

Issue 6: Enabling safer and stronger communities, supported with viable and accessible community and cultural facilities

Strategic Objective 6: Creating safe, inclusive, and resilient communities Supporting all communities across the County to make them safe, inclusive, resilient to change with enhanced community cohesion.

Rep ID	Respondent (ID)	Agent	Officer Summary – Q32 – Q34	Officer Comments
4268	Environment Agency (Mrs Nicola Reyman, Planning Specialist) [855]		The approach to define the limits of development for settlements aligns with the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework to protect and enhance the natural environment. In particular, paragraph 174 b) states that planning policies should contribute to the natural environment by ‘recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services....’	Support for approach noted
4185	De Merke Estates [589]	Barton Willmore, now Stantec (Seth Tyler, Graduate Planner) [1141]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Planned Limits to Development (PLD) need to be reviewed for Oakham and Barleythorpe. • Oakham and Barleythorpe is now identified as single settlement via the recent “Oakham and Barleythorpe Neighbourhood Plan” (O&BNP) - this should be reflected clearer in the Local Plan (inc Figure 2, p.26, I&O). • Consistency is important. • “The Lookout” @ NW Oakham/Barleythorpe is a highly sustainable location for comprehensive development (circa 500 homes) – inc publicly accessible Country Park. • Opportunity for local service and facilities (i.e., Primary School, GP Surgery). 	Noted. See PLD Review Report August 2023

4157	John Meara [776]		With regard to Cottesmore, the current PLD have various anomalies and are in serious need of review.	Noted. See PLD Review Report August 2023
4147	Silver Fox Developments (John Edmond) [1138]		<p>The use of Planned Limits of Development (PLD) historically have sought to define where development should and should not be located. For example, that beyond the PLD development is restricted to countryside uses. This approach is considered appropriate where such limits are kept up-to-date and deliver sufficient growth, including any additional flexibility required to meet local housing needs. Local Plan will need to take account of any large-scale allocations required and located within PLDs and the wording should be re-assessed.</p> <p>The current PLDs were defined in 2012, some 10 years ago, and are accepted by the Council as being out-of-date when assessing current planning applications in the County.</p> <p>They undoubtedly need to be reviewed as part of the new Local Plan and should include sufficient land to meet the Council's spatial strategy. This is specifically important in the most sustainable areas where the majority of additional housing is likely to be located, for instance at the town of Uppingham, which forms the second largest town in the County.</p>	Noted. See PLD Review Report August 2023
4128	Avant Homes [1131]	Mr Alasdair Thorne [562]	<p>The use of Planned Limits of Development (PLD) historically have sought to define where development should and should not be located. For example, that beyond the PLD development is restricted to countryside uses. This approach is considered appropriate where such limits are kept up-to-date and deliver sufficient growth, including any additional flexibility required to meet local housing needs.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.8.2 of the Local Plan states that within the PLDs</p>	Noted. See PLD Review Report August 2023

			<p>small scale development and the conversion or redevelopment of existing buildings is generally considered to be acceptable (subject to matters of detail). However, this takes no account of any large scale allocations required and located within PLDs and the wording should be re-assessed.</p> <p>The current PLDs were defined in 2012, some 10 years ago, and are accepted by the Council as being out of date when assessing current planning applications in the County. They undoubtedly need to be reviewed as part of the new Local Plan and should include sufficient land to meet the Council's spatial strategy. This is specifically important in the most sustainable areas where the majority of additional housing is likely to be located, for instance at the town of Oakham which forms the principal settlement in the County.</p>	
4103	Wells McFarlane [365]	Pegasus group (Mrs Georgina Doyle) [575]	<p>Defining the limits to development is supported. However, whilst the principle of development within the settlement limits is considered to be acceptable, the location of a proposal adjacent to or just outside of the limit should not automatically mean that planning permission would be refused. All proposals, whether inside, adjacent, or outside of the settlement limit should be determined in accordance with the Development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.</p> <p>To build flexibility into the development strategy and to help maintain a long-term supply of new housing, the limits to development need to be reviewed.</p>	Noted See PLD Review Report August 2023
4075	Cottesmore Parish Council (Parish Council Representative) [410]		<p>In many cases the line seems to be drawn basically around the existing built up area, offering no indication of where it would make sense to allow some limited small scale new development, particularly in Local Centres such as</p>	Noted See PLD Review Report August 2023

			Cottesmore. It is then left to the Development Control process – rather than the plan-making process to identify changes to the PLD by the granting of a planning permission, thereby causing a ‘de-facto’ change in the boundary. This is the wrong way round.	
4024	John Dejardin [128]		My concern is with the smaller villages, without controlling the loss of small affordable/social housing these villages become socially and communally unbalanced. They then also draw in support services such as gardeners, cleaners, child care etc. from other more distant settlements. Some growth in these villages should be permitted in order to maintain this balance and make the communities more sustainable. With the advent of electric vehicles through the 20 year plan carbon footprint will reduce rather than increase from any growth in population. The planned limit of development has severely damaged the character of many villages due to the increased density of the settlement; this needs careful consideration when reviewing settlement PLD boundaries.	Noted, see policies SS1, SS3 and SS4
3995	The Society of Merchant Venturers [693]	Savills (Julia Mountford, Planning Consultant) [735]	We support the fact that the Council agree that their PLDs (Planned Limits of Development) will need to be reviewed to support the level of required future growth within the County. It will be important for the PLDs to be amended to reflect the proposed allocations as the Plan progresses.	Support noted. See PLD Review Report August 2023
3969	Clipsham Parish Meeting (Clifford Bacon) [110]		The setting of PLD’s should be a plan-making process. It should not be left to Development Control to make changes to PLD’s by approving development outside or beyond the existing PLD.	Noted. See PLD Review Report August 2023
3764	Historic England (Emilie Carr) [219]		If limits to development are changed, potential impacts upon heritage assets should be assessed in a similar way to housing allocations to ensure that heritage assets and their settings are protected.	Noted. See PLD Review Report August 2023

3742	Sinclair Rogers [1120]		<p>nothing has appeared on our horizon on this issue. Please list what the county council sees as its objectives on this issue for the next five years.</p>	<p>Noted. See PLD Review Report August 2023</p>
3727	Tim Allen [521]		<p>The principle of defining Planned Limits of Development (PLD's) is a sound approach to protecting the countryside and limiting encroachment into it. However, the way that the PLD's are set is often a function of simply drawing a line, on a 2D plan, round the existing built-up area and setting that as the limit. This can mean the opportunities for future development and growth in villages, through viable and sensible windfall sites that happen to be on the edges of settlements and that would have little or no impact on the surroundings of the settlement, are excluded from the plan.</p> <p>Therefore, whilst supporting the principle of PLD's, we would argue that a more sophisticated and considered approach should be adopted in defining them. This is especially relevant in the larger villages that have good supporting infrastructure and facilities and where the small scale development opportunities offered by windfall sites on the edges of these settlements could represent a sustainable and appropriate policy response.</p> <p>As stated in our response to Q32, we consider that some of the larger villages (often referred to as Service Centres) are appropriate locations for growth - usually of a modest scale, and often delivered through windfall provisions. In general, the majority of Local Plans define that this type of development should only take place within PLD's, but this means that windfall provision is limited. There may be perfectly suitable locations that lie on the edges of service centres that could make a sustainable contribution to growth, with limited or no impact to the local area, and</p>	<p>Support noted. See PLD Review Report August 2023</p>

