

Issue 3: Meeting identified current and future housing needs

Strategic Objective 3: Meeting Rutland's identified current and future diverse housing needs, including the affordability of housing, through the provision of high-quality new homes.

id	Respondent	Agent	21 Do you have any additional suggestions or comments about how the Local Plan can meet current and future housing needs?
4247	Ketton and Tinwell Joint Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (Neighbourhood Plan Group Representative) [196]		Listen to communities about how much, and what, is needed; challenge developer assumptions about what should be built.
4209	The Society of Merchant Venturers [693]	Savills (Lynette Swinburne, Associate Director) [520]	<p>Q16- We consider that Option A is most appropriate as the mix of housing required should be informed by ongoing monitoring of local needs through an up-to-date evidence base, as well as site-specific characteristics, viability and market information. This will help to ensure that new housing delivery is appropriate to local needs and is deliverable at individual sites, whilst ensuring flexibility in the policy approach to enable the mix proposed on specific sites to respond to site specific circumstances, consider need and adapt to changes in the market.</p> <p>The Local Plan should therefore be informed by up-to-date evidence of local needs, with flexibility for the specific size and mix of market housing on individual sites to be provided based on site-specific circumstances, market requirements and viability. This approach closely aligns with Option A in encouraging developers to provide a mix of housing to reflect local needs, whilst ensuring that development is deliverable and can come forward as required.</p> <p>Q18 - Broadly, the second part of Option B, i.e. ensuring a proportion of larger sites are available for self-builders, seems logical. However, appropriate evidence to justify the scale of site required to provide self-build plots will be required. Additionally, it is important to ensure that there is relevant evidence to justify the proportion of self-build plots and that there is sufficient flexibility in how the policy is applied to respond to site specific and market requirements ensuring that developments remain viable and</p>

			<p>deliverable.</p> <p>Opportunities for self-building in smaller settlements should also be explored in the emerging Plan.</p>
4156	John Meara [776]		<p>It is important that new housing development should provide an adequate supply of smaller homes – e.g. 2-bedrooms – irrespective of the type of ownership.</p>
4143	Silver Fox Developments (John Edmond) [1138]		<p>Q17- 3.37 This requirement should be based on evidence. However it is inappropriate to embed requirements in the Local Plan policy, as needs can change over the span of the Local Plan. We would therefore propose that general requirements should be set out in the policy with specific requirements outlined in an appropriate Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), a ‘living document’ that is capable of being updated as appropriate as new evidence concerning need comes forward.</p>
4126	Avant Homes [1131]	Mr Alasdair Thorne [562]	<p>Q17 - It is our view that requirements should be based on evidence. However we do not consider it appropriate to embed requirements in the Local Plan policy, as needs can change over the span of the Local Plan. We would therefore suggest that general requirements should be referred to in the policy with specific requirements outlined in an appropriate Supplementary Planning Document which is capable of being updated as appropriate as new evidence concerning need comes forward.</p>
4102	Wells McFarlane [365]	Pegasus group (Mrs Georgina Doyle) [575]	<p>Q16- The current 67%/33% affordable rental and affordable home ownership requirement is supported by evidence to justify its requirement. Any change from this requirement would equally need to be justified by strong housing evidence and supported by a viability appraisal.</p> <p>The provision of 30% affordable would be included in land South West of Oakham which is promoted for development as part of this plan.</p> <p>Q18- Encouraging self-build development by setting out where it will be supported in principle is supported.</p> <p>Under the Self Build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 and the NPPF, it is the Council's responsibility, not landowners or developers, to ensure sufficient permissions for selfbuild and custom build housing are granted to meet demand. The NPPG outlines ways Councils should consider supporting self and custom build housing through engagement with developers and encouraging them to consider self and custom build where they are interested.</p> <p>The issue of self and custom build units on larger developments was a matter addressed</p>

