

Local Plan Vision, Objectives, Plan period, and Issues

Id	Respondent	Agent	Question 3- Please let us have additional suggestions you may have
4235	Ketton and Tinwell Joint Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (Neighbourhood Plan Group Representative) [196]		<p>Question 1 Future Rutland document is remarkably detailed and this could cause difficulty in taking it as an all-embracing vision. Its main themes are not adequately inclusive unless you can take the rest of the document into account.</p> <p>We would therefore argue for a new vision for the Local Plan, which needs to be far simpler, and targeted.</p> <p>Question 2 additional comments: SOs 1 and 2 need particular attention on sustainability, especially in the larger villages which are likely to be targets for increased development. Overall infrastructure is not mentioned although traffic and drainage are, and there is thus a danger that in highlighting two areas and not others, there is an implication that wider infrastructure questions are not as important.</p> <p>We would argue for a strong definition within the Local Plan of what is deemed to be sustainable, and how that is to be tested.</p> <p>S09 could usefully make reference to the importance in protecting the natural environment in helping combat the impacts of climate change, including the potential for ecosystem services, and in the benefit to public health and well-being.</p> <p>We would agree with the proposition that these objectives will need fine-tuning once the detail of the Local Plan has been further developed, as factual information and further research may lead to the conclusion that the objectives need amendment, and they should not be seen as "set in stone" at this stage.</p>
4216	Lightsource BP (William Adkison) [999]		<p>LSbp is encouraged by the Council's proactive recognition of climate change in Strategic Objective One, however this should be broadened to specifically acknowledge the importance of the delivery of low carbon and renewable energy projects with the district as at present the objective appears to focus on improving efficiencies with new buildings. The National Planning Policy Framework stipulates that "plans should take a proactive approach to mitigating and adapting to climate change ... and support appropriate measures to ensure the future resilience of communities and infrastructure to climate change impacts" (Paragraph 153).</p>

4202	The Society of Merchant Venturers [693]	Savills (Lynette Swinburne, Associate Director) [520]	<p>Q1- Suggest some additional elements that should be added to the vision suggested through Option A such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • addressing need the overall for additional housing provision or growth in general. • to ensure new housing is sustainably located close to the main settlements, ensuring people have affordable housing in accessible areas, close to market centres and employment hubs • enhance the County’s green infrastructure and biodiversity provision, alongside the need to create open spaces to support health and wellbeing are supported. <p>The vision should be updated to reflect the latest Government objectives in regard to growth, energy and home ownership and, in particular, incorporate flexibility in its wording and objectives, to enable the vision to respond appropriately to any future updates to national policy.</p> <p>Q2- The 12 proposed strategic objectives identified for consideration (as set out on p10-11 of the Issues and Options consultation document) are generally supported and considered to broadly reflect the local needs and characteristics of the County, as well as the overarching economic, social and environmental objectives of the planning system (NPPF paragraph 8).</p> <p>Strategic Objectives 2, 3 and 5 seek to ‘deliver sustainable development’, in addition to growth around the market towns, the objective also recognises the importance of seeking to sustain a network of larger villages that serve local needs; and enabling the proportionate viability and sustainability of smaller villages and countryside.</p> <p>This approach is generally supported, however, it is noted that further analysis of the extent of additional housing and growth required through the Local Plan is necessary to determine whether additional housing sites are required to meet the Council’s housing requirements.</p>
4167	De Merke Estates [589]	Barton Willmore, now Stantec (Seth Tyler, Graduate Planner) [1141]	<p>The Objectives should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider sustainable location for large scale residential-led development on the edge of key settlements especially in Oakham/Barleythorpe (as the Principal settlement) to deliver the variety of housing required; • Consider early and proactive engagement with the local community through Local Plan Consultation Process;

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider the Duty to Cooperate and how it can help meet the needs of housing for the wider HMA through the delivery of a minimum of 190 dpa; • Prioritise the allocation of sites that can deliver new homes in sustainable locations, provide positive impacts for wildlife, biodiversity and new infrastructure to support the community; • Allow Sites to increase density to make the best use of the land ; and • The Council should also consider improving its own integrated network of sustainable and accessible transport options before looking at collaborate with other neighbouring Local Planning Authorities.
4162	The Burley Estate [691]	Savills (Lynette Swinburne, Associate Director) [520]	<p>The 12 proposed strategic objectives identified for consideration (as set out on p10-11 of the Issues and Options consultation document) are generally supported and considered to broadly reflect the local needs and characteristics of the County, as well as the overarching economic, social and environmental objectives of the planning system (NPPF paragraph 8).</p> <p>It is important that the Emerging Local Plan recognises the significant impact that the leisure and tourism economy can make to the area, particularly when this is undertaken in a way that complements and enhances existing assets.</p> <p>Whilst Strategic Objective 4 refers to business investment and job creation, it may be appropriate to ensure that all businesses are supported across a range of sectors, including leisure and tourism.</p> <p>Similarly, there may be scope to ensure that the opportunities that are offered through new leisure and tourism development are explicitly supported within Strategic Objective 8 and Strategic Objective 9.</p>
4134	Silver Fox Developments (John Edmond) [1138]		<p>The intention to deliver sustainable development in Objective 2 is welcomed we consider the wording of this objective could imply that the Council will not meet, in full, its housing need and may instead seek to restrict growth to a level the Council deems appropriate.</p> <p>Government housing need of 142 represents only the starting point for identifying need. It may be appropriate to seek higher levels of delivery, particularly if the Council is to make a meaningful attempt to address the aspiration set out in the Future Rutland Vision to ensure fair access to affordable and sustainable housing given that affordable housing delivery in the County has, in recent years been insufficient to address local identified need.</p>

			<p>Given that part of this objective seems to be repeated in Objective 3 which seeks to meet ‘Rutland's identified current and future diverse housing needs, including the affordability of housing, through the provision of high-quality new homes’.</p> <p>We suggest that Objective 2 is amended to read <i>‘Delivering sustainable development by determining an appropriate level and location of development in Rutland, sited in locations where people can access jobs and services, and in delivering wider social and economic outcomes, taking account of environmental considerations’.</i></p>
4118	Avant Homes [1131]	Mr Alasdair Thorne [562]	<p>The intention to deliver sustainable development in Objective 2 is welcomed we consider the wording of this objective could imply that the Council will not meet, in full, its housing need and may instead seek to restrict growth to a level the Council deems appropriate.</p> <p>Government housing need of 142 represents only the starting point for identifying need. It may be appropriate to seek higher levels of delivery, particularly if the Council is to make a meaningful attempt to address the aspiration set out in the Future Rutland Vision to ensure fair access to affordable and sustainable housing given that affordable housing delivery in the County has, in recent years been insufficient to address local identified need.</p> <p>Given that part of this objective seems to be repeated in Objective 3 which seeks to meet ‘Rutland's identified current and future diverse housing needs, including the affordability of housing, through the provision of high-quality new homes’.</p> <p>We suggest that Objective 2 is amended to read <i>‘Delivering sustainable development by determining an appropriate level and location of development in Rutland, sited in locations where people can access jobs and services, and in delivering wider social and economic outcomes, taking account of environmental considerations’.</i></p>
4108	MR PJSR HILL AND PIKERACE LIMITED [1130]	Andrew Granger & Co (Stephen Mair, Planning	<p>We would agree that the objectives contained within the Issues and Options document appropriate for continuation within the preparation of the new Local Plan. However, this is subject to any necessary amendments that may be required to the Objectives once the proposed strategy, to address the specific issues to be considered within the Plan Review, has been finalised.</p>

		Consultant) [483]	
4055	Cottesmore Parish Council (Parish Council Representative) [410]		<p>The wording of Objective 5 (relating to the Spatial Strategy) is somewhat clumsy. Also need to reflect the importance of enhanced protection for farmland in view of the need to become more self-sufficient in food production nationally. In particular unnecessary development that could go elsewhere should be resisted.</p> <p>Also given the size of Rutland, the strategic policy 11 (relating to ensuring a steady and adequate supply of minerals) should be reformed around meeting primarily Rutland’s needs with some contribution to sub-regional requirements.</p>
4007	John Dejardin [128]		<p>Local Plan Vision – The Future Rutland Vision appears very weak when addressing the climate crisis; “combatting the climate crisis through the power of choice” is hard to understand what it means; seems more like a political statement than a serious statement of intent.</p> <p>The next 20 years needs a stronger vision in tackling the climate crisis, a near permanently brown Rutland landscape would hardly meet other aspects of the FR Vision.</p> <p>Objective 3 - the term “high-quality new homes” is fairly meaningless surely we are not building poor quality new homes. In this critical 20 year period of the plan they all need to be high quality low carbon new houses or the net zero target will not be met.</p> <p>If the Zero target is to be met the 20 year plan has to make it clear to developers that achieving low carbon homes will mean higher costs but evidence exists that in time these will diminish as superior materials and systems become the readily available as they are in other more advanced parts of Europe.</p>
3986	The Society of Merchant Venturers [693]	Savills (Julia Mountford, Planning Consultant) [735]	<p>Q1- Suggest some additional elements that should be added to the vision suggested through Option A such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • addressing need the overall for additional housing provision or growth in general. • to ensure new housing is sustainably located close to the main settlements, ensuring people have affordable housing in accessible areas, close to market centres and employment hubs • enhance the County’s green infrastructure and biodiversity provision, alongside the need to create open spaces to support health and wellbeing are supported. <p>The vision should be updated to reflect the latest Government objectives in regard to growth, energy and home ownership and, in particular, incorporate flexibility in its wording and objectives, to enable the vision to respond appropriately to any future updates to national policy.</p>

