Issue 12: Ensuring development is supported by essential infrastructure and services

Strategic Objective 12: Ensuring development is supported by essential infrastructure and services and promotes safe movement and more sustainable modes of travel by enhancing greener travel networks for walking, cycling and public transport.

Rep id	Respondent (ID)	Agent	62 Do you have any additional suggestions or comments about how the Local Plan can ensure that new development is supported by essential infrastructure and services?
4291	Leicestershire Police (Stephen Day, Architectural Liaison officer) [248]		At present Rutland County Council has Policing facilities where much of the policing activity for the Town is based. However, where additional development is proposed Leicestershire Police may seek to deploy additional staffing and additional infrastructures to ensure quality community based policing and so as not to put unacceptable pressure on existing staff and our capital infrastructures which will seriously undermine their ability to meet the policing needs of the development and maintain the current level of policing. Rutland County Council are requested to work with Leicestershire Police by consulting with them on large-scale applications, firstly to gain their perspective from a design front and secondly to understand whether the associated growth would produce a need for additional policing infrastructure. If this is the case then Leicestershire Police will assess each application on an individual basis, by looking at the current level and location of available officers and then the demand associated with that development.
4287	Mr Richard Boston [909]		In Uppingham both the local schools and surgery are at capacity at the present time, how is this to addressed? Road safety is already an issue in Uppingham, increase the traffic through development and the problem becomes even more critical; any expansion plans must include the north south bypass.
4272	Environment Agency (Mrs Nicola Reyman, Planning Specialist) [855]		Question 60 additional comments: We are pleased to see open space is included as a potential priority. We advise this is broadened to 'Green and Blue Infrastructure' which we consider to be a priority due to the multi-functional benefits it can provide, including safe walking and cycling routes, access to nature, health and wellbeing, natural flood management, and improving biodiversity. We recommend that water and wastewater are recognised in the listed priorities for further consideration. Question 62: We support opportunities for infrastructure solutions to deliver multi-functional

| | | | | benefits, for example, road enhancements that also deliver flood storage and carbon sequestration opportunities.

We are pleased to see that paragraph 3.15.4 sets out that the Local Plan will include policies to cover specific types of infrastructure including water and wastewater, Sustainable urban Drainage Systems, transport, and open space. It is important to ensure that any proposed development is required to provide the necessary water and wastewater infrastructure on site, but also that the existing foul sewers and water recycling centres have the capacity to take these additional flows. To ensure that growth can occur without a deterioration in the water quality of the area, it is important for Rutland County Council to liaise with the water companies to ensure they have suitable measures planned, and to gain assurance that these measures will be in place, in time to deal with any increased flows from the proposed developments.

We would like to take this opportunity to highlight that the withdrawn Local Plan and Sustainability Appraisal process recognised the current environmental constraint with regards to wastewater infrastructure; it states in the table within paragraph 2.35 of the Publication Draft Plan (2020) that 'Foul wastewater treatment works in Rutland do not have capacity to accept further wastewater from growth without an increase in the volumes they are consented to discharge.'

The Environment Agency and Rutland County Council produced a Statement of Common Ground (December 2020) for the withdrawn plan to address any issues between both parties which could inform the Inspector of the matters that both parties agreed.

Whilst the Local Plan is currently reviewing options for levels of growth, it is vital that wastewater infrastructure is recognised as a priority for the Rutland area. The water supply, wastewater and water quality Planning Practice Guidance recognises the pressure on wastewater infrastructure caused by growth and the importance of working with the Environment Agency, water companies and other relevant bodies to prevent harm to the water environment and amenity. This is essential to ensure water recycling centres do not receive wastewater beyond their treatment capacity, leading to flooding and/or pollution of watercourses, as well as ensuring that the proposed growth ambitions are deliverable, and development is not stalled or held back. |
|---|---|---|---|---|