			<p>by the Inspector examining the Blaby Part 2 Local Plan. In this case the Inspector noted that whilst the Self-Build and Custom Build Register may indicate an interest in this type of housing, it was not clear how this evidence translated into actual demand, with potential issues of double counting where individuals register with more than one Council. In proposing a Modification to the plan to remove the requirement for self-build housing on larger sites, the Inspector concluded that the requirement was not justified by the available evidence, there were potential viability issues and there may be negative consequences for the provision of affordable housing (paras 73-79, Inspector's Report, Blaby Part 2 Local Plan, 21st December 2018).</p> <p>The Council would need to have robust evidence that justifies the inclusion of a selfbuild requirement policy in the plan. Any evidence must be supported by a thorough viability and impact assessment</p> <p>The Council should also consider the practicalities (for example health & safety implications, working hours, length of build programme, long-term gaps in the street scene caused by stalled projects, design inconsistency etc.) of implementing any such housing mix policy approach</p> <p>Q19 - The Planning Practice Guidance advice that local planning authorities will need to gather evidence to determine whether there is a need for additional standards higher than Building Regulation requirements in their area and justify setting appropriate policies. Local Authorities should consider the impact of using the standards as part of their local Plan viability assessment.</p> <p>The requirement to provide all or a proportion of new homes to be built to higher building regulations for accessibility and future adaptation for all new development is not supported as it may impact on affordability and customer choice. It is important that that the Council presents clear local evidence of need and impacts on viability to justify the inclusion of this policy in the plan.</p>
4049	Vistry Group c/o Pegasus Group (Jonathan Porter, Strategic Planning Manager) [1129]	Pegasus group (Mrs Clare Clarke, Associate Planner) [523]	<p>Q16-The provision of a mix of housing on sites is supported as is maintaining the current flexibility on the different house types/sizes that should be provided on housing site and encouraging the mix to reflect local needs. It is important that requirements for a specific mix are not set out in policy as this prevents the most up to date evidence being used to inform the appropriate mix.</p> <p>The Local Plan policy on housing mix needs to leave room for the decision maker to have</p>

regard to up to date evidence of local housing needs, housing market evidence, economic conditions, viability and site specific circumstances.

A flexible approach supports the deliverability of development and uses the evidence in relation to housing mix to guide development over the course of the plan period. There are also site specific circumstances where a mix of homes based on the County wide or local need would not be appropriate from a design point of view, for example in a street where one size of property dominates.

The provision of 30% affordable would be provided on the proposed site in Ketton.

The evidence underpinning the current affordable housing target and split of 67%/33% affordable rental and affordable home ownership is getting dated and should be updated. Any new requirements should be justified by a needs assessment and viability appraisal.

Q18- Encouraging self-build development by setting out where it will be supported in principle is supported.

Under the Self Build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 and the NPPF, it is the Council's responsibility, not landowners or developers, to ensure sufficient permissions for self-build and custom build housing are granted to meet demand. The NPPG outlines ways Councils should consider supporting self and custom build housing.

The issue of self and custom build units on larger developments was a matter addressed by the Inspector examining the Leicestershire authority, Blaby's Part 2 Local Plan. In this case the Inspector noted that whilst the Self-Build and Custom Build Register may indicate an interest in this type of housing, it was not clear how this evidence translated into actual demand, with potential issues of double counting where individuals register with more than one Council. In proposing a Modification to the plan to remove the requirement for selfbuild housing on larger sites, the Inspector concluded that the requirement was not justified by the available evidence, there were potential viability issues and there may be negative consequences for the provision of affordable housing (paras 73-79, Inspector's Report, Blaby Part 2 Local Plan, 21st December 2018).

The Council would need to have robust evidence that justifies the inclusion of a self-build requirement policy in the plan. Any evidence must be supported by a thorough viability and impact assessment.