			<p>Q2- Strategic Objectives 2, 3 and 5 seek to ‘deliver sustainable development’, in particular in and around the market towns in order to meet the demand for housing in the County. This approach is generally supported, however, it is noted that further analysis of the extent of additional housing and growth required through the Local Plan is necessary to determine whether additional housing sites are required to meet the Council’s housing requirements.</p> <p>It is considered that in order for this objective to be met, growth should also be directed to allocations located in sustainable and accessible locations.</p>
3949	Clipsham Parish Meeting (Clifford Bacon) [110]		<p>1. Ref Objectives 5&9: There is a need to specifically reflect the importance of enhanced protection for farmland in view of the need to become more self-sufficient in food production locally and nationally. Inappropriate development that could be provided elsewhere should be resisted. The use of farmland for solar projects should be the subject of an urgent Supplementary Planning Guidance such as was produced at short notice for windfarm development in November 2012.</p> <p>2. Ref Objective 11: Should be reformed towards meeting primarily Rutland’s needs with limitations on our contribution to sub-regional requirements. Local Aggregate Assessments must be enforced in practice.</p> <p>3. There needs to be more emphasis on reducing the causes of climate change and therefore preventing any increase in commuting traffic.</p>
3914	Anglian Water (Darl Sweetland, Spatial Planning Manager) [234]		<p>Anglian Water considers that the new Local Plan should quantify the carbon reduction which the Council is seeking and prioritise those options which reduce capital and operational carbon</p> <p>Anglian Water considers that in planning the spatial distribution and quantum of growth, utilising existing infrastructure capacity development will be less costly for developers and buyers of new homes and commercial property.</p> <p>Development which requires new infrastructure will incur additional costs from utility companies as well as increasing carbon generated by that ill planned growth. Reducing infrastructure costs also enables limited funding to be used on other objectives including more stretching environmental gains. Similarly through using existing visitor and recreation infrastructure to support tourism business and employment we can reduce the operational carbon associated with visitors and tourism. ,</p>
3857	Ryhall Parish Council (Parish		<p>Yes we agree that viability is important however this must not out way the need for smaller affordable dwellings.</p>

	Council Representative) [435]		<p>CIL payments should be applied as these help to support the community that is affected.</p> <p>Identity of villages are important and clear definition between settlements are necessary</p>
3823	Sally Renner [1124]		<p>Could be an objective to support, maintain and ensure an adequate supply of food through farming- why are minerals given such a big focus, when we are a rural county with many farms. At least farming/food production could come into other objectives</p>
3812	Ketton Darby & Joan Club (Ruth Renner) [1122]		<p>15 years is more realistic.</p>
3811	Ketton Darby & Joan Club (Ruth Renner) [1122]		<p>12 objectives/issues are rather alot. Perhaps a focus should be placed on fewer</p>
3756	Historic England (Emilie Carr) [219]		<p>The vision proposed does not reference heritage assets and their settings. Rutland has a particular wealth of heritage assets and to illustrate their importance and value, reflecting the aims of the NPPF, they should be referenced within the vision. Historic England would be very happy to advise on wording.</p> <p>Strategic Objective 9 is welcomed. Reference to ‘heritage assets and their settings’ should be included to reflect NPPF wording. It may be clearer to include a specific heritage assets objective. Again, Historic England would be very happy to assist with wording.</p>
3719	Tim Allen [521]		<p>Objective 2 and 5 could be considered to conflict with each other as suggesting that housing growth should be in locations that are accessible to jobs may be interpreted to preclude the villages, where there are few jobs. Nevertheless, some of the villages are highly accessible, sitting on strategic corridors and with high quality bus and active mode connections from them to the larger centres and employment areas. At the same time, as Strategic Objective 5 identifies, it is critically important to ensure that village settlements of all sizes are considered in terms of their viability and that growth is properly planned for them to counter-act tendencies towards economic decline. The loss of amenities in villages (schools, shops and community activities) acts to seriously impact the overall sustainability of these communities, and it is vital that the Local Plan for Rutland - a highly rural district, purposely identifies the need for planned growth in the villages.</p> <p>We consider that Strategic Objective 2 should be amended to make clear that there is always a balance to be struck between supporting and enhancing local sustainability and economic connections to employment in a rural district. We would suggest that it reads:</p>

			<p><i>Delivering sustainable development by determining an appropriate level and location of housing growth in Rutland, sited in locations that support sustainability in local communities, especially the villages, and where there are good public transport and active mode connections to jobs and services, and in delivering wider social and economic outcomes, taking account of environmental considerations</i></p> <p>With regard to Strategic Objective 9, Plan should take a more proactive approach to ensuring that, where development is permitted, it plays its part in securing this objective. This might mean making appropriate contributions to the protection and enhancement of these assets, but could also encompass schemes for enabling development that are specifically devised to secure valuable assets in perpetuity. Such development proposals will need to be sympathetically designed and reflect the setting of the assets that they seek to secure, but should be considered positively where they would secure an asset that would otherwise be likely to be in increasing danger. If such proposals can provide a viable future for endangered cultural assets in perpetuity, then they should be considered as providing a sustainable outcome for the purposes of the Plan.</p> <p>We would suggest that the Strategic Objective should better reflect this pro-active approach by reading as follows:</p> <p><i>Protecting and enhancing Rutland’s varied and high-quality environment, including its natural landscapes, green infrastructure and biodiversity, as well as its rich historic built environment and cultural assets and seek proactive and creative approaches to securing endangered assets in perpetuity</i></p>
3685	Severn Trent (Chris Bramley) [230]		<p>Supportive of general principles.</p> <p>Climate change is anticipated to have an impact on the availability of water, alongside increasing demand due to population growth, we would therefore recommend that Strategic objective 1 also highlights water sustainability / efficiency.</p> <p>Section 2.3 Priority and Development Viability,</p> <p>Severn Trent would recommend that Water Efficiency and SuDS are highlighted, as both elements could result in some additional costs, Water Efficient Technology is often energy Efficient potentially mitigating the impacts of climate change in Multiple ways. SuDS however have a land take element, especially if</p>

			added as an afterthought but this can be partly mitigated by incorporating it to the site layout form the beginning adding green blue corridors that provide the biodiversity benefits and flood resilient.
3649	Ms Janet Taylor [1109]		Are they objectives, or simply a generic list of rather woolly phrases that tick all the sound-good boxes, and could be applied to anywhere. And if they are in any order then item 12 should be item 1 – we cannot have any more development until we have infrastructure, and that must come before any other works are done.
3528	Barrowden Parish Council (Mr Gordon Brown, Chairman) [1103]		Objectives 2 and 5 are too general in that they could result in a very wide range of outcomes based on the decision-maker's point of view. How accessible a settlement might be or how it might be sustainable. This needs a lot more detail.
3494	PDR Planning Limited (Mr Philip Rawle, Director) [627]		<p>Question 1: The Local Plan vision involves looking ahead to what Rutland will look like in 15-20 years' time so it should reflect the Plan period, and what you want to achieve and thinking about different ways of approaching it.</p> <p>The vision should be based on a sound understanding of the form and function of the Plan area, and can draw upon various sources including past Plans, sustainability work being undertaken alongside the Plan and stakeholder involvement, (including, the Future Rutland Vision work).</p> <p>The vision should be aspirational but realistic, locally distinctive, and spatial in planning terms. In addition, the NPPF requires (paragraphs 24-27) that local planning authorities are under the duty to cooperate with each other, and with other prescribed bodies, on strategic matters that cross administrative boundaries.</p> <p>Question 2: Greenlight suggests Strategic Objective 5 be split in two, so that the market towns and the villages are treated separately. The detail for how villages should be treated is set out in our response to Question 3 (below).</p> <p>Question 3: Further to our response to Question 2, Greenlight suggests the reinstatement of Strategic Objective 3 'Diverse and thriving villages', as set out in the Local Plan Review Consultation Draft (July 2017), which states:</p> <p><i>"To develop diverse and thriving villages by encouraging sustainable development where it supports the role of the larger villages as 'service hubs' for the smaller villages and meets local needs in the smaller villages to maintain and improve their vitality and viability."</i></p>

