

## **Suggested responses to examiner clarification points – revised draft for Uppingham Town Council meeting on Wed. 10<sup>th</sup> January 2024**

1.1 Uppingham Town Council (TC) welcomes the opportunity to respond to the Examiners Clarification Note. We would like to thank Mr Ashcroft for his diligence and attention to detail in visiting Uppingham and reviewing the Neighbourhood Plan (NP) and supporting documents. The TC is also grateful for the extension in time granted to provide these responses, recognising the impact of the Christmas and New Year break and our commitment to openness and local democracy which has been consistent throughout the NP review process. The TC notes that its responses should make direct reference to the policy, or the matter concerned.

1.2 For clarity, the responses are set out in tabular form. Table 1 concerns the examiner points and the specified consultees comments. Table 2 concerns the extensive comments submitted by Rutland County Council (RCC). In both cases, the clarification points/comments are set out in full in the left-hand column with the responses/comments of the TC in the right-hand column. Appendix 1 comprise a more detailed response to the issue of agricultural land quality as a raised by RCC. In addition to these responses, the TC considers that it would be helpful to provide brief commentaries on some issues related to the question/concerns expressed by the examiner and consultees. These are set out below:

1.3 There is an existing “Made” NP for Uppingham and, although this is a comprehensive review some of the principles, formal policies and other aspirations are carried forward into the new document. These have been subject to examination and the TC hopes that they can be carried forward, notwithstanding the comments from RCC. An example of this is the policy focus on IT provision. The TC believes that the provision of good quality broadband in the town has helped many businesses to remain in the town centre whilst also developing profitable online services. It has also supported home working, before, during and in the aftermath of the 2020 pandemic.

1.4 Uppingham has a distinctive character. The Central Conservation Area is extensive, covering all of the town centre. The town has 106 listed buildings, most of which are in the centre. In addition to these heritage assets, the protection of which is essential to the character and economy of the town, there are other constraints on development. These include topography, especially the steep valley immediately to the south of the town centre along with historic open spaces, including The Arboretum, Tods Piece and the historic Uppingham School cricket ground. Station Road is the only traditional industrial estate in the town.

1.5 Uppingham School has a major influence on the town, with around 850 students around 800 of whom are boarders. It occupies many buildings in and around the centre for administration, education, accommodation for students and has an extensive, modern, sports campus. The town also has a community college and two primary schools. The above factors combine to create significant constraints on development in the town and brownfield opportunities are very limited. This means that new development has to be accommodated on greenfield sites.

1.6 It is noted that, since the submission of the NP, a draft (preferred options) version of Local Plan (LP) has been published for consultation. There are cross references to this document by RCC in comments on the NP, but at present it has no status in decision making. During 2022 & 2023, the TC took account of the emerging LP and RCC officers/members accepted the approach to new housing provision set out in the NP.

1.7 The publication of a new NPPF on 19<sup>th</sup> Dec. could affect the LP programme. The TC wishes for the NP to be “made” as soon as possible, because the current LP only looks forward to 2026. The TC notes the new NPPF, especially; increased emphasis on NPs, guidance on “Strategic” & “Non- Strategic “matters and advice that LPs should reflect NPs. The TC considers that the content and approach of the NP reflects both the previous and new NPPFs.

**Table 1 Examiner clarification points, specified consultee comments and suggested responses.**

Clarification points	Consultee comments
<p><b>SEA/Environmental Report</b> Paragraphs 4.4/4.5 and 4.11/4.13 of the AECOM report set out the context to the selection of the proposed housing allocations. As I read the report, it justifies the case for the package of sites based on earlier work rather than grappling with potential alternatives to deliver the strategic requirement for the town in the emerging Local Plan (such as applying different packages or higher densities to individual sites).</p> <p>It would be helpful if the Town Council commented on this reading of the Environmental Report and the extent to which it meets the basic conditions. Similarly, it would be helpful to understand the way in which the Town Council incorporated specific findings of the Environmental Report into the submitted Plan.</p>	<p>The TC was completely satisfied with the SEA completed by AECOM and RCC were consulted during its preparation. The TC had been advised by RCC that the SEA would be best timed to be undertaken on a full draft version of NP. This reflected practice on other NPs in Rutland and in neighbouring authorities (e.g. South Kesteven).</p> <p>Based on the content of an earlier (submission draft) version of the RCC LP, the review of the NP took account of the emerging strategy for growth in Rutland and drew upon the Call for Sites (2015 and subsequent analysis up to 2018). Whilst that plan was withdrawn by RCC in Sept. 2021, the background work on alternative options within the county remained pertinent to the Uppingham NP. In addition, reflecting a commitment to working locally with the community, landowners and developers, the TC undertook a comprehensive site assessment and selection process, involving a further call for sites. This process is detailed in the report; Housing</p>

Sites Selection (August2022) <https://uppingham-neighbourhood-plan.com/consultation-documents/> See Sec. 4 (site identification). This demonstrates that a range of sites had been identified and considered before the preferred sites were selected for more detailed assessment. This sifting involved liaison with landowners and developer along with a full community consultation exercise.

