

## Issue 7: Promoting sustainable and active modes of travel

**Strategic Objective 10: Ensure development is supported by essential infrastructure and services** Ensuring development is supported by essential infrastructure and services, this includes (but is not limited to):

- blue and green infrastructure
- digital infrastructure and utilities
- health care facilities
- roads and active travel routes
- schools
- sport and recreation
- waste management
- water supply and wastewater management
- Safe movement around the County for all
- sustainable modes of travel by enhancing greener travel networks for walking, cycling and public transport.

Rep ID	Respondent (ID)	Agent	Officer Summary Q39-Q40	Officer Comments
4257	Ketton and Tinwell Joint Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (Neighbourhood Plan Group Representative) [196]		<p>A number of important considerations need to be noted here.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Merely reducing maximum parking spaces on developments will not discourage the numbers of cars related to those developments – it is likely only to result in overspill onto neighbouring streets and lanes.</li> <li>• There needs to be proper realism about what is seen as sustainable, in terms of transport options, when assessing the sustainability of a particular development site. For instance, in the case of Ketton, a short walk to a very small general store and to a bus stop where the service may operate at very limited times and with extremely large gaps in between, does not create a sustainable site which discourages vehicle use.</li> <li>• In a such a situation, where local facilities and transport services are unlikely to suddenly increase, the onus must be put</li> </ul>	<p>Noted. Policy INF2 provides the highways authorities requirements for achieving sustainable, safe and accessible development proposals and cover the full range of modes of travel. Policy INF3 requires sustainable forms of transport to be integrated into the design of new developments and connectivity to and from development and existing built-up areas to be a key component for the layout of development.</p>

			back on the rationale for the development of a site, given the resultant pressures that would be placed on the local area.	
4219	The British Horse Society (Wendy Bannerman, Access Field Officer West and East Midlands) [1145]		<p>The language used in this section is focussed on walking and cycling at the exclusion of other modes of travel including horse riding. According to BETA two-thirds of equestrians are women and Church et al (2010) found 37% of women who are horse riders are over 45 years of age and over a third would pursue no other physical activity. The therapeutic and physical benefits of horse riding and carriage driving have been proven for people with disabilities (Favali and Milton, 2010).</p> <p>Public Rights of Way (PRoW) connect communities and provide access to the countryside. Research shows that ‘activity with horses .... in nature environments is a source of wellbeing, enjoyment, self-confidence and social contacts (Schwarzmueller-Erber et al, 2020). The government's Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy Safety Review says: "1.2 But safety has particular importance for vulnerable road users, such as walkers, cyclists and horse riders. The more people who use Active Travel, the fitter and healthier they will be, and the more their communities will benefit from lower congestion and better air quality, among a host of other benefits"(Jesse Norman, Minister for Transport). Housing growth proposed is likely to increase pressure on roads and impact on vulnerable road users. Jesse Norman in House of Commons debate on Road Safety, 5 November 2018 said: “We should be clear that the cycling and walking strategy may have that name but is absolutely targeted at vulnerable road users, including horse-riders”. Final point by Jesse Norman in debate: “Horse riders are vulnerable road users—there is no doubt about that, and there never has been—and they have been included in the work we are doing.”</p>	Noted. See Policy EN7 on Green and Blue infrastructure. The Green and Blue Infrastructure Network policy will conserve the existing GBI in Rutland and promote the opportunities for the creation of new high quality GBI.

			In response to Question 40, Designing equestrians into development plans will enhance equestrian access and activity, reaping benefits for safety, health and wellbeing.	
4212	The Society of Merchant Venturers [693]	Savills (Lynette Swinburne, Associate Director) [520]	<p>As identified in the Issues and Options consultation document and the Local Transport Plan 4, the Local Plan Review should promote growth which reduces the need to travel by less sustainable modes, i.e., car, as far as possible. This should be underpinned by the spatial strategy and be achieved by supporting new development in sustainable locations (such as in and around the market towns) which offer good access to key services and facilities, as well as employment opportunities. In addition, a diverse mix of homes with appropriate infrastructure and broadband connections should be supported to ensure that homes can integrate home working opportunities to reduce the need for travel to work.</p> <p>In regard to the provision for home working, the Local Plan Review should be sufficiently flexible and ensure that it considers and provides for future travel behaviours. The policy objectives should also provide for the establishment of a charging network to facilitate more sustainable travel and support a low carbon future.</p> <p>In particular, given the fact that “Rutland is a rural area, and that car travel is inevitable for many households” (Paragraph 3.9.5 of the Issues and Options consultation document), a holistic approach is required in the new Local Plan to promote opportunities for sustainable travel, whilst ensuring there are initiatives to improve public transport opportunities and walking and cycling connections, with measures to reduce the adverse impacts of car travel through car sharing. This reflects a combined approach of Options A, C, D and E.</p>	Noted. This has been considered in developing the spatial strategy and through the assessments of sites for allocation

