

Rutland County Council Officer response to Uppingham NP Regulation 16 Consultation



Reference	Comment on Regulation Submission NP
	<p>General comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It would be helpful if the site allocation policies included a set of development principles for each site <p>Walking and cycling infrastructure to support development sites</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include reference within specific allocation policies to the need for walking and cycling provisions within the development sites themselves and links to surrounding areas and arterial routes. Based on the proposed allocations, it is suggested that potential pedestrian and cyclist improvements could be sought in the following locations, to support the combined development: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ayston Road, Leicester Road, Twitchbed Road A47 Further consideration required through a full transport assessment.
7.0	Indicative dwelling requirement
7.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regulation 18 Local Plan proposes 316 dwellings for Uppingham.
7.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consultation on Reg 18 Local Plan commences 13th November 2023. Regulation 18 Local Plan proposes 316 dwellings for Uppingham
9.	Neighbourhood Plan Policies and Community Aspirations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 9.5.5(b) Affordable housing definition. The section on Starter Homes has been replaced by the Government policy on First Homes, which is described in the First Homes section of the national

Rutland County Council Officer response to Uppingham NP Regulation 16 Consultation



Reference	Comment on Regulation Submission NP
	Planning Practice Guidance, which has a hyperlink to the relevant Written Ministerial Statement covering First Homes. The reference to Starter Homes should be removed, please and reference to First Homes added.
	Neighbourhood Plan Policies
GP1	General Principles of development and addressing climate change
Rationale – Para 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> “Development will only be encouraged where it can be shown that the scheme will help to achieve the Objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan” - Is it worth saying that decisions should be made in accordance with the development plan - which will include the NP when adopted - unless material considerations apply?
GP1 –a) vii)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is this for all development proposals? Include passenger transport (sustainable travel mode) Not clear how this is judged, also overlaps with Building Regs. Building regs requires that a new residential building with associated parking must have access to electrical vehicle charge points This is ok to include, however what happens if an application doesn't provide this? Its highly unlikely that the LPA could refuse applications on this point – wouldn't hold up at appeal/ and is also going into Building regulations territory.
GP1 – b) c)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (b) – Ok to have, but aspirational; could not be used as a basis of refusal (NPPF encourages it but not a requirement). (c) – same a (b) – non-specific, and couldn't be used to refuse an application 'anticipate climate change' – what does this mean in a practical sense for applications?
H1	Overall Housing Numbers

Rutland County Council Officer response to Uppingham NP Regulation 16 Consultation



Reference	Comment on Regulation Submission NP
H1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Needs Evidence to support the density requirement of 25, It would be helpful if density was set on a site by site basis in the development principles with evidence to support this linking back to the character and
H2	Associated Infrastructure
Rationale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to explain how CIL works, we operate CIL and so developers will expect the impact of development to be secured through CIL contributions. This policy is not in line with national policy and guidance
H2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is covered by CIL. RCC can't ask for more than is required by CIL, and CIL sets the level that developers have to provide. Include cycle infrastructure Second paragraph (private sector investment) – not clear how this relates to new housing – need to be set out clearer. Not in line with national guidance Not appropriate as a planning policy, maybe a community aspiration No reference to green and active travel infrastructure and provision – only roads. To include walking and cycling provision as well as public transport and electric vehicle charging provision.
H3	The timing of development
H3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (A) 'Timely manner' –this can't be quantified. Time limits for commencement are set by planning conditions. Once commenced permissions are extant. (B) – Can't do this – Developers are within their rights to submit different types of applications. If (B) was used as a reason for refusal this would be likely to result in costs being awarded at any appeal. (C) – The wording binds the neighbourhood plan group to do this (i.e. 5 year ticking clock unless all sites have been commenced?) The development could have outline consent Overall, this isn't a land use policy and is something for monitoring and review

Rutland County Council Officer response to Uppingham NP Regulation 16 Consultation



