

Rutland County Council Officer response to Whissendine NP Regulation 16 Consultation



Reference	Comment on Pre-Submission NP
	General comments
Page 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the reason for the plan end date of 2035? We would recommend that the Plan cover the period to 31 March 2041, in line with the emerging local plan.
Page 18 - Existing supporting text	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> "The Neighbourhood Plan does not seek to modify Local Plan requirements for mix and affordable housing, but to shape how housing development, including affordable provision, is provided." This would be better repeated in the 'Interpretation' section that follows the policy.
	Policies
WH1: Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Part 1- for clarity it should be noted that the PLDs are being reviewed through the new Local Plan. This may result in changes to the PLD shown on the plan within the Neighbourhood Plan. Suggest adding to the Interpretation note referring to any future amendments to PLDs made through the Local Plan. Part 5) In practice, Rutland County Council requires a ratio of 67:33 for 67% social rent/affordable rent and 33% affordable home ownership (including First Homes) for affordable housing delivery through section 106 sites. The AECOM report is well-argued at 60:40, but the Council would suggest a consistent approach across the County of 67:33 (prioritising the greatest need, which is affordable housing for rent) where market and site-specific factors permit. Part 8) Does this add anything further to the requirements of the Building Regulations?
Page 20 - Interpretation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should add that the thresholds and overall percentage for affordable housing provision and, where applicable, commuted sums are in local plan policies and guidance
Pages 21 and 24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan should be portrait – it has been distorted in the PDF document

Rutland County Council Officer response to Whissendine NP Regulation 16 Consultation

Reference	Comment on Pre-Submission NP
WH2: Community Facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comment
WH3: Employment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Part 1a)- for clarity it should be noted that the PLDs are being reviewed through the new Local Plan. This may result in changes to the PLD shown on the plan within the Neighbourhood Plan. Suggest adding to the Interpretation note referring to any future amendments to PLDs made through the Local Plan. Need to clarify whether part 1 b) and c) is intended for development within the PLD or includes the countryside as well.
Page 28 – Whissendine Design codes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> References the document however there is no link and cannot find online, not clear if this is adopted or is part of the NP
WH4: Design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Part 3) it would be helpful to refer to the Whissendine Design Code and the Rutland Design Guidelines within the policy to give them the policy hook required to use them in the determination of applications. Part 4) unusual to refer to development on the edge of the countryside, not sure how this will be interpreted – might it be clearer to say development adjoining the countryside or development on the built edges of the settlement? Without knowing the content of the Design Codes – it’s difficult to comment on the NP design policy – as its difficult to identify any gaps or things missed however generally a good policy with some helpful guidance – presumably the design codes identify more precisely local materials and define the character – for example in relation to WH4: 3. Potential gaps in this design policy include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Could mention the design process – for example site analysis, response to context needed first Car parking (although covered later) Interpretation: – Could also mention the National Design Guide (as we as the NMDC) and also Manual for Streets as highway design guidance that responds to context.

Rutland County Council Officer response to Whissendine NP Regulation 16 Consultation



Reference	Comment on Pre-Submission NP
WH5: Landscape & Heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Part 1) “overall adverse impact” is negatively worded and difficult to interpret. Suggest phrase it as “development will be expected to protect and where possible enhance Whissendine’s rural and historic landscape....” Biodiversity net gain will be a national requirement from November 2023 Part 2) a) – d) clarify whether all should apply by adding “and” Part 3) Suggest adding “the setting of and” to “views to local heritage
WH6: Whissendine Windmill	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comment
WH7: Surface Water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Part 1 – Missing Cross reference to the plan Part 1) - Difficult to see how this part of the policy will be interpreted and used in the development management process, requires greater clarity
WH8: Infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Part 6) not clear what is meant by ‘screened’ might need to be explained in the supporting text Interpretation - Could extend definition of active travel to walking, wheeling and cycling – as Active Travel England do this.
Page 46-47 – Parking Design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is sound advice but again, no link to the full code. Reference is different here from page 28, as we are given a year of 2022 given so suggests the code was adopted in 2022.