			<p>The Council should also consider the practicalities (for example health & safety implications, working hours, length of build programme, long-term gaps in the street scene caused by stalled projects, design inconsistency etc.) of implementing any such housing mix policy approach.</p> <p>Q19- The Planning Practice Guidance states that local planning authorities will need to gather evidence to determine whether there is a need for additional standards higher than Building Regulation requirements in their area and justify setting appropriate policies. It goes on to highlight that Local Authorities should consider the impact of using the standards as part of their local Plan viability assessment.</p> <p>It is important that that the Council presents clear local evidence of need and impacts on viability to justify the inclusion of this policy in the plan.</p>
3994	The Society of Merchant Venturers [693]	Savills (Julia Mountford, Planning Consultant) [735]	<p>Q17- As per our response to Question 16, it is considered that the split between affordable rental and affordable home ownership should be informed by up-to-date evidence of local needs, site-specific characteristics, viability and market information. This will ensure that new affordable housing delivery is appropriate to local needs and site specific circumstances at individual sites, ensuring delivery and viability of the wider site is not compromised. It is also important that the viability requirements for affordable housing should be considered cumulatively alongside the viability implications of other policies of the Local Plan as a whole. Paragraph: 002 Reference ID: 10-002-20190509 of the NPPG, confirms this approach by setting out that, ‘The role for viability assessment is primarily at the plan making stage. Viability assessment should not compromise sustainable development but should be used to ensure that policies are realistic, and that the total cumulative cost of all relevant policies will not undermine deliverability of the plan.’</p> <p>Additional evidence is therefore required in order to confirm which option would be supported and ensure the requirements of the NPPG are appropriately reflected in policy. Part of this evidence should include justification and clarification as to the how the Government’s ‘First Homes’ targets is intended to be applied to affordable home ownership in the County, given the implications for viability and deliverability.</p> <p>Q18- Broadly, the second part of Option B, i.e. ensuring a proportion of larger sites are available for self-builders, seems logical. However, appropriate evidence to justify the</p>

			<p>scale of site required to provide self-build plots will be required. Additionally, it is important to ensure that there is relevant evidence to justify the proportion of self-build plots and that there is sufficient flexibility in how the policy is applied to respond to site specific and market requirements ensuring that developments remain viable and deliverable.</p>
3944	Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) [1042]	Montagu Evans LLP (Miss Lauren Hawksworth, Associate) [1041]	<p>Q16- The DIO believe that housing mix should be determined with reference to the Local Plan evidence base documents. The consultation document states that the policies in the withdrawn Local Plan will provide a useful starting point for development of the new Local Plan.</p> <p>The DIO support the preparation of a new SHMA for the new Local Plan. Planning policy should not be prescriptive but enable sufficient flexibility to respond to site specific characteristics and design. The DIO agree that the Local Plan should require a mix of housing typologies, including houses and flats, to meet the identified housing need. This should include specialist housing, homes for an ageing population and custom and selfbuild housing.</p> <p>Q17- The DIO believe that the approach to Affordable Housing should be informed by the Local Plan evidence base. The consultation document states that the policies in the withdrawn Local Plan will provide a useful starting point for development of the new Local Plan.</p> <p>The DIO support the preparation of a new SHMA for the new Local Plan. Planning Policy should require a range of affordable housing tenures, to meet the identified local need throughout the plan period. This should include a greater mix of housing typologies. The new Local Plan should be robust with requirements for a target housing mix to be applied to future development sites, however this should be subject to viability and allow future development to respond to local housing need and site-specific considerations.</p>
3901	Melton Borough Council (Mr Jorge Fiz Alonso, Senior Planning Policy Officer) [1025]		<p>Q16. Option A. Housing need changes over the time of a plan period and should reflect the most recent housing need evidence.</p> <p>Q17. Option A. This reflects the SHMA evidence of housing need</p> <p>Q18. Option A. Our own policy requiring a proportion of large housing sites to be</p>