3465	The Burley Estate [691]	Savills (Lynette Swinburne, Associate Director) [520]	<p>The 12 proposed strategic objectives identified for consideration (as set out on p10-11 of the Issues and Options consultation document) are generally supported and considered to broadly reflect the local needs and characteristics of the County, as well as the overarching economic, social and environmental objectives of the planning system (NPPF paragraph 8).</p> <p>It is important that the Emerging Local Plan recognises the significant impact that the leisure and tourism economy can make to the area, particularly when this is undertaken in a way that complements and enhances existing assets.</p> <p>Whilst Strategic Objective 4 refers to business investment and job creation, it may be appropriate to ensure that all businesses are supported across a range of sectors, including leisure and tourism. Similarly, there may be scope to ensure that the opportunities that are offered through now leisure and tourism development are explicitly supported within Strategic Objective 8 and Strategic Objective 9.</p>
3462	Mrs Pam Allen [1085]		The majority of the vision and objectives you have outlined cover(s) development of property. The plan should cover environmental objectives and strategies, enhancing wildlife and improving the environment and heritage of the county.
3387	Mr Adam Cade [1078]		Objective 1 should include biodiversity as it is so closely related to climate change as both a problem and solution.
3348	Empingham Parish Council (Mrs Rowan Scholtz, Parish Council Representative) [413]		<p>12 strategic objectives is far too many, as set out it is all apple pie and motherhood, a wish list.</p> <p>Objectives 2, 3 and 9 and 12 should be prioritized as they deal with our rural environment, truly affordable housing, and essential infrastructure.</p>
3248	Edith Weston Parish Council (Parish Council Representative) [411]		<p>While there are too many objectives in our view here are Edith Weston Parish council additional comments:</p> <p>The vision should concentrate on the very essence of what Rutland is and should focus on ensuring the rural nature of the county, its two market towns and village communities are maintained and enhanced to ensure the continued.</p> <p>Objective 1 is important and as part of that minimisation of travel to places of employment and other facilities is key. Large scale development outside the main employment areas of Oakham and Uppingham</p>

		<p>would be inappropriate.</p> <p>Objective 2 refers to the appropriate level of development and location. It is important that the level and location of development is set at levels that reflect and are sympathetic to the surrounding environment and existing communities.</p> <p>Objective 3 should reflect only the level of development required specifically for Rutland and not include unnecessary additional housing numbers.</p> <p>Objective 5 is supported as it emphasises the need for the two market towns to be the places for economic and cultural activity while sustaining the larger villages and ensuring the viability of the smaller villages. Therefore, any proposed large scale developments outside or not adjoined with the two market towns would totally conflict with this objective.</p> <p>Objective 7 correctly refers to “...design that reflects local character, contributes to local distinctiveness...”</p> <p>Objective 9 provides for the protection of the county’s high quality environment, its natural landscape and historic environment which is positive.</p> <p>Objective 10 should put emphasis on the “prudent” use of previously developed land. It should also refer to minimising the impact on adjoining or nearby communities and/or landscapes.</p> <p>Objective 11 is important as the county has reserves of nationally important minerals. These reserves should be protected, not just for the forecast use in the plan period, but beyond for the benefit of future generations. In considering this even current unviable reserves should be protected as they will become viable in the future.</p>
3018	Mr Malcolm Touchin [1038]	<p>The Strategic Objectives are very limited in scope, and seem to be focused almost entirely on new housing developments and directly related issues (although Issue 9 recognises that measures to preserve some existing buildings would not be excluded from the plan). There should also be objectives covering:</p> <p>Need to ensure compatibility with developments in adjoining authorities, especially for transport, health and education needs, as there will inevitably be significant influences across the county's borders. This is also relevant to employment opportunities (Issue 4).</p>

			<p>A suitably balanced approach to land-use should be a key feature of the plan, to ensure we set aside enough for housing, business/industry/retail, agriculture, energy generation, leisure/tourism, etc. There should also be consideration of longer-term goals (as noted at paras 2.4.3 and 2.4.4) – how long do we keep adding more houses, etc.? Is there a limit somewhere which should be set out in policy, i.e. an overall planned limit of development for the county (Q4, Issue 2a, Issue 6), as new development clearly cannot be sustained indefinitely.</p> <p>There should be an objective around development of renewable energy supply and storage facilities so that adequate diversity of supply can be maintained. There will be a range of options for solar panels - should be fitted on all industrial roofs, for instance - , wind turbines, battery storage, etc., on which many residents will have valid views, and which should inform policy in this area.</p> <p>What about maintaining/enhancing support and services for existing homes as well as for new ones (broadband, electric car charging, energy use, e.g.) (Q7)? Any enhancements to infrastructure provision must ensure that the infrastructure as a whole supports all of the community, not just new developments (Issue 12).</p> <p>There should be an explicit statement about ensuring that the scale of new development and related infrastructure (schools, health, transport, etc.) is coherent with anticipated demographics (Issue 2a, Issue 12), and with ongoing changes in business and working practices, retail behaviour and leisure needs. Does RCC have any intention to influence those demographics by, for instance, encouraging particular types of employment/businesses, the creation of more specific attractions or assets for the county, or promoting much more genuinely affordable housing (beyond current government formulae) (Issue 3, Issue 4, Issue 6, Q37, Q38, Issue 10)?</p>
2938	Mr Brian Grady [1052]		<p>There is a need for a detailed vision on the establishment of renewable energy installations. There is a potential for such structures to change the whole rural character of the County.</p> <p>There is also a need to identify the type and location of sites which might be suitable for such development in a similar way to those sites for housing and industrial development. Also there is a need to establish what total output of energy would be needed to sustain the future needs of Rutland.</p>
2921	Mrs Laura Gray [1050]		<p>New housing should be near the existing towns of Oakham and Uppingham.</p>

2901	Mrs Janie Johnson-Crossfield [1049]		<p>More specifics on services such as Health, GP practices</p> <p>More specifics needed on new housing stock green credentials... e.g solar panels, heat pump etc</p>
2876	Mr Simon Frearson [1047]		<p>We should have the option to 1) change the order of the objectives set and 2) totally disagree with certain objectives if considered irrelevant.</p> <p>The order and priorities are wrong</p>
2822	Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) [1042]	Montagu Evans LLP (Miss Lauren Hawksworth, Associate) [1041]	<p>Question 1 – Local Plan Vision Future Rutland Vision should be used as the basis of preparing the new Local Plan, as the vision reflects the matters which are important to the local community. However, the Local Plan should be clear about the vision for the identified plan period, in order to give the community certainty over how development will come forward and the timing of associated infrastructure that will be needed.</p> <p>Question 2 and 3 – Local Plan Strategic Objectives The Council’s proposed Strategic Objectives have been drafted to help achieve the proposed vision for Rutland. The DIO are supportive of the Council’s approach to the new Local Plan objectives.</p>
2815	CPRE Rutland (Mr Ron Simpson, Chair) [1036]		<p>Missing are the need to host sources of sustainable energy e.g nuclear, solar and wind.</p> <p>Also the need to support sustainable vehicular transport based on motor vehicles e.g. electric cars and community buses.</p> <p>Also the need to support a county based Rutland Community Bus Company which would incorporate call and collect as well as link between villages and the two market towns.</p>
2781	North Luffenham Neighbourhood Planning Group (Tim smith) [265]		<p>12 strategic objectives are far too many and, as set out, just a wish list. Objectives 2, 3 9 and 12 should be prioritized as they deal with our rural environment, truly affordable housing, and essential infrastructure.</p>
2736	Jeakins Weir Ltd [1037]	Mr Alasdair Thorne [562]	<p>The intention to deliver sustainable development in Objective 2 is welcomed we consider the wording of this objective could imply that the Council will not meet, in full, its housing need and may instead seek to restrict growth to a level the Council deems appropriate.</p>

