



Consultation Statement

Greetham Neighbourhood Plan

2014 -2016

Introduction

- 1 At the end of 2013 the Parish Council agreed that a village meeting should be held to ascertain whether or not there was support from residents for a Neighbourhood Plan.
- 2 The village meeting was held in January 2014. It was advertised by delivering a notice to all households and in the Parish Magazine. Over 80 persons attended. There was unanimous support for preparing a Neighbourhood Plan. Twenty persons volunteered to form a Steering Group.
- 3 The Steering Group concluded that the most appropriate Designated Neighbourhood Plan Area was the whole of the Greetham Parish boundary. Rutland County Council undertook a Designated Area consultation process from 14th March 2014 to 25th March 2014 and the area was approved.

Village consultative meetings & questionnaire

- 4 Village meetings were held in June 2014 to identify the important issues and in the light of this a questionnaire was prepared by the Steering Group.

Distribution and collection

- 5 A questionnaire was distributed to each of the 560 residents on the electoral roll. There was a response rate of well over 50% which was very encouraging. An appropriate questionnaire was also circulated to all children in the parish. This process took place in June 2014 to August 2014.

Data analysis

- 6 The data from the 280 completed questionnaires returned was entered onto spreadsheets and a document “Greetham Neighbourhood Plan Summaries of questionnaire responses 13th October 2014”¹ prepared. This was made available to villagers through hard copies in public

¹ Available on the village website



places (i.e. the shop & Community Centre) and the village website.

Further consultation processes

- 7 Focus groups within the Steering Group were set up to review the survey data and identify the key issues. Further consultation exercises included:
 - a Business Workshop held at the Greetham Golf Club in January 2015
 - a workshop for older residents, young people and parents of children in April 2015
- 8 Throughout the period of the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan residents have been kept abreast of progress and asked to add their input where possible. This has been done by means of the Parish Magazine which is published monthly, large notices in the village shop window and the village website which has a dedicated area for the plan.

First consultative Draft February 2016

- 9 Following extensive work by the Focus Groups, a First Consultation document was prepared. All the proposals therein were based on the issues identified from the Questionnaire, where it was evident there was a significant majority opinion on the matter.
- 10 In April 2015 this was circulated to all residents on the electoral register and the list of organisations recommended by Rutland County Council.
- 11 96% of the respondents supported the Plan as presented.
- 12 All the comments received from the First Consultation document were entered onto a spreadsheet and considered by the Steering Group. See Appendix 1.
- 13 The comments fell into the following categories:
 - Advice from Rutland County Council on some of the policies and layout of the section on housing.
 - Suggestions which would improve the document without materially affecting the policies presented.
 - Minor corrections as to matters of fact.
 - Comments / opinions that were not considered by the Steering Group to represent a majority point of view. (For example, a request that Great Lane should be reopened. When it was closed some six years ago, there was a village vote on the issue and a strong mandate to close the road. There was no evidence to suggest that opinions have changed since then)



- Comments / opinions which if adopted would render the plan non compliant with statutory requirements.

14 The Steering Group agreed to changes to the First Consultation as identified in Appendix 1. A summary of the changes follows:

- On advice from Rutland County Council, part of the Housing Development section was split into a separate section entitled “Protection of the Village Character and Heritage”. It was recognised that it was not appropriate for all new housing to be in stone, as different areas of the village already have a diversity of build material. A document entitled “Greetham Character Assessment” was prepared to record the characters of different parts of the village and the policy on build form modified to require new builds to be in character with their surroundings.
- On advice from Rutland County Council, the policy on housing for the elderly was modified and incorporated into policy HD2
- On advice from Rutland County Council, the policy on housing density was dropped as it did not conform with the policy in Rutland’s Core Strategy document.

15 The Steering Group judged that the revised plan could be submitted without a further consultation exercise, as none of the changes significantly affected the policies in the First Consultation document.