			these are excluded from the Plan on the basis of an overly simple approach to PLD's in the larger villages.	
3560	Barrowden Parish Council (Mr Gordon Brown, Chairman) [1103]		They were not reviewed as part of the 2017 draft Local Plan, and many are out of date due to subsequent developments which have extended beyond the PLDs and identified errors. There are at least two errors in Barrowden but were not changed in the withdrawn Local Plan because PLDs were not reviewed.	Noted. See PLD Review Report August 2023
3511	PDR Planning Limited (Mr Philip Rawle, Director) [627]		<p>Greenlight does not accept that the imposition of 'limits of development for settlements' is justified, as it is not consistent with the NPPF.</p> <p>In an NPPF world there should be no policies in a Local Plan that would have the effect of undermining the requirement to 'boost significantly the supply of housing'. The ability of a local planning authority to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites is a minimum requirement. It is important to avoid policies the practical effect of which would be to turn the minimum into a maximum. Policies that limit any future housing development to within imposed limits of development for a settlement would restrict the supply of housing to in effect the allocated sites. This is because we know that the scope to build within development boundaries, other than on sites allocated through the Plan process, is very limited. That is the precise reason why these limits/boundaries will need to be expanded as part of the current Plan process.</p> <p>If a proposal passes the three-dimensional test of sustainability set out in the NPPF it should be permitted. Which side of a pre-imposed development limit/boundary a site falls tells us very little whether the proposal is sustainable or not. Location is only one of the matters that</p>	<p>Noted. The PLD Review 2023 does not therefore seek to redefine the whole PLD boundaries from scratch, but to identify where systematic and objective assessment criteria for the alignment of the PLD indicate amendment is appropriate.</p> <p>However, the Spatial Strategy Evidence Report provides background information and justification for Policy SS1 Spatial Strategy for new development, which seeks to concentrate growth on the main urban areas of Oakham (with Barleythorpe); Uppingham and Stamford (which is out-with Rutland County Councils administrative area but adjoins the county boundary and is considered to be a sustainable location for development). The policy also identifies 21 Larger</p>

			<p>feeds into an assessment of sustainability. Further, even if the focus is solely on sustainability as locational accessibility, it is by no means true that all sites within development limits/boundaries are accessible and all sites that abut that limit/boundary are inaccessible. In fact, it will rarely be the case that a site which falls within the boundary is sufficiently accessible but one that abuts that boundary is not.</p> <p>The effect of the ‘limits of development for settlements’ will be that even if a proposal passes the three dimensional test of sustainability set out in the NPPF, it will be contrary to the Local Plan if it is outside of a settlement limit/boundary, (other than in a very limited range of exceptions). This would be fundamentally in conflict with the NPPF, would unnecessarily constraint the supply of housing, and have the practical effect of ensuring that no more housing gets delivered than that allocated in the Plan (i.e., it would turn the minimum into the maximum). Anything meaningful that can be squeezed from windfalls within settlement limits/boundaries has already been exhausted, given the years of constraint operated by local planning authorities. If ‘limits of development for settlements’ remain, then Greenlight agrees, they need to be reviewed. Such a review is required to help guide development and needs to be mindful of the land needed to accommodate growth in Rutland up to 2041.</p> <p>If a site is going to be allocated for development up to 2041 in the new Local Plan, it should be included within the development boundary for that settlement.</p>	<p>Villages with Planned Limits to Development (PLDs) where some small-scale allocations will be made and where windfall sites within the PLDs will be acceptable in principle.</p>
3444	Vistry Homes East Midlands [1070]	Marrons (Mr Dan Robinson-Wells,	Where a Neighbourhood Plan is proposing to allocate land to meet its development needs it should be clear in the Local	Noted. See PLD Review Report August 2023

		Associate Director) [535]	Plan that the planned limits of development will be amended through the Neighbourhood Plan process.	
3367	Empingham Parish Council (Mrs Rowan Scholtz, Parish Council Representative) [413]		Every Parish/Town Council should be asked to review and recommend any necessary or desired changes.	Suggestion noted.
3265	Edith Weston Parish Council (Parish Council Representative) [411]		These should only be reviewed if required and any changes in the PLD should only be undertaken where the Parish Council/Town Council is in full agreement particularly parishes that have Neighbourhood Plans.	Noted. See PLD Review Report August 2023
3109	Mrs Hannah Williams [925]		I am unsure where the current PLDs are. I imagine there has been planning permission granted which may change the share of some towns/ villages. For Oakham: It makes sense to try and build only around where there is existing infrastructure. The area South of the trainline in Oakham (Brooke Road/ Wellend Way) has huge amounts of traffic, and I would suggest developing closer to the ring-road would be better.	Noted. See PLD Review Report August 2023
3029	Mr Malcolm Touchin [1038]		Any changes to the boundaries must be coherent with an overall strategy for the use of land across the county, to ensure that a balanced approach is maintained. I would also suggest that it would be wrong and, indeed, unsustainable, simply to continue building more and more houses; there will need to be a longer-term limit to development county-wide, recognising that there is a finite amount of land we can use, and that it must be used other purposes as well.	Noted. See PLD Review Report August 2023
3001	Mrs Janie Johnson-Crossfield [1049]		we are already breaching the accepted boundary areas such as the by-pass by entertaining new housing development-why?	Concern noted
2895	Mr Simon Frearson [1047]		Greater flexibility is required to ensure PLDs remain current	Noted. See PLD Review Report August 2023

2855	CPRE Rutland (Mr Ron Simpson, Chair) [1036]		Neighbourhood plans should be actively encouraged, and the local plan reflect their aspirations. Local communities should determine planning boundaries while complying with the NPPF.	Noted.
2835	Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) [1042]	Montagu Evans LLP (Miss Lauren Hawksworth, Associate) [1041]	<p>The DIO agree that the Planned Limits of Development (PLD) around the limit of built up areas of towns and villages across the County is an appropriate approach. The Limits of Development boundary for existing development around Edith Weston and St George’s Barracks should be amended to include the St George’s Barracks site. The adopted local plan tightly draws the Limits of Development around existing brownfield land in Edith Weston, with no room for sustainable growth. The approach creates pockets of development rather than a single cohesive settlement.</p> <p>The St Georges Barracks site is an established area of brownfield land. As per NPPF Paragraph 119 and Strategic Objective 10 of the Issues and Options Plan, development of this category of land should be used for development.</p> <p>The purpose of the ‘Limits of Development’ boundary is to identify existing built up areas and brownfield land where development is considered to be acceptable in principle. The St Georges Barracks site clearly meets the definition of brownfield land and is an established area of built form in Edith Weston. It is therefore suggested that the Limits of Development are amended to include the St George’s Site which will promote sustainable brownfield development and create a new area of planned growth for Edith Weston without encroaching in to undeveloped areas of the village. This echoes the position in the emerging design guidance for</p>	<p>Noted. See PLD Review Report August 2023.</p> <p>The PLD for Edith Weston has not been amended to include the ST George’s Barracks site as this does not meet the criteria set out in the review.</p>