Reference	Comment on Regulation Submission NP
H4	Proposed new housing sites (Policies U-HA1 to U-HA5)
U-HA1, U-HA2, UHA-3, UHA-4, UHA-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RCC has undertaken their own site assessments following ‘a call for sites’ including sites that were submitted for Uppingham the site submissions were forwarded to UTC. As part of the RCC assessment of the sites – the report concludes that none of the proposed UNP sites are suitable for allocation due to them all grade 1 or 2 agricultural land. • RCC recognise in this situation that some BMV land would need to be allocated to meet the housing need. It is not clear whether this has been picked up by the UNP in their site assessment – if not this should be acknowledged as part of the site selection process. • RCC Site appraisal for the Uppingham sites can be made available to the Examiner if required. • The Plan would benefit from having a set of development principles for each proposed site derived from the site assessments undertaken
U-HA1, U-HA2, UHA-3, UHA-4, UHA-5	<p>Housing Strategy Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submission draft plan retains requirements for affordable housing to be provided 'working with local providers', despite previous comments by RCC. It is not clear what is intended by this. There is only one registered provider based in Rutland and this is an almshouse provider. • There are no other registered providers of social housing based in Rutland. Even the housing association with the largest stock in Rutland, the Longhurst Group (formerly Spire Homes) do not have a housing management office in Rutland for its 1,460 properties in Rutland. • We are happy to encourage organisations such as community land trusts, but these have not demonstrated that they have capacity to take on more than a small number of dwellings at present and there are a very large number of affordable homes to be allocated by the Neighbourhood Plan. • It is really difficult for developers working in Rutland to find any registered providers (for-profit or not-for-profit) to take properties on reasonable terms for section 106 sites at the moment, regardless of whether or not they are local and of the number of properties they have in Rutland. Any restriction on the ability of developers to select providers, other than the standard clause in RCC's

Rutland County Council Officer response to Uppingham NP Regulation 16 Consultation



Reference	Comment on Regulation Submission NP
	<p>section 106 agreements giving it the right to approve the provider, in the policies could really hamstring RCC's ability to enable affordable housing for local people.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the Parish Council wished to encourage local providers this should be in the supporting text rather than in the policy. The previous suggestion from RCC of developers using 'reasonable endeavours' to select providers if possible with a minimum of 50 properties in Rutland, or (not 'and') providers based in Rutland could be in the supporting text but I would caution strongly against using it at all. It is certainly not now suitable for the policy. • First Homes, generally brought forward by the site developers, would also need to be excluded from any 'reasonable endeavours' test as First Homes are unlikely to be provided through providers based in Rutland (they are normally brought forward by the private developer) but are still a requirement of national planning policy. • Section 106 agreements ensure that local housing needs are met, regardless of where the provider is based.
Rationale – Para 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What consultation has taken place with highways, ecology or heritage?
Table 1 – U-HA1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How is the 'future link road' referenced and evidenced in the plan?
Table 1 – U-HA2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where is the evidence for the need of bungalows and why on this specific site?
Table 1 – U-HA4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where is the evidence for the need of bungalows and why on this specific site?
Table 1 – U-HA5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See highway comments
Table 1 – U-HA6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See highway comments
Policy H4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Numbers – needs to be less prescriptive e.g. 'at least/up to 110 dwellings, plus or minus'. • Doesn't give any room for less/more than exactly 330 homes. • Inconsistent with other housing policies where 'up to' is used.

Rutland County Council Officer response to Uppingham NP Regulation 16 Consultation



Reference	Comment on Regulation Submission NP
U-HA1	Site Allocation: Land in front of Cricket Club, off Leicester Road
Rationale – Para 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How are open space requirements determined? • Needs justification for the ‘possible future investment in roads’
Rationale – Para 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to explain the status and likelihood of the proposal of the bypass
U-HA1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a) Justification required for including single storey dwellings • b) Unreasonable for a policy to specify local providers, the use of a local provider is a community aspiration and not appropriate in this planning policy which needs to promote viable development. • e) Unreasonable and unjustified to include this within the policy • 110 dwellings - below the 25 dwellings target density in Policy H2 – density is 22 dwelling per hectare • (f) ‘include access’ – to what? Without a full transport assessment – Unclear whether this site will be deliverable <p>Highway Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A full Transport Assessment will be required to assess the impact on the surrounding road network, identify the type of junction necessary on Leicester Road and identify any mitigation for any unacceptable impact (both capacity & safety) beyond the access. • Existing speed limit/vehicle speeds along Leicester Road also need consideration, which will not necessarily be appropriate once the new development is in place. • A reduction in speed limit combined with measures to ensure a reduced speed limit is self-compliant is likely to be requested by the LHA. • A Traffic Regulation Order(TRO) will be required to regulate any changes to the current speed limit • Whilst a secondary access is not necessary for this development on its own, should there be any intention for future development beyond this site, consideration may need to be given to a