4266	Ketton and Tinwell Joint Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (Neighbourhood Plan Group Representative) [196]		This comment is directed more in the implementation rather than the policy, we expect, but there is an absolute need to test the robustness of existing infrastructure before embarking on approving new development. This requires frank discussion by the Local Authority with infrastructure providers (e.g. water companies).
4225	The British Horse Society (Wendy Bannerman, Access Field Officer West and East Midlands) [1145]		Consider the use of CIL monies in supporting the off-road network. Encouraging more people to be active in the countryside, including equestrians, will require sufficient resourcing in terms of maintaining and improving Public Rights of Way and shared/multi-user/active travel routes. Using more environmentally friendly materials to provide surfaces appropriate for all users and in line with the heritage of the landscape. Resources are also needed to extend the network through addressing anomalies on the Definitive Map and to assess claims for additional routes or to upgrade the status of a route. The BHS has detailed guidance on these crucial matters to ensure all users are included and developments meet requirements of the Equality Act 2010 and associated legislation. https://www.bhs.org.uk/advice-and-information/free-leaflets-and-advice
4200	Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland ICS (Adhvait Sheth) [201]		Healthcare is a necessary infrastructure area as all people require some sort of health provision in during their lives. The need for Rutland is outlined in the Joint H&WB strategy and healthcare vision and plan.
4186	De Merke Estates [589]	Barton Willmore, now Stantec (Seth Tyler, Graduate Planner) [1141]	The Council should: • Participate in early engagement with stakeholders in the Local Plan consultation process. • Any discussions/ engagement should be proactive not just a tick box exercise. • On larger more viable housing sites provision should be made for both on site provision of service and infrastructure as well as CIL contributions to facilitate development across the wider county.
4161	John Meara [776]		It appears to me that the document has little to say about how access to essential services – education, medical… will be achieved in the context of new development. The final version needs to include more detail on this issue.
4152	Silver Fox Developments (John Edmond) [1138]		Q59- We would advocate a hybrid option comprised of Options B, C and D. We consider that targeting most growth within or adjoining Uppingham would ensure that existing infrastructure located in the town is able to meet the needs of new residents.

			Clearly there will be instances where growth needs to be supported by additional infrastructure provision and a focussed approach would allow for the delivery of new or enhanced infrastructure in the town which would benefit new and existing residents. However as with any strategic growth the Council has an obligation to properly plan for their area and we would expect that the Council play a central role in identifying the new infrastructure required and where appropriate securing funding from a combination of public and private sector partners.
4132	Avant Homes [1131]	Mr Alasdair Thorne [562]	Q59 -We would advocate a hybrid option comprised of Options B, C and D. We consider that targeting most growth within or adjoining Oakham would ensure that existing infrastructure located in the town is able to meet the needs of new residents. Clearly there will be instances where growth needs to be supported by additional infrastructure provision and a focussed approach would allow for the delivery of new or enhanced infrastructure in the town which would benefit new and existing residents. However as with any strategic growth the Council has an obligation to properly plan for their area and we would expect that the Council play a central role in identifying the new infrastructure required and where appropriate securing funding from a combination of public and private sector partners.
4107	Wells McFarlane [365]	Pegasus group (Mrs Georgina Doyle) [575]	The provision of infrastructure is one of many threads of ensuring that development is sustainable. It should be considered at the same time as all aspects of achieving sustainable development to ensure that development is in the right place. Therefore, the options for funding infrastructure improvements will become clear when the evidence is gathered to determine the most sustainable development strategy. This exercise will also determine which infrastructure could take priority. The development to the south west of Oakham would support the development strategy of locating development closed to existing service and facilities. It would be located adjacent to the most sustainable town in the County. It would be well located to access existing service and facilities in Oakham. The proximity of the site to Oakham Town Centre means that it would be highly sustainable location for residential development. A full range of day-to-day service and facilities, education and employment are all within easy walking and cycling distance.
4053	Vistry Group c/o Pegasus Group (Jonathan Porter, Strategic Planning Manager) [1129]	Pegasus group (Mrs Clare Clarke, Associate Planner) [523]	The provision of infrastructure is one of many threads of ensuring that development is sustainable. It should be considered at the same time as all aspects of achieving sustainable development to ensure that development is in the right place. Therefore, the options for funding infrastructure improvements will become clear when the evidence is gathered to determine the most sustainable development strategy. This exercise will also determine which