		As noted in response to Question 38, development in locations such as Egleton that are close to existing Green and Blue infrastructure could present an opportunity for development to assist in the delivery of additional sustainable connections.	
4148	Silver Fox Developments (John Edmond) [1138]	<p>3.45 We would support the hybrid approach comprised of Options A, C and D. As noted previously, deprivation in respect to the Housing and Access to services domain is relatively high. There is clearly a need to address this issue and in our view, given the rural nature of the County, it is likely that focussing growth on the most sustainable locations (and in particular, we suggest in Uppingham) will ensure that future residents have the best access to existing services and facilities and can support the further provision of new infrastructure where this is required. Moreover, it is likely that public transport provision and access to active travel (walking and cycling) will be best in a main town, like Uppingham.</p> <p>3.46 Whilst it may be appropriate to review parking standards, it is our view that this is a matter best considered through a Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) as it is possible standards could change over the plan period.</p> <p>3.47 We do not consider that it would be appropriate to discourage the use of private cars.</p> <p>As we accept that for many people in more rural parts of the County, they will be dependent on their car to access day to day services and employment. Clearly it would not be fair to create barriers for existing residents. Nonetheless, we consider the best way to ensure people do not become car dependent is to provide genuine transport choice by locating development in areas with a high level of public transport provision or even</p>	Noted and has been considered through development of the Local Plan.

			better in places with significant employment, retail and social infrastructure available locally.	
4129	Avant Homes [1131]	Mr Alasdair Thorne [562]	<p>We would support the hybrid approach comprised of Options A, C and D. As noted previously, deprivation in respect to the Housing and Access to services domain is relatively high. There is clearly a need to address this issue and in our view, given the rural nature of the County, it is likely that focussing growth on the most sustainable locations (and in particular Oakham) will ensure that future residents have the best access to existing services and facilities and can support the further provision of new infrastructure where this is required. Moreover, it is likely that public transport provision and access to active travel (walking and cycling) will be best in the County's main towns.</p> <p>Whilst it may be appropriate to review parking standards, it is our view that this is a matter best considered through a Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) as it is possible standards could change over the plan period.</p> <p>We do not consider that it would be appropriate to discourage the use of private cars. As we accept that for many people in more rural parts of the County, they will be dependent on their car to access day to day services and employment. Clearly it would not be fair to create barriers for existing residents. Nonetheless, we consider the best way to ensure people do not become car dependent is to provide genuine transport choice by locating development in areas with a high level of public transport provision or even better in places with significant employment, retail and social infrastructure available locally.</p>	Noted and has been considered through development of the Local Plan.
4104	Wells McFarlane [365]	Pegasus group (Mrs Georgina Doyle) [575]	The NPPF states that transport issues should be considered from the earliest stage of the plan making process (paragraph 104). Therefore, including this topic in this consultation is supported as it allows opportunities to promote walking, cycling	Noted. Policy INF2 provides the highways authorities requirements for achieving sustainable, safe and

			<p>and public transport. Suggesting policies that actively discourage the use of the private car is not supported. The NPPF does not set out such restrictive policies but instead recommends that policies provide for attractive and well-designed walking and cycling networks (paragraph 106). This would provide a safe and attractive alternative to the private car. All modes of transport play a key role in allowing communities to gain access to jobs and services.</p> <p>The Local Plan should make provision for improving and extending walking and cycling networks and ensure that priority is given first to pedestrian and cycling movements. Recognition that travelling by bus and train is also essential for longer journeys across the County. Providing good quality and well-designed alternatives to the use of the car from new and existing development will give residents the opportunity to use alternative modes of transport without the need to implement restrictive policies.</p> <p>The NPPF also states that setting local parking standards for residential and non-residential development should only be set where there is a clear and compelling justification that they are necessary for managing the local road network or optimising the density of development in city or town centres. Limiting parking space available and actively discouraging the use of the private car by imposing traffic calming measures is more likely to create poorly designed developments with high levels of on street parking and over engineering streets unless it can be demonstrated that regular and sustainable alternative modes of transport are a more attractive form of travel.</p>	<p>accessible development proposals and cover the full range of modes of travel. Policy INF3 requires sustainable forms of transport to be integrated into the design of new developments and connectivity to and from development and existing built-up areas to be a key component for the layout of development. See Policy EN7, the Green and Blue Infrastructure Network policy will conserve the existing GBI in Rutland and promote the opportunities for the creation of new high quality GBI.</p>
4050	Vistry Group c/o Pegasus Group (Jonathan Porter,	Pegasus group (Mrs Clare Clarke,	3.27. Continuing with the existing approach of directing development to the most sustainable locations and encouraging the use of a range of sustainable travel options is	Noted and has been considered through development of the Local