			<p>Government housing need of 142 represents only the starting point for identifying need. It may be appropriate to seek higher levels of delivery, particularly if the Council is to make a meaningful attempt to address the aspiration set out in the Future Rutland Vision to ensure fair access to affordable and sustainable housing given that affordable housing delivery in the County has, in recent years been insufficient to address local identified need.</p> <p>Given that part of this objective seems to be repeated in Objective 3 which seeks to meet ‘Rutland's identified current and future diverse housing needs, including the affordability of housing, through the provision of high-quality new homes’.</p> <p>We suggest that Objective 2 is amended to read <i>‘Delivering sustainable development by determining an appropriate level and location of development in Rutland, sited in locations where people can access jobs and services, and in delivering wider social and economic outcomes, taking account of environmental considerations’.</i></p>
2724	Braunston Parish Council (Mrs Carole Brown, Parish Clerk) [1003]		<p>The above are not objectives, but a list of sensible criteria against which objectives would be met. Desired outcomes still need to be set.</p> <p>The plan should set local objectives for increasing local industry supported by local infrastructure this would develop in parallel with rebuilding local agriculture rather than re-wilding; this would form and employment plan, driving the need for any growth in housing with the aim of bringing economic benefit to Rutland</p>
2635	Mr Jamie Weir [1030]		Encourage local spend
2617	Define (on behalf of William Davis Homes) (Mr Sam Perkins, Graduate Planner) [1027]		<p>Vision (Additional comments regarding Question 1):</p> <p>Future Rutland Vision document presents a high-level outlook for the area and it is important that Rutland County Council (RCC) considers how it can realise that vision by developing an appropriate spatial strategy. In particular, the Future Rutland Vision document sets out that “growth in Rutland will be sustainable and preserve the county’s quintessential character” and that new homes “will be built in a way that protects and enhances the things that matter most to everyone – Rutland’s sense of community and its unique rural identity.” Clearly the Local Plan will need to consider how its spatial strategy can achieve that, based on an evidence base that considers all key factors in the round.</p>

			<p>Objectives (Additional comments regarding Question 2):</p> <p>WDH support the scope of the proposed objectives for the Local Plan Review (LPR), and in particular the inclusion of strategic objectives that recognise the requirement to meet Rutland’s current and future housing needs through the provision of new homes.</p> <p>Focusing appropriate growth to the County’s settlements is key to sustaining the vitality of settlements and the services and facilities therein in accordance with paragraph 79 of the NPPF, which states that planning policies “should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services.”</p> <p>Moreover, the Local Plan must recognise how services and facilities operate in a collective manner in rural areas, with networks of settlements effectively coming together to meet the daily needs of the residents of all settlements. The LPR should consider how suitably located residential growth can enhance this and should identify residential development sites accordingly.</p> <p>Viability:</p> <p>It is noted that paragraph 2.3.1 states that, “there is a risk if expectations and policy requirements are too high, that development may not be viable.” It should be clarified, however, that development will certainly not be viable if policy requirements are too high, and in that regard it is critical that RCC carry out a comprehensive policy requirement that considers the cumulative impact of all proposed policy requirements in the Plan to ensure that its policies and proposed allocations are all deliverable in accordance with NPPF paragraph 35c.</p>
2528	Pigeon Investment Management Ltd [1022]	Carter Jonas (Ms Kimberley Brown, Associate Partner) [601]	<p>Question 1 Local Plan Vision:</p> <p>It is suggested that the Local Plan Vision should include references to the following: the relevant plan period; the delivery of all three objectives of sustainable development; meeting development needs for housing, employment and other uses; areas to be protected from development; locations that will be the main focus for growth; the strategy for Oakham and Uppingham; the strategy for other types of settlement in the hierarchy; and, community aspirations.</p> <p>Question 2 Local Plan Strategic Objectives: The proposed strategic objectives are supported, and they are generally consistent with national policy contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).</p>

			<p>However, if the strategic objectives are to be delivered it will be necessary for the emerging Rutland Local Plan (RLP) to meet identified housing needs in full, and to allocate sites to meet that need in suitable locations where there are no constraints, or any constraints can be addressed through mitigation measures. Pigeon is promoting land off Burley Road in Oakham for residential development.</p> <p>No additional strategic objectives are needed.</p>
2474	Mr james youatt [593]		needs to have more emphasis on affordable housing provision with mixed tenure
2459	Francis Jackson Homes Ltd (Mr Paul Johnson, Land and Planning Director) [761]		Given the Council's 4.1 year housing land supply position, it should be acknowledged that housing is needed in the immediate term to address this point - as such, the Strategic Objectives need to acknowledge that housing is needed across the plan period (including right at the start of it - or before), and larger sites which will take longer to come on stream need to be complemented with smaller and/or more immediately deliverable sites in the short term to meet local housing needs.
2456	Mr Harold Dermott [1001]		<p>These 'Local Plan Strategic Objectives' are so vague as to be meaningless and are designed so that the obvious answer is Agree.</p> <p>Who would not want to live in this amazing sounding Utopia that RCC is creating for us all? Except it won't be delivered. They are also intended to enable carrying forward the majority of policies from the previous Local Plan - again. The reality is different.</p> <p>Take Objective 1, where RCC "will (ensure) new development takes a proactive approach to carbon reduction". Really? Despite the highly selective summary shown, Fig 6.2 in the SA document, shows that, apart from a few brief months in 2012, between 2005 and 2018 Rutland produced more CO2 per sq km than both the East Midlands region and the entire UK. RUTLAND IS A MAJOR EMITTER OF CO2 and this data clearly shows it is not getting any better. Major action is needed in this new Local Plan, not just another rearrangement of the deckchairs on the Titanic.</p> <p>RCC's inadequate Climate Change strategy - which is a proven failure - runs through all the Objectives and requires RCC to raise its game. This required improvement is in many cases supported by the NPPF 2021. Objective 3 should require ALL homes to be carbon neutral from the start of this plan in 2025 and this would be supported by Paras 152 and 107 of NPPF 2021. (Note: The Heat & Buildings Strategy, part of the Net Zero Strategy referenced in the SA, sets standards for new build homes that natural gas boilers are unlikely to meet from 2025, at the time of issue of this Local Plan. All natural gas boilers will be banned in new build homes from 2035, well within the life of this Local Plan. What are RCC doing in this Local Plan to</p>

			support the transfer to all-electric new home builds?) A modern home can be made virtually carbon neutral immediately by requiring the fitment of an ADEQUATE number of solar panels to the roof of each and every new home, and is supported by Paras 152 to 158 of NPPF 2021. Note particularly 154(b), the 'orientation' of new homes, to maximise the efficiency of any solar panels.
2435	Uppingham Town Council (Parish Council Representative) [445]		There should be an additional Strategic Objective for RCC to actively promote Neighbourhood Planning and to guarantee to allow those communities that wish to allocate sites for development to do so through appropriate Neighbourhood Plans.
2414	Muller Property Group [1012]	Harris Lamb (Miss Josie Hobbs, Planner) [1010]	<p>We are in general agreement with the strategic objectives that have been set out particularly Strategic Objective 2 that seeks to deliver sustainable development by determining an appropriate level and location of housing growth in Rutland and Strategic Objective 3 which seeks to meet the identified current and future diverse housing needs, including the affordability of housing, through the provision of high quality new homes.</p> <p>We do not believe that there is any need for additional strategic objectives other than the ones listed in the consultation document.</p>
2405	Les Allen [174]		<p>I do not agree with all the objectives. Seven out of twelve of your objectives are about development or property. This subject disproportionately outweighs other objectives which have been missed. The Local Plan should have stronger environmental strategies which will enhance wildlife and improve the environment. In Rutland we have been blessed with excellent wildlife sites which need greater protection from the encroaching pressure to build dwellings close to protected wildlife sites. Our tourism (through wildlife) business requires a much deeper level of commitment from RCC with some strong measures to protect and enhance what we have painstakingly tried to build over the last 50 years!</p> <p>Secondly as a county we have less trees per square kilometre than any other English county and yet we try to portray that we are endeavouring to reach climate change protection target? As the smallest county we should punch above our weight to show others that we champion and embrace reduced emission targets, which hopefully will persuade others follow our lead. UK Govt will surely assist us if we show our resolve as the Govt are keen to build more trees to meet its emission targets .</p>
2344	Limes, Firs & Spurs Resident's Association (Mr		There should be an additional Strategic Objective for RCC to actively promote Neighbourhood Planning and to guarantee to allow those communities that wish to allocate sites for development to do so through appropriate Neighbourhood Plans.

