

Future Rutland Conversation: North Luffenham Parish Council (NLPC) Response

1. NLPC welcomes the opportunity to be involved in the 'Future Rutland Conversation' and submit the following.
2. NLPC is concerned that any comments and observations will be properly noted and there will be feedback.
 - a. The concern is because the previous engagement with local parishes on the proposals for St. George's Barracks (SGB) was a public relations exercise in name only.
 - b. The revelation that the MoU between Rutland County Council and the Ministry of Defence was kept secret for a year strongly suggests that the decision had already been made and thus any subsequent consultations were meaningless.
 - c. The comments that were made, of which 90% were opposed to the proposals, were largely ignored at the Regulation 19 Consultation.
 - d. Concerns over the viability, employment, impact of traffic on the surrounding area and on the environment have not been addressed with the local communities. (It is stated the development will adhere to 'Garden Village Principles' and these explicitly state that engagement and agreement of local communities is fundamental).
 - e. Responses that were made included such suggestions as alternative uses of the SGB site such as tourism, science park and film studio but such 'blue sky' thinking was also ignored.
3. Employment
 - a. There should be encouragement towards skilled employment and not industrial such as incineration (B2) or warehousing type work (B8).
 - b. Better paid and interesting employment could possibly attract younger people, an asset that Rutland needs.

4. Transport

- a. Public Transport is poor, particularly for outlying parishes, and it has been established in North Luffenham that over 90% of the population use the car as their main mode of transport.
- b. NLPC recognises that to develop an economically viable public transport is difficult but an effort should be made to improve the present service. (A start for North Luffenham would be a direct bus to the county town).
- c. Walking is a popular pastime and also has health benefits. Existing footways should be maintained and if possible new ones created.
- d. A threat to people's enjoyment of walking in country lanes would be a big increase in traffic and any development should aim to divert vehicles towards main highways.
- e. Cycling is similarly a popular and healthy activity and should be encouraged by low volume or traffic free routes and dedicated cycle lanes.

5. Leisure Facilities.

- a. Rutland is not well blessed and there should be encouragement of such facilities such as a cinema, venues for younger people to meet and theatre.
- b. Sporting activities should be encouraged and financial support considered to support clubs and their activities.
- c. The above could again be an attraction for a younger population to remain or move to the county.

6. Health and Wellbeing

- a. The University Hospitals of Leicester can be difficult to get to by public transport and parking is not easy and this can cause problems for the less able. For major procedures people understand the necessity of attending a major unit but with developing technologies much more investigation and treatment can be done on an outpatient basis so that the journey begins and ends locally.
- b. The Rutland Memorial Hospital either needs a major upgrade or replacing with an up to date facility.

- c. There could be better coordination between the various social services and local volunteer groups to support vulnerable groups.

The above are not just the opinions of NLPC but are the result of surveys and discussions with the parish of North Luffenham and neighbouring parishes.