Strategic Planning Manager) [1129]	Associate Planner) [523]	<p>supported. This is an important cornerstone of planning and is reflected in the proposed housing site on land off Bartles Hollow and Park Road, Ketton which would direct development to one of the most sustainable settlements in the County and provide opportunities for walking and cycling to key services and facilities. It will also provide new open space and play equipment in walking distance from the new homes and this existing residential area and ensure development is provided in a location which benefits from a regular bus service to larger centres.</p> <p>3.28. Suggesting policies that actively discourage the use of the private car is not supported. The NPPF does not set out such restrictive policies but instead recommends that policies provide for attractive and well-designed walking and cycling networks (paragraph 106). This would provide a safe and attractive alternative to the private car. All modes of transport play a key role in allowing communities to gain access to jobs and services.</p> <p>3.29. The Local Plan should make provision for improving and extending walking and cycling networks and ensure that priority is given first to pedestrian and cycling movements. Recognition that travelling by bus and train is also essential for longer journeys across the County. Providing good quality and well-designed alternatives to the use of the car from new and existing development will give residents the opportunity to use alternative modes of transport without the need to implement restrictive policies.</p> <p>3.30. The NPPF also states that setting local parking standards for residential and non-residential development should only be set where there is a clear and compelling justification that they are necessary for managing the local road network or</p>	Plan. Chapter 5 sets out the policies for the Spatial Strategy, and approach to directing development to the most sustainable locations.
------------------------------------	--------------------------	---	--

			<p>optimising the density of development in city or town centres. Limiting parking space available and actively discouraging the use of the private car by imposing traffic calming measures is more likely to create poor designed developments with high levels of on street parking and over engineering streets unless it can be demonstrated that regular and sustainable alternative modes of transport are a more attractive form of travel.</p>	
4027	John Dejardin [128]		<p>Keep increases in development located at the two main towns so that public transport systems can be more viable. Ensure new expansion areas give priority routes for these and cycleway/footpaths.</p>	Noted
3997	The Society of Merchant Venturers [693]	Savills (Julia Mountford, Planning Consultant) [735]	<p>As identified in the Issues and Options consultation document and the Local Transport Plan 4, the Local Plan Review should promote growth which reduces the need to travel by less sustainable modes, i.e., car, as far as possible. This should be underpinned by the spatial strategy and be achieved by supporting new development in sustainable locations (such as in and around the market towns) which offer good access to key services and facilities, as well as employment opportunities. In addition, a diverse mix of homes with appropriate infrastructure and broadband connections should be supported to ensure that homes can integrate home working opportunities to reduce the need for travel to work.</p> <p>In regard to the provision for home working, the Local Plan Review should be sufficiently flexible and ensure that it considers and provides for future travel behaviours. The policy objectives should also provide for the establishment of a charging network to facilitate more sustainable travel and support a low carbon future.</p> <p>In particular, given the fact that “Rutland is a rural area, and that car travel is inevitable for many households” (Paragraph</p>	Noted and has been considered through development of the Local Plan. Chapter 5 sets out the policies for the Spatial Strategy, and approach to directing development to the most sustainable locations.



			<p>3.9.5 of the Issues and Options consultation document), a holistic approach is required in the new Local Plan to promote opportunities for sustainable travel, whilst ensuring there are initiatives to improve public transport opportunities and walking and cycling connections, with measures to reduce the adverse impacts of car travel through car sharing. This reflects a combined approach of Options A, C, D and E.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, to ensure that future pressures on the highway network are mitigated, housing growth should be directed to the most sustainable locations in and around the market towns where road, public transport and pedestrian infrastructure is more advanced. 'Land at Stamford Road' and 'Land at Uppingham Road' are examples of such sites which are connected via existing pedestrian and cycle links to Oakham, as well as being located close to Stamford Road and Uppingham Road which has the No.9 bus service operating from Oakham to Stamford and the RF1 bus service from Oakham to Uppingham respectively. This will limit use of the private car, as well as travel distances to work and to essential services and facilities.</p>	
3906	Melton Borough Council (Mr Jorge Fiz Alonso, Senior Planning Policy Officer) [1025]		Working with neighbouring local authorities and county councils might enable additional alternatives.	Noted and has been considered through development of the Local Plan.
3895	House Builders Federation (Joanne Harding, Planning Manager – Local Plan (North)) [1125]		The HBF considers that it would be appropriate for the Council to continue to direct development to sustainable locations and to encourage the use of a range of sustainable travel options, this could include policies that support active and sustainable travel. The HBF does not consider it is necessary to include policies in relation to EV Charging Points as these are now covered by the Building Regulations, and it is not necessary for policies to repeat these requirements.	Noted. Chapter 5 sets out the policies for the Spatial Strategy, and approach to directing development to the most sustainable locations.

3878	Ryhall Parish Council (Parish Council Representative) [435]		Invest in car share schemes	This does not relate to the Local Plan.
3844	Sally Renner [1124]		Option E- it may be too early to reduce car parking spaces, but the other aspects should be encouraged  Anything to make cycling safer will be brilliant	Noted.
3743	Sinclair Rogers [1120]		local public transport is dire. The new houses will contribute little to encouraging the need for more and better public transport. These new families will be car based and add about 500 more cars in the village. This is in direct opposition to public transport	Noted. Policy INF2 provides the highways authorities requirements for achieving sustainable, safe and accessible development proposals and cover the full range of modes of travel. Policy INF3 requires sustainable forms of transport to be integrated into the design of new developments and connectivity to and from development and existing built-up areas to be a key component for the layout of development.  See Policy EN7 on Green and Blue infrastructure. The Green and Blue Infrastructure Network policy will conserve the existing GBI in Rutland and promote the opportunities for the creation of new high quality GBI.