	David Ainslie, Chairman) [1006]		
2286	Mr Peter Coe [1004]		The vision should more specifically refer to the rural nature of the county, it's numerous traditional villages which should be protected from over development such that any future development whether within the limits of permitted development or adjoining is proportionate.
2253	Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan Group (David Ainslie) [270]		There should be an additional Strategic Objective for RCC to actively promote Neighbourhood Planning and to guarantee to allow those communities that wish to allocate sites for development to do so through appropriate Neighbourhood Plans.
2248	Mr Murdo Ross [890]		<p>The strategic objectives are statements without any context in terms of a specific baseline and what is expected to be delivered and at what stage within the overall timescale of the plan. As statements they are difficult to disagree with.</p> <p>Example: If we are to have a vibrant town centres / profitable retail operations, we require an increase in the number of people in employment in the county itself. It follows that there must be specific steps in the plan to ensure the creation of viable employment opportunities and not simply beds for commuters. So what NEW steps are to be taken to attract business to Rutland. There are benefits of scale; is there not a case for a mixed development within the Stamford North / St George's Barracks conurbation. What steps can be taken to improve further education provision, possibly by association with Corby / Stamford and an extended role for the Rutland Agricultural Society</p>
2223	Severn Trent (Chris Bramley) [230]		<p>Climate change is anticipated to have an impact on the availability of water, alongside increasing demand due to population growth, we would therefore recommend that Strategic objective 1 also highlights water sustainability / efficiency.</p> <p>Section 2.3 Priority and Development Viability,</p> <p>Severn Trent would recommend that Water Efficiency and SuDS are highlighted, as both elements could result in some additional costs, Water Efficient Technology is often energy Efficient potentially mitigating the impacts of climate change in Multiple ways. SuDS however have a land take element, especially if added as an afterthought but this can be partly mitigated by incorporating it to the site layout form the beginning adding green blue corridors that provide the biodiversity benefits and flood resilient.</p>

2129	Mr Norman Milne [996]		<p>I disagree with Strategic Objective 10. Everything should be sustainable in New Developments</p> <p>RCC should focus on affordable not social housing</p>
2056	Mrs Penelope Forbes [994]		I broadly agree but Objectives 9 and 12 should be much higher priorities than this list suggests.
1994	Mr David Denness [990]		<p>I disagree with objective 4 as written. Investment and job creation should only be supported if it is fully compatible with objective 9.</p> <p>Objective 3 should be changed to 'Meeting Rutland's identified current and future diverse housing needs, including the affordability of housing, through the provision of high-quality new homes that support Objective 9.</p> <p>Overall there are too many objectives. I think Objective 9 should not be overridden for the achievement of other objectives.</p>
1958	Mr Malcolm Forbes [988]		The underlying principles are fine but to be able to focus on that number of objectives seems far too much. Identifying and pursuing the top priority objectives is required.
1937	Mr Bernard Glick [987]		12 strategic objectives is far too many and, as set out, just a wish list. Objectives 2, 3, 9 and 12 should be prioritized as they deal with our rural environment, truly affordable housing, and essential infrastructure.
1848	Ms Rosemary Harris [984]		Whilst agreeing with the proposed objectives they do not mention sustainable rural development. This is just a continuation of the old Local Plan which seemed to actively discourage such development. This goes against the Government's stated "levelling up" agenda.
1818	South Luffenham Parish Council (Mr Victor Bacon, Councillor) [982]		There are too many issues and they are not prioritise and aligned with the objectives
1815	South Luffenham Parish Council (Mr Victor Bacon, Councillor) [982]		There are too many strategic objectives, it reads as a wish list.
1660	Lincolnshire County Council (Mr PHILIP HUGHES,		Strategic Objective 10 is very weak with respect to making provision for waste management and disposal – particularly given that Rutland currently exports most of its waste. The objective should include a commitment to seek net self-sufficiency in waste management in line with the NPPG. Just because Rutland is a small county doesn't mean it shouldn't play its part in dealing with waste.

	Strategic Planning Manager) [968]		
1576	Mr Neil Robertson [846]		More priority given in planning to ensure sufficient healthcare and education infrastructure and all growth in population protected by prorated increases in health and education resources
1525	Whissendine Parish Council (Parish Council Representative) [447]		Add ridge and furrow protections
1497	Mr Andrew Lunn [689]		12 strategic objectives is far too many. Too many objectives become a wish list and normally not achievable. Objectives 2, 3 9 and 12 should be prioritised as they deal with our rural environment, truly affordable housing, and essential infrastructure.
1474	Mr Julian Barwell [962]		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Need additional GP access 2. Need local secondary school provision for children with SEN 3. Job opportunities for young adults 4. Complete bypass around Oakham due to bottlenecks around the station and Brooke Road. <p>These would create opportunities/environment for new housing</p>
1326	Mr John Redshaw [919]		Within the meaning of the objectives it is important that the potential for carbon-free energy generation is included and ideally highlighted. We are already seeing the pressure on land use by the various proposals for wind and solar farms driven by erroneous central financial policies and creation of conflicts regarding prime farming land and land availability for housing. Very clear issues exist that are not necessarily going to be objectively assessed - eg taking prime farming land for a solar farm backed by grants means additional food imports with increased carbon footprints! Is there a need for a further objective specifically targeting the route to a carbon zero future ?
1283	Mr Tony Wray [545]		Objective 5 - Consideration should be given to a more enlightened view of development in small villages. Part of making the sustainable is to ensure that there is a housing supply for young families, starter homes and/or smaller homes for downsizing. RCC has allowed the construction of large 'trophy' houses that reduce the village populations and make them ever more expensive enclaves for a tiny minority of potential owners.

			<p>The outdated Limits Of development should be reviewed as many are no longer relevant with the development and extension of property boundaries that have taken place over time.</p> <p>Imaginative, carbon negative, low cost, highly efficient, affordable buildings of great rural character could be encouraged as in fills and edge of development, particularly as these could be built by small local builders rather than the large house builders. Further, such properties could be covenanted to ensure any onward sales are to local families, pensioners etc as first time buyers or downsizing elderly residents.</p> <p>Objective 7 - The same comments as above apply to the consideration of new developments. Stop allowing trophy buildings that take the place of multiple homes in small villages and encourage more innovative, carbon negative, low cost, affordable, rural housing to keep our villages vibrant with young, first time buyers or self builders being able to add to the vitality of our ageing small villages.</p>
1272	Oakham Quaker Meeting (Ms Susan Bolter, Clerk) [941]		The Strategic Objectives appear to be the same as the "key issues". Maybe too many to retain focus?
1255	CLA (John Greenshields, Chartered Surveyor) [937]		<p>Whilst the CLA is in agreement with the majority of the proposed objectives, there is a lack of attention given to sustainable rural development.</p> <p>Much of Rutland's rural areas have been starved of needed sustainable development. This undermines the vitality, vibrancy and opportunities within rural areas. There should be explicit support of rural development to improve the sustainability of rural areas. Such improvements will help contribute to the other objectives.</p>
1236	Mrs Hannah Williams [925]		<p>I would suggest alternative wording for Strategic Objectives 11 and 12. All other objectives I feel are acceptable with consideration to the competing needs of our land and local area.</p> <p>Objective 12 has so much content, that I feel it may be worth breaking down into individual parts - 'active travel and greener travel networks', 'infrastructure' and 'services'. These are also what most local complaints centre around - GP and Healthcare access, bus services and lack of a swimming pool - agreeing at least the objective at this point would be a worthwhile investment.</p> <p>Strategic Objective 11: States "ensure a steady and adequate supply of minerals to meet national, regional and local needs whilst taking account of impacts on environments and local communities." I would argue that we as a county are unable to 'ensure' something such as this, and could only 'endeavour' to best use</p>

		<p>our resources.</p> <p>In addition, I would instead put the impact on the wider environment and local communities first. It is very easy to see examples of short-termism in our past, and therefore we should be careful and ensure sufficient scrutiny of these decisions. I would write: "Ensure proper scrutiny to safeguard and minimise impact on both environment and local communities of our obligation [or, in seeking] to provide a steady and adequate supply of minerals to meet national, regional and local needs."</p> <p>In a similar vein, with Objective 12 the easier (and cheaper) options of sustainable and greener modes of travel are put second to active travel/ public transport, with less strong wording - I would like to see this reversed. I appreciate that we cannot let roads crumble to gravel, but investment in sport and active travel, for example, delivers better returns than major road projects (see https://bit.ly/3R4Ug6u) and "Every £1 spent on community sport and physical activity generates nearly £4 for the English economy and society" - https://bit.ly/3CH9sCx.</p> <p>"Ensuring development is supported by essential infrastructure and services (most notably: roads, schools, health facilities and utility provision) and promotes safe movement and more sustainable modes of travel by enhancing greener travel networks for walking, cycling and public transport" should be changed to "Support safe movement for all and sustainable modes of travel by enhancing greener travel networks for walking, cycling and public transport"</p> <p>I would then add either a 13th objective, or a second sentence: "Support development by ensuring sufficient infrastructure and services (most notable: health facilities, sports provisions, schools, utility provision and roads)." I would argue that sports and healthcare are more complex and also more likely to be left too late or given less thought till last/ too late whereas developers advocate for the road infrastructure themselves - they need this but the direct value in a healthy and thriving workforce is less apparent. Finally, as a local authority we know that investment towards health and wellbeing will produce a healthier, more independent and less 'needy' society - resulting in less cost for social care and other statutory costs which make up a significant part of Rutland's expenditure.</p>
1227	Jane Bateman [124]	<p>Strategic Objective 3 - the reference to affordability of housing through the provision of high-quality new homes. There is no mention of social housing which is far more important for local residents than</p>