			<p>available for self-builders is not very effective in practice</p> <p>Q19. Option C. It is important to require housing to be adaptable and accessible, as set out in Option A, although requiring all housing to meet the higher Building Regulations may present viability issues on many sites. It is also important to identify sites for specialist housing. If bungalows are required on sites as part of the mix, it is advisable to set a required percentage otherwise it is likely difficulties will be encountered with the delivery of these.</p>
3894	House Builders Federation (Joanne Harding, Planning Manager – Local Plan (North)) [1125]		<p>Q17-</p> <p>The HBF considers that any affordable housing split will need to take into consideration the need to provide affordable home ownership products including First Homes in line with national policy. The NPPF states that where major development involving the provision of housing is proposed, planning policies and decision should expect at least 10% of the total homes to be available for affordable home ownership. The PPG states that First Homes are the Government’s preferred discount market tenure and should account for at least 25% of all affordable housing units delivered by developers through planning obligations. The HBF also considers that it is important that the Council considers the viability implications in relation to affordable housing provision, and ensure that the policy includes flexibility to allow the proportion of affordable housing or the tenure of affordable housing to be amended if needed due to viability issues or due to changes in demand in affordable housing provision.</p> <p>Q18</p> <p>The HBF considers that a policy which encourages self and custom-build development and sets out where it will be supported in principle would be appropriate. The HBF also considers that allocating sites specifically for self and custom-build home builders could also be appropriate, however, this would need to be done through discussion and negotiation with landowners. The HBF does not consider that requiring a proportion of large housing sites to be available for self-builders is appropriate. The HBF would be interested to know whether any of the people on the self-build register have identified a preference to living on a large housing site, and whether the Council considers that there would be evidence of a demand for such sites. The HBF would also highlight the practical issues in terms of developing a large site where there are self-build plots on site, with</p>

			<p>potentially different builders and construction programmes. The Council will also need to consider the viability implications of this provision on larger housing sites.</p> <p>Q19 The HBF is generally supportive of providing homes that are suitable to meet the needs of older people and disabled people. However, if the Council wishes to adopt the higher optional standards for accessible, adaptable and wheelchair homes the Council should only do so by applying the criteria set out in the PPG. The PPG identifies the type of evidence required to introduce a policy requiring the M4 standards, including the likely future need; the size, location, type and quality of dwellings needed; the accessibility and adaptability of the existing stock; how the needs vary across different housing tenures; and the overall viability. It is incumbent on the Council to provide a local assessment evidencing the specific case for Rutland which justifies the inclusion of optional higher standards for accessible and adaptable homes in its Local Plan policy. If the Council can provide the appropriate evidence and this policy is to be included, then the HBF recommends that an appropriate transition period is included within the policy. The PPG also identifies other requirements for the policy including the need to consider site specific factors such as vulnerability to flooding, site topography and other circumstances, and the ability to provide step-free access. The Council should also note that the Government response to the Raising accessibility standards for new homes states that the Government proposes to mandate the current M4(2) requirement in Building Regulations as a minimum for all new homes, with M4(1) applying in exceptional circumstances. This will be subject to a further consultation on the technical details and will be implemented in due course through the Building Regulations. M4(3) would continue to apply as now where there is a local planning policy in place and where a need has been identified and evidenced. The HBF considers that it would be appropriate to identify sites specifically for specialist housing for older people such as support housing or extra care schemes. This should be done through discussions with landowners and developers of specialist and older persons housing.</p>
3762	Historic England (Emilie Carr) [219]		As with all site allocations, heritage assets and their settings should be fully taken into account. Historic England are very happy to advise on informal early consultations regarding site allocations.