3671	Ms Janet Taylor [1109]		<p>Reducing the number of car parking spaces is an own goal; until such time as people are confident that they do not need to use their car, or do not need a second car, this will only lead to parking problems, and to people driving elsewhere for shopping or leisure activities.</p> <p>Better footways, more cycle paths, better public transport has to come first.</p>	Noted
3610	Mr John Redshaw [919]		<p>The options in question 39 fail to cover the practical needs of a rural community with an aging population -needs a critical review. Forced to click option A in order to move on.</p>	Noted
3563	Barrowden Parish Council (Mr Gordon Brown, Chairman) [1103]		<p>We live in a rural community with an elderly population. Walking and cycling for everyday purposes such as shopping and visits to medical facilities are not realistic and until government is prepared to properly fund regular bus services at least hourly to all villages in excess of 300 residents then travel by car will be the first choice of residents.</p> <p>This also reinforces point that Options A and B which must be the core of the Spatial Strategy</p> <p>When considering 800m for local services, the elevation of the site in relation to the services must also be considered,. 800 metres maybe fine on the flat but in Ketton for example 300 metres might be more appropriate in Geeston or at the top of Empingham Road at Wooton Close</p>	Noted and has been considered through development of the Local Plan. Chapter 5 sets out the policies for the Spatial Strategy, and approach to directing development to the most sustainable locations.
3446	Vistry Homes East Midlands [1070]	Marrons (Mr Dan Robinson-Wells, Associate Director) [535]	<p>As noted in response to the Climate Change questions above, directing growth towards the most sustainable locations, where means of travel other than the private car is an option should be prioritised.</p>	Noted. Chapter 5 sets out the policies for the Spatial Strategy, and approach to directing development to the most sustainable locations.

3428	Mr Richard Hurwood [1084]		<p>Create a series of "Quiet Roads" from the byways and rural lanes that are used primarily by walkers, cyclists and horse riders.</p> <p>I saw such a road with signs in Suffolk recently: motorised vehicles are not banned, but the signs highlight the priorities of users.</p> <p>Thorpe Road in Lyddington is a prime example: within the 7.5 tonne HGV exclusion zone, a single track road with a ninety degree corner, two blind summits and no passing points except the verge (a steep drop from the tarmac) and the occasional farm gate. The lane is used extensively by walkers, cyclists, horse riders with farm vehicles intermittently. There is a bench to rest on and enjoy the view.</p> <p>There is an alternative route which takes less time (fewer corners and blind spots as well as less chance of meeting walkers and horse) and is more suitable for all motorised vehicles.</p> <p>I am sure there are many other rural lanes in the County that should fall into the same category.</p>	Noted
3425	Mrs Janet Hughes [1081]		Do not do anything to deter car use. Rutland is a rural area and car use is essential, for residents and tourists. In an ideal world there would be better bus services, but this is probably a pipedream.	Noted
3408	Mr Adam Cade [1078]		Bus depot (e.g., in Ketton) in cooperation with SKDC, Cycle paths/ lanes for all new road improvements	Noted
3370	Empingham Parish Council (Mrs Rowan Scholtz, Parish Council Representative) [413]		<p>Any option for sustainable travel should recognize that as a rural county Rutland is and will continue to rely on private car travel.</p> <p>Reducing car parking standards for new developments would</p>	Noted. Chapter 5 sets out the policies for the Spatial Strategy, and approach to directing development to the most sustainable locations.

			<p>be a disaster for those developments. Option A would direct new development to the most suitable locations i.e., Oakham/Uppingham where walking and cycling is a reliable option.</p>	
3336	Ketton Parish Council [329]	Mary Cade [638]	<p>Coordinate bus and train times (Stamford and Oakham train stations).</p> <p>Ensure that bus connection times are convenient for passengers.</p> <p>Have 'use your bus' promotions e.g. free travel at certain times or days.</p> <p>Run some evening, Sunday and Bank Holiday bus services.</p> <p>Run 'bus specials' to popular events.</p> <p>Buses should be capable of carrying bicycles.</p> <p>Cycle racks at bus stops. Secure cycle parking at train stations.</p>	Noted. Some of these suggestions go beyond the remit of the Local Plan
3268	Edith Weston Parish Council (Parish Council Representative) [411]		<p>Any option should recognise that as a rural county Rutland does and will continue to rely on the car. Reducing car parking standards for new developments would be a disaster for those developments.</p> <p>Option A would direct new development to the most sustainable locations. i.e., Oakham/ Uppingham where walking and cycling is a realistic option.</p> <p>Public transport needs to be improved for outlying villages before any thought of reduced car usage can be considered,</p>	Noted and has been considered through development of the Local Plan. Chapter 5 sets out the policies for the Spatial Strategy, and approach to directing development to the most sustainable locations.