			the Edith Weston and North Luffenham Neighbourhood Plans which shows development on the St Georges site.	
2777	Jeakins Weir Ltd [1037]	Mr Alasdair Thorne [562]	<p>As set out in the Local Plan, the use of Planned Limits of Development (PLD) historically has sought to define where development should and should not be located. For example, that beyond the PLD development is restricted to countryside uses. This approach is considered appropriate where such limits are kept up-to-date and deliver sufficient growth, including any additional flexibility required to meet local housing needs.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.8.2 of the Local Plan states that within the PLDs small scale development and the conversion or redevelopment of existing buildings is generally considered to be acceptable (subject to matters of detail). However, this takes no account of any large scale allocations required and located within PLDs and the wording should be re-assessed. The current PLDs were defined in 2012, some 10 years ago, and are accepted by the Council as being out of date when assessing current planning applications in the County. They undoubtedly need to be reviewed as part of the new Local Plan and should include sufficient land to meet the Council's spatial strategy. This is specifically important in the most sustainable areas where the majority of additional housing is likely to be located, for instance at the town of Oakham which forms the principal settlement in the County.</p>	Noted. See PLD Review Report August 2023
2707	Braunston Parish Council (Mrs Carole Brown, Parish Clerk) [1003]		Not applicable, given our answers above. However, these limits should be respected and enforced by RCC, contrary to current practice	Noted
2685	Mr Jamie Weir [1030]		Oakham south should infill to bypass	Noted

2663	Mrs Karen Hubbard [1033]		Smaller villages need to be given the opportunity to grow. Nobody wants to live somewhere with no shop/pub/community centre so make these a priority	Noted, see policy SS3 and SS4
2641	Mr Harold Dermott [1001]		I have answered "Disagree" to Qu 33, because any review of the current PLDs would require full compliance with the whole of Chapter 13 in NPPF2021, and in most places in Rutland this would involve building in the "Green Belt". It is not clear to me which organisation in Rutland has the skill set to do the work and be able to carry out such a review in an unbiased manner.	Noted – Rutland does not have any designated green belt.
2628	Define (on behalf of William Davis Homes) (Mr Sam Perkins, Graduate Planner) [1027]		There is a clear need to allow for additional growth in suitable locations adjacent to LSCs to support the services and facilities within those settlements and nearby villages (given that such settlements often work as a 'network'). Indeed, that reflects the NPPF's recognition that "housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities." Therefore, planned limits to developments (PLD) should be amended both to reflect the allocations that are identified in the Plan and to allow opportunities for settlements to expand. WDH's comments in response to Question 15 highlight the merits of 'Land North of Mill Lane, Cottesmore' as a location for growth and, therefore, it is suggested that the site is allocated and PLD amended accordingly.	Noted. See PLD Review Report August 2023
2544	Pigeon Investment Management Ltd [1022]	Carter Jonas (Ms Kimberley Brown, Associate Partner) [601]	The approach of defining the limits of development around settlements is common and is used elsewhere to determine land that is within the urban area or in the countryside. It should be made clear in any policy relating to development limits that site allocations are likely to be made on land outside of those limits in order to meet development needs. Therefore, PLDs need to be reviewed	Noted. See PLD Review Report August 2023

2501	Francis Jackson Homes Ltd (Mr Paul Johnson, Land and Planning Director) [761]		Land north of Pennine Drive, Edith Weston, currently the subject of outline planning application reference 2022/0903/MAO should be included within the PLD. It is set between 2 existing blocks of housing, has low landscape impact, a significant Highways frontage and in all other senses is a logical and deliverable site that can provide housing (including Affordable Housing) and notable POS in the immediate term.	Noted
2460	Uppingham Town Council (Parish Council Representative) [445]		Where a Neighbourhood Plan exists (or is being prepared) this should be the vehicle for determining the limits of development and not the Local Plan	Noted
2429	Muller Property Group [1012]	Harris Lamb (Miss Josie Hobbs, Planner) [1010]	<p>In light of the representator's interests at Whissendine and the recent grant of outline planning permission on the land to the south of Stapleford Road and to the west of Harborough Close a further amendment of the settlement boundary on the western side of Whissendine to accommodate an additional phase of residential development in the village is now sought. A site location plan that formed the basis of the representor's Call for Sites submission is attached and which highlights the extent of the change to the defined limit to development around Whissendine.</p> <p>The rationale for directing additional development to this part of the village is predicated on the basis that outline planning permission has recently been granted for 66 dwellings and that in doing so the Council acknowledged and accepted that residential development could be adequately accommodated on the site and that there were no technical, physical or environmental reasons that would prevent its delivery. We contend that the same is true for the additional land that is now proposed as a further residential</p>	Noted

			allocation for the village which could contribute an additional circa 75 dwellings.	
2363	Limes, Firs & Spurs Resident's Association (Mr David Ainslie, Chairman) [1006]		Where a Neighbourhood Plan exists (or is being prepared) this should be the vehicle for determining the limits of development and not the Local Plan.	Noted. PLD's will be amended by Neighbourhood Plan's if they include allocated sites.
2320	Mr Peter Coe [1004]		There may be certain areas where the PLD boundaries may need changing where a particular community cannot meet its housing numbers for the plan period. This should be agreed with the community and designated by the Neighbourhood Plan where one exists to allow for example for small scale additional developments in villages and service centres	Noted. See PLD Review Report August 2023
2272	Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan Group (David Ainslie) [270]		Where a Neighbourhood Plan exists (or is being prepared) this should be the vehicle for determining the limits of development and not the Local Plan.	Noted. PLD's will be amended by Neighbourhood Plan's if they include allocated sites.
2143	Mr Norman Milne [996]		Changing planned limits of development is an extensive problem. By way of example: locally the SGB site is split across two parishes and it is clear there is at least an opportunity to build a new village. 500 Houses + appropriate facilities at maximum using what is yet to be defined Brownfield (within the wire). However, the pre-existing plans from the MOD are far out of alignment with local views. This was why the local plan in part was rejected. At the time the surrounding villages took issue with the overall number of properties and warned of the unexpected consequences of that approach. Time passed and now the shoehorning of a New Town into an existing plan period is still possible but both Climate Change, Environment, Viability and Sustainability are to the fore. Only a location change would work (Woolfox)	Comments noted – See PLD Review Report August 2023 Much of this relates to a broader issue around the county

			<p>Change the boundaries by linking Stamford and Rutland into the same plan and thus use space sensibly between the towns. Sub regional development after appropriate consultations would permit more even minded solutions that meet more appropriate needs of a much larger community.</p> <p>Upcoming Boundary Commission changes may assist in this. How else will you take the heat out of Stamford, appease a very rightly grumpy set of Citizens in Oakham and help Uppingham to grow organically. They really want to... but fix health care and community facilities in Oakham first.</p>	boundary with Lincolnshire rather than village PLDs
2078	Mrs Penelope Forbes [994]		Each Town Council and Parish should be consulted as to their respective needs. They are the people who understand their areas best and therefore their needs.	Noted
1980	Ms Rosemary Harris [984]		The boundaries of smaller settlements should be changed to allow for developments to satisfy local needs.	<p>Noted. See PLD Review Report August 2023.</p> <p>Policy SS4 allows for some very limited development in and around these settlements as infill, rounding off and appropriate redevelopment of previously development land.</p>
1711	Barry Hobbs [646]		To meet the desires of Neighbourhood plans	Noted
1512	Mr Andrew Lunn [689]		Every Parish /Town Council should be asked to review and recommend any necessary or desired changes.	Noted
1298	Mr Tony Wray [545]		In most Rutland villages the PLD's are no longer relevant. RCC have permitted considerable extensions of residential boundaries beyond PLD's and there are numerous examples of new builds and/or repurposing of buildings outside of the PLD's. There is considerable scope for the creation of many	Noted. See PLD Review Report August 2023