Main organisations consulted

16 All the individuals / organisations listed below were sent either a hard copy or e-mail of the First Consultation Document:

Local residents

Rutland County Council

The Parish councils adjoining Greetham:

Barrow Parish Meeting

Clipsham Parish Meeting

Cottesmore Parish Council,

Exton Parish Council

Pickworth Parish Meeting

Market Overton Parish Council,

Stretton Parish Council

Thistleton Parish Meeting

Local businesses – Identified from community consultation events:

Kendrew Barracks

MoD



Anglian Water
Severn Trent
NHS East Leicestershire and Rutland Clinical Commissioning Group
Historic England
Natural England
Environment Agency
Highways Agency
Homes & Communities Agency



Example of Shop poster

 <h1 style="text-align: center;">Greetham Neighbourhood Plan</h1> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Visit www.greethamrutland.com (Village and Community life - Greetham Parish Council tabs) for more information</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Business Drop in session 29th January 2015 Greetham Valley Hotel, Golf & Conference Centre 6.30pm to 8.30pm</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Light refreshments + glass of wine will be available.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">An opportunity for you to tell us what would help your business in Greetham, or how can we help you work from home? Open to all business in Greetham and working people living in Greetham.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Event Planning meeting 29th January 2015 7.30 pm to 8.15pm Greetham Valley Hotel, Golf & Conference Centre</p> <p>If you are involved in organising any events in Greetham to which the public are invited, we would like you to attend this meeting to help us create an event calendar for the year. Refreshments as above.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Greetham Website Group AGM 29th January 2015, 8.15pm to 8.30pm Greetham Valley Hotel, Golf & Conference Centre</p> <p>The website will be holding its AGM. Open to all. Please come along and help us maintain a great website. Refreshments as above.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Issue 12th January 2015</p>	<p>Objective</p> <p>To give the residents of Greetham a greater say in the future development of the village</p> <p>Final outcome</p> <p>A plan for the village for the next 20 years. There will be a referendum with the question - "Are you in favour of the plan?" If 50% of voters say yes it will come into force and will be a significant factor in future planning decisions.</p> <p>Progress so far</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steering group formed • Open days held • Questionnaire distributed • Some 300 questionnaires completed and returned. • Data analysed • Summaries produced and published • Focus Groups set up and holding meetings <p>Next Steps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus Groups to decide what should be included in the Neighbourhood Plan. Research solutions to issues raised • Draft policies • Test whether or not draft policies will be acceptable to majority of residents <p>The Steering Group</p> <p>The Steering group is formed of some twenty volunteers from the village. The group includes representatives from the Parish Council.</p> <p>Want to get involved?</p> <p>It is not too late to join the Steering Group and help with this project. Contact as below.</p> <p>Funding</p> <p>Support and a grant provided by the Supporting Communities in Neighbourhood Planning programme led by Locality with RTP/Planning Aid England and Partners, available through My Community</p> <p>Contact</p> <p>David Hodson 01572 813902 E-mail hodson001@gmail.com</p>
--	--



Example of Villager Flyer

Neighbourhood Consultation Plan Greetham needs You !



How do you want your village to look in
10..15...20...25... years time

Join us at the
Community Centre
Friday 6th June 6-9.30pm
BBQ ,Games, Sports (Friday evening only)
Sat 7th June 2.00 to 4.00 PM
(all children to accompanied by a parent)
Also at "Shattered on Saturday"
Greetham Church 7th June 10.30 -12.30
(Tea and cakes)

To discuss/look at the parish maps and the
Neighbourhood Consultation Plan
We need you to put forward your wishes,
Opinions, ideas and suggestions.