Returning to the SEA, the document was reported to and fully considered by the Neighbourhood Plan Advisory Group (NPAG) which was set up by the TC to advise on the NP review, but at all stages, NPAG reported strategic and policy recommendations to the TC. With reference to densities, the approach taken by the NP has not been to theoretically test different densities on a given site, but based on community consultation, local knowledge and liaison with developers, to set out what is best for each site. This took into account factors including: a desired dwelling mix, the potential for mixed uses, access needs, links to longer term sites, future infrastructure, landscape and the character of Uppingham. In paras. 4.21 to 4.24 the need to address low past development rates and take account of a (then) less than 5-year housing land supply are addressed and agreed by the assessors. The TC considered that the SEA endorsed the strategy and site preferences that had been set out in the Reg. 14 Draft NP. RCC did not indicate any degree of dissatisfaction that would require significant changes to the NP prior to Submission. It is also pertinent that, in relation to both the SEA and the Draft Plan, Historic England, Natural England and the Environment Agency did not submit objections or request for significant changes to the NP. The changes to the NP related to the SEA were, therefore, limited but alongside comments from RCC, the

	<p>local community and others, changes were introduced, for example to sustainable development, community wellbeing and transportation. The TC acknowledges that the SEA recommended that site specific policies should be enhanced to encourage development proposals to complete a proportionate heritage impact assessment at the application stage. However, the location of the preferred sites, reflecting the need to protect and enhance the character and heritage of the town centre, means that they do not directly affect designated heritage assets.</p> <p>The TC considers that the NP meets the Basic Conditions, and in particular that it promotes sustainable development and reflects national guidance. The process of reviewing the NP has been thorough and is sound. RCC was engaged at all stages and officers agreed the approach to dwelling numbers and site selection for the Reg. 14 Draft and the Submission Version.</p>
<p><b>Policy H1</b> The Town Council has approached the delivery of new homes in a positive way. I note the general support from the landowners and potential developers on a site-by-site basis. Nevertheless, the policy’s indication of 25 homes per hectare for new development is very low and has the potential not to make the best use of land. It would be helpful if the Town Council expanded on the commentary in the Rationale on this matter and provided further guidance about the reasoning for the density specified.</p> <p>In this context how has the Town Council balanced the need to deliver new homes with density and the overall amount of land allocated for housing development? Is the Town Council satisfied that the various housing allocations are viable and deliverable in general, and at the densities proposed in particular?</p>	<p>The approach to density stems from the character and setting of Uppingham. As explained in the introduction heritage, the presence of the school and historic street patterns limits opportunities for development in or around the town centre. There is, therefore, no alternative to greenfield sites adjoining the built-up area. Several factors then combine to justify lower than average densities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A desire to respect landscape and to retain trees, hedges, wet areas and meadows within new development.</li> <li>- To enable a transition between new development and open countryside, through varying densities, design and open space.</li> <li>- To reflect the local demand/aspiration for bungalows.</li> <li>- To enable mixed uses (e.g., on Ayston Road and Uppingham Gate).</li> </ul>

	<p>- To ensure that developments have inbuilt capacity for possible future infrastructure, e.g. a possible relief road.</p> <p>In the case of mixed used sites, it is accepted that if retail, commercial or community development do not emerge or are unacceptable, the number of dwellings on them may be increased and this could impact on density.</p> <p>Landowners and developers have been involved in the site assessment and selection process from the outset and as evidenced by the consultation responses, are generally supportive of the approach to densities taken by the TC.</p> <p>It is unfortunate that the need for an indicative dwelling requirement and the nature of consultation/examination creates a focus on a very specific dwelling total and the perceived capacity of sites. Whilst not accepting the developer aspiration that the dwelling requirements should be expressed as a minimum (with an unspecified maximum), the TC recognises that the average densities ultimately achieved, and the overall number of new dwellings may vary from the figures contained in the submission draft NP. In addition, the TC wishes to note the following aspects of housing provision related to density:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- The need to avoid the cramped environment which results from larger detached dwelling being developed at high density. This does not reflect the character of Uppingham.</li><li>- Higher densities, with smaller townhouses and/or blocks of apartments, can be part of achieving more lower cost market housing (for first time buyers) and specialist accommodation for older people.</li></ul>
--	--