3753	Jane Ellis [1121]		It is good to see that residential housing in market towns is being considered as a way to revitalise town centres eg conversion to housing from other use. This should encourage businesses into towns and help to some extent, to limit car use, unlike development on the outskirts of towns, which increase car use
3750	Taylor Wimpey Straetgic Land [660]	Bidwells (Mr Mark Harris, Partner) [659]	<p>Taylor Wimpey do not believe it is appropriate to set specific requirements for the type and mix of homes to be provided. Whilst the need to marry the need to the supply of homes, it is not appropriate to effectively require all sites to delivery the same, or very similar housing mixes.</p> <p>It would be more appropriate to identify within site specific allocations where particular sites may be more appropriate to deliver a certain type of housing. However, we would still suggest that this should be a general mix and policy should not seek to micro-manage the matter of housing mix.</p> <p>Taylor Wimpey do not consider it appropriate to require large development sites to make serviced plots available for self-builders. The intent of the Government policy on self-build is to increase opportunities for development. Requiring plots on larger sites does not achieve this as it simply swaps how homes on larger site are delivered – slowing down delivery.</p> <p>Self-build plots are best provided on specifically allocated sites or by way of a policy which sets out the criteria where they will be allowed. This ensures they add to the supply and self builders can build hoes on sites that are likely to be more attractive to them.</p>
3738	Sinclair Rogers [1120]		the imposition of designs by national house building companies has not allowed Ketton to play any meaningful part in 'meeting identified current and future housing needs'. We need more truly affordable houses, bungalows and flats. It appears that the majority of houses that the village will be saddled with in the current developments are bought-in designs that look as if they were chosen for their profitability for the companies.
3661	Ms Janet Taylor [1109]		There should be much less speculative private housing development which is always geared towards maximising the profits of the developers. There should be a greater emphasis on the council directly providing housing for social rent, as we used to have, and that housing should be of a high standard.
3550	Barrowden Parish Council (Mr Gordon Brown, Chairman) [1103]		Rutland County Council should consider a CPO of one acre of land which would probably meet our G & T needs for the Plan Period

3443	Vistry Homes East Midlands [1070]	Marrons (Mr Dan Robinson-Wells, Associate Director) [535]	<p>Regarding the Options for Affordable Housing, whilst Option A is the most appropriate of the three listed, the policy should be led by the evidence, but should offer a degree of flexibility and adhere to the First Homes policy, which should then clearly identify the remaining split of affordable housing products.</p> <p>Regarding self build, Option A is the most appropriate. Vistry Homes support the Council's intention of providing opportunities for self-builders to enter the housing market. However, the issue with subdividing allocations artificially is that it creates significant design, planning and management issues, which fundamentally undermine the delivery of any given site.</p> <p>Regarding Options for Older Person's Housing, both options are potentially suitable, however any policy should be clearly evidenced and viability tested and be sufficiently flexible to allow for site specific circumstances.</p>
2846	CPRE Rutland (Mr Ron Simpson, Chair) [1036]		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Accept timber (sustainable) built homes in rural locations 2. Acknowledge and accept housing development proposed in N Plans. 3. Support the creation of locally led community land trusts 4. Support only those developments which include local transport and electric car charging 5. Ensure plan polices support sensible vehicle parking at home and for visitors 6. Link housing areas to employment sites to reduce need to travel 7. Encourage district heating schemes 8. Ensure adequate supply of green and open space in new developments plus sufficient adopted roads 9. Ensure a sound bio diversity strategy is embodied in all new developments. 10. Policies should encourage parishes to build municipally owned homes.
2714	Braunston Parish Council (Mrs Carole Brown, Parish Clerk) [1003]		<p>Direct provision of high standard social housing. This will save costs of temporary housing and privately owned rental housing over the long run, and reduce living costs if done properly</p>
2656	Mrs Karen Hubbard [1033]		<p>Care homes should consider expansion so that spouses can live with their partner. This alongside improvements in facilities & standards of care would encourage more elderly couples to move out of large family homes. I personally, would much rather be able to buy an apartment in a care home for myself & my spouse than be made to move in on my own or worse still left at home with visiting carers. The current situation where so many older people are visited by carers in their own homes is unsustainable. Many such people</p>