Rutland County Council Officer response to Uppingham NP Regulation 16 Consultation



Reference	Comment on Regulation Submission NP
	<p>secondary access off Leicester Road (if the indicated bypass on plan UP-NP-DS-U-HA1 does not come to fruition).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whilst this development land on its own would not warrant a bypass, nor would it be viable, land could be set aside for a future scheme although at present there are no plans for such a road. • It is not clear why the indicative bypass route including a very large roundabout is required or why it is located in such a way as to sever the proposed development land leaving two strips remote from the remainder of the development. Whilst acknowledging that this is an indicative sketch, the bypass shown looks over-designed and excessive in size. • It is our view, if a bypass is warranted for reasons (other than this site alone) an indication of the entire bypass route should be provided and it would be better located to encompass any and all future developed land, rather than siting within. • The indication of a bypass cannot be construed as any form of approval from Rutland County Council at this stage, or until due process is followed. • The LHA are relatively satisfied that this development (not the bypass) could be acceptable in capacity and safety terms subject to detailed assessment and the implementation of suitable mitigation. • Should Uppingham Town Council (UTC) have an aspiration for a bypass (as partly indicated on this plan) it is strongly recommended that this is progressed first in order to identify a suitable route which can then be used to design within. • However, UTC should note that the LHA would not wish to see a connecting link road from Leicester Road through to a bypass within a housing development.
U-HA2	Site Allocation: land off Ayston Road
Rationale – Para 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Justification required along with evidence of consultation with the Highways authority
Rationale – Para 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Justification required for the bungalows

Rutland County Council Officer response to Uppingham NP Regulation 16 Consultation



Reference	Comment on Regulation Submission NP
Rationale – Para 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Justification for the inclusion of a retail site – Benefit from a specific retail policy or development principles • Where is the landscape impact assessment? The northern part is an area of high landscape sensitivity • New up to date Landscape evidence for the Local Plan has been published: https://www.rutland.gov.uk/planning-building-control/local-plan/new-local-plan/local-plan-evidence-base/landscape-evidence
U-HA2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Density is only 13 dwellings per hectare, not according with NPPF most efficient use of land • a) If the dwellings are market homes, how can the policy specify this, it is superfluous - ‘catering for first time buyers, families and older persons’ – very broad – covers the vast majority of homeowners – therefore why exclude the rest? • b) Unreasonable to specify local providers, the use of a local provider is a community aspiration and not appropriate in this planning policy which needs to promote viable development. • c) Justification required, how big? What type of play area? LEAP or LAP? – Public open space - why isn’t this a requirement on the previous site? (U-HA1). Also, if this is covered by RCC standards, why is this needed in the NP? • f) – The Highway Authority currently are objecting to a new access. Forestry Officer – objecting to removal of RCC trees to facilitate access. • g) Justification required – what type of retail development? How has the juxta-positioning of employment and residential uses been assessed? • Without a full transport assessment – Unclear whether this site will be deliverable based on Highways comments • Need to keep development away from the mature trees along the northern boundary. To keep development out of the narrow and ecologically sensitive strip of land in the west. To sensitively work with the levels and avoid unsightly retaining features. <p>Highway Comments</p>

Rutland County Council Officer response to Uppingham NP Regulation 16 Consultation



Reference	Comment on Regulation Submission NP
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LHA agree that this land can only be accessed by a single access, given its frontage, however its location and type must be given very careful consideration with detailed design. An access between the arms of Ayston Road roundabout and Northgate would NOT be acceptable due to the constricted length between. Access 'may' be possible opposite Northgate, however the design must ensure vehicles are not backed-up up to and on to the A47 junction/A47. A full Transport Assessment will be required (including the other 3 parcels both sides of Ayston Road, should they be included in the final neighbourhood plan) to assess fully the impact of this and neighbouring development locally and within the surrounding road network, the extent of which is to be agreed with the LHA. The LHA cannot at this stage give any indication as to the acceptability of development on this site without further work. It is also worth noting that it is highly unlikely that a spur off the A47 roundabout would be possible due to the existing layout of the roundabout, topography of the land and the fact that the roundabout already has 5 arms.
U-HA3	Site Allocation: Land at Uppingham Gate
Rationale Para1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refers to a proposed food retail store. Is this in addition to the proposed commercial/retail use referred to in Policy U-HA3? There is a new retail study which supports a retail site to come forward in Uppingham based on qualitative need but would require an Impact assessment and meet the sequential test . Evidence available here: https://www.rutland.gov.uk/planning-building-control/local-plan/new-local-plan/local-plan-evidence-base/economy-employment-evidence
Rationale Para 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refers to there may be potential for a nursing home or extra care facility – this may impact on the overall housing numbers if housing not delivered unless this is intended as part of the mixed-use business and employment
Rationale Para 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Without a full transport assessment – Unclear whether this site will be deliverable.

