efficiency of new developments	Amend proviso i) to read 'higher standards of energy efficiency in line with Core Strategy Policy CS20'.	For clarity	Amended as Recommended

Section 11. Transport and Road Safety			
Parish Proposal COT TRS1 - Controls on Traffic Speed to Improve Road Safety	In proposal vi), replace 'lobbying' with 'discussions should take place to encourage'	For clarity	Amended as Recommended
Parish Proposal – COT TRS2 – Traffic Signage	Delete buff coloured section with no text at the bottom of page 21.		Amended as Recommended
Parish Proposal COT TRS5 – Pedestrian Routeings	Replace the word 'Routeings' with the word 'Routes'	For clarity	Amended as Recommended
Parish Proposal COT TRS6 – Public Transport	After (i) remove the word 'lobbying' and replace with the phrase 'Undertaking discussions with RCC to encourage improvements'.	For clarity	Amended as Recommended
Section 12. Housing			
Figure 3, page 36	Amend the PLD boundary to reflect the Core Strategy and RCC Site Allocations and Policy Document	For clarity	Amended as Recommended
Affordable Housing	Delete the 3 rd sentence preceding Policy COT H3 to read: 'Any future development in Cottesmore would be required to include a proportion of affordable houses, or if the development is too small, to pay a contribution by way of a commuted sum payment to an affordable housing fund. Rutland, as a whole, suffers acute affordable housing problems, as set out in its Core Strategy. This is in part because it has high average house prices and a high proportion of large houses.'	For clarity	Amended as Recommended
Policy COT H3 – Affordable Housing (Subject to Emerging National Policy Guidance)	Insert 'and Rutland' into the Policy title to read 'subject to Emerging National and Rutland Policy Guidance'.	For clarity	Amended as Recommended
	Amend Policy COT H3 to read: ' (i) A minimum of 35% affordable housing	For clarity	Amended as Recommended

	<p>provision will be sought from all developments that include self-contained dwellings, in line with RCC Policy CS11 (Affordable housing) and SP9 (Affordable housing) and subject to any relevant Supplementary Planning Documents.</p> <p>(ii) On all rural exception sites and for other sites of more than 5 dwellings the affordable housing should be provided on site. Where affordable housing is not provided on site an equivalent commuted sum payment should be made towards the provision of affordable housing as a first priority elsewhere within the Cottesmore parish, or if not as a pooled contribution to provide affordable housing located as close as possible.'</p>		
	<p>Following Policy COT H3 replace 3 paragraphs to read:</p> <p>'Affordable housing is seen as essential in helping to provide a range of housing to facilitate access to market housing. There may be exceptional circumstances where the development may not be economically viable with an affordable housing contribution, but it would fall upon the developer to provide at their expense evidence to support this position. In these circumstances, the on site affordable housing requirement may need to be modified to improve viability or alternatively a commuted sum payment would need to be made depending on the merits of the application.</p>	For clarity	Amended as Recommended

	<p>Affordable housing could be for rent or intermediate (for example shared ownership). The Rutland Core Strategy sets out 80% for rent / 20% intermediate housing across the county; acknowledging that local circumstances and national economic conditions could lead this to be varied. In Cottesmore, a similar split may be appropriate subject to these factors.</p> <p>It is accepted by RCC that small sites for affordable housing could be located outside the PLD boundary if they satisfy the criteria set out in the RCC Policies CS 11 (Affordable housing) & SP10 (Market housing within rural exception sites).'</p>		
Policy COT H5 – Design Guidance	Delete 4 th Criterion ‘ Design developments that enhance social cohesion’	For clarity	Amended as Recommended
Policy COT H6 Housing Development Principles	In paragraph 2, page 28 the phrase in brackets should read ‘(as opposed to imposed)’	For clarity	Amended as Recommended
	In proviso (ii) after ‘public transport’ insert ‘to encourage less use of the car and more sustainable transport’.	For clarity	Amended as Recommended
Policy COT H7 – Areas safeguarded from Development	Include an additional plan that identifies the location and boundaries of the areas to be safeguarded.	Ease of reference	Shown on map
Policy COT H8 – Guidance to Potential Housing Development	In recommendation (v) for consistency purposes the bullet points should start ‘using’, ‘respecting’ and ‘minimising’.	For consistency	Amended as Recommended
	Policy (vi) should be headed Proposal COT H8	Ease of reference	Amended as Recommended
Section 14. Community			
	This section heading is ‘Community’ but the section considers village signs and potential	For clarity	Amended as Recommended

	<p>footpath routes. The section on 'village signs' should be placed in Section 11 'Traffic and Safety'.</p>		
Footpath Options and Priorities	<p>It would be helpful to identify the 3 footpath priorities clearly in figure 5 and to indicate the safer route from Rogues Lane to the school.</p>	Ease of reference	<p>It is not possible to identify the route from Rogues lane to the school in Mill Lane in figure 5, as no route has been agreed and as such is not considered to be helpful at this stage..</p>