			infrastructure could take priority. Focusing development in locations with existing infrastructure provides an opportunity to improve and expand services facilities.
4005	The Society of Merchant Venturers [693]	Savills (Julia Mountford, Planning Consultant) [735]	Q59- growth should be directed to the most sustainable locations in and around the market towns where road, public transport and pedestrian infrastructure is more advanced. Additionally, the Council needs to identify and demonstrate its infrastructure priorities and requirements through evidence such as the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to help inform the details of the proposed approach. A range of sites, including small and medium sized sites is required in order to help ensure more continuous receipts from CIL (rather than relying on fewer larger/ strategic urban extensions). The approach to CIL also needs to be considered alongside (and not in isolation) to the approach to s106 obligations ensuring the viability of development and additionally the plan as a whole can be considered. Q61- The provision of certainty over development requirements for each allocated site is helpful, subject to these requirements being accompanied by relevant evidence to justify and support the specified requirements. Any requirements must also meet the relevant tests in terms of being: - necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; - directly related to the development, and - fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.
3984	Clipsham Parish Meeting (Clifford Bacon) [110]		Q61 - Yes, the Local Plan should include these , but they should be worked up with and agreed with the local community before they appear in the draft plan. Early resourcing could save a lot of problems down the line. Furthermore, this would be a good example of RCC's renewed commitment this time to work much closer with all the stakeholder communities of Rutland in developing and preparing the Local Plan
3947	Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) [1042]	Montagu Evans LLP (Miss Lauren Hawksworth, Associate) [1041]	Question 59 – Options for funding Infrastructure improvements The DIO believe that the Council should take a flexible approach to the funding of infrastructure improvements depending upon the size and scale of development. The use of CIL is supported and the DIO agree with the Council's intention to prepare an Infrastructure Delivery Plan and to undertake viability testing for new policies and development proposals. The DIO do not support the Option to only focus new development on areas of existing capacity

			or certainty about the delivery of infrastructure improvements as this is unlikely to provide a deliverable and viable solution to meet the Council's identified need or reflect the strategic and long-term nature of the Local Plan period.
3910	Melton Borough Council (Mr Jorge Fiz Alonso, Senior Planning Policy Officer) [1025]		Q59. Melton Borough Council asked a similar question when creating the Local Plan, and might be asking this question during the review. From experience, due to the decline of infrastructure such as public transport, Option C may be the most logical route to proceed with. We have noticed a substantial reduction in public transport availability to settlements which some may see as creating unsustainable development. Therefore, an infrastructure-led approach may ensure that effective and efficient sustainable development is created within the County. Q60. Melton Borough Council went through a prioritisation process of infrastructure when creating our Developer Contributions SPD, even though this has been adopted and we have a clear table of prioritisation, there is still significant challenges when it comes to the reality of determining a planning application. Therefore, from experience, it is useful to have a basis of prioritisation, but the policy would need flexibility built into it. Unforeseen circumstances can cause the prioritisation to be compromised (e.g., 100% affordable housing site). Q61. No comments. Q62. Melton Borough Council would welcome the opportunity to work with you on infrastructure-based issues and policies, our cross-boundary relationship means that we share a significant amount of infrastructure including open space, public transport, etc. Collaboration on the IDP will be vital to ensure that we have a good understanding of the infrastructure available within areas close to the boundary. In addition, we would be happy to explore a collaboration with you on any evidence bases that may involve cross-boundary infrastructure.
3883	Ryhall Parish Council (Parish Council Representative) [435]		In general to employ quality contractors who do a good job which will last. To maintain a quality of maintenance to ensure longevity.
3809	Ketton Darby & Joan Club (Ruth Renner) [1122]		Q62 update and improve the electricity network to enable more solar panels on house/factory/barn roofs rather than using farm land.

| 3681 | Ms Janet Taylor [1109] | | Q62 By taking a stand occasionally to make sure that no new development is permitted until infrastructure requirements are fully funded and met.

Ongoing liaison with communities to ensure that there is an up to date assessment of what services are needed, so that decisions can be made on accurate data. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 3582 | Barrowden Parish Council (Mr Gordon Brown, Chairman) [1103] | | Q61 Especially a local shop on larger sites in excess of 300 homes on site or within 800 metres on the flat |
| 3570 | Stretton Parish Council (Ms Shani Storrie, Stretton Parish Councillor) [1101] | | Q61 No a generic one with an option for consultation on certain aspects.

To include and ensure robust electrical, water and sewerage supplies are in place in any future developments. |
3505	Mrs Pam Allen [1085]		Q62 Use the expansion at the two Rutland towns to maximise existing resources. Other infill development can be 'resourced' within existing rural communities.
3453	Vistry Homes East Midlands [1070]	Marrons (Mr Dan Robinson-Wells, Associate Director) [535]	On site infrastructure should only be identified where necessary to serve the site or wider area and not simply be identified for the sake of it. More broadly, focussing development where there is existing infrastructure capacity, or improvements can be made locally, should be a key determinant of the spatial strategy.
3383	Empingham Parish Council (Mrs Rowan Scholtz, Parish Council Representative) [413]		Any significant development should be required to demonstrate how it contributes to the local plan vision.
3347	Ketton Parish Council [329]	Mary Cade [638]	Allocate land for a bus depot in Rutland so that it is possible to have a better, more extensive and more reactive bus service.
3284	Mr Harold Dermott [1001]		Whatever the evidence, there is very much a feeling that improvements in infrastructure have not met the needs of the community during the rapid development of Oakham over the last few years. The developers appear to be in the driving seat, with RCC trailing along behind. For example, the doctors surgery in Oakham, already under pressure, appears not to be able to cope with the additional influx from Oakham North and other developments.