3267	Edith Weston Parish Council (Parish Council Representative) [411]		<p>Any option should recognise that as a rural county Rutland does and will continue to rely on the car. Reducing car parking standards for new developments would be a disaster for those developments.</p> <p>Option A would direct new development to the most sustainable locations. i.e., Oakham/ Uppingham where walking and cycling is a realistic option</p>	Noted. Chapter 5 sets out the policies for the Spatial Strategy, and approach to directing development to the most sustainable locations.
3225	Mr Martin Lester [1058]		Within towns and larger villages, ensure that all homes are no more than 400m from a bus stop served by a regular bus route	Noted
3198	Mrs Judy Geer [901]		The policies should take account of the fact that the population of Rutland has a high proportion of older people who are not able to cycle or to walk far, therefore the reduction of parking spaces and discouragement of cars is not appropriate in new developments which will be required to provide housing for older people. Transport by bus is not handily available in all locations either. many more electric vehicles charging points will be needed.	Noted and has been considered through development of the Local Plan. The Building Regs part S requires all new homes which have parking will need an electric car charger. This includes buildings undergoing a change of use, such as an office block being repurposed into apartments.
3152	Mr Roger Banks [1056]		Walking and especially cycling can be unpleasant and unsafe when drivers do not respect speed limits. Much more needs to be done to enforce speed limits.	Noted
3129	Mrs Hannah Williams [925]		<p>Promotion of 20 MPH zones and traffic calming measures - these are an easy way of tilting the dial back towards alternative travel (bikes, walking and public transport) and also help keep people safer. Most people are in support of these schemes.</p> <p>Introduction of a car share club, run by either a social enterprise, charity or council.</p>	Noted. Some of these suggestions fall outside the scope of the Local Plan.

			<p>Bike hub - where people can learn how to fix their bike.</p> <p>More cycle paths within the town areas, and safer off-road cycling and walking routes across the county.</p> <p>Requirement for cycle parking at all new developments, retrofit of additional bike facilities across Rutland.</p> <p>Free bike pump stations.</p> <p>Scheme could be developed with discounts for active travel at local retailers.</p> <p>Wider pavements!</p>	
3128	Mr Martyn Williams [1055]		<p>No car zones around schools: ban cars from parking close to schools. Do more to tackle unsustainable methods of children travelling to schools.</p> <p>We need wider pavements, so many pavements aren't wide enough.</p> <p>Investment in long-distance walking paths between town and villages.</p>	Noted. These suggestions fall outside the scope of the Local Plan.
3080	Leicestershire County Council (Mitch Harper, Public Health Strategic Lead - Rutland) [939]		<p>Option D offers the boldest solution to improving walking and cycling connections, whilst still providing car use as an option for necessity purposes. To encourage cycling and walking, all factors need to be included in developments to enable behaviour change (connectivity, safety, confidence etc).</p> <p>Having a separate policy will help enable new developments to factor in all aspects. This will also encourage community engagement on new developments, which cycling and walking</p>	Noted and has been considered through development of the Local Plan. Chapter 5 sets out the policies for the Spatial Strategy, and approach to directing development to the most sustainable locations.

			help to enable. For a rural area like Rutland, this is particularly important.	
3031	Mr Malcolm Touchin [1038]		Allowance should be included for the eventual use (likely in the currency of the proposed plan) of autonomous means of transport, for both personal use and for delivery of goods, etc., which would reduce the need for parking and road capacity but might require specific measures to be implemented on the roads.	Noted and has been considered through development of the Local Plan.
3013	Mrs Janie Johnson-Crossfield [1049]		New housing estates have narrow roads & people have to park on the pavements & therefore block access for deliveries & emergency services. It's difficult to persuade people to give up their cars when we have an appallingly limited train service & partial bus service. I have to regularly drive to Corby to get a train as services from Oakham insufficient.	Noted
2898	Mr Simon Frearson [1047]		Stop car bashing. RCC fails and will always fail to provide adequate public transport due to the nature of the County and so encourage the use of vehicles but emphasize and encourage EV's.	Noted
2858	CPRE Rutland (Mr Ron Simpson, Chair) [1036]		RCC must cease its hate campaign against the motorist and acknowledge as a rural county we are still very dependent upon the motor vehicle. This will remain the case for many years or until the county develops a sustainable public transport service. This does not prevent active support for a healthy lifestyle and walking and cycling as a desirable lifestyle choice when and where possible.  Creating a community led Rutland Bus Company CIC should be a policy priority.	Noted
2837	Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) [1042]	Montagu Evans LLP (Miss Lauren Hawsworth,	The DIO are supportive of all policy options which seek to encourage sustainable development, promote sustainable travel and limit the use of private cars. This includes public transport services, promotion of high quality walking and cycling routes and encouraging the installation of electric	Noted



		Associate) [1041]	<p>charging infrastructure.</p> <p>The St George’s Barracks Site has the ability to deliver a sustainable new community which encourages a range of green transport modes to benefit the new and existing community.</p>	
2778	Jeakins Weir Ltd [1037]	Mr Alasdair Thorne [562]	<p>We would support the hybrid approach comprised of Options A, C and D. As noted previously, deprivation in respect to the Housing and Access to services domain is relatively high. There is clearly a need to address this issue and in our view, given the rural nature of the County, it is likely that focussing growth on the most sustainable locations (and in particular Oakham) will ensure that future residents have the best access to existing services and facilities and can support the further provision of new infrastructure where this is required. Moreover it is likely that public transport provision and access to active travel (walking and cycling) will be best in the County’s main towns.</p> <p>Whilst it may be appropriate to review parking standards, it is our view that this is a matter best considered through a Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) as it is possible standards could change over the plan period.</p> <p>We do not consider that it would be appropriate to discourage the use of private cars. As we accept that for many people in more rural parts of the County, they will be dependent on their car to access day to day services and employment. Clearly it would not be fair to create barriers for existing residents. Nonetheless, we consider the best way to ensure people do not become car dependent is to provide genuine transport choice by locating development in areas with a high level of public</p>	<p>Noted and has been considered through development of the Local Plan. Chapter 5 sets out the policies for the Spatial Strategy, and approach to directing development to the most sustainable locations.</p>