Rutland County Council Officer response to Uppingham NP Regulation 16 Consultation



Reference	Comment on Regulation Submission NP
U-HA3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy U-HA3 – density is 18 dwellings per hectare • a) If the dwellings are market homes, how can the policy specify this, it is superfluous– too prescriptive (35 houses 25 bungalows makes exactly 60, whereas first section says ‘up to 60’) - a percentage would be better. • c) Does this need specifying in the policy? See highways comments Transport assessment/affordable homes already covered by RCC Highway Authority/affordable homes policies • d) This is not a land use policy • e) Unreasonable to specify local providers, the use of a local provider is a community aspiration and not appropriate in this planning policy which needs to promote viable development. • Need to retain mature trees and create features out of them within the layout. <p>Highways Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A full Transport Assessment will be required (including the other 3 parcels of land both sides of Ayston Road, should they be included in the final neighbourhood plan) to determine the impact of this and neighbouring developments on the junction of Northgate with Ayston Road and the surrounding road network. There is likely to be a need to upgrade the junction of Northgate and Ayston Road, but without the benefit of a Transport Assessment the LHA cannot predict what this is likely to consist of.
U-HA4	Site allocation for land east of the Beeches
Rationale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preamble says Highway Authority suggested a secondary access only (not main) could be possible through The Beeches –but if the main vehicular access can only be only allowed through U-HA3, then the ‘development should not commence until’ doesn’t add anything?
U-HA4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy U-HA4 – no site area given

Rutland County Council Officer response to Uppingham NP Regulation 16 Consultation



Reference	Comment on Regulation Submission NP
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access – Preamble says Highway Authority suggested a secondary access only (not main) could be possible through The Beeches –but if the main vehicular access can only be only allowed through U-HA3, then the ‘development should not commence until’ doesn’t add anything? <p>Highways Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same comments as U-HA3 above. • It is noted that this site abuts The Beeches, which would be an excellent secondary connection. However, whilst The Beeches is adopted public highway there is third party land between the public highway and the site edge red for U-HA4. • Further investigation would be necessary to identify the owner of said land and to see if this land could be used as a point of access. • At minimum pedestrian connectivity would be welcomed. Should this be possible, the area between would need to be re-configured to meet adoptable standard of a housing estate road. • Concerns about the deliverability of the site due to access
U-HA5	Site Allocation: Land off Goldcrest/Firs Avenue
Rationale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy U-HA5 – no site area given
U-HA5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access –, would be better to say ‘primary access must be through U-HA2, including construction traffic’, and site U-HA2 reworded to say that there must be access through to site U-HA5 (rather than ‘access considered’). <p>Highways Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same comments as U-HA2 above. • It would appear that this land is only going to be accessible through the above-mentioned U-HA2 site. Given this and in order to future proof any connection on to Ayston Road, this land and use must be factored into an overall assessment for both sites as well as the two sites on the opposite side of Ayston Road.

Rutland County Council Officer response to Uppingham NP Regulation 16 Consultation