			small sites suitable for low cost, carbon zero, affordable, attractive rural homes for self-build, first time buyers, existing residents downsizing, etc with a more innovative approach to considering PLD's and what is acceptable within them.	
1265	CLA (John Greenshields, Chartered Surveyor) [937]		It is essential that the boundary of settlements, especially rural, are reviewed in order to permit future development. Development of desperately needed houses and non-domestic buildings in order to create, once more, vibrant, safe and resilient communities. The current continual decline must be reversed, and this can only be achieved by balanced sustainable growth. Continual organic growth, that the settlement can absorb, must be permitted and the view that such settlements are at the bottom of the hierarchy must be reversed.	Noted. See PLD Review Report August 2023
1151	Mrs Sarah Ford [922]		No, I can't, but would suggest that a review - which does not automatically mean a change - would be sensible given 10 years has passed since the current PLDs were set	Noted. See PLD Review Report August 2023
661	Mr Andrew Nebel [864]		PLDs should be defined flexibly to take account of local circumstances ... there's no one size fits all. The PLDs of villages near major developments should be restricted to avoid loss of their local identity and separation.	Noted See PLD Review Report August 2023
617	North Luffenham Neighbourhood Planning Group (Tim smith) [265]		Every Parish /Town Council should be asked to review and recommend any necessary or desired changes.	Noted See PLD Review Report August 2023
373	Martin Shewry [755]		Recognise the strength of local opinion and the Neighbourhood Plans	Noted.
298	Mr Graham Layne [801]		Given the current situation in Ketton re developments outside on the PLD all communities need to have an up to	Noted. See PLD Review Report August 2023

			date assessment carried out so that we can determine how the housing requirement can be evenly spread	
167	ANCER SPA Ltd (Mr Keith Webster, Principal Consultant) [742]		The PLD for Uppingham Gate should be changed to allow for mixed-use development to subsidise the delivery of the employment land allocation and provision of a new access to the A47 Uppingham Road. This would then accord with proposals in the emerging refreshed Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan.	Noted. See PLD Review Report August 2023

Rep ID	Respondent (ID)	Agent	Officer Summary – Q35	Officer Comments
4255	Ketton and Tinwell Joint Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (Neighbourhood Plan Group Representative) [196]		By aiming to provide prompt guidance and assistance, and a shared intention to make the Plan work properly for local people. In the case of our Plan, RCC staff have been very supportive, despite what are clearly serious competing calls on their time, and a constrained Council budget. However, that support and advice needs to continue if Neighbourhood Plans are to be an effective force for community involvement and retain the communities' buy-in.	Support for this approach welcomed.
4229	National Highways (Mrs Catherine Townend, Spatial Planner) [1063]		National Highways have recently been consulted on various Neighbourhood Plans in the area including that from Ketton and Tinwell, and Uppingham. We suggest that Neighbourhood Plans are considered sufficiently throughout the development of the new Rutland Local Plan to ensure that future goals and aspirations are aligned to road infrastructure needs and more specifically to understand how this growth is likely to impact on the SRN.	Noted
4187	De Merke Estates [589]	Barton Willmore, now Stantec (Seth Tyler, Graduate Planner) [1141]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent use of settlement boundaries between Neighbourhood Plans and the Emerging Local Plan. • The Oakham & Barleythorpe's NP's evidence base should be used to help inform the LP. 	Noted
4076	Cottesmore Parish Council (Parish Council Representative) [410]		By definition, it should be left to local communities to establish Neighbourhood Plan and identify their own priorities. Implementing properly an agreed Service Level Agreement about the setting out of technical guidance and advice is fine, but only if it is adhered to. We had virtually no help from RCC in developing the Cottesmore Neighbourhood Plan and very little so far on when and whether we need to think about reviewing it.	Noted – we have not been approached by Cottesmore for advice on a review.

4039	Stamford Town Council (Mr Richard Tracey, Administration Officer) [1061]		Stamford's Neighbourhood Plan has recently been adopted and now forms part of the statutory Development Plan for SKDC it will be used to determine planning applications in the Stamford area. RCC has stated that it fully supports Neighbourhood Plans including existing and proposed development applications in Neighbourhood Plans. Furthermore it clearly states that those that have been approved before the RCC Local Plan takes place will also 'continue to carry full weight in decision making'. If there is conflict between the Local Plan and the Neighbourhood Plan, then the most recently adopted plan will take precedence.	Noted.
4025	John Dejardin [128]		For a short time during the early stages of the Wing NP the council had a full time officer assisting the NP process. This was very useful but since this ended dialogue has been difficult and at times confusing and appearing to give advice contrary to the national picture. A specialist officer dealing with NP's would be most helpful	Noted.
3904	Melton Borough Council (Mr Jorge Fiz Alonso, Senior Planning Policy Officer) [1025]		Support the current approach. We have received communication as needed for neighbourhood planning consultations in areas adjacent to Melton Borough's boundaries. Access from the website (planning page) could be easier.	Noted – hopefully the new web site will assist this
3876	Ryhall Parish Council (Parish Council Representative) [435]		Planning Officers to be more mindful of neighbourhood plans and to take more notice of local comments and parish council feedback. The neighbourhood plan is a lot of work and perhaps does not have the weight it deserves.	Noted.
3842	Sally Renner [1124]		Independent consultants should be brought in	Noted – NP groups have access to funding through locality to employ consultants to support them.

3796	Ketton Darby & Joan Club (Ruth Renner) [1122]		NP require too much work to be undertaken by villages- so the Council should fund independent consultants to develop them.	Noted – NP groups have access to funding through locality to employ consultants to support them.
3765	Historic England (Emilie Carr) [219]		Although Historic England have no specific comment at this stage, the following recently published guidance may be of assistance: - https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/neighbourhood-planningand-historic-environment-advice-note-11/	Noted
3669	Ms Janet Taylor [1109]		The problem is that people aren't going to get involved when they see such things as just another waste of the council's resources. With approval of unwanted planning applications, e.g., Bellway on Braunston Rd and the Brooke Rd allotment site, people are just cynical.	Noted
3562	Barrowden Parish Council (Mr Gordon Brown, Chairman) [1103]		Continue the existing formal support but also encourage the use of volunteer Neighbourhood Planning Champions. Create an RCC sponsored NP Club for existing and prospective NP Group who can meet regularly, twice per year. Leics CC have one of these where NP Groups learn from speakers but also exchange information between Groups	Noted
3543	Market Overton Neighbourhood Planning Group (Andy Williamson) [262]		appoint planning officer to conduct dialogue with NP committees in our case we (Market Overton) we did not have a guidance officer for nearly two years which slowed down the development of our NP	Noted whilst there has not been a dedicated NP officer in post the policy team has continued to provide advice and support whenever requested.
3472	Mrs Debra Thatcher [1083]		Signposting of support - financial or otherwise	Noted
3445	Vistry Homes East Midlands [1070]	Marrons (Mr Dan Robinson-Wells,	The Council should support local areas that wish to prepare Neighbourhood Plans. It can be an effective way of increasing community engagement and meeting local	Noted