			transport provision or even better in places with significant employment, retail and social infrastructure available locally.	
2704	Braunston Parish Council (Mrs Carole Brown, Parish Clerk) [1003]		Community planned an installed EV charger network in the County. Suggest collaboration with one of the top charger network owners to accelerate the pace of installation	Noted.
2674	Mr Harold Dermott [1001]		Important to remember that travel by electric vehicle (EV), especially one charged by solar energy, is highly sustainable, and that before half way through this Local Plan, the majority of vehicles on the road will be EVs. At the moment, 20% of all NEW vehicles in the UK are EV, and this will rise to 100% by 2030, just 8 years away and 5 years after this Local Plan is introduced. This Local Plan is woefully inadequate to prepare for that. Of course walking and cycling needs to be supported and increased, but it is naive in the extreme to assume that travel by car will not remain the primary method of travel for several years, especially in rural, high disposable income Rutland, and it is the job of this Local Plan to make proper and appropriate provision for that and to support and accelerate the move away from the use of fossil fuel in transport. Buses, often mentioned in this Local Plan, especially the old buses used in Rutland, are hideous producers of both CO2 and toxic oxides of nitrogen (NOx). They need to be replaced with electric buses when due. Again, Rutland is lagging behind other areas in the East Midlands and UK in doing this. If RCC is serious about encouraging cycling, especially in the older population, it must invest in cycleways which are physically separated from vehicles. The so-called cycleway in Barleythorpe is just plain dangerous near the pedestrian crossing. It is not much wider than the handlebars, with a wall on one side and traffic thundering past on the other. It terrifies me, and I remain astonished that anyone at RCC thought it was viable. NOTE: OPTION E HAS BEEN TICKED ON THE ASSUMPTION THAT THE	Noted and has been considered through development of the Local Plan.

			WORDS "REDUCE THE AVAILABILITY OF CAR PARKING SPACES" ARE DELETED. IT IS NOT EITHER/OR, IT IS BOTH.	
2665	Mrs Karen Hubbard [1033]		As the only option for many is to travel by car, we need to urgently address the problem of charging points for existing properties without off-road parking, every older house will need somewhere to charge a car or have the law changed to drag cables across the pavement	Noted
2631	Define (on behalf of William Davis Homes) (Mr Sam Perkins, Graduate Planner) [1027]		<p>WDH recognises the importance of promoting sustainable travel and is of the view that all potential options presented could play a role in that; albeit RCC must carefully consider that there is a spatial nuance to such discussions and that some options will be less effective in certain areas of Rutland. For example, RCC will need to consider whether there is supporting evidence to demonstrate that reducing the availability of parking spaces (Question 39, Option E) lowers car usage across all areas. Whilst that may be the case in town centres, it is unlikely to have the same effect in more remote areas of the County and may actually give rise to other conflicts.</p> <p>As a predominantly rural authority, it is critical that RCC ensures that its rural villages are well-connected if it is to promote sustainable and active travel. In that regard, WDH welcomes the recognition in RCC's Bus Service Improvement Plan 2021-2036 Version 4 (October 2021) that buses are a key sustainable travel option, and also welcomes the clear commitment by RCC and bus operators to improving the connectivity, frequency and affordability of bus services in the county. It is important that the spatial strategy plays a part in achieving RCC's objectives, as focusing residential growth appropriately to rural locations can support the provision and long-term vitality / viability of those critical services. In that regard, WDH's response to Question 15 highlights how a more nuanced approach to bringing forward the County's spatial strategy is needed to account for such</p>	Noted and has been considered through development of the Local Plan. Chapter 5 sets out the policies for the Spatial Strategy, and approach to directing development to the most sustainable locations.

			<p>considerations.</p> <p>Specifically, focusing growth to Cottesmore, which acts as a centre for its surrounding settlements in the north of the County and also offers good access to the Main Towns, would assist in delivering the services and facilities required to increase connectivity between Cottesmore and surrounding villages. Indeed, development of a reasonable scale would likely provide developer contributions towards such schemes (subject to meeting CIL Regulation 122 tests), and also increase the population in those areas which will, in turn, increase demand for such services in order to secure their long-term viability. WDH's response to Question 15 outlines the opportunity present at Land North of Mill Lane, Cottesmore in that regard.</p>	
2615	Ms SUSAN SEED [1028]		<p>None of the above, any development will increase cars by double at least the number of houses built. It would be good to improve parking rather than reduce it. You might get more people using Oakham town centre.</p>	Noted
2545	Pigeon Investment Management Ltd [1022]	Carter Jonas (Ms Kimberley Brown, Associate Partner) [601]	<p>Section 9 of the NPPF seeks to promote sustainable transport. Paragraph 104 identifies the transport issues that should be considered at plan-making stage, including opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport. Paragraph 105 expects significant development to be directed to sustainable locations. Paragraph 106 identifies the transport issues for planning policies and includes providing for attractive and well-designed walking and cycling networks and secure cycle parking facilities. Paragraphs 107 and 108 set out the approach towards parking standards. The sustainable transport and parking policies for the emerging RLP will need to be consistent with these national policies. Options A and C would be consistent with national policy and are supported.</p> <p>It is considered that the selection of sites for allocation in the</p>	Noted and has been considered through development of the Local Plan. Chapter 5 sets out the policies for the Spatial Strategy, and approach to directing development to the most sustainable locations.