Reference	Comment on Regulation Submission NP
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The comments relating to Firs Avenue are noted, however a secondary connection (permanent, not construction traffic) could be possible but this may give rise to opposition from those residents. • A connection via Goldcrest would potentially be viable in geometry terms, however there is third party land between the existing public highway and the site edged red for this site, therefore a connection may not be possible in any event. • Further investigation work would be required to identify the owner of said land and to see if this land could be used as a point of access, subject to the views of those residents. • At minimum pedestrian connectivity would be welcomed. • Concerns about the deliverability of the site due to access
	<p>All Sites/Overall Map</p>
All Sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safe and convenient pedestrian connectivity is fundamental and serious consideration must be given to public transport provision as some of the sites are of significant size or geometry that would render any existing services too difficult or too far in our view. • This later point would however depend also on whether the public transport providers consider a route through these sites viable.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal for all of these sites within close proximity to one another will undoubtedly result in a significant increase in traffic leading to a potentially severe impact which must be fully assessed and fully mitigated against. Whilst the main impact will be at the junction of Northgate and Ayston Road, given the amount of development, the impact will occur further afield and similarly will need to be assessed and any unacceptable impact mitigated against. • Under no circumstances will all or any parts of the development be allowed to impact on the A47 or the roundabout by way of queuing. It may transpire that not all sites are developable due to capacity of the road network and impact on highway safety, in which case a decision will need to be taken to decide which sites come forward and which do not.

Rutland County Council Officer response to Uppingham NP Regulation 16 Consultation



Reference	Comment on Regulation Submission NP
Allocations Map	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Route appears to come to an abrupt end Need to include some commentary on the likelihood of the possibility of the route
OH1	Affordable Housing
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The second sentence is contrary to paragraph 64 of the NPPF as the Parish of Uppingham is not in a 'designated rural area'. The policy should also require 'at least' 30% affordable housing, in line with the wording in the allocation policies. The last sentence needs to be strengthened; it is suggested that a similar wording is used to that currently in Policy SP9: "The Council may refuse development proposals which, in its opinion, seek to under-develop or split sites in a way that is likely to reduce the affordable housing contribution and/or promote off-site provision."
Rationale – Para 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This would be best addressed as a community aspiration. An alternative could be, for instance, to seek that the developer use reasonable endeavours to select a provider having at least 50 dwellings (including shared ownership) in management in Rutland or being based in Rutland.
OH1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> b) How will this be achieved? Final sentence is not a land use policy This should include a provision for lettings to be supported by an appropriate nominations agreement with Rutland County Council as Local Housing Authority. This is the normal practice in Rutland and recognises the Council's duties under the Housing Act 1996 (as amended), such as maintaining the statutory housing register and tackling homelessness. As a small town in the settlement hierarchy, Uppingham is expected to help meet the needs of the surrounding area within Rutland and well as meeting its own needs. The Town Council should not have a veto over management arrangements. An alternative could be, for instance, for Rutland County Council to seek that the developer use reasonable endeavours to select a provider having at least 50 dwellings (including shared ownership) in management in Rutland or being based in Rutland.

Rutland County Council Officer response to Uppingham NP Regulation 16 Consultation



Reference	Comment on Regulation Submission NP
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Policy should include this or a similar phrase: "Rutland County Council may refuse development proposals which, in its opinion, seek to under-develop or split sites in a way that is likely to reduce the affordable housing contribution and/or promote off-site provision."
OH2	Meeting Local Needs and providing flexibility
Rationale – Para 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RCC Strategic Housing Market Assessment has been updated: https://www.rutland.gov.uk/sites/default/files/2023-08/Rutland_HMA_Final_Report_23-08-23_12pt_accessible.pdf
OH3	Self-build and custom housebuilding
Rationale para 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is not a shortfall in self-build plots, it is more a case of planning for future needs. RCC monitoring reports show that we are meeting the requirement to provide sufficient serviced permitted sites to meet numbers on the self-build register Based on the RCC approach but what approach is that?
Rational para 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not sure how helpful this paragraph is, it seems to contradict Policy OH3? It is the Council's view that proposals for self-build will be supported by the Council where they are in conformity with all relevant local and national policies
OH4	Infill Housing
Rationale – Para 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why is 9 or less considered when Policy OH4 refers to 10 dwellings or less not 9.
OH4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy OH4 refers to new housing on infill sites as 10 dwellings or less and contradicts para 3 above
OH5	Design and Access Standards
OH5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> b) Be of an appropriate scale, density and massing, using high quality materials reflecting the area;

Rutland County Council Officer response to Uppingham NP Regulation 16 Consultation