			affordable housing and no mention of new homes being built being energy efficient, ie with solar panels, heat pumps, EV charges.
1120	Nick Townsend [153]		The objectives should take account of the increasing impact of technology on our lives including the need for digital infrastructure to assist businesses and households, the importance of connectivity in accessing services, changing modes of transport based on electric vehicles, renewable energy technologies etc.
1088	Mr Michael Pearson [914]		Objectives must specifically recognise and reflect the impacts of the inevitable increasing age profile of our residents on healthcare provision, bus and rail services.
1052	Mr Paul Forster [912]		Does Strategic Objective 10 adequately cover the need to refurbish existing sites rather than demolish and rebuild, which creates far more Co2 emissions?
1049	Mr Andrew Greasley [910]		Ensure that the Planning Committee follows these Objectives. For example, No hydrocarbon fuels in new housing stock, No further destruction of grade 1 agricultural land, especially wheat fields, No further housing without real choices primary healthcare especially in Oakham that matches national averages
1019	Mr Peter Tippet [906]		My main issue is infrastructure especially health and access to doctors and dentist within Rutland with the current property development plans - Objective 12 should be much higher on the list of objectives to ensure that the access to Doctors and dentist should be equal if not better that it was in 2010! Before development starts this should be implemented and demonstrated before permission to continue is given.
882	Rutland Quarry Forum (David Hodson) [113]		None
727	Environment Agency (Mrs Nicola Reyman, Planning Specialist) [855]		<p>Question 1 additional comments: need to establish a sustainable strategy for the scale and location of future development. Must encapsulates the principles and requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework, Planning Practice Guidance and other important documents including the Government's 25 Year Environment Plan.</p> <p>The vision should capture the overarching objectives of sustainable development. This includes recognising the importance of the water environment to achieve good place-making which considers the network of rivers, streams, and landforms to achieve a measurable net gain in biodiversity, whilst connecting people with nature and attracting economic investment. The vision should emphasise the importance of wildlife corridors connecting both urban and rural areas. In addition, it could refer to taking a natural capital approach to growth and infrastructure provision and protecting and enhancing natural assets, and the role of the Nature Recovery Network.</p>

			<p>It is integral that the vision recognises the challenges faced by climate change, and how these challenges may develop over the coming years.</p> <p>The vision should be ambitious, and the approach should be both sustainable and measurable</p> <p>Question 3: We broadly agree with the proposed strategic objectives but recommend the following updates.</p> <p>Objective 1 should be broadened to add greater emphasis to the importance of addressing climate change through appropriate mitigation and adaptation, to better reflect the aspirations of the 25 Year Environment Plan to `take all possible action to mitigate climate change, while adapting to reduce its impact` and to `reduce the risk of harm to people, the environment and the economy from natural hazards including flooding, drought and coastal erosion`. We support that it refers to `carbon reduction`, however this is only one aspect of climate change mitigation.</p> <p>We suggest this objective could also refer to opportunities for carbon capture, including carbon sequestration and to seek opportunities to support green and blue infrastructure. Whilst we support the reference to `managing flood risk`, this could be expanded to seek to reduce flood risk. Furthermore, we consider this objective does not adequately acknowledge other factors linked to climate change. A greater emphasis could be made on these other factors, such as protecting and enhancing water resources, including water quality and habitat resilience.</p> <p>Objective 2 focuses on delivering sustainable development by determining an appropriate level and location of housing growth in Rutland alongside the delivery of economic and social infrastructure. The reference to `taking account of environmental considerations` should be given further consideration to take a more proactive approach to protect and enhance the natural environment. Development should not be at the detriment to the natural environment and therefore we suggest this is reworded to ensure development captures opportunities to make a positive contribution to green and blue assets. It is well documented that England has experienced a significant loss to biodiversity in recent decades and we are experiencing a biodiversity and climate crisis. The NPPF sets out that policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural local environment. This could be reworded to `...social and economic outcomes, whilst protecting and enhancing the natural environment, taking a natural capital approach`. A natural capital approach seeks to incorporate the wider social and economic benefits of the environment into decision making.</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>Objective 7 is important to achieve high quality places. This could be expanded to include ‘climate resilient’ places.</p> <p>Objective 8 should emphasise the importance of providing sustainable access to rich greenspaces and blue spaces which provide a range of health and wellbeing benefits to all members of a community. It should commit to connecting people with nature, particularly enhancing areas where there is currently limited access.</p> <p>Objective 9 should be expanded to refer to both green and blue infrastructure; healthy blue infrastructure (watercourses, lakes and groundwater) contribute to the integrity of the green infrastructure network and are integral for biodiversity. It could also refer to a net gain in biodiversity, adopting a natural capital approach and refer to Local Nature Recovery Strategies. Furthermore, it could include reference to the hierarchy of internationally, nationally, and locally designated sites (The Framework, paragraph 179a) which all contribute to the ecological network and are essential components to the natural environment.</p> <p>We welcome that objective 10 recognises the importance of encouraging the effective use of previously developed land and natural resources. It specifically refers to providing for waste management and disposal. The reference to natural resources should be expanded. For Rutland to achieve its growth ambitions, development must consider the environmental capacity and limitations in the area. For example, we advise this objective includes water resources, water quality, and flood management, alongside waste management.</p> <p>Objective 12 should be broadened to recognise the importance of providing people with access to green and blue infrastructure networks.</p>
739	Environment Agency (Mrs Nicola Reyman, Planning Specialist) [855]	<p>Objective 10 encourages the effective and prudent use of previously developed land. Whilst we support this objective, we note that it does not mention the risk of contaminated land in any of the issues. The Framework encourages Local Plans to enhance the natural and local environment, including by ‘remediating and mitigating unspoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated and unstable land, where appropriate’. The Water Framework Directive and the Groundwater Directive set out objectives for groundwater including aiming for good chemical and quantitative status; reverse upwards trends in pollution; and preventing or limiting the entry of certain substances to waterbodies. Contamination in or on land can present unacceptable risk to human health and the wider environment, including groundwater,</p>

			and it may be caused by previously developed land. It is vital that the Rutland Local Plan policies ensure that where land is affected by contamination, it will not create unacceptable risk, it protects soils and water and contributes positively to reducing the impacts of and adapting to climate change
692	Mrs Hilary Smith [868]		But these are numerous objectives and perhaps should be reduced Nos 2,3 9,and 12 being the most important. Strategies that allow for low cost housing - not the same as affordable housing need considering
678	Mrs Karen Nagel [866]		The vision and objectives are commendable and I am grateful for the opportunity to contribute. My main concern on ALL current and prior developments has been the essential infrastructure i.e Objective 12. I believe the Council do a good job already with many of the objectives but the lack of local health services is a huge problem now so must be addressed before more development occurs and we certainly need to consider affordable housing. Current developments close to towns are fine in Brownfield sites but in Oakham the roads reach gridlock in rush hour around the train station. Unfortunately the current provision of train services for the area is woeful and if we really want people to take trains and buses these have to be improved. I am sure I saying everything you already know.
641	Mr Andrew Nebel [864]		It is important that the weighting given to Zero carbon emissions be high enough to encourage maximum energy efficiency in all residential and commercial property development... particularly designing properties that use heat pumps, ground water pumps, integral solar panel tiles, surface water tanks for garden watering etc. Too many property designs are locked in the past and buildings must be Future Proofed.
640	Mr Andrew Nebel [864]		Whilst I agree with some of these I feel the objectives fail to address the important issues associated with important community infrastructure, in particular Health Service provision both in Rutland, Leicester and in Stamford and Peterborough.
595	North Luffenham Neighbourhood Planning Group (Tim smith) [265]		12 strategic objectives is far too many and, as set out, just a wish list. Objectives 2, 3 9 and 12 should be prioritized as they deal with our rural environment, truly affordable housing, and essential infrastructure.
563	Mr Ian Higgins [860]		The strategic objectives for Rutland should not include helping neighboring counties to meet their housing objectives and targets.
525	Mrs Jayne Williams [857]		There should be a neither agree nor disagree option with space to explain. In theory these points seem acceptable if a bit wordy and full of jargon. I feel they should be listed in a way that the respondent can prioritise them. Number 12 would be my highest priority and no development until supporting infrastructure is in place - BEFORE not lagging years behind housing development. No new