<p><b>Policy H3</b> The intentions of the policy are very clear. However as submitted is it a land use policy? Parts B and C read as commentary on a potential further review of the Plan.</p>	<p>Great effort has gone into site selection, liaison with landowners and developers and consultation with RCC. The NP is based on a strategy to manage how sites come forward, so as to enable rather than prevent future development. It is, therefore, important that the principle of this policy remains in place. The TC acknowledges that it could be reworded with some detail moved into the rationale.</p>
<p><b>Policy U-HA1</b> What is the status of potential new road access between Stockerston Road and Leicester Road? Is it appropriate for such a road to be shown on the potential layout of the site? Could criteria d/e/f be delivered in a co-ordinated and overlapping way?</p>	<p>The possible link road has no formal status and is not in a current programme. However, the TC has commissioned feasibility studies for such a route which suggest it is achievable. The key policy intent is to ensure that access is provided in such a way that part of the route could be enabled and, critically that site layout does not prejudice future provision. The landowner/developer support this approach. However, the route could be shown in a more diagrammatic manner. It is considered that criteria d/e/f could be delivered in the way suggested, but the intent could be combined into a single criterion.</p>
<p><b>Policy U-HA2</b> The supporting text and the policy suggest that further work is required to establish a safe access/egress into the site. Has further work been undertaken on this since the Plan was submitted? How would an access address the difference in levels between Ayston Road and the proposed site? In criterion (g) is the need retail store intended to be a local convenience store for the homes on the proposed allocation? Does this approach overlap with that proposed in Policy BE2 or is it in addition to the provisions of that policy?</p>	<p>It is understood that Allison Homes (consultee comment 7 – 1.3.4) has an access strategy, based on a single access point off Ayston Road and that a Transport Assessment has been submitted to RCC. In addition, access arrangements were agreed in principle in relation to discussion on the existing NP in 2014. The level difference is not significant near to the site southern site boundary. In criterion(g) the store referred to is that which is specified in more detail in BE2. It is acknowledged that the policy could be reworded to make this clearer.</p>
<p><b>Policy U-HA3</b> What is the status of the proposed food store (identified in the Rationale)? Is it that proposed in Policy BE1? The purpose of criterion (c) is self-evident. However, is an ‘unfettered vehicular access’ a commercial rather than land use planning matter?</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that the potential for a food store on this site is understated in the policy as drafted, but it is intended that the provisions of Policy BE1 will also apply.</p>

<p>Is the highways access intended to be taken from the highway between the GP surgery and the other medical commercial uses?</p>	<p>It is important that this development enable future access to site U-HA4, but the requirements set out in clause d could be incorporated into clause c on access requirements.</p> <p>The use of the existing access to serve part of the site is a matter for the highway authority, but a new junction to the east on the A47 is strongly preferred by the TC to enable other development on the site and access to site U-HA4.</p>
<p><b>Policies U-HA4 and 5</b> Has the Town Council specifically chosen not to include any specific criteria for the detailed development of these sites?</p>	<p>That is the case because the sites are intended to be longer term. Key requirements on access and affordable housing are, however specified. In addition, the design requirements of OH5 will need to be met and this need could be reflected in the rationales.</p>
<p><b>Policy OH2</b> Is the approach in the policy intended to be applied to the allocated sites?</p>	<p>Yes, it is intended to apply to the allocated sites, but also to any larger windfall sites that emerge over the plan period, albeit that the nature of Uppingham means that the likelihood of the latter is low.</p>
<p><b>Policy OH4</b> Should the policy directly refer to infill development within the Planned Limits of Development? If so, is the second criterion needed?</p>	<p>The first clause could be amended to refer to the PLoD, such that the sub clause b could be deleted.</p>
<p><b>Policy OH5</b> The policy is commendable comprehensive. However, should the commentary on biodiversity be elsewhere so that the policy can focus on design issues?</p> <p>I understand the final part of the policy. However, as a process matter is it reasonable? Could it be better located in the supporting text?</p>	<p>Biodiversity protection and enhancement can be achieved through good sustainable design and layout. Perhaps the importance of nature conservation could be emphasised more in the rationale. Otherwise, a standalone policy could be added to the Open Spaces and Environment Policy section.</p> <p>The TC has used independent design reviews regularly in the past to improve the quality of development and, in part to provide clarity to developers, it is considered appropriate that this requirement remains as part of a formal planning policy.</p>
<p><b>Policies C&amp;H1/C&amp;H2</b> The significance of the conservation area and the town's heritage assets was self-evident during the visit.</p>	<p>The conservation area, listed buildings and the settings are fundamental to the character of Uppingham, reflecting a unique local juxtaposition of an historic market town with a renowned</p>