		Associate Director) [535]	<p>housing needs. Uppingham is a good example of this approach through its existing and emerging Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>However, if the Local Plan states that allocations will be determined at a local level, on a partial or wholesale basis, should this not transpire the Local Plan must have a mechanism to address this and make further allocations to meet Rutland's housing requirement.</p>	
3421	Mrs Janet Hughes [1081]		It would be useful if RCC could have a representative on the steering group of each Neighbourhood Plan, to provide advice and prevent unnecessary timewasting.	Noted
3406	Mr Adam Cade [1078]		<p>Have a dedicated officer to support with time allocated to attend key parish meetings.</p> <p>Ketton had very little support at all after the dedicated officer left, other than advice from Roger Ranson at the final stage of drafting.</p>	Noted
3368	Empingham Parish Council (Mrs Rowan Scholtz, Parish Council Representative) [413]		Reduce the burden on limited Parish resources.	Noted – NP groups have access to funding through locality to employ consultants to support them.
3334	Ketton Parish Council [329]	Mary Cade [638]	Actively encourage communities to create Neighbourhood Plans. Once a community has decided to create a Neighbourhood Plan, assign an officer/county councillor/neighbourhood plan champion to provide advice and support on a regular basis, and attending meetings if requested.	Noted
3301	Allison Homes (Mrs Hannah Guy, Planning Manger) [1067]		Control expectations of the NP Groups and align NP's with Local and National policy	Noted

3078	Leicestershire County Council (Mitch Harper, Public Health Strategic Lead - Rutland) [939]		<p>Provide a framework and guidance for neighbourhoods to follow advising on meeting the Local Plan requirements, good design guides e.g. Building for a Healthy Life and local design guides.</p> <p>Provide support on insight for understanding their neighbourhood from a social, economic, environmental and health perspective. The neighbourhood's views are most important, however supporting with quantitative insight would be beneficial.</p>	Noted. This is available on website
3030	Mr Malcolm Touchin [1038]		Should the Council accept that local community needs, as may be captured in neighbourhood plans, should themselves influence the Local Plan, not just vice versa?	Noted
3007	Mrs Janie Johnson-Crossfield [1049]		<p>Create simple flowchart style to guide people through the options. I do wonder how many people are put off by the length of consultations such as these. it has taken me some time to read it all, go-back, re-read, work our how to make my comments (you should tell people to click on the purple boxes!) & try to connect it all.</p> <p>Also, use different means to cover the variety of learning styles....use pictures, audio, video, cartoons etc</p>	Noted. This is available.
2958	Mr Brian Grady [1052]		There is a need for residents to have confidence that once a plan has been accepted it will have real influence on future decisions. More guidance is necessary on the process.	Noted
2896	Mr Simon Frearson [1047]		Ensure the NDPs are in line with the Local Plan and clearly communicate the scope to the Town and Parish Councils. Objectivity is key and the more this is devolved, the more subjective it becomes.	Noted
2856	CPRE Rutland (Mr Ron Simpson, Chair) [1036]		It is not for the Council to guide N Plans. The new Local Plan should be guided by the county's N Plans and all villages encouraged to develop them.	Noted

2767	Barrow parish meeting (Parish Council Representative) [401]		By talking to the community that is involved, and providing examples to show the kind of detail and structure that is needed.	Noted
2737	Jane Bateman [124]		This is key so local communities have a say in where and how development occurs in their local area.	Noted
2706	Braunston Parish Council (Mrs Carole Brown, Parish Clerk) [1003]		When communities see the value in neighbourhood plans they will write them. So far we are all aware that local plans have been ignored	Noted
2686	Mr Jamie Weir [1030]		Community engagement	Noted
2642	Mr Harold Dermott [1001]		Consult with the Neighbourhood Plan teams in Rutland that have had plans 'made'. Have an open review of the process and ask them how RCC could have done better (What went well. what didn't go so well) This process is standard practice in any successful business.	Noted
2629	Define (on behalf of William Davis Homes) (Mr Sam Perkins, Graduate Planner) [1027]		<p>In the context that RCC cannot demonstrate a five year supply of housing land and has a position that is likely to deteriorate as a result of the County's limited supply (due to it not having an up-to-date Plan), it is imperative that RCC boosts its supply of housing in the short-term to re-establish a five year supply. Key to that is ensuring that RCC strictly controls Neighbourhood Plans to ensure that they do not unnecessarily restrict the delivery of housing (for example, by seeking to introduce tighter PLD or restrictive designations surrounding settlements).</p> <p>The most effective approach to bolstering RCC's supply of housing in the short-term would clearly be for the Local Plan to identify sufficient allocations to fully meet the housing requirement with a buffer of 20%. RCC should, therefore, only seek to rely on Neighbourhood Plans under very specific circumstances; where there is a designated</p>	<p>Noted See PLD Review Report August 2023</p> <p>Noted see Policy H1 -which identifies the sites which the Council has assessed as being suitable for housing development and provides an indication of how many houses might be built on the site.</p>

			<p>Neighbourhood Area, where there is a genuine will / ability to develop a Neighbourhood Plan in short order, and where Neighbourhood Planning Groups / Parish Councils are open to bringing forward a positively prepared plan that fully responds to the housing needs of the locality.</p> <p>Whilst WDH's clear preference would be for the Local Plan to identify all allocations itself, if RCC is to allow Neighbourhood Plans to respond to housing and other needs, then the Local Plan should be strict and clear in setting minimum housing requirements for neighbourhood areas and should also set a mechanism to allow for suitable developments to come forward where Neighbourhood Plans are not brought forward in a timely manner and / or fail to identify sufficient land to meet the housing requirement for the area, and / or where there is a deficit in the area's overall land supply.</p>	
2613	Ms SUSAN SEED [1028]		<p>They should listen to their parish councils and residents, large scale developers who only have money and their own interests at heart are not good for any community.</p> <p>A lovely landscape can be spoilt by large scale development.</p>	Noted
2508	Francis Jackson Homes Ltd (Mr Paul Johnson, Land and Planning Director) [761]		<p>It is important for the Council to provide the message that Neighbourhood Plans cannot seek to restrict development, or else place additional barriers to development that then compromise the higher level housing delivery objectives (i.e. maximum development scales, unjustified mixes, or undermine Affordable Housing delivery).</p> <p>Any Neighbourhood Plan currently in preparation or under review really wants to come forward post completion of the new Local Plan to ensure it is compliant in the longer term and not immediately rendered out of date by a new Local</p>	Noted