Reference	Comment on Regulation Submission NP
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> d) BNG will require biodiversity enhancements and preference is for on site provision as much as possible – so enhancements should always be made - so could remove, where possible; f) perform positively – could mention the RCC design SPD and also Building for a Healthy Life and the national Design Guide. Cover green blue infrastructure and SuDS best practice Is this appropriate? Not sure this paragraph should be included within the policy as it cannot be used a consideration to determine a planning application. Better placed in the supporting text. Suggest add the design process (as set out in the Design SPD) – undertake a site and contextual analysis and response to context at the beginning of the design process. Does the NP want to retain the concept of houses clustered around green spaces from the previous NP? (this is a strong and simple design concept)
C&H2	Other designated heritage assets, including Listed Buildings, Important Open Spaces & Frontages, and archaeological sites.
(1)	Not necessary to include this in the policy
(2)	Does this add anything to Policy SP20?
(3)	Does this add any additional protection to Policy SP20?
TC1	Primary Retail frontages
TC1 – Last Sentence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Para d) what is intended by ‘will provide a direct service to the public’? What is the justification for the extensions? Is there evidence to support this? There is a new retail study which supports a retail site to come forward in Uppingham based on qualitative need but would require an Impact assessment and meet the sequential test . Evidence available here: https://www.rutland.gov.uk/planning-building-control/local-plan/new-local-plan/local-plan-evidence-base/economy-employment-evidence

Rutland County Council Officer response to Uppingham NP Regulation 16 Consultation



Reference	Comment on Regulation Submission NP
OR1	Preferred locations for convenience stores
OR1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This policy is vague, what would be an appropriate scale and an appropriate site? As written this could be anywhere • Policy U-HA2 sets out the adjoining land to the north is proposed for community/retail development. Policy U-HA3 also refers to retail use. • Sites unlikely to be able to have both come forward without subject to retail impact test and meeting the sequential test – Needs to be clear. • See link above to up to date retail study • New up to date Landscape evidence for the Local Plan has been published and needs to be taken into account: https://www.rutland.gov.uk/planning-building-control/local-plan/new-local-plan/local-plan-evidence-base/landscape-evidence
Community Proposal TC2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Note RCC can only make an area of special control order after it has been approved by the Secretary of State. • Before making an order and applying for approval from the Secretary of State, local planning authorities are expected to consult local trade and amenity organisations about the proposal.
BE1	Uppingham Gate business and related uses
BE1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See earlier comments for Policy U-HA3 for mixed use and commercial including Highways comments. • a) How is this achievable? • d) Need to reference accessibility • Last paragraph of policy – See Highways comments
BE2	Land at the junction of A47 and Ayston Road

Rutland County Council Officer response to Uppingham NP Regulation 16 Consultation



Reference	Comment on Regulation Submission NP
Rationale – Para 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 2017 landscape study says a lot more than what is described here. Note earlier link to up to date landscape study published 2023
BE2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See policy and highways comments for U-HA2 Needs further detail to address landscape impact concerns The site will be screened by the existing mature trees – which RCC would like to keep and protect – so the landmark building element is less relevant – better to say to retain the trees, keep development a distance away from them so as not to damage them and also to minimise impacts on the watercourse. Views will be glimpsed in winter through the trees from the roundabout – so the building will be partially visible so could still mention the building – but more to fit with the rural character and mature trees and green gateway to the settlement
BE3	Station Road Industrial Estate
Rationale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seems to be more a community aspiration
BE3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can this be required without any supporting evidence when the supporting text reads more of a community aspiration <p>Highways Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no plan to identify the extent of the area in question, whether this is for redevelopment of the existing industrial area, or an extension to the existing industrial area. There is no detail for any of the improvements listed so it is unclear if all or any of these can be achieved. The policy refers to a new future point of access or egress from the eastern section of the industrial estate, however there are no details provided to show where this is envisaged or if it is achievable.

Rutland County Council Officer response to Uppingham NP Regulation 16 Consultation



Reference	Comment on Regulation Submission NP
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As a consequence, the LHA are unable to provide any meaningful response as to the acceptability of the proposals, and therefore are unable to support the proposals, primarily due to a lack of information at this stage. Depending on the size of the development, any future planning application may need to be supported by a Transport Assessment or Statement.
BE4	Welland Vale Business Zone
BE4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why would these proposals be accepted on this specific site? <p>Highways Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no plan to identify the extent of the area in question, so it is difficult to understand the potential development size. Depending on the size/type of development, any future application may need to be supported by a Transport Assessment or Statement. It is not clear if it is intended to create an additional access (or use the existing) or even whether one would be possible within the site extent/frontage as it is not clear whether the field to the east is included.
BE5	Information technology and Communications
BE5 – 1) & 2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This provision is subject to the practicality of achieving this The building regs RA1 now require dwellings to be gigabit-ready for electronic communications/broadband The needs/preferences of the property owners and occupiers is not appropriate within a land use policy Viability implications if the policy goes beyond the building regs.
BE6	Proposed tourism development