EVERYONE'S OPINIONS NEEDED
from under 11's to Over 80's

Transport available please contact Karen ..812044



Appendix 1

<u>Greetham Neighbourhood Plan - 1st Consultation Document - Villagers Comments</u>				
<u>COMMENTS BY RESIDENTS</u>		<u>STEERING GROUP COMMENT</u>	<u>NP AMENDED</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>
<u>1</u>	HD Proposals and Proposal LW3: Taking into account the current value of land and economic and political uncertainty, I think it is overly optimistic to hope that a local farmer can afford to be philanthropic and donate any parcels of land for allotments. I suggest that all new build housing developments should have gardens of sufficient size to permit a decent vegetable plot; I also suggest that some of the land designated for housing development be allocated for allotments. of course, with the Parish Council being in line to receive 25% of CIL over the next 3 years (to be then reviewed) one of the first items the PC could purchase would be land from a local farmer for allotments. The rental from the allotments would then return to the PC for further investment within the village.	Policy HD4 -Community Infrastructure Levy amended.	YES	ALLOTMENTS
<u>2</u>	Page 17: Policy HD5: I would suggest that the statement "There should be no further brick built buildings" should be changed to "there should be no further brick built buildings within the designated conservation area". I say this because there is a lot of brick construction outside the conservation area and building in stone can sometimes then look inappropriate in a predominately brick location. There are some dreadful extensions to brick houses in Ketton that have adopted this policy. I would suggest that there should be some comment either positive or negative for render and even timber finishes as modern building regulations and methods are going to see more of both these materials in the next 20 years. it may be prudent to be very specific about the use of materials in the conservation area only and it will be thus less prescriptive elsewhere.	Policy PC1 Built Form wording amended	YES	BUILT FORM
<u>3</u>	Built Form:page 15: This ought to include Rutland Core Strategy for energy efficient and environmentally friendly housing. Ref page 53 and 4 Policy CS20			BUILT FORM
<u>4</u>	Policy CS22 states "The quality and character of the built and historic environment of Rutland will be conserved and enhanced". Has this been taken into consideration for the proposed sites at the Garden Centre and North Brook Close?	A Greetham Character Assessment document has now been produced to support amendments to HD5.		BUILT FORM



Appendix 1

<u>5</u>	1. Business and Tourism - it is apparent that whilst Greetham inhabitants recognize the support of visitors in propping up local businesses e.g. Pubs and shop, they want numbers of visitors limited. Unfortunately for the businesses involved, costs are only ever going to increase - trying to limit tourism and visitor numbers to keep the facilities they support for mainly villager's use is therefore impractical, unworkable and very short sighted. policies aimed at increasing the numbers of tourists, both within the locale of Greetham itself and Rutland as a whole, can only be good for our local economy and businesses. From personal experience, many of our Hotel, Lodge and Cottage guests visit the two local pubs (on our recommendations) either via walking across the golf course, cycling, driving or we drop them off in our minibus. We recommend that our self catering guests purchase their supplies in the village shop. Greetham inhabitants alone cannot support the viability of these facilities going forward.	We believe our current wording is about right (it acknowledges that we need tourism but that we don't want it to increase dramatically)	NO	BUSINESS & TOURISM
<u>6</u>	Business & Tourism: attempting to limit visitors and tourists to the village and to the area will have a negative effect on the facilities that they currently support i.e. The two pubs and village shop. The Government's and County Council's own policies are aimed at increasing revenue from Tourism and can only be good for our local businesses.	Comments Noted - Refer above comments	NO	BUSINESS & TOURISM
<u>7</u>	My only piece of constructive feedback would be that it addresses the needs of children and young people a bit lightly	Noted - No Action		BUSINESS & TOURISM
<u>8</u>	I would be interested to know on what basis you say that "the village hasslow broadband speed". I am on supetrfast broadband and get speeds of 60-70 mb	Proposal B3 wording has been amended	YES	BUSINESS AND TOURISM
<u>9</u>	I am disappointed that a 20 year plan does not feel that it can seriously promote a by pass. The B668 is a major through route and it has been closed twice already this year. Since the closure of Great Lane there is no acceptable route around the village under 40 minutes (the ambulance driver returning patients to Oak House , was very stressed). A bypass and controlled housing development (especially the quarry site) are the only two things of true significance to Greetham's future in my opinion.	Noted - Proposal T1 has been amended	YES	BY-PASS
<u>10</u>	Proposal T5 - Safer walking and Cycling Routes - Would it be more appropriate for the Proposal to be supporting the review of footpaths being undertaken by the Traffic Focus Group rather than the Traffic Focus Group itself?	Noted - no action taken		FOOTPATHS
<u>11</u>	P18 - 4 lines from the bottom -has raised concerns add "over many years" regarding the safety etc. The report may wish to add the <u>increase</u> of pedestrians using the footpath since the opening of the camping and caravans site.	Noted and wording amended.	YES	FOOTPATHS
<u>12</u>	Footpaths should comply to minimum width requirements for "villages" (widths attached for reference). Greetham footpaths should/must comply to the absolute minimum of 1 metre. It would be diffierent /impossible to impose 2m or 1.5m.	Noted		FOOTPATHS