<p>Nevertheless, do the policies bring any specific added value beyond the contents of national and local planning policies?</p>	<p>educational institution also present in and around the centre. Uppingham is a high-quality visitor destination based on independent shops and hospitality creating a character very much related to heritage. It is important, therefore, that heritage policies in the NP reflect this and are not absent, such that reliance has to be placed on national policies. The TC would welcome suggestions from the examiner as to how this policy can be made even more locally focused. That said, the support from Historic England and the comment made by LCC requesting more detail on heritage indicate the importance of including heritage policies in the NP.</p>
<p><b>Policies TC1/TC2</b> These are good policies which will help to reinforce the viability and vitality of the town centre</p>	<p>Noted and welcomed. The TC considers that concerns of RCC on frontages (see table 2) represent interference in terms of what is strategic and what is local in terms of determination through an NP.</p>
<p><b>Policy OR1</b> As submitted this policy could have unintended consequences and detract from the overall role of the town centre. Does the Town Council have any comments on the size of stores which would be appropriate/acceptable? Does the Town Council have any comments on the number of new stores which would be appropriate/acceptable? Has the Town Council assessed opportunities for the development of additional food stores within/adjacent to the Town Centre?</p>	<p>At present, the role/scope/potential Co-op in the town centre is limited, but it gives rise to traffic and parking problems. Uppingham residents travel to Corby or Oakham for larger (convenience) shopping, which is not sustainable. Local knowledge suggested that there are no sites within or adjoining the town centre which could accommodate a new store. Three key local factors apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The historic nature of the town centre.</li> <li>- The extent of Uppingham School (thriving &amp; successful).</li> <li>- Need to protect open spaces and the allotments at Tod's Piece and Leicester Road.</li> </ul> <p>The TC feels that a larger modern store (around 1000sq.m.) would be acceptable but is concerned that development occurs in the short term, hence the flexibility presented on the Uppingham Gate &amp; Ayston Road sites. Based on local knowledge, the TC considers that there are no other suitable sites for such a development closer to the</p>



	<p>town centre. This relates to both scale and traffic generation. This is in accordance with the RCC 2023 Retail Impact study (Para. 12.5)</p> <p>The TC recognises, however, that careful sequential and retail impact will need to be demonstrated as part of development proposals.</p>
<p><b>Policy BE1</b> I fully understand the purpose of criterion (a) about new uses addressing the local market. Nevertheless, how does the Town Council anticipate that this aspiration would be controlled through the development management process by the County Council?</p> <p>Is there capacity in the highways system to allow an additional spur off the A47 roundabout?</p>	<p>Criterion A reflects strategic RCC concerns that development addresses local needs, so as not to prejudice planned development elsewhere. However, the TC would not object to its amendment or deletion. The capacity of the A47 roundabout is a matter for the highway authority, but a new junction to the east is strongly preferred by the TC to enable other development on the site and access to site U-HA4.</p>
<p><b>Policy BE2</b> Criterion (b) seeks to address the sensitivity of the site. Nevertheless, is a landmark building appropriate in this sensitive location on rising ground?</p>	<p>The site excludes existing mature trees and hedges along Ayston Road, the A47 roundabout and the A47 (west). This means that the impact of development on land which rises gently only 13m, is reduced. However, the term “landmark building” could be deleted, reinforcing the need for sensitive design.</p>
<p><b>Policy BE3</b> Given that the continuation of land uses does not need planning permission is the purpose of the first part of the policy to support the development of new employment or the consolidation and extension of existing employment uses in this part of the town? What is the context to the second paragraph of the policy? Is a new access to the eastern part of the Industrial Estate likely to come forward within the Plan period?</p>	<p>There are no other “traditional” employment sites in Uppingham and despite access constraints, Station Road is thriving. The intent is to identify and protect Station Road as an important local employment site, to support appropriate development within it but to ensure that potential future access improvements are not prejudiced. In addition to providing a context for the consideration of new building and change of use applications, this policy will be used in part as a platform for external funding bids, but it is acknowledged that access improvement may not occur within the plan period.</p>
<p><b>Policy BE5</b> The need for the policy has now been overtaken by the introduction of Part R of the Building Regulation in December 2022. In these circumstances I am minded to recommend that the deletion of the policy. I am satisfied that the supporting text can provide an</p>	<p>In effect, this is carried forward from the existing NP. It is accepted Part R fulfils some requirements, but the TC would like to see the simplified policy retained, as it relates to attracting investment in</p>