			Plan with different housing target figures, spatial and deliverability objectives.	
2496	Mr James Youatt [593]		by getting rid of them	Noted
2467	Uppingham Town Council (Parish Council Representative) [445]		RCC should welcome and embrace the concept of Neighbourhood Plans. Whilst it is acknowledged that there is a duty to advise and guide on Neighbourhood Plans, the heavy handed use of " Strategic Policies" can stifle local initiatives and support. Far from needing another policy that sets out yet more hurdles for Neighbourhood Plans to pass. RCC should be seeking a much lighter touch and a more inclusive approach to those communities who make the considerable effort to produce a Neighbourhood Plan.	Noted
2385	Les Allen [174]		Creating the neighbourhood plan to take account of policies that are a constantly moving feast within the proposed Local Plan is difficult. RCC are making every effort to support those devising NP's, but perhaps more resource may be required?	Noted
2364	Limes, Firs & Spurs Resident's Association (Mr David Ainslie, Chairman) [1006]		RCC should welcome and embrace the concept of Neighbourhood Plans. Whilst it is acknowledged that there is a duty to advise and guide on Neighbourhood Plans, the heavy handed use of "Strategic Policies" can stifle local initiatives and support. Far from needing another policy that sets out yet more hurdles for Neighbourhood Plans to pass, RCC should be seeking a much lighter touch and a more inclusive approach to those communities who make the considerable effort to produce a Neighbourhood Plan.	Noted
2321	Mr Peter Coe [1004]		RCC are having a series of meetings for parish/town councils preparing neighbourhood plans. It is considered that this, as present, is probably sufficient	Noted
2316	Mr Murdo Ross [890]		By working with the other 4 adjoining counties. It is difficult to understand how vibrant rural communities are to be sustained when public transport is so inadequate	Noted

			and expensive and bigger alternative centres can be quickly accessed by car	
2273	Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan Group (David Ainslie) [270]		RCC should welcome and embrace the concept of Neighbourhood Plans. Whilst it is acknowledged that there is a duty to advise and guide on Neighbourhood Plans, the heavy handed use of “Strategic Policies” can stifle local initiatives and support. Far from needing another policy that sets out yet more hurdles for Neighbourhood Plans to pass, RCC should be seeking a much lighter touch and a more inclusive approach to those communities who make the considerable effort to produce a Neighbourhood Plan.	Noted
2195	Dr H Crowden [1000]		Enhance Existing support to provide best guidance on how neighbourhood plans can work within the existing and proposed planning framework. To do this by a critical assessment on what has been achieved so far and consultation across the County involving those who have neighbourhood plans and those who wish to achieve them. This would make them integral to the Local planning framework.	Noted
2144	Mr Norman Milne [996]		This is a complex matter and suggesting specialist help under planned precept is best	Noted
2110	Mr George Bretten [995]		By working closely with the parish councils	Noted
2082	Mrs Penelope Forbes [994]		By listening to Parish and Town Councils - again, they can best identify their needs.	Noted
2023	Edith Weston Neighbourhood Plan Group (Julie W) [783]		Make parish councils aware of grants, do workshops etc.	Noted
1921	Mr John Donaldson [986]		Set up a consultative group of Rutland residents	Noted
1889	Mr David Lewis [983]		Share best practice from communities wo have been successful in completing a Neighbourhood Plan.	Noted

1792	Mrs Kim Cross [978]		No one engages as no one firstly knows what they are for - do neighbourhoods really have a final say on stuff that is potentially happening in their village like development? if yes then push this front - if no its just for them to give their opinion then people won't engage - what's the point as someone else who doesn't know the village will decide.	Noted
1746	Great Casterton Parish Council (Mr Mark Bush, Chairman) [961]		Encourage more villages to create their own local plan and ensure that it fits in with the overall Rutland Plan	Noted
1712	Barry Hobbs [646]		No comment	
1620	Oakham Quaker Meeting (Ms Susan Bolter, Clerk) [941]		There is a great deal of work to be undertaken to develop a NP. The Council should fund independent consultants to support areas develop NPs.	Noted
1596	Mr Neil Robertson [846]		Think these are a bad idea and encourage NIMBYism	Noted
1492	Janet Underwood [125]		Do not override the wishes and opinions of local communities. If a community objects to a proposed large development proactively support the objections even if a developer goes to appeal. The local communities know better what is or is not appropriate development for their area	Noted
1418	Stamford Town Council (Mrs Elaine Hooper, Chair of Planning Committee) [955]		Through consultation with other town's Adopted Neighbourhood Plans for example Stamford which borders Rutland.	Noted
1371	Normanton Parish Meeting (Mr Christopher Renner, this is my personal view from Normanton Parish Meeting) [109]		Continue as before.	Noted

1206	Nick Townsend [153]		By proactively and promptly delivering the commitments set out in the Service Level Agreement to ensure that there is no delay in the process of creating a Neighbourhood Plan	Noted
1152	Mrs Sarah Ford [922]		Share expertise information and provide independent review of Neighbourhood Plans for alignment with wider Rutland plans	Noted
1111	Ms Patricia Dalby [916]		The NP should be controlled and directed by the Town Council, not by unelected groups. Consultation and participation has to be ensured with the whole community, not cherry picking parts of the community, and not prescribed by a number of unelected inter connected groups influencing decision making.	Noted
989	Mrs Victoria Owen [902]		Not applicable in Teigh	Noted
952	Mrs Gillian Hodson [896]		Employ advisor with appropriate knowledge to provide advice	Noted
902	Rutland Quarry Forum (David Hodson) [113]		Make provision for giving expert advice on the preparation and updating of Neighbourhood Plans	Noted
853	Mr John Sharp [897]		Agree to take them into account and not ride roughshod over them.	Noted
826	Mrs Angela Hawkins [898]		By frequent consultation opportunities such as this	Noted
715	Mrs Hilary Smith [868]		Speaking actively to parish councils	Noted
662	Mr Andrew Nebel [864]		The task of developing a Neighbourhood Plan can be resource heavy and be beyond the competence of some individual Parish Councils if unsupported. Central County Council assistance with the development of Neighbourhood Planning is needed.	Noted
618	North Luffenham Neighbourhood		Encourage local communities to develop a NP Give as much guidance as possible	Noted

	Planning Group (Tim smith) [265]		Regular contact with a named RCC Planning Officer	
506	Mr Nigel Roberts [705]		Respond within a set timeframe, to allow Neighbourhood plans to enable them to be produced in timely fashion.	Noted
374	Martin Shewry [755]		Allow the NPs in Rutland to be developed by the local people in the village etc, and do not seek to overrule at RCC committee level	Noted
299	Mr Graham Layne [801]		By providing better support from all council departments and employing a NP engagement officer with the power and time to support communities who have or are preparing an NP	Noted
261	Mr Christopher Jordan [712]		By speeding up the process of approval of neighbourhood plans.	Noted

Rep ID	Respondent (ID)	Agent	Officer Summary Q36 -Q38	Officer Comments
4256	Ketton and Tinwell Joint Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (Neighbourhood Plan Group Representative) [196]		Listen to communities and work together with Neighbourhood Plan groups.	Noted
4211	The Society of Merchant Venturers [693]	Savills (Lynette Swinburne, Associate Director) [520]	Support the Council in ensuring that opportunities for new local services and facilities are appropriately delivered, where viable, alongside new development to create accessible community and cultural facilities. Villages such as Egleton present an opportunity for small scale growth in proximity to existing Green and Blue infrastructure. Supporting proportionate housing growth in proximity to existing attractions such as Rutland Water is an important means of enhancing accessibility for local people, as well as visitors, and could have a wider impact by encouraging new infrastructure such as cycle routes or footpaths as part of any proposals.	Noted
4188	De Merke Estates [589]	Barton Willmore, now Stantec (Seth Tyler, Graduate Planner) [1141]	The Safeguarding of land on larger strategic sites for community/other uses for the future needs of the population of Rutland.	Agree
4077	Cottesmore Parish Council (Parish Council		Looking at the list of community facilities and with physical and mental wellbeing in mind, more emphasis on the provision of local sport and leisure facilities.	Noted, see policy SC5 this policy requires new development to promote and support physical and mental health and well-being