			As many times before in this survey, the options in Qu 59 should not be exclusive. (I appreciate they are described and structured to give RCC the single answer they want). In Qu 59, Option D should surely be a standard part of the planning approval process, not an either/or option? However, Option A does appear to offer the worst of everything, except the need for RCC to do nothing. It may also be time for RCC to review its CIL Charging Schedule, even if this requires some grown-up negotiations with developers who of course will tell you they can't afford it. As I said, the developers appear to still be in the driving seat. Also, requiring every new dwelling to have solar panels and EV chargers as currently required (which within 5 years will be as important to a home as good broadband is now) can also shift infrastructure costs to the developer outside of the CIL legislation. Otherwise if the community want extra infrastructure that cannot be funded via CIL or Council Tax, then the community must pay for it, which will quickly identify which infrastructure is actually important to the community.
3281	Edith Weston Parish Council (Parish Council Representative) [411]		Q62 Affordable housing is not the same as social housing and this issue needs to be addressed. All new housing development should recognise that Rutland is a rural county and we this should not be forgotten or spoilt. Also it needs to be recognised that has a rural community the people rely on the car and spaces should be included off road for 2 vehicles. Finally with new developments please consider the waste bins, there will be 5 wheelie bins in future and these can be unsightly and prove to be a H&S issue if not provided with adequate space.
3280	Edith Weston Parish Council (Parish Council Representative) [411]		A large new development will not be appropriate in planning, viability and sustainability terms and will have a significant negative impact on the two market towns and villages that require small levels of development to remain sustainable. Option C in question 59 for example would be appropriate as it will identify certainty and improve existing infrastructure – Utilities, Transportation and sewage systems.
3159	Mr Martyn Williams [1055]		All new builds should have access to washing line / place to dry clothes outside. All new builds should have someone to store a bike.
3016	Mr Malcolm Touchin [1038]		All of the requirements listed above at Q60 are important, and their provision must be tailored to the scale and nature of related developments, demographics, etc. Digital infrastructure should also be included, but the response form for Q60 does not allow for other than copying

			the given items. That said, I would place Open Spaces, Leisure and Cultural facilities at a lower priority that the others (including digital).
2919	Mr Simon Frearson [1047]		Consider each development application on its own merit and make an objective decision.
2692	Braunston Parish Council (Mrs Carole Brown, Parish Clerk) [1003]		A current assessment of all communities current and future infrastructure needs should be maintained
2673	Mrs Karen Hubbard [1033]		Digital, water, sewage all need significant upgrades around the recent Barleythorpe development. Existing housing is suffering a much poorer infrastructure than before the development was built. Aim to improve services for all not just the new housing
2634	Define (on behalf of William Davis Homes) (Mr Sam Perkins, Graduate Planner) [1027]		Question 59: it is clear that residential growth adjacent to rural villages (and in particular the LSCs) can facilitate and support community infrastructure, services and facilities. RCC should consider that relationship when bringing forward a well-balanced spatial strategy that appropriately responds to the needs of its rural population. Question 60: priorities for infrastructure should respond to the specific context of each proposed development and must offer flexibility to change. That is particularly the case for Rutland as a rural authority, where some settlements are often reliant on the services, facilities and infrastructure that are present in surrounding groups of settlements and/or higher order settlements. To attempt to rank / prioritise infrastructure at a County-level would, therefore, be inappropriate. Instead, it should be stated that contributions will be sought towards providing new infrastructure or supporting existing infrastructure, subject to the tests set out in CIL Regulation 122. With that said, affordable housing should not be considered as 'infrastructure', and instead should be seen as a key part of the housing offer. Question 61: Once proposed allocations are identified, the Local Plan should set out development requirements and key infrastructure priorities associated with larger development sites, to provide certainty to the developers of those sites. It is recognised, however, that the

			development requirements and the required developer contributions for many sites will be established through the application process.
2554	Pigeon Investment Management Ltd [1022]	Carter Jonas (Ms Kimberley Brown, Associate Partner) [601]	Question 61: The emerging RLP should set out clearly at plan-making stage, in an Infrastructure Delivery Plan, what infrastructure is required and whether it would be funded by developer, CIL or s106.