update about the Building Regulations. Does the Town Council have any comments on this proposition?	infrastructure, as well as delivery through the Building Regs. If this is not possible, could it be retained as Community Proposal?
<b>Policy BE6</b> This is a good policy which responds positively to the importance of tourism to the local economy.	Noted, but it is also accepted that the final part of the clause on sustainable rural tourism could be amended in relation to comments made by Welland Vale Garden Centre (see below).
<b>Policy TR1</b> The policy reads as a summary of national and local policies (and site allocation policies) rather than as a land use policy. It will be helpful if the Town Council expands on its thinking for the approach taken.	It is acknowledged that the wording could be amended, but it relates to the contentious, but locally very important, need that where possible development enables future road connections and in no circumstances prejudices future provision.
<b>Policy TR3</b> I understand the approach taken in the policy. However, several of its elements would be unlikely to need planning permission. Please can the Town Council elaborate on the approach taken?	This policy reflects local concerns and is carried forward from the existing NP. The TC would welcome retention of intent of the policy in any rewording but would like to see it kept as a formal policy. EV charging points are important to help address climate change.
<b>Policy TR4</b> The policy reads as a highways policy rather than a land use policy. Please can the Town Council elaborate on the approach taken?	This policy reflects local concerns and is carried forward from the existing NP. The TC would welcome retention of intent of the policy in any rewording but would like to see it kept as a formal policy.
<b>Policy CF1</b> This is a good policy which recognises the importance of community facilities to the well-being of the town.	Noted, thank you – cross reference to the comment submitted by the Leicester, Leicestershire & Rutland Integrated Care Board. The TC is also concerned about other facilities, in particular, the Post Office.
<b>Monitoring and Review</b> The Plan positively addresses this important matter in a comprehensive way. It acknowledges that national and local planning policies may change within the Plan period. In this context I am minded to recommend the inclusion of an additional sentence on this point to indicate that the Town Council would consider the need or otherwise for a partial or full review of the Plan within six months after the adoption of the emerging Local Plan. Does the Town Council have any comments on this proposition?	Notwithstanding the time and effort required to updates NPs, the TC is committed to keeping the Uppingham NP as up to date as possible. The TC would be comfortable, therefore, to “consider the need or otherwise” for a review when a new RCC LP is finally adopted but leaves the decision with the TC.

<p><b>Representations</b> Does the Town Council have any comments on the representations made to the Plan? I would find it helpful if the Town Council commented on the following representations:</p>	
<p>Matrix Planning (Representation 4 - NB No.5 on RCC website)</p>	<p>See earlier justification for not increasing the dwelling requirement. GP1(b) – prefer to retain as a requirement, it is in other NPs. U-HA5 – noted but not relevant to formal planning.</p>
<p>Uppingham Gate Ltd (Representation 5 - NB No.6 on RCC website)</p>	<p>See earlier justification for not increasing the dwelling requirement. For scale/density, within the context of the overall dwelling requirement, there could be flexibility in numbers if access, layout and design aspirations can be met. In terms of a retail store, if there is a commitment to delivery, the TC could accept a focus on Uppingham Gate.</p>
<p>Allison Homes (Representation 6 - NB No.7 on RCC website)</p>	<p>See earlier justification for not increasing the dwelling requirement. For scale/density, within the context of the overall dwelling requirement, there could be flexibility in numbers if access, layout, design and landscape needs can be addressed. In terms of a retail store, if constraints emerge, the TC could accept a focus on Uppingham Gate, however it is considered that Ayston Road has potential to accommodate other commercial or specialist uses alongside housing.</p>
<p>Langton Homes (Representation 9 - NB No.10 on RCC website)</p>	<p>This support, backed up by justification and policy analysis which prove the deliverability of the site, is welcomed.</p>
<p>Vistry Homes (Representation 16); and</p>	<p>The support for the allocation (U-HA4) and GP1 is welcomed.</p>