	Representative) [410]			<p>through the design and layout of development. The policy also sets out when a Health Impact Assessment (HIA) will be required and how it should be developed alongside the development proposal.</p> <p>Policy SC7 seeks to create new high quality open spaces to meet the new needs of the current and future population of Rutland</p>
3996	The Society of Merchant Venturers [693]	Savills (Julia Mountford, Planning Consultant) [735]	<p>support the Council in ensuring that opportunities for new local services and facilities are appropriately delivered, where viable, alongside new development to create accessible community and cultural facilities.</p> <p>It is considered that a holistic approach would work best, alongside the provision of Green and Blue Infrastructure, to ensure that new development provides useable and integrated amenity and cultural space (as highlighted in our answers to Questions 48 and 49 below), helping with the longer term success/ viability of the development.</p>	<p>Noted, see policy SC5 this policy requires new development to promote and support physical and mental health and well-being through the design and layout of development. The policy also sets out when a Health Impact Assessment (HIA) will be required and how it should be developed alongside the development proposal.</p> <p>Policy SC7 seeks to create new high quality open spaces to meet the new needs of the current and future population of Rutland</p>
3843	Sally Renner [1124]		Facilities and activities for younger people	Noted
3670	Ms Janet Taylor [1109]		Having better public transport would help outlying villages access those facilities that can only be found in town.	Noted

3584	Barrowden Parish Council (Mr Gordon Brown, Chairman) [1103]		<p>There are two clear parts to this question, maintaining existing viable (possibly volunteer-run) operations but also there are times when new facilities are required, and we need to be able to deliver these quickly for our communities, that is, if there is a genuine need.</p> <p>In such a case, significant local support for the new development should be required within or beyond the PLD.</p> <p>Barrowden NP policy BW 14 might be a useful template.</p>	<p>Noted, see policy SC5 this policy requires new development to promote and support physical and mental health and well-being through the design and layout of development. The policy also sets out when a Health Impact Assessment (HIA) will be required and how it should be developed alongside the development proposal.</p> <p>Policy SC7 seeks to create new high quality open spaces to meet the new needs of the current and future population of Rutland</p>
3475	Mrs Debra Thatcher [1083]		Funding needs to be made available for those running community facilities - they cannot be operated in a financial vacuum	Noted
3335	Ketton Parish Council [329]	Mary Cade [638]	Plan for more affordable and social housing and provide better public transport.	Noted
3149	Mr Roger Banks [1056]		Children's safe play areas / recreation grounds	Noted
3111	Mr Martyn Williams [1055]		Focus on social value when procurement/ planning decisions are made.	Noted
3079	Leicestershire County Council (Mitch Harper, Public Health Strategic Lead - Rutland) [939]		<p>In such a rural place, community facilities are arguably of greater importance than urban areas. They offer more of a necessity, particularly for those with difficulty accessing facilities more distant.</p> <p>Public/community toilets and changing places should also be factored in as they can be the deciding factor for whether some residents leave the house.</p>	<p>Noted, see policy SC5 this policy requires new development to promote and support physical and mental health and well-being through the design and layout of development. The policy also sets out when a Health Impact Assessment (HIA) will be required</p>

				<p>and how it should be developed alongside the development proposal.</p> <p>Policy SC7 seeks to create new high quality open spaces to meet the new needs of the current and future population of Rutland</p>
2897	Mr Simon Frearson [1047]		All Parish owned Fields in the County should be reviewed for potential planning/building - currently local residents are taxed for the maintenance and upkeep of each of these fields. The current control, workload and taxation burden would be reduced if these were developed and County rates revenues would increase, should suitable sites be identified for building.	Noted
2857	CPRE Rutland (Mr Ron Simpson, Chair) [1036]		Plan should actively support Right to Build and the Right to Acquire community facilities.	Noted
2836	Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) [1042]	Montagu Evans LLP (Miss Lauren Hawksworth, Associate) [1041]	The DIO agree that the Local Plan should protect community facilities in sustainable locations and the provision of new local community services and facilities where there is an identified need alongside new development. This includes the range of community facilities identified in Question 37.	<p>Noted, see policy SC5 this policy requires new development to promote and support physical and mental health and well-being through the design and layout of development. The policy also sets out when a Health Impact Assessment (HIA) will be required and how it should be developed alongside the development proposal.</p> <p>Policy SC7 seeks to create new high quality open spaces to meet</p>

				the new needs of the current and future population of Rutland
2739	Jane Bateman [124]		Creating safer and stronger communities is important so that residents do not have to travel unnecessarily.	<p>Noted, see policy SC5 this policy requires new development to promote and support physical and mental health and well-being through the design and layout of development. The policy also sets out when a Health Impact Assessment (HIA) will be required and how it should be developed alongside the development proposal.</p> <p>Policy SC7 seeks to create new high quality open spaces to meet the new needs of the current and future population of Rutland</p>
2705	Braunston Parish Council (Mrs Carole Brown, Parish Clerk) [1003]		Improve transport links and safe access by foot and cycle	Noted
2688	Mr Jamie Weir [1030]		Allow development in all villages	See policies SS1, SS3 and SS4
2664	Mrs Karen Hubbard [1033]		Use creativity to create rural jobs & business opportunities	Noted
2645	Mr Harold Dermott [1001]		Depends on the size of the community and its access to these facilities in nearby locations that can be accessed by "walking, cycling or public transport", as this is a severe restriction for many of Rutland's elderly population?	Noted, see policy SC5 this policy requires new development to promote and support physical and mental health and well-being through the design and layout of

			<p>However, every community should have a Community Hall and a Public House. I also note that "GP Surgery" does not appear in the list (above) to choose from, although it appears in the preamble. RCC has done a very poor job on health care by substantially increasing the size of Oakham without expanding GP facilities, resulting in the existing surgery becoming effectively unusable as it cannot offer anything like the (good) service it used to. This is the reality: there may be a set of data somewhere that tells you that you are within specified limits, but I would recommend you don't get ill in Oakham now. There are also better alternatives to these suggestions, for example a "travelling" post office which visits several different villages for half a day or one day a week. General Stores have also largely been replaced by "online" shopping deliveries which provide the breadth of choice and low prices that village stores often don't. For residents without a computer or broadband, this is exactly what the local community could supply - a facility to have this order done for you.</p>	<p>development. The policy also sets out when a Health Impact Assessment (HIA) will be required and how it should be developed alongside the development proposal.</p> <p>Policy SC7 seeks to create new high quality open spaces to meet the new needs of the current and future population of Rutland</p>
2630	Define (on behalf of William Davis Homes) (Mr Sam Perkins, Graduate Planner) [1027]		<p>It is important that the policy in the emerging plan is specific to meet the tests of the NPPF and PPG. It should also be recognised that there are, in any case, other measures that protect such facilities; in particular the Assets of Community Value designation.</p> <p>The policy should, therefore, be focused on the specific circumstances under which the loss of key community services and facilities would be permitted. It should also be specific in setting out that the provision of new community facilities alongside new development must be justified on the basis of a clear evidence of need, and must meet the CIL Regulation 122 tests in that it must be necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.</p>	Noted
2614	Ms SUSAN SEED [1028]		By not destroying them with large scale development.	Noted
2517	Francis Jackson Homes Ltd (Mr Paul Johnson,		With reference to previous comments, additional housing should be encouraged and supported in Local Service Centres as a way to retain and provide footfall for key village services to allow communities there to	Noted. The Spatial Strategy Evidence Report provides background information and