Question 62: As set out elsewhere in these representations, the selection of suitable sites for allocation will be important for the emerging RLP, including where infrastructure is already available e.g., education, health facilities and public transport services or where additional development could contribute towards infrastructure improvements. It is requested that decisions about which sites to allocate in the emerging RLP take into account opportunities to improve infrastructure at settlements. |
2523	Uppingham Town Council (Parish Council Representative) [445]		Yes, Make appropriate reference and support to any relevant policies in Neighbourhood Plans (where they exist). This will be of particular importance where CIL priorities are listed and should refer to all CIL collected for any given development and not just the proportion (25%) due to the area with a made Neighbourhood Plan.
2377	Les Allen [174]		On question 60, I believe the most important priority should be "environment" and yet you have not even mentioned it?
2159	Mr Norman Milne [996]		Regular Public Transport to all Service Centres and Larger Service centres. Minimum 30 mins Build more medical facilities in advance of development as there is undersupply in the county
1990	Mr Malcolm Forbes [988]		Don't take developer money in place of actually providing necessary facilities
1845	Mr David Lewis [983]		Ensure that infrastructure is in place before houses are built.
1728	Barry Hobbs [646]		Reference and support policies in Neighbourhood Plans.

All S106 and CIL monies should be allocated to facilities in the area where they arise and spent to meet the policies in Neighbourhood Plans. |
| 1658 | Mr Peter Lawson [969] | | The services related to any significant development must be in place immediately people move in |
| 1270 | CLA (John Greenshields, | | With all of these answers there must be a caveat, being that the devil is in the detail.

The CLA supports the move to ensure all development has the appropriate infrastructure. The |

	Chartered Surveyor) [937]		Council will have to make a decision as to what it determines as essential for development that will affect Council Tax payers. As asking for development to pay for items such as open spaces, public transport and leisure items all adds costs, even if these items aren't used by those who ultimately pay the bill, thereby reducing the affordability and viability of the development. Potentially killing, what would have otherwise been a development which would have made a significant positive contribution, supported local services and added to Council Tax receipts. At a time of the cost of living crisis the Council may wish to revise what it deems to be 'essential.'
1217	Nick Townsend [153]		By requiring the prompt preparation of a Local Infrastructure Development plan in partnership with developers, and utilities and services providers to establish priorities and funding
676	Mr Andrew Nebel [864]		It must ensure adequate primary care facilities can be accessible
592	Mrs Susan Wood [861]		I do agree that Rutland needs to grow with small housing developments. However There can't possibly be anymore growth until you can look after the villages you already have. I live in Caldecott where the neglect from RCC is very evident. This village is being abused by such heavy traffic as in HGV heavy goods, freight and more recently cement trucks that it is becoming unbearable to live. The noise level needs to be monitered as I believe the extreme noise of these vehicles must be breaking and enviromental legislation. The HGV lorries travel all night and day. Are you expecting this little Rutland village to take more traffic to your newly built homes while our Grade 2 listed houses shake everytime the 100 to 200 a day HGVs pass? This is the first village of Rutland, the gateway, this has to be addressed before there is anymore development. I have spent the summer emailing Lucy Stephenson and Alicia Kearn about getting the HGVs stopped for now and forcing them to use the £35 million by-pass that has been built for them...there has been no help. As I said please do not spend anymore taxpayers funds on expanding until you can look after the areas you have. We are now being forced to install cameras to monitor the traffic along main street and seek other professional advice so that we can make a case of neglect, environmental noise and poor air quality caused by motorway emissions.

550	Mrs Jayne Williams [857]		Tighten up policy so that developers cannot back out of obligations to provide infrastructure.
522	Mr Christopher Jordan [712]		Development should be based on local need not building £500,000+ properties that certain estate agents in the area want to encourage wealthy commuters here. By building in the Oakham and Uppingham towns this should allow the infrastructure and services to develop along side the house building in a structured manner.
450	Richard Camp [155]		Local jobs must be available with an appropriate proportion of affordable homes relevant to the nature of locally available jobs.
389	Martin Shewry [755]		As recommended by the local NPs
314	Mr Graham Layne [801]		Don't turn down grants that are presented to us