Appendix 1

<u>13</u>	Public Footpaths - open/reopen a footpath on the north side of the village linking the Viking Way (at the small caravan site) to the footpath off Wheatsheaf Lane.. This would provide a "Greetham Circular Footpath" around (nearly) the whole village. NB In part, this follows an old stone wall, which I believe forms part of the old village holmdaiz? (common land) (Map provided)	Noted		FOOTPATHS
<u>14</u>	Page 29: Proposal EH4: I would support a joint pedestrian cycleway to link Greetham to Stretton rather than just a footpath.	Noted and Proposal EH4 wording amended	YES	FOOTPATHS
<u>15</u>	Footpaths and Bridleways Page 28: The description of the Viking Way ought to be either North Lincolnshire to Rutland or Barton on Humber to Oakham	Noted and wording amended.	YES	FOOTPATHS
<u>16</u>	1. Great Lane should be re-opened. This will benefit the Community Centre. I suggest that the Centre could then take full advantage of the 28 days per annum of Caravan Rallys that can be held on the field, without having to apply to RCC for the gates to be opened. I further suggest that a footpath be prepared between the Community Centre and Rutland Caravan & Camping Site, encouraging the use of the Centre bar by visitors, adding further to community funds.	Noted - No Action	NO	GREAT LANE
<u>17</u>	P23 - Greethams Assets - add petanque club with others. We have been going for a long time too!	Noted and wording amended	YES	GREETHAM ASSETS
<u>18</u>	Policy T1 - HGV Restriction - I feel that this policy would have more strength if it stated that HGV's should be limited through Greetham and that the support for Cottesmore's proposal is the secondary consideration. The traffic problem through Greetham is more severe than through Cottesmore because of the road characteristics and the relationship of the road and pavement.	Noted and Proposal T1 wording amended	YES	HGV
<u>19</u>	I would also like to see a limit to HGV's through the village but cannot see how this can be achieved.	Noted - see above	NO	HGV'S



Appendix 1

20	I agree whole heartedly with the proposal for smaller properties & bungalows - only concern will be their affordability with the building materials suggested: local stone and thatch are expensive options	Noted	NO	HOUSING
21	Policy HD1 - Final Paragraph - Reference to development being through 'small allocated sites' could be misconstrued as additional small allocated sites although I believe the Policy is actually referring to the two sites with planning consent. Perhaps this should be clarified?	Noted		HOUSING
22	Policy HD5 - Built Form - This is an important policy for future development. Looking at recent new development in the conservation area particularly in Main Street, the size and height of some new houses does not complement the adjoining development of the street generally. Perhaps Policy HD5 could include reference to the scale of new buildings reflecting the scale of adjoining surrounding development.	Noted - Policy PC 1 amended	YES	HOUSING
23	P16 - Policy HD4 - parking space for at least 2 cars given that many households have two cars - parking on road may continue to be a problem.	Noted		HOUSING
24	I agree that the number of new houses planned is sufficient and that any more development would overwhelm the village and damage its character. The Housing Development Policies are broadly correct.	Noted	NO	HOUSING
25	I have one question which is mainly for information - there are a number of planned houses referred to, it would be useful to know where these are to be situated. The others outlined on page 12, and which underpins the content of the document, is most welcome.	Noted - Respond directly and provide a map if possible	NO	HOUSING
26	we do not need all these extra houses at the west end	Noted - No action taken	NO	HOUSING
27	Main Concern is: Planning for the Quarry leading to even further congestion in/around the village	Noted - no action - RCC advise not allowed to include in NP	NO	HOUSING
28	I suggest you make it clearer as to how many dwellings have been approved by the 12 individual planning permissions referred to on pages 14 and 16	Noted - policy HD1 wording has been amended to be less specific about individual panning applications as advised by RCC	YES	HOUSING