	Land and Planning Director) [761]		thrive and grow. Throttling back/restricting development in such key villages could threaten the viability and retention of services in the longer term when further housing development will actually support them and the wider smaller village network that also rely on them.	<p>justification for Policy SS1 Spatial Strategy for new development, which seeks to concentrate growth on the main urban areas of Oakham (with Barleythorpe); Uppingham and Stamford (which is out-with Rutland County Councils administrative area but adjoins the county boundary and is considered to be a sustainable location for development). The policy also identifies 21 Larger Villages with Planned Limits to Development (PLDs) where some small-scale allocations will be made and where windfall sites within the PLDs will be acceptable in principle.</p> <p>Policy SC5 this policy requires new development to promote and support physical and mental health and well-being through the design and layout of development. The policy also sets out when a Health Impact Assessment (HIA) will be required and how it should be developed alongside the development proposal.</p>
2470	Uppingham Town Council (Parish Council		Instead of RCC looking to take all the S106 money generated from developments, developers should be encouraged to build community facilities such as those outlined above within the boundaries of their	Noted

	Representative) [445]		developments. This would help ease the demand on our existing community facilities and provide alternatives.	
2376	Limes, Firs & Spurs Resident's Association (Mr David Ainslie, Chairman) [1006]		Instead of RCC looking to take all the S106 money generated from developments, developers should be encouraged to build community facilities such as those outlined above within the boundaries of their developments. This would help ease the demand on existing community facilities and provide alternatives.	Noted
2318	Mr Murdo Ross [890]		By adhering to the Govt's policy of seeking to provide care "CLOSER" to home. This will require the retention of Rutland Memorial Hospital, with extended health services and the restoration of care beds within the two wards that existed.	Noted
2274	Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan Group (David Ainslie) [270]		Instead of RCC looking to take all the S106 money generated from developments, developers should be encouraged to build community facilities such as those outlined above within the boundaries of their developments. This would help ease the demand on existing community facilities and provide alternatives.	Noted
2145	Mr Norman Milne [996]		As discussed elsewhere	
2085	Mrs Penelope Forbes [994]		In many communities there are no facilities for children of all ages. Children should be able to play safely near to their homes, to develop local friendships and build sustainable communities for the future. Their homes and environs should be happy places that they will care for.	Noted
2024	Edith Weston Neighbourhood Plan Group (Julie W) [783]		I think new development facilities needs to be done in conjunction with the parish council and communities that it will affect or impact. Set rules won't work in our rural county.	Noted
1991	Ms Rosemary Harris [984]		Encouragement of community ownership of village shops, pubs, etc.	Noted
1887	Mr David Lewis [983]		The Local Plan should encourage community facilities to be multi-purpose, e.g., shop in a public house.	Noted

1793	Mrs Kim Cross [978]		Our biggest community issues are on street parking and lack of any facilities in the village (no shop, or pub etc and 2 buses a day into the nearest town) - everything has to be done via a trip in the car so everyone has a car or 2 or more, fix those issues and the community will all get along, building new houses and forcing them to park on the street outside of others homes because RCC haven't stipulated enough parking for the new builds and their visitors in order to squeeze as many houses on the plot as possible just causes hostility in villages and bad feeling from the start - opposite of the safer and stronger communities what you are trying to achieve.	Noted
1713	Barry Hobbs [646]		Use S106 and CIL monies for local facilities in the areas they arise	Noted
1622	Oakham Quaker Meeting (Ms Susan Bolter, Clerk) [941]		There needs to be facilities for young people such as play areas, skate parks youth clubs etc.	Noted, Policy SC7 seeks to create new high quality open spaces to meet the new needs of the current and future population of Rutland
1621	Oakham Quaker Meeting (Ms Susan Bolter, Clerk) [941]		More use could be made of redundant and under-used churches	Noted
1597	Mr Neil Robertson [846]		GP SURGERY in q 36	Noted
1493	Janet Underwood [125]		Support public transport at evenings and weekends - currently very limited - so that people can attend these community and cultural visitors outside of working hours when they obviously cannot attend! Also, ensure that all activities are price - capped and affordable	Noted
1266	CLA (John Greenshields,		I would like to qualify Qu. 37, whilst we support the protection of all community facilities this protection should not be absolute. In the modern world there may not be a justification for the maintenance of some	Noted

	Chartered Surveyor) [937]		<p>facilities, which have a better alternative use available. It is also worth highlighting that today services such as a good broadband connection is much more important than a Post Office or Community Hall to residents.</p> <p>What is essential is balance to be struck and to have a vibrant community. Items cannot be pigeon holed. Such as housing or local businesses cannot be artificially separated from community facilities which rely on there being a suitable local critical mass of people and disposable income.</p> <p>For more information we would be most grateful and strongly recommend you consider the below documents</p> <p>https://www.cla.org.uk/documents/374/Levelling_Up_-_Unleashing_the_potential_of_the_rural_economy.pdf https://www.cla.org.uk/documents/481/Sustainable_Communities_final_report.pdf</p>	
1211	Nick Townsend [153]		By encouraging the development of Neighbourhood Plans as it will be the local communities who will decide which facilities are most important to them and should be protected	Noted
1179	Mrs Penelope Rowe [926]		Ensure linked public transport plans.	Noted
990	Mrs Victoria Owen [902]		None in Teigh	Noted
827	Mrs Angela Hawkins [898]		Support for play and sporting facilities	Noted. Policy SC7 seeks to create new high quality open spaces to meet the new needs of the current and future population of Rutland
736	Environment Agency (Mrs Nicola Reyman, Planning		It is important that the Local Plan recognises the role of green and blue spaces, such as local parks, open spaces, and water environments, in providing a space for people to meet, connect, interact, strengthen community cohesion and positively contribute to health and wellbeing. Natural assets provide an integral use to a community and improve the	Noted, see policies EN7 Green and Blue Infrastructure (GBI) is a network of green spaces and water environments that sustains the ecosystems needed for a

	Specialist) [855]		liveability of a place; they provide opportunities for walking and cycling, such as green and blue infrastructure corridors, and other sports and recreational uses, improving quality of life for residents. Paragraph 3.8.10 refers to improved access to green infrastructure but the listed community facilities do not currently refer to any natural assets. We advise that the network of green and blue infrastructure is protected through this policy to recognise the important role it has for community use. The National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) sets out the planning policies and decisions should provide the social, recreational and cultural facilities and services the community needs, including planning positively for the provision and use of shared spaces and community facilities, including open space. Open Space is defined in the Glossary of the Framework as ‘All open space of public value, including not just land, but also areas of water (such as rivers, canals, lakes and reservoirs) which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation and can act as a visual amenity’. We recognise this matter links to Issue 8 Ensuring new development is well designed and encourages active and healthy lifestyles; policies addressing Issue 6 could reference policies addressing Issue 8.	good quality of life and EN8 The policy prevents adverse impacts on designated Important Open Spaces and/or Frontages which contribute to the character of settlements in Rutland. Policy SC7 seeks to create new high quality open spaces to meet the new needs of the current and future population of Rutland
663	Mr Andrew Nebel [864]		The Integrated Care Partnership Strategic Plan need to be developed to ensure the needs of Rutland are not subordinated to those of our larger neighbours in Leicester & Leicestershire.	Noted, see the Infrastructure Delivery Plan
634	Sport England (Steve Beard) [233]		Should be clear if this section includes built sports and leisure facilities or area, they covered in others sections	Noted, Policy SC7 seeks to create new high quality open spaces to meet the new needs of the current and future population of Rutland