		<p>emerging RLP will be an important part of promoting the use of sustainable modes of transport. For example, it is much more likely that residents would choose to undertake some journeys by sustainable modes of transport from development sites at settlements with a good range of services and facilities and employment opportunities, and where walking and cycling routes and public transport services are available.</p> <p>It should be noted that the proposed scheme by Pigeon, at land off Burley Road in Oakham (also subject to planning application Ref. 2022/0336/MAO) is within walking and cycling distance of Oakham town centre where there are bus and rail services. The site is adjacent to a Co-op food store and there are bus stops on Burley Road. The proposed scheme would connect with the existing pedestrian and cycle network and would provide new foot/cycle paths and pedestrian crossings, all of which would enable residents to walk and cycle to and from the site. It is considered that the proposed development at this site would promote the use of sustainable modes of transport.</p> <p>Question 40: Do you have any alternative suggestions for promoting sustainable modes of travel?        As set out in the representations to Question 39, the selection of sites for allocation in the emerging RLP will be an important part of promoting the use of sustainable modes of transport. It is more likely that the use of sustainable modes of transport would be increased where walking and cycling facilities and public transport services are already available, which potential development sites could connect to or could provide new additional facilities.</p>	
2482	Uppingham Town Council (Parish Council Representative) [445]	There needs to be a recognition that we are living in a rural community with long distances between facilities. Poor public transport often leaves the private car as the only viable option,	Noted

			and this is so bad that communities are having to resort to charity funded community transport. This is not sustainable and until there is a recognition that rural bus services will never be viable on a commercial basis, this situation will continue.	
2319	Mr Murdo Ross [890]		<p>Developments have been approved with limited road width, for the access of large buses and the drop-offs by delivery vans, thereby damaging pavements.</p> <p>More generally we have narrow roads across the county. If public transport is to be successfully used, we should ignore the demand existing in the 'end of journey' stage (e.g., to Leicester) and size buses based upon likely demand in Rutland only</p>	Noted
2146	Mr Norman Milne [996]		Rutland is rural. There are inevitably transport issues. The car is the only obvious way of travel for many. One day wire guided buses may be available at a regular service level. Until then make travel by car to local centres easier by improving parking facilities. Promotion is one thing, but individual expectations of an urban environment cannot be mirrored in Rutland. This question whilst noble is simply not at all feasible.	Noted
2047	Nick Townsend [153]		Development should take place in the larger more sustainable settlements with a range of transport options	Noted. Chapter 5 sets out the policies for the Spatial Strategy, and approach to directing development to the most sustainable locations.
2025	Edith Weston Neighbourhood Plan Group (Julie W) [783]		<p>Impossible in a county of 50 villages to not use cars.... therefore, development MUST focus on our towns.</p> <p>Option D is not feasible.</p> <p>Option E makes no sense - will where you park your car to use electric charging points!</p>	Noted. Chapter 5 sets out the policies for the Spatial Strategy, and approach to directing development to the most sustainable locations.
1886	Mr David Lewis [983]		All new homes must have an electric vehicle charging point. However, it is essential that there is also sufficient off street	Noted. The Building Regs part S requires all new homes

			parking for all cars. Having too many cars parked on the pavement or on roads discourages walking and cycling.	which have parking will need an electric car charger. This includes buildings undergoing a change of use, such as an office block being repurposed into apartments.
1876	Mr Paul Hargreaves [966]		There is no need to increase the availability of electric vehicle charging points because it expensive to install them, the electricity mainly comes from sources such as biomass, gas, oil but very little from renewables.	Noted
1794	Mrs Kim Cross [978]		Let's make all new developments have ev charging points, let put ev charging points on street with existing houses who use on street parking - make it easier in conservation areas to have a drive installed to be able to charge your car at home, let's have some EV buses! and definitely some safer walking routes - a walk into town next to multiple hgvs tearing past is not something I want for my lungs or my safety.	Noted
1748	Great Casterton Parish Council (Mr Mark Bush, Chairman) [961]		Ensure that Bus times fit in with people's requirements	Noted
1714	Barry Hobbs [646]		Out county is very rural, and facilities are widespread with poor public transport so traditional modes of transport are essential	Noted
1623	Oakham Quaker Meeting (Ms Susan Bolter, Clerk) [941]		Put in safe walking and cycling routes. We need wider pavements and cycling tracks - off road - not on road!	Noted
1548	Whissendine Parish Council (Parish Council Representative) [447]		minibus sized service for rural villages  Cycle routes to connect rural villages to nearest town	Noted
1546	Whissendine Parish Council (Parish Council Representative) [447]		Minibus sized services for rural villages	Noted
1513	Mr Andrew Lunn [689]		Any option should recognise that as a rural county Rutland is and will continue to rely on the car. Reducing car parking	Noted