Rutland County Council Officer response to Uppingham NP Regulation 16 Consultation



Reference	Comment on Regulation Submission NP
BE6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy needs to accord with Local Plan policies as well as the neighbourhood plan
	<p>Transport and Active Travel</p>
TR1	<p>Reducing town centre traffic</p>
Rationale – Para 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The plan should comment on the likelihood of the ‘new relief road’ <p>Highways Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> See highways comments made for all the allocations Whilst generally the LHA acknowledge most of the content of this policy, the Arup report commissioned by the Town Council was found on the Town Council’s website and appears to be in draft format only. The report seems to be more of a costing exercise for the purpose of the Town Council. Whilst it is clear a bypass would be beneficial; it is not clear where the funding would come from and at this time Rutland Local Highway Authority do not have any such funds. Individual major developments will be assessed by means of a Transport Assessment through the planning process in order to determine what, if any, off-site highway improvements are necessary. Although a bypass would clearly be beneficial, it is unlikely in our opinion that any individual development could be required to mitigate the impact of their development by way of any of the bypass options proposed in the Arup report due to viability and costs. Whilst the LHA would support the principal of a bypass and would agree that one would potentially ease the pressure within the town centre, this would be subject to funding, detailed design, land ownership, ecology, to name a few and is at a very early stage in its consideration. With regards all major developments that come forward through the planning process, many will require a Transport Assessment to assess the effects on the surrounding road network and where applicable, highway improvements required to mitigate the developments impacts.

Rutland County Council Officer response to Uppingham NP Regulation 16 Consultation



Reference	Comment on Regulation Submission NP
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LHA are mindful of the current stresses on the town centre and where reasonable and practical will require off-site highway improvements, including pedestrian improvements, to mitigate the impacts of developments, however this is unlikely to be a bypass.
TR2	Providing safer walking and cycling and public transport
TR2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to be more specific, will this apply to all development? What about household extensions? Reference should be included within this section that ensures any new walking and cycling infrastructure is built in accordance with LTN1/20 - https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/cycle-infrastructure-design-ltn-120 This is Department for Transport guidance for local authorities on designing high quality, safe cycling infrastructure. Suggest make reference to Manual for Streets, Gear Change: A bold vision for walking and cycling and LTN 1/20. Ideally all future cycle provisions should be built to this standard, thus any new development should meet the standards outlined within LTN1/20. Reference should also be made to the Council’s newly adopted Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) which sets out the Council’s strategic priorities for walking and cycling improvements across the county. The LCWIP is now approved, but is not yet on our website, but will be in due course. Inclusion will ensure future development does inhibit LCWIP scheme aspirations.
TR3	Town Centre Parking
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It would be beneficial for the plan to include a list of known areas of concern. Inclusion of specific locations will help leverage any future potential funding.
TR3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reconfiguring existing parking is not a land use policy

Rutland County Council Officer response to Uppingham NP Regulation 16 Consultation



Reference	Comment on Regulation Submission NP
	<p data-bbox="450 296 898 325">Parking Management Comments:</p> <ul data-bbox="450 376 1814 1361" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="450 376 1814 523">• Comments relate to Policy TR3 and its rationale for Policy TR3: RCC has a Parking Policy which deals with wider issues but includes most of elements of TR3. Elements below may differ from RCC policy. There is already timetabling for reviews. RCC Parking Policy has primacy and Planning need to consult it.<li data-bbox="450 536 1814 603">• Differences include: There is no Parking Policy element which refers to a hunt for a new car park, due to the fact that there are no real opportunities to create a new car park.<li data-bbox="450 616 1814 683">• In terms of statement “number of parking areas do not have marked bays”, it is not in Parking Policy to have such and existing individual bay divides are not to be maintained.<li data-bbox="450 695 1814 762">• Secondly there is some statement of opinion re: TR3 - which we find needs clarifying as opinion (who, when, link to evidence and date/update of evidence) or needs better inclusion /signposting.<li data-bbox="450 775 1814 884">• We met with Ron Simpson recently and he explained where the statements might have originated and that statements like “fragmented nature of provision” and the need for “improved management” are not a criticism of RCC parking operations.<li data-bbox="450 896 1814 1005">• Although we can appreciate comment “insufficient town centre parking at peak time” we feel this needs a note that about where the pressure is (car parks, onstreet restricted or unrestricted areas and which type of user – visitor, business or resident if affected.)<li data-bbox="450 1018 1814 1085">• Our October 2023 spot checks, although we do not disagree with the statement especially when events are on, show some frequent spare capacity in car parks.<li data-bbox="450 1098 1814 1206">• In terms of Seaton Road, for years there has been a process whereby Parish / Town Councils can submit a highways concern for issues to be investigated. Process: https://www.rutland.gov.uk/roads-transport-parking/transport/report-road-safety-or-transport-issue<li data-bbox="450 1219 1814 1361">• The issue of car park directional signage has been explored already – in terms of on street signage RCC are waiting on UTC to come back with locations about where they feel it needs improving, in terms of pedestrian signage from car parks to High Street East etc there is an issue that the foot alleys may not be RCC land nor public rights of way.