Appendix 1

29	Page 11 of 26 para.3: I note that the report mentions that the current population is 200 more than in 1911. It may be worth mentioning that the population in 1881 census is similar to today's population, and that the current population has only regained this original level by new house building.	Noted - no action	No	HOUSING
30	Page 14: para 6 last sentence I disagree with the statement that "no further houses are needed to meet the aspirations of Greetham residents for their village". Firstly the 12 approvals may never be built and secondly the approvals that have been gained do not fully address the needs and requirements of the village: single occupancy and downsizing properties and self build properties are still not included in the proposed mix of new housing.	Noted		HOUSING
31	Page 16: Policy HD7: I note and support the support for sheltered acomodation. Interestingly Rutland County Council has just got rid of all its sheltered accomodation by sacking all their resident wardens....so I would actually query what is meant by sheltered accommodation.	Wording amended on advice from RCC		HOUSING
32	My principle caveat to the proposals concerns the O.P.P. For Greetham Garden Centre. Taking into account the full planning permission for the 19 houses at North Brook Close and the 12 individual applications: the plan for 35 dwellings at the Garden centre seems excessive. I am aware that this plan has been approved over County Council objection. Although not wishing to come across as a Nimby, I question if the infrastrudtures of both village and county can support such a large expansion. Quite rightly the houses envisaged are for smaller properties suitable for the retired and younger families. Are there enough facilities to accommodate young and old, adequate public transport and employment opportunities? As you point out traffic in the village is already a problem. Especially in the earlier hours of the morning Main St. is crammed with cars as well as HGV's and PSVs the problem exacerbated by the unavoidable on street parking.	Noted - No action	NO	HOUSING
33	Is it not possible for the plan to be reduced at least to the lower end of the original neighbourhood plan of a total of 50 houses?	Noted - No action	NO	HOUSING
34	As planning permission has already been granted for North Brook Close, it seems pointless to make any comment. However I object to the use of the tables in the "Housing Development " Section to justify Building just because the current housing mix does not match the average. Also object to the implication that the building levy is the only source of income for village improvements - why do I pay council tax	Noted - No action	NO	HOUSING



Appendix 1

<p>35</p>	<p>HD3 Proposal - first impressions count! The entrances to the village should be enhanced by the aesthetically pleasing architecture of the houses - PLEASE can this be taken into account on the new development coming from Cottesmore? Smaller houses do not have to look like brick boxes. Greetham is full of small, attractive, even quirky, cottages, which should be reflected on the approaches to the village.</p>	<p>Noted - a Character Assessment document has since been written and a new chapter 'Protection of the Villages Character and Heritage' has been included with 3 additional policies.</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>HOUSING BUILD FORM</p>
<p>36</p>	<p>I suggest that Great Lane be widened from the north end in conjunction with and to facilitate housing development on the east side of the lane. The Parish Council's 25% share of CIL engendered by any such development will ensure healthy community funds. Some of these funds can be used to purchase allotment land. The rental from the allotments would thence be recycled back to the village funds.</p>	<p>Noted - This site has been proposed for the 2015/16 site allocation review. Policy HD6 - Community Infrastructure Levy amended to include the purchase of land for allotments</p>	<p>NO/YES</p>	<p>HOUSING SITE ALLOCATION</p>
<p>37</p>	<p>How much impact will it (sic) really have, especially regarding building in the village against the likes of large developers with deep pockets?</p>	<p>Noted - No action</p>	<p>NO</p>	<p>MISC</p>
<p>38</p>	<p>Since Great Lane has been closed off it has made great lane a dangerous place to exit from. This is due to traffic parked on the junction on both main street and great lane. When I exit Great Lane to turn left I am face to face with westbound traffic on the main road before I can see on coming traffic. An accident is imminent. Can this be sorted out?</p>	<p>Noted - no action Traffic Focus Group will continue to liaise with RCC</p>	<p>NO</p>	<p>PARKING</p>
<p>39</p>	<p>We need to do something about the parking problem through the Main Street we do not need all these extra houses at the west end</p>	<p>Traffic Focus Group currently discussing with RCC. Houses at the west end already won on appeal</p>		<p>PARKING</p>
<p>40</p>	<p>Policies HD5 and HD8 should refer to preferred types of boundary treatments e.g. Stone walls and to hedges as well as trees and shrubs.</p>	<p>Noted - a Character Assessment document has since been written and a new chapter 'Protection of the Villages Character and Heritage' has been included with 3 additional policies.</p>	<p>YES</p>	<p>PLANNING</p>
<p>41</p>	<p>I agree with the comments of an improved bus service for commuters and shoppers. The bus from here to Oakham either arrives in town too early or too late for a 9.00 a.m. start. What about a weekly "shopping" bus for the residents who don't drive, to allow them to go to one of the super markets to buy their groceries or just meet friends for lunch etc.</p>	<p>Noted - The NP already proposed that we should approach RCC Transport Dept and Bus Companies to provide a rush hour service.</p>	<p>NO</p>	<p>PUBLIC TRANSPORT</p>