			<p>houses before additional doctors, NHS dentists, improved transport provision both public transport and better roads.</p> <p>Number 9 next most important. No development that would threaten or change beyond recognition our natural environment and heritage.</p>
452	Richard Camp [155]		<p>It is critically important that Rutland should not become a commuter county. The withdrawn Local Plan indicated that around 40% of working Rutland residents commuted out of county to local towns and cities. This commuting to relatively distant jobs by car must be stopped in the interests of climate change reduction. As indicated in a recent email to the Planning Policy Manager, copied to the Leader of the Council, the Chair of the Planning and Licensing Committee and the Chief Executive, application of the standard method for calculating local housing need (LHN) is not mandatory (as established by my communication with the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities). Thus, unless appropriate numbers of local jobs are available, it would be essential to reduce the proposed LHN below 140 new dwellings per annum. Further, the ratio of affordable to more costly homes in new developments should be governed by the nature of available jobs. Other reasons for reducing the LHN number include the current inadequacy of GP services.</p>
442	Mrs Jo Munro [834]		<p>If you are going to build new houses then you need more schools, dental surgeries, GP practices and better transport links including better public buses. Please do not allow the housing developers to shirk their responsibilities.</p>
355	Martin Shewry [755]		<p>Housing has proven the most sensitive local issue - especially new estates. This must be recognised!</p>
279	Mr Graham Layne [801]		<p>Ensure that communities that are closer to Stamford than Oakham and Uppingham are given equal consideration and are better linked to the rest of Rutland</p>
276	Mr Jerry Barnes [781]		<p>This may be covered later, but inclusion of further leisure facilities such as swimming pool in County and a Cinema would be welcomed.</p>
193	Natural England (Roslyn Deeming, Senior Planning Adviser) [236]		<p>Question 1 Additional Comments: Suggest that a more focussed and specific vision would be preferable for the Local Plan.</p> <p>The Vision for the Local Plan should set out what can be achieved through the land use planning process. Natural England would wish to see the following included within the Vision - Enhancement of the natural environment and the ecosystem services it provides; protecting and enhancing natural habitats and species connecting to the Nature Recovery Network; provision of high quality accessible green infrastructure for the benefit of people and nature.</p>

			<p>Question 2 additional comments: Natural England generally support the strategic objectives particularly 1,8, and 9</p> <p>Question 3 additional comments: Natural England suggest that Strategic Objective 1 should mention Nature Based Solutions to climate change.</p>
172	Mr Keith Henbrey [751]		NORTH LUFINGHAM!!!

id	respondent	agent	Question 4b- If you disagree, please suggest the timeframe you think the plan should cover.
4168	De Merke Estates [589]	Barton Willmore, now Stantec (Seth Tyler, Graduate Planner) [1141]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We agree with a 20-year Plan period. • But the previously withdrawn Local Plan’s Evidence Base should also be revisited accordingly – ie not simply “re-used” with a changed date on the front. • The majority of the I&O Supporting Documents have not been updated, and still dated 2019. • The SA Scoping Report is dated March 2022 – but does not refer correctly to the I&O – it is based on a Plan period to only 2036. • The baseline studies (referred to in the SA Scoping) need to be revisited in the context of the new Local Plan and the extended Plan period (2041) – at present it fails to do this – and will result in a(nother) failed Local Plan. • The new Local Plan requires an overhaul of the entire evidence base, as opposed to a cut/paste exercise from that of the previously withdrawn Local Plan.
4135	Silver Fox Developments (John Edmond) [1138]		<p>It is noted that the introductory text to the consultation provides that Plan will ‘shape how Rutland changes and develops over the next 15 to 20 years’. However, given that the Plan will not be adopted until Autumn 2025 we would agree that in order to ensure that the Plan can look ahead over a minimum 15-year period from adoption (in line with paragraph 22 of the National Planning Policy Framework) the earliest end date should be 2041.</p> <p>3.18 To allow for slippage in the Local Plan programme, we consider it would be reasonable and prudent to</p>

			prepare a Plan which covers the period 2022-2042. This may better reflect the date meaningful work on the Plan commenced (for example the first consultation) and would allow some flexibility for the Council's plan preparation programme to slip, which given the complexity of the plan making process cannot be ruled out.
4119	Avant Homes [1131]	Mr Alasdair Thorne [562]	We note that the introductory text to the consultation states that Plan will 'shape how Rutland changes and develops over the next 15 to 20 years'. However, given that the Plan will not be adopted until Autumn 2025 we would agree that in order to ensure that the Plan can look ahead over a minimum 15 year period from adoption (in line with paragraph 22 of the National Planning Policy Framework) the earliest end date should be 2041. However it is our view that it would be more sensible to prepare a Plan which covers the period 2022-2042. This would better reflect the date meaningful work on the Plan commenced (for example the first consultation) and would allow some flexibility for the Council's plan preparation programme to slip, which given the complexity of the plan making process seems like a likely proposition.
4095	Wells McFarlane [365]	Pegasus group (Mrs Georgina Doyle) [575]	The proposed 20-year plan period is supported. The NPPF states at paragraph 22 that Strategic policies should look ahead over a minimum 15-year period from adoption. At paragraph 33 it further states that Local plans and spatial development strategies should be reviewed to assess whether they need updating at least once every five years. This will ensure that the Local Plan does not become out of date due to the long development plan period. It will also be important to plan for the development needs for at least 20 years.
4042	Vistry Group c/o Pegasus Group (Jonathan Porter, Strategic Planning Manager) [1129]	Pegasus group (Mrs Clare Clarke, Associate Planner) [523]	The proposed 20-year plan period is supported. The National Planning Policy Framework states that Strategic policies should look ahead over a minimum 15-year period from adoption to anticipate and respond to long-term requirements and opportunities, such as those arising from major improvements in infrastructure. It will take at least two years to prepare and adopt a new local plan and so it is essential that the Rutland Local Plan looks ahead 20 years from 2021, to ensure there are 15 years covered by the plan at adoption.
4008	John Dejardin [128]		In accepting this plan period it will be essential that the policies fully appreciate and promote the rapid changes needed to meet net zero because by 2041 it will be far too late.
3938	North Northamptonshire Joint Planning & Delivery Unit (Samuel Humphries) [244]		Proposed timescale for the plan period, 2021-41 aligns with the proposed period for the North Northamptonshire Strategic Plan (NNSP) - helps with the continuation of the Duty to Cooperate and makes it easier for both authorities to address any cross-boundary issues that may arise during the respective plan making processes.

3916	Anglian Water (Darl Sweetland, Spatial Planning Manager) [234]		2.3.1 Anglian Water considers that in planning the spatial distribution and quantum of growth, utilising existing infrastructure capacity development will be less costly for developers and buyers of new homes and commercial property. Development which requires new infrastructure will incur additional costs from utility companies as well as increasing carbon generated by that ill planned growth. Reducing infrastructure costs also enables limited funding to be used on other objectives including more stretching environmental gains. Similarly through using existing visitor and recreation infrastructure to support tourism business and employment we can reduce the operational carbon associated with visitors and tourism.
3824	Sally Renner [1124]		15 years
3777	Ketton Darby & Joan Club (Ruth Renner) [1122]		15 years would be better. The climate is changing and other goals may need to be set before 2041.
3686	Severn Trent (Chris Bramley) [230]		Whilst the plan could not be incorporated into this DWMP, we would look to incorporate additional growth projections and information into our future DWMP, which will set out our long-term plan on a 25 year bases, therefore the longer the period your plan covers the more proposals, we will be able to incorporate it into our plan. However, it is accepted that a longer the plan period can result in reduced reliability of the projections and that a balance is therefore needed.
3650	Ms Janet Taylor [1109]		We already have a plan that ends in 2026, so the proposed plan should start from then.
3607	Jaynic Property Group [1106]	DLP Planning Ltd (Mrs Megan Wilson, Associate Director) [1105]	<p>Paragraph 22 of the NPPF21 requires strategic policies to look ahead over a minimum of 15-years post adoption. In line with the April 2022 Local Development Scheme, the Council are currently anticipating adoption of the new Local Plan in September 2025. Accordingly, the proposed Plan period to 2041, does meet these requirements, but should any significant delay in the preparation of the Plan occur, as is often our experience with Plan making, the Council may find that they are unable to achieve provision for a minimum of 15-years upon adoption.</p> <p>As such, it may be sensible to include an appropriate buffer of provision towards additional needs for housing and economic development that would potentially support an extension to the plan period, if required. This would avoid circumstances where a minimum of 15-years post adoption cannot be achieved.</p> <p>Aligned to this it is noted that the proposed base-date of the plan period in 2021 includes circa 4 years for monitoring prior to adoption. It is critical that the Council's updated evidence base addressing needs for</p>