Rutland County Council Officer response to Uppingham NP Regulation 16 Consultation



Reference	Comment on Regulation Submission NP
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is also the fact that with the layout and small geographical spread of the town, there is argument that no further signage is needed for motorists or pedestrians. • The NP policy refers to a signage section of the plan, linkage / better signposting required. RCC Signs Policy and street clutter needs considering. • The mentioned “cumulative approach” and “potential to refigure existing on and off street parking” needs explaining further, especially in light of parking services work with UTC (June meeting where no radical changes were desired). This applies to the mention of an action plan too. • In terms of bus situation further reviews of the interchange provision on North Street East may be considered in-line with public bus network review. Coach parking ideation is ongoing and is open to the highways concern process as mentioned above and well as private parties bringing forward opportunities. • Disabled parking off street is guided by car park layout guidance; on street there are only 2 bays which are out of action on market days. Blue Badges may remain with no time limit in the on street Blue Badge, residents and limited waiting bays, and may park free up to 3 hours in car parks (to be charged for longer than 3 hours). • The statement about the concern about aging population needs expanding as there are bays extremely close to shops and if Blue Badges are held, except where there is a loading ban, Blue Badges may remain for up to 3 hours on single and double yellow lines outside shops. • The statement “servicing and unloading cause congestion” needs expanding to be a helpful comment on the town centre situation where one would expect levels of loading and enforcement.
TR4	Improved facilities for public transport and coaches
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A redesign of the bus interchange is a community aspiration not a land use policy • Uppingham bus interchange has previously been reviewed under the Council’s highway and transport working group. The concern was closed in spring 2021. • Any further review of the interchange provision on North Street East may be considered in-line with public bus network review.

Rutland County Council Officer response to Uppingham NP Regulation 16 Consultation



Reference	Comment on Regulation Submission NP
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May be of benefit to include suggested locations for coach parking. • It is recommended that any development takes into consideration the Bus Service Improvement Plan and Enhanced Partnership Plan and Scheme: https://www.rutland.gov.uk/busserviceimprovementplan
CF2	Investment in new and improved community facilities and services
CF2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This policy cannot be used to determine a planning application, more a community aspiration. • Investment is covered by CIL therefore this policy is inappropriate • The final sentence is not clear what is intended.
OS2	Open space provision within new housing developments
OS2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a) Provision of larger open spaces, and the practicality/viability of these is for the determination of RCC as the LPA and not the Town Council • b) Need to reflect that Policy SP22 will be updated • c) Needs clarification • New up to date evidence for the Local Plan has been published for open space assessment, green and blue infrastructure strategy and may need to be taken into account: https://www.rutland.gov.uk/planning-building-control/local-plan/new-local-plan/local-plan-evidence-base/environment-evidence
OS3	Proposed Local Green Spaces
OS3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allotments are already safeguarded by policy CS23 as they fall under the definition of green infrastructure on page 57 Para. 5.18) and as such it is difficult to see what added protections designation of the land as local green space (LGS) would bring even if the site would match the requirements of the NPPF. • Tod's piece is also identified as an Important Open Space and Frontage and subject to Policy SP21 in the Rutland Local Plan

Rutland County Council Officer response to Uppingham NP Regulation 16 Consultation