Appendix 1

42	P19 - Public Transport - currently the bus service is 2 hourly during the day and just 1 hour at "rush hour" . The information in the report is inaccurate. You may wish to print "bus times at the time of printing are - that covers all eventualities.	Noted - wording amended to reflect bus times are correct at time of printing.	YES	PUBLIC TRANSPORT
43	Public Transport - a) The bus service to Oakham via Exton is 2 hourly which means that there is a 2 hour stay in Oakham (e.g. Going to Oakham on the 9.37 (the first on which the pensioners bus passes are valid) entails a wait until 12.00 for the return journey. b) The Service to Melton via Cottesmore is also 2 hourly. c) The lack of a bus to Stamford (except via Oakham then a change to the Peterborough Service) is a glaring omission.	Noted - no action	NO	PUBLIC TRANSPORT
44	Buses to Oakham: If possible to increase the frequency of the RF2 and to start earlier in the morning to allow our boys to either catch the Stamford school bus which leaves Cottesmore at 7.34 or to catch the 07.46 train from Oakham to Stamford?	Noted - no action	NO	PUBLIC TRANSPORT
45	Members of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group: Ann Jenkins also participated in the ESD focus Group. Paul Talbot-Jenkins also participated in the EH focus Group. Helen McGarrigle has not been included	Noted - wording amended	YES	STEERING GROUPS
46	On a more positive note., I raised the matter of the Empingham Practice opening a Surgery in Greetham at a Patients Participation and Reference Group some time ago, and the Practice Manager was encouraging. She has since retired so i do not know how her successor and the partners would react if a formal approach was made to them. I'll sound out options at the next PPRG meeting if you think this is a good idea.	Noted		SURGERY
47	The bio-gas digester. I am concerned that this will increase traffic through the village particularly heavy goods vehicles bringing in supplies.	Noted - for future reference	NO	SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT
48	The objectives listed on page 5 of the report are short of one of the essential requirements as listed in the RCC, see page 16 Core Strategy CS21(a)(b)(f) which are to do with climate impact, environmental impact and the management of waste. Item (f) in particular "minimise the use of resources and meet high environmental standards in terms of design and construction with particular regard to energy and water efficiency, use of sustainable materials and minimisation of waste"	Noted - These suggestions will be passed to Energy Focus Group	NO	SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT
49	Somebody made a comment about the proposal for a bio-gas digester to replace the existing facility, that it appeared to be someone's hobby horse? A bio-gas digester meets all of the requirements of energy, water efficiency and the minimisation of waste. The inescapable fact is that the existing system cannot cope with the existing demand and will need major upgrade to cope with any new housing in the village. According to the plans, the existing plastic pipe that runs from the pump house in Bridge Lane to the treatment plant between Cottesmore and Greetham is 6" in diameter, it passes under Kirks Close and through the land South of the conservation area. This pipe would have to be dug up and a new larger pipe of 24" diameter laid in its place. The existing installation was put in place in the mid 1950's since when the village had doubled in size at least. Rutland Council must have a map showing the route of the pipe.	Noted - These suggestions will be passed to Energy Focus Group	NO	SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT



Appendix 1

50	Sustainable Development: The RCC Core Strategy CS20 requires new housing to be energy efficient. A high degree of insulation to lofts, walls and floors; energy efficient appliances etc. Houses should be constructed so they are orientated to take best advantage of solar gains and with respect to the installation of solar panels There are on the market, roof tiles that incorporate PV features.	Noted - These suggestions will be passed to Energy Focus Group	NO	SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT
51	Page 25: The Chart is confusing. The answer to the question "if so what fuels do you use" ought to be in a box on its own. The box "on a scale of 1-5 how important is sustainable development to you?" ought to be tabulated fully in a separate chart with columns showing results for each category from 1-5.	Noted - no action		SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT
52	Regarding traffic flow and road safety, I believe the 20 mph signs are a waste of point, whilst out with my dog early morning about 6.45, the through traffic, as a majority, travel at speeds well in excess of 40 mph: twice the recommended speed. This really needs urgent attention. Thank goodness for the parked cars, at least they slow the traffic in the main part of the village, but we need more action at both ends . perhaps a speed camera similar to the one on Rockingham Hill in Corby	We are continuing to work with RCC to monitor the 20 mph speed limit. RCC Constabulary have also been conducting speed traps at both ends of the village. Also, in the very near future RCC will introduce a 4 week width reduction and traffic flow experiment in the village at two points in the village (where the pavements are narrowest)	NO	TRAFFIC
53	Key Aim - The Plan addresses the concerns raised about the problems of traffic and heavy lorries passing through the village. Given the importance of this particular issue and its implications for road and pedestrian safety would it be appropriate to include a reference to this in the Key Aim.	Noted - Page 5 amended to include 2nd bullet point "To improve road and pedestrian safety"	YES	TRAFFIC
54	Speeding Traffic - From my vantage point on Main Street I see little reduction in speed since the 20 mph signs were erected. It seems clear that only the installation of measures such as a camera plus enforcement of speed limits will make a difference to speed of vehicles (bicycles offend as frequently as do 4 wheel vehicles)	Traffic Focus Group currently discussing with RCC	NO	TRAFFIC



Appendix 1

55	We would like to think that HGVs could be stopped using the B668 through the village, as we can foresee someone getting hurt or killed using the footpath in the narrow parts (what about permanent traffic lights).	Traffic Focus Group currently discussing with RCC	NO	TRAFFIC
56	Main Concerns are: Traffic Control, roads are a death trap	Traffic Focus Group currently discussing with RCC	NO	TRAFFIC
57	Page 20 Para 4: The discussion on the problems of the road should also include a comment on the damage that is being done by the speed, volume and weight of the traffic on Grade 11 Listed buildings that line the Main Street. There are 4 Grade 11 listed buildings along Main Street and Stretton Road, either directly on the highway or within 1 metre of the highway. Some support should be included here to preserve these buildings.	Noted - No action	NO	TRAFFIC
58	Our primary concern is really the speed and volume of traffic through the village and also along Great Lane and the inconsiderate parking. Heavy goods traffic., at speed along Main Street, and Great Lane does give concern	Traffic Focus Group currently discussing with RCC	NO	TRAFFIC
59	After all the trouble that went into the 20 mph speed limit in the village, 90% of traffic is not conforming to the 20 mph. I have been overtaken 3 times between the Old School House and the Oakham Side of Main Street when I was observing the 20 mph. No overtaking signs would also be ignored. Could it be possible to police the speed limit more often?	Traffic Focus Group currently discussing with RCC	NO	TRAFFIC
60	Transport - Traffic Management and Road Safety - 1st Paragraph - I think the reasons for the amount and type of traffic using the B668 through Greetham is more complex than suggested. Sat navs, the increase in locally generated traffic etc also contributes to the increase in traffic generally and lorries in particular. I think it would be useful to provide the width of pavements at the narrowest points and to pointout that there is no pavement on the south side of the road and there are no verges and consequently pedestrians and traffic are in very close proximity most of the length of the pavement from the westerly junction at Church Lane and Main Street to the Bridge Lane.	Noted = will measure narrowest pavements (in the 2 chicanes) and add to the NP	YES	TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT
61	P28 - line 11 - a pedestrian/cycle path which runs . Line 16 - Trees - add - preserving and enhancing the village's environment	Noted - Page 36 wording amended	YES	TREES
62	P10 - Photograph - "copyright" not "copywrite"	Noted and amended	YES	TYPO