			<p>standards for new developments would be a disaster for those developments.</p> <p>There is little public transport available for the villages, many of which cannot get to our county town via public transport, walking or cycling.</p>	
1494	Janet Underwood [125]		Private car ownership and parking should not be discouraged unless public transport is vastly improved - especially to the villages. However, there should be secure, lockable facilities for bikes (including electric bikes) in multiple places (e.g., GP surgeries, Rutland Memorial hospital, libraries community centres etc)	Noted
1442	Mrs Sarah Lunn [957]		<p>Increased public transport for Rutland's population and visitors and a sustainable future is essential.</p> <p>Examples to be studied are Thanet Loop and North Norfolk Coasthopper.</p>	Noted
1267	CLA (John Greenshields, Chartered Surveyor) [937]		The CLA supports the promoting of sustainable transport. That being said, the CLA believes that the Council should refrain from adopting policies that will penalise the use of private vehicles in a rural County. As such a policy will have a negative impact on people's mobility, freedoms and could have direct economic costs which would greatly outweigh any gains.	Noted
1180	Mrs Penelope Rowe [926]		Bear in mind that an increasingly elderly population may have significant mobility issues that preclude walking and cycling. Buses need to be both accessible and routed to both major commercial centres within Rutland.	Noted
1154	Mrs Sarah Ford [922]		Definitely more electric charging infrastructure, better public transport provision. As a comment - reducing parking spaces in new developments will almost certainly NOT reduce car usage unless combined with a wide range of sustainable and	Noted



			sustained alternatives e.g., subsidised public transport. All it will do is lead to new developments with access roads clogged with cars, and greater congestion. Reduced car usage requires carrot, not stick mentality.	
991	Mrs Victoria Owen [902]		You cannot live in a Rutland village without a car	
855	Mr John Sharp [897]		Stop punishing car owners, they are the only practicable way of living here.	Noted
737	Environment Agency (Mrs Nicola Reyman, Planning Specialist) [855]		<p>Q39: welcome the various options to promote sustainable modes of transport and consider that a combination of these options would be most appropriate.</p> <p>We support the approach that directs development in the most sustainable locations which aligns with the sustainable development objectives set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. We are pleased to see and strongly support the consideration of policies to actively promote sustainable travel and consider improving walking and cycling connections. We suggest that consideration is given to the role of green and blue infrastructure corridors which provide important connections between places, whilst providing a multitude of other benefits to both people and nature. Option E is also important to support the move toward electric vehicles through ensuring the availability of charging points, whilst ensuring there is adequate safe storage to encourage cycling.</p>	Noted and has been considered through development of the Local Plan. Chapter 5 sets out the policies for the Spatial Strategy, and approach to directing development to the most sustainable locations.
664	Mr Andrew Nebel [864]		The age of the population (high proportion of 65+) and its rurality will dictate the need to continue an effective public transport system and the ease with which private vehicular transport can be used to access retail centres and have good parking capability to ensure a sufficient footfall to sustain vibrant high streets.	Noted
635	Sport England (Steve Beard) [233]		Active Travel England - opportunity/time for consultation?	Noted

523	Mrs Jayne Williams [857]		Rutland cannot get away from dependence on the car. We have little or no public transport, which recently has been cut again. All services have been removed from most villages and centralised in the towns.	Noted
466	Richard Camp [155]		Promote the use of all-electric vehicles e.g., cars, vans, buses	Noted
408	Mr Stephanie Belson [822]		Look at the existing bus services -it is madness that, from some areas of the county (e.g., Edith Weston) you cannot get to Oakham. There is no train and walking and cycling not an option. The Travel Plan needs to be real! Take account that walking and cycling isn't always do-able (especially on narrow country lanes with no footpath) and ensure that funds are put into a bus service that serves. People have no option but to use a car around here. Please don't penalise us when there isn't an alternative!	Noted
302	Mr Graham Layne [801]		EV charging points for cycles is an excellent idea given the promotion of tourism and age demographic in the county. A direct bus service from the south east of Rutland to Oakham, giving better access to the county's services would help residents to feel that we belong to Rutland.	Noted
231	Miss Catherine Wymer [771]		Need to improve bus links, make more regular and reliable.	Noted
199	Natural England (Roslyn Deeming, Senior Planning Adviser) [236]		Natural England is supportive of Option D to improve walking and cycling connections and ensure street are designed to be attractive, safe and prioritise pedestrians and cyclists. We suggest there is a strong link should be made to Green Infrastructure, for example cycle and pedestrian routes should incorporate verges or boundaries of natural habitat and street trees to connect to other natural habitats and green spaces.	Noted and has been considered through development of the Local Plan. See Policy EN7 on Green and Blue infrastructure. The Green and Blue Infrastructure Network policy will conserve the existing GBI in Rutland and promote the opportunities for the creation of new high quality GBI.