		<p>have enjoyed a mainly good retirement with a good income but insist on staying in their own homes as they do not like the alternatives. We must make the alternatives something people look forward to using!</p>
2626	<p>Define (on behalf of William Davis Homes) (Mr Sam Perkins, Graduate Planner) [1027]</p>	<p>Housing Mix (Additional comments regarding Question 16): WDH supports Option A of Question 16, which would provide flexibility on the house types and sizes delivered on sites to ensure that housing will respond to local needs over time. Additionally, the supporting text should make clear that final housing mixes should be informed by up-to-date evidence regarding localised housing need / demand, site and settlement-specific characteristics and viability, in order to support that flexible approach to meeting the housing needs of the area. Pursuing Option A would, therefore, ensure that the policy does not quickly become out-of-date when the evidence base underpinning the mix is updated.</p> <p>Affordable Housing (Additional comments regarding Question 17): Given that the Government now requires 25% of all affordable homes to be secured as 'First Homes', RCC should bring forward an updated SHMA that considers the associated implications. Indeed, as a result of that requirement, Option A of Question 17 would effectively only require 8% affordable home ownership provision, which may not be appropriate, and RCC should revisit this matter in order to reach an informed view based upon up-to-date evidence. Notwithstanding the approach pursued, RCC should allow for sufficient flexibility within the policy to allow for final affordable housing offers to take account of evidence of housing need and demand in the area, settlement and site-specific matters and characteristics, and viability. Furthermore, the proposed policy will need to be subject to a comprehensive viability appraisal that considers the cumulative viability implications of the Plan's policy requirements.</p> <p>Custom and Self Build Housing (Additional comments regarding Question 18): Whilst it is noted that RCC is required to address and respond to the demand for Custom and Self-Build Housing (CSB), it is critical that the policy approach taken is justified and based on evidenced demand for CSB provision, in order to be effective / deliverable. The I&O document makes reference to the Council's Self-Build Register and, whilst the number of registrations on that register are not referred to, WDH has in-principle concerns as to the validity of such registers as an evidence of actual demand for CSB</p>

plots. Such registers are not means tested; often only require an individual's name and address, and do not seek to ascertain whether an individual or group has the financial resources to deliver such a plot should the opportunity arise. The reality is, therefore, that the actual demand for CSB housing would fall well below the number of registrations on the register.

Moreover, registrations on CSB registers often relate to a desire for CSB in a specific location, rather than within market housing developments. Irrespective of the above point, therefore, that calls into question whether seeking CSB plots on market housing sites would be appropriate to meet any demand arising.

Furthermore, delivering CSB housing within market housing schemes can be practically challenging. For example, the delivery of CSB houses is often dependent on the ability of sites to provide independent construction access and infrastructure, and deal with difficult health and safety issues. Moreover, CSB housing has the potential to undermine the realisation of consistent design principles across a scheme, and can also negatively impact on delivery timescales.

In light of the above, it is clear that delivering CSB plots on larger sites would be wholly inappropriate and it is instead suggested that RCC identifies specific sites for the delivery of CSB housing or, as an alternative, sets out policy requirements in relation to speculative proposals for CSB housing.

Accessible and Adaptable Housing (Additional comments regarding Question 19):

The approach that is taken in relation to the delivery of specialist housing for elderly people should be informed by evidence and should take a hybrid approach reflecting that the need and demand for specialist housing for elderly people is comprised of different elements. Thus, it is recommended that a robust evidence base is prepared that makes the distinction between whether there is a need for specialist housing on specific sites (i.e. care homes or assisted living) or for adaptable and accessible housing in market developments. That is likely to identify that the most appropriate strategy would combine Options A and B, each of which respond to different elements of that need.

In relation specifically to the delivery of accessible and adaptable housing on market sites, it is noted that any policy should be sufficiently flexible to allow for the provision of such housing to respond to up-to-date evidence of need and demand, location and site-specific characteristics and viability considerations. Moreover, the proposed policy approach