Appendix 1

63	Page 25 : Village Shop. I am concerned about the statement that the village shop should continue in its existing form. This is not really a good idea: a shop that is limping along with poor access is not something to be lauded. I would suggest that to relocate the shop would be a much better solution for the village as this would enable the inherent problems of the shop to be overcome. At the moment there is a step down into the shop which makes it inaccessible to a good number of people. I would support "the opposition for a change of use of the current shop premises"	Noted - No Action taken. Please note this response is identical to that received from Rutland Access Group.	NO	VILLAGE AMENITIES
64	Greetham Community Centre: keen that the playing fields are made use of more than they currently are I have put forward to the centre bringing back the cricket nets this season, and possible next year helping to organise social Sunday cricket side, you may have seen some information on this already	Noted - Pass on to Community Centre	NO	VILLAGE AMENITIES
65	As I am sure you know well enough, there are 3 pubs in the village, not 2. Of course by the time the Plan comes to fruition there may be only 2.	Noted - no action	NO	VILLAGE AMENITIES
66	Both my wife, Suzanne and I support the Greetham Draft Neighbourhood Plan. I was heavily involved in writing the Housing and Renewal section of Langham's NP (we have a land interest there) and so I am familiar with process. Langham's Plan is more elaborate but I felt uncomfortable with the pressure from vested interests and the lacklustre commitment to provide affordable housing. There seems to be a collective delusion about the 'uniqueness' of the village which serves as a means of blocking development. Langham's Plan seeks a lot from Rutland CC but is parsimonious in what it offers by way of planned and controlled development. In contrast, I think you have got it right.. Well done	Noted	NO	
-	68 RESPONSE FORMS RETURNED FROM VILLAGERS			
-				
-	COMMENTS FROM EXTERNAL BODIES			
67	No Comments	Cottesmore Parish Council	NO	
68	No Comments	Anglian Water	NO	
69	Highways England consider that the scale of growth targeted for Greetham is relatively small and it should not impact significantly upon the operation of the strategic road network.	Highways England		
70	Highways England welcomes Proposal T5 - Safer Walking and Cycling Routes and Proposal T6 - improved bus services and timetable	Highways England	NO	
71	No Comments	Natural England	NO	



Appendix 1

72	Page 16 Policy HD2 - RAG supports Policy HD2 and specifically the requirement for the construction of bungalows. The mention of wheelchair accessible housing with wheelchair turning circles would be an improvement to this policy	Rutland Access Group	YES	
73	Page 17 Policy HD6. The Access group supports the improvement of cycle paths and footpaths as this is beneficial for all users including wheelchair users.	Rutland Access Group	YES	
74	Page 17 Policy HD7: Housing for the elderly could also include housing for the elderly and disabled.	Rutland Access Group	YES	
75	Page 20: policy T5: Add mention of improvements for wheelchair and scooter users, as the village is particularly poor for access for wheelchairs users. I note that there is no reference anywhere in the report to the Rutland Access Group survey of the village which took place in October 2001, a copy of which was given to the transport group. This highlighted particular problems with the pavements in Greetham and the Access Group are disappointed that there is no specific support to make improvements in this area.	Rutland Access Group	YES	
76	Page 22, signage. The access group would hope that if tourist signage is developed for the village, tactile signage be included along with standard written signage.	Rutland Access Group	NO	
77	Page 24. Proposal LW1. the access group note the plan for new benches. To be fully accessible benches should have arm rests at each end to enable people with mobility problems to use the benches in safety.	Rutland Access Group	Information passed on to Benches Focus Group	
78	Page 25 Village Shop. The access group fully support the provision of a shop in the village however this shop is currently inaccessible to anyone in a wheelchair or scooter, and even buggy users will struggle to get into the shop. Proposals to relocate the shop, or adapt the shop to be fully acceptable would be supported by the access group.	Rutland Access Group	information passed on to village shop focus group	
79	Page 29. Proposal EH1. The access group fully support the requirement for maintenance to all footpaths. The maintenance should include not only the surfacing but also ensure that vegetation does not grow across pedestrian routes as this can be a distinct hazard for anyone with mobility problems.	Rutland Access Group	information passed on to Focus Group	
80	We agree with all you have said in your summary. In particular, we agree with your doubts about the future use of the Quarry for housing development. The Quarry being outside your planned limits of development for Greetham, we agree that this site should not be allowed for housing. A quarry which has come to the end of its commercial life is an ideal site for retention for nature conservation and to develop a scheme for the enhancement of biodiversity within the previously quarried area. Such a site can be easily adapted for nature conservation and biodiversity enhancement. In many planning approval documents for quarries it is a stated condition that at the end of its commercial life a quarry must be restored for nature conservation.	Clipsham Parish Council	noted	



Appendix 1

81	Response from DLP Planning on behalf of Ivor Crowson in respect of Greetham Quarry	Ivor Crowson	noted	
82	Response received from Rutland County Council Departments	Sharon Baker	A follow up meeting was held with RCC and amendments discussed. Revised wording has been agreed with RCC which takes into account their feedback	