			<p>economic development (and housing) aligns with this base date. Positive planning for employment needs is required urgently to support sustainable economic growth and development. This applies particularly in terms of the wider requirements of the logistics sector and reflects the very limited ability to make provision for additional land and floorspace to meet needs in Rutland in recent years. This adds further weight to reasons not to adopt a ‘constrained’ requirement in the years prior to adoption (for example, based on short-term trends).</p> <p>As a result, and without additional provision in the immediate term, this would anticipate a substantial shortfall in delivery against a robust assessment of overall needs upon adoption in 2025. The solution to this, in the event of no alternative supply in the short term, would also be to ensure sufficient choice of sites and flexibility to provide a buffer in overall provision.</p>
3530	Barrowden Parish Council (Mr Gordon Brown, Chairman) [1103]		The Plan Period will be subject to the type of development which comes forward. For example if either of Woolfox or St George's is allocated then a timescale stretching out to 2045 or even 2050 might be appropriate.
3496	PDR Planning Limited (Mr Philip Rawle, Director) [627]		<p>NPPF Paragraph 22 states, “Strategic policies should look ahead over a minimum 15-year period from adoption.” The Council assumes the new Local Plan will be adopted in September 2025 (LDS, April 2022); hence the Council is proposing that the Plan period should be for a minimum of 20 years from 2021 to 2041; however, this is only a 15 year Plan period (from adoption), which does not factor in any time for slippage.</p> <p>A more appropriate period would be for a minimum of 20 years from adoption of the Plan in 2025, so to 2045.</p>
3464	Mrs Pam Allen [1085]		2025-40
3430	Vistry Homes East Midlands [1070]	Marrons (Mr Dan Robinson-Wells, Associate Director) [535]	The start date of 2021 and ending in 2041 is appropriate currently. However, the NPPF states that plans should look ahead over a MINIMUM of a 15 year period from adoption. Experience elsewhere shows that Local Plan examinations are becoming increasingly protracted along with the production of the Local Plan through regulation 18 and 19 consultations. The Council should be mindful of being flexible as the plan progresses to ensure the plan period can be extended if necessary and have planned for sufficient sites from an early stage to easily do so.

3187	Taylor Wimpey Straetgic Land [660]	Bidwells (Mr Mark Harris, Partner) [659]	This date should be kept under review to ensure that any short-term slippage in the timetable does not lead to less than 15 years remaining in the plan period on adoption.
2877	Mr Simon Frearson [1047]		2024 - 2044 There is no point in looking backwards as you cannot change history. Set a realistic period timetable for the plan to cover for the future.
2816	CPRE Rutland (Mr Ron Simpson, Chair) [1036]		Ten years would allow the planning function to more quickly adapt to a rapidly changing and likely to be regularly updated NPPF and its planned successor.
2738	Jeakins Weir Ltd [1037]	Mr Alasdair Thorne [562]	We note that the introductory text to the consultation states that Plan will 'shape how Rutland changes and develops over the next 15 to 20 years'. However, given that the Plan will not be adopted until Autumn 2025 we would agrees that in order to ensure that the Plan can look ahead over a minimum 15 year period from adoption (in line with paragraph 22 of the National Planning Policy Framework ³) the earliest end date should be 2041. However it is our view that it would be more sensible to prepare a Plan which covers the period 2022-2042. This would better reflect the date meaningful work on the Plan commenced (for example the first consultation) and would allow some flexibility for the Council's plan preparation programme to slip, which given the complexity of the plan making process seems like a likely proposition.
2723	Braunston Parish Council (Mrs Carole Brown, Parish Clerk) [1003]		We disagree. We have a perfectly viable plan, which runs to 2026. We should raise a fifteen year plan with 5 yearly reviews, which would extend the plan by five years and make any revisions needed. The plan should set measurable outcomes which are reported on a quarterly basis on the RCC website. The Council and its executive should take responsibility for these outcomes and the executive should be rewarded according to the results achieved.
2618	Define (on behalf of William Davis Homes) (Mr Sam Perkins, Graduate Planner) [1027]		Establishing a plan period at this point of the LPR process is premature, given that the spatial strategy has not yet been established and this can influence the extent of the plan period; NPPF paragraph 22 requiring plans to provide at least a 30 year vision if they are seeking to facilitate new settlements or significant extensions to existing settlements. With that point of principle made, the proposed plan period of 2021 to 2041 is inappropriate and appears to

			<p>have been informed by the anticipated adoption date of the plan (2025), allowing for a 15 year period post-adoption in accordance with NPPF paragraph 22. However, the timescales set out for the plan's preparation in RCC's Local Development Scheme (LDS) are overly unrealistic, with the LDS suggesting the plan will be submitted for examination just over 2 years on from this current Issues and Options (I&O) consultation. However, in preparing the now withdrawn plan, that period took 4.5 years. Further, Local Plan Examinations can often be protracted, particularly where there is the need for significant modifications.</p> <p>Therefore, to suggest that the plan will be adopted within 3 years of this I&O consultation is entirely unrealistic. Rather, allowing for 4.5 years to submission (as per the withdrawn plan) and 18 months from the plan's submission to adoption (rather than 1 year) would be more appropriate. That would suggest a more realistic adoption date of mid to late 2028 which, allowing for 15 years post-adoption, would suggest an end date of 2044. A plan period of 2021 to 2044 is, therefore, more appropriate.</p>
2580	Mr Jonathan Griffin [1023]		2023-2053
2577	Ms Lelia O'Connell [1008]		I think it should be for longer - at least 30 years, if not more. The changes could be profound, so looking further ahead than 20 years will ensure better plans can be made for future generations.
2529	Pigeon Investment Management Ltd [1022]	Carter Jonas (Ms Kimberley Brown, Associate Partner) [601]	<p>Paragraph 22 of the NPPF requires strategic policies to look ahead over a minimum 15-year period from adoption. It is predicted that the emerging RLP would be adopted in Autumn 2025 and the proposed end date of the plan would be 2041. Therefore, the emerging RLP would have 16 years remaining of the plan period from adoption, which would meet the requirements of national policy. A plan period for the emerging RLP to 2041 is supported.</p> <p>It is noted that some of the supporting documents for the emerging RLP e.g. the SA Scoping Report and the Strategic Housing Market Assessment Update refer to a plan end date of 2036 which is inconsistent with the Issues & Options consultation document.</p>
2476	Mr james youatt [593]		10 years maximum
2461	Francis Jackson Homes Ltd (Mr Paul Johnson, Land and Planning Director) [761]		There is a fine balance to be struck. Plans of considerable length may become outdated and/or rendered irrelevant, however, longer term strategic thinking is to be encouraged. It would perhaps be better to have a longer term plan period of say 25 years to allow strategic levels planning to take place, but some options to early review within this to ensure the plan remains relevant and flexible enough to adapt to changing circumstances.

1956	Mr Malcolm Forbes [988]		15 years maximum from the time of achieving legal status
1284	Mr Tony Wray [545]		Whilst the timeframe would be appropriate there needs to be an adequate mechanism to recognise any significant developments (eg national Policy changes, technological breakthroughs, etc) that provide the opportunity for better outcomes than those originally envisaged in the plan.
1273	Oakham Quaker Meeting (Ms Susan Bolter, Clerk) [941]		15 years
1121	Nick Townsend [153]		Agree that 20 years is appropriate for the current plan period but the Plan must be subject to regular review (at least every five years) and the vision must look beyond the 20 year period to a carbon neutral 2050
1095	Ms Patricia Dalby [916]		10 years
777	Mr Paul Topham [894]		30 years
751	Mrs Gemma Flavell [888]		5-10 years
728	Environment Agency (Mrs Nicola Reyman, Planning Specialist) [855]		<p>Whilst we do not object to the proposed plan-period, it is important that the Local Plan aligns with the long-term aspirations of the 25-year Environment Plan and considers the long-term threat posed by climate change, for example ensuring development is flood resilient over its lifetime.</p> <p>The new Rutland Local Plan should also recognise that effective plans need to be kept up to date; the National Planning Policy Framework sets out that Local Plans should be reviewed to assess whether they need updating at least once every 5 years. The review process is important where flood risk data is continuously evolving, where the impact of climate change will likely alter the levels of risk during the plan period.</p>
642	Mr Andrew Nebel [864]		Given 2050 is the target date for zero emissions should not the plan cover a longer duration ...and should it not also have built in review stages to permit 'course corrections' to cope with unplanned and unpredictable geopolitical events? War in Ukraine being an obvious example ...as is the predictable showdown with China when it invades Taiwan and brings about a collapse in globalisation. And if plans take 5 years to produce there must be a scheduled start of a new plan 5 years before the end of the current one.
181	Mr Michael Masters [752]		Twenty years is too long in such a fast changing world. There should be rolling 15 year plans,