			should be the subject of a comprehensive viability assessment to ensure that the policy requirements are cumulatively deliverable.
2607	Ms SUSAN SEED [1028]		Questioning the need to provide sites.
2538	Mr Harold Dermott [1001]		RCC really don't have a Gypsy and Traveller policy. They have largely been presented by various fait accomplis by the Gypsy & Traveller Community which they then rubber stamped. Hopefully the forthcoming GTAA will allow a proper policy to be created, rather than just extend the existing sites.
2450	Uppingham Town Council (Parish Council Representative) [445]		Listen more to local people and empower them to help provide solutions. This can best be achieved by giving Neighbourhood Planning a more prominent place within the Local Plan.
2356	Limes, Firs & Spurs Resident's Association (Mr David Ainslie, Chairman) [1006]		Listen more to local people and empower them to help provide solutions. This can best be achieved by giving Neighbourhood Planning a more prominent place within the Local Plan.
2265	Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan Group (David Ainslie) [270]		Listen more to local people and empower them to help provide solutions. This can best be achieved by giving Neighbourhood Planning a more prominent place within the Local Plan.
2234	Mr David Denness [990]		This document needs to justify why RCC propose to update the 2016 GTAA. In the absence of this there is no evidence to support the review.
2173	Hugh Cheneywood [839]		Support a new settlement (including industrial sites) at Woolfox in collaboration with Lincs to ease pressures on both Stamford and the current two towns in Rutland. Such a development ,in particular, would greatly improve transport within the existing towns and ease highways problems in providing for North/S access to the A1.
2099	Mr George Bretten [995]		No
1913	Mr John Donaldson [986]		No sites should be provided
1784	Mrs Kim Cross [978]		By nature travellers travel, we should have enough to cater for those passing through for future years.
1759	Ms Gayle Burgess [976]		What level of adaptation of existing houses is possible? Some of the older properties in the villages look stunning and are an important part of the 'feel' of the area, but after previously living in one such house in Ketton (a rented property, opposite St Mary's Church) if they are not appropriately maintained by Landlords or owners they become almost unlivable. The house I was in had thick layers of ice inside during the winter and a

			permanently sodden carpet in the lounge all year. Perhaps some of the buildings that are deteriorating the most could be retrofitted within the considerations for listed properties? I appreciate this is expensive but there must be some developers that would take on this challenge.
1705	Barry Hobbs [646]		Incorporating Neighbourhood plans
1613	Oakham Quaker Meeting (Ms Susan Bolter, Clerk) [941]		Introduce policies that limit second homes and short-term holiday lets. We wish to give priority to local people's housing needs, not those of people who choose to live the majority of their time elsewhere.
1262	CLA (John Greenshields, Chartered Surveyor) [937]		We were unable to answer questions 17-20 due to lack of options/details that would permit an answer to be given. With regards to question 17, an assessment should be made to consider whether or not increasing Affordable Housing provisions should be made. As this policy doesn't increase the supply of housing, which is of great importance in making housing more available and affordable. With the policy impacting the ability of developers to deliver high quality development and can mean that costs are merely moved about in the tiered system. The affordability problem, is at its core a supply and demand problem only. As such the only true solution can be found by addressing the supply side, not what proportion of new housing is 'Affordable.' Wider comment can be found in the documents enclosed in the answer to Qu. 6.
1085	Miss Brenda Palmer [915]		To date all Rutland sites are in Langham, do not increase our sites, allocate a site to another parish. it is not fair to place all such settlement in 1 parish.
983	Mrs Victoria Owen [902]		Any policy would be better than what we have at the moment
733	Environment Agency (Mrs Nicola Reyman, Planning Specialist) [855]		Any future policy regarding Gypsy, Traveller, and Travelling Show People accommodation should ensure that the health and wellbeing of occupants are not put at risk, including unacceptable flood risk or contaminated land. Furthermore, should the findings of the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) identify a need for additional sites, we recommend that policy sets the requirement for the connection to the mains sewage network. The Environment Agency recommend that applicants fully investigate the practicality of connection to the mains sewage network as the most appropriate approach, for example to prevent any potential contamination to groundwater, and to protect the health of people and wildlife. All policies relating to housing in the Local Plan should be clear that development should not be proposed in flood risk areas and that a sequential test, and where required an

			exception test, should be completed. We recognise that Rutland has minimal areas in flood zones 2 and 3 and therefore the Environment Agency would expect that any allocations for housing sites should be possible in Flood zone 1.
654	Mr Andrew Nebel [864]		The siting and size of such sites need very careful consideration.
574	Mr Ian Higgins [860]		Questioning the need to provide sites
497	Mr Nigel Roberts [705]		Questioning the need to provide sites
366	Martin Shewry [755]		Recognise the strength of local opinion and the Neighbourhood Plans
291	Mr Graham Layne [801]		Ensure that housing aligns with the demographic of people currently resident in the county to allow for down sizing and support living in old age.