<p>Welland Vale Garden Centre (Representation 20)</p>	<p>In terms of H1, see earlier justification for not increasing the dwelling requirement. The TC notes that higher densities in appropriate locations could facilitate lower cost and specialist housing.</p> <p>In terms of density, some flexibility may be applied, but 30 should not be seen as a norm by developers. 25 reflects local character.</p> <p>In H3, the potential inconsistency with U-HA4, on timing, is noted. For U-HA4, it is important locally that access is from Uppingham Gate. However, some flexibility on density/numbers is possible.</p> <p>The comments on BE4 are accepted, other than in Clause (c) use of the word substantial (or significant), in relation to harm.</p> <p>The TC would not oppose the addition of a clause relating to rural tourism.</p>
<p>In addition, the <b>County Council</b> makes a series of detailed comments and suggestions about the Plan's policies (Representation 23). I would also find it helpful to have the Parish Council's comments on those matters.</p>	<p>This matter is dealt with in a separate Table 2, which follows.</p>

**Table 2 Consideration of Rutland County Council comments and suggested responses**

<p><b>General</b> It would be helpful if the site allocation policies included a set of development principles for each site.</p> <p><b>Walking and cycling infrastructure to support development sites.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include reference within specific allocation policies to the need for walking and cycling provisions within the development sites themselves and links to surrounding areas and arterial routes.</li> <li>• Based on the proposed allocations, it is suggested that potential pedestrian and cyclist improvements could be sought in the following locations, to support the combined development: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ayston Road, Leicester Road, Twitchbed Road and the A47</li> <li>• Further consideration required through a full transport assessment.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>The TC believes that the policies U-HA1 to U-HA5, coupled with the requirements set out in H2, OH1, OH2 and OH5, provide a detailed framework for these sites.</p> <p>However, the TC agrees that additional requirement related to walking and cycling infrastructure could be inserted.</p> <p>The site allocations U-HA1, U-HA2 &amp; U-HA3 each make reference to the need for a transport assessment, reflecting RCC comments at the Reg. 14 consultation stage. For the avoidance of doubt, the TC accepts that a similar clause could be added to the longer-term site allocations (U-HA4 &amp; U-HA5).</p>
<p><b>Indicative dwelling requirement</b></p> <p>7.3 Regulation 18 Local Plan proposes 316 dwellings for Uppingham.</p> <p>7.8 Consultation on Reg 18 Local Plan commences 13th Nov. 2023.</p> <p>Regulation 18 Local Plan proposes 316 dwellings for Uppingham</p>	<p>The emerging Local Plan (which postdates the submission of the NP) does not yet have policy status. The Dec. 2023 NPPF could result in a re-appraisal of figures and suggest a more equal relationship between LPs and NPs. These factors suggest that the earlier figures approved by the RCC Cabinet (Nov. 2021), adjusted to reflect commitments/completions, should remain as the basis for the NP. In addition, the TC would refer to a basic principle of NPs that they may provide for more dwellings than the minimum requirement.</p>
<p><b>9. Neighbourhood Plan Policies and Community Aspirations</b></p> <p>9.5.5(b) Affordable housing definition. The section on Starter Homes has been replaced by the Government policy on First Homes, which is described in the First Homes section of the National Planning Practice Guidance, which has a hyperlink to the relevant Written Ministerial Statement covering First Homes. The reference to Starter Homes should be removed and reference to First Homes added.</p>	<p>The TC notes the revised guidance and is happy to see this text amended accordingly.</p>

<p><b>Policy GP 1 General Principles of development.....</b>  Rationale – Para 2 “Development will only be encouraged where it can be shown that the scheme will help to achieve the Objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan” - Is it worth saying that decisions should be made in accordance with the development plan - which will include the NP when adopted - unless material considerations apply?  GP1 –a) vii)  • Is this for all development proposals?  • Include passenger transport (sustainable travel mode)  • Not clear how this is judged, also overlaps with Building Regs. Building regs requires that a new residential building with associated parking must have access to electrical vehicle charge points  • This is ok to include, however what happens if an application doesn’t provide this? Its highly unlikely that the LPA could refuse applications on this point – wouldn’t hold up at appeal/ and is also going into Building regulations territory.  GP1 – b) c)  (b) – Ok to have, but aspirational; could not be used as a basis of refusal (NPPF encourages it but not a requirement).  (c) – same a (b) – non-specific, and couldn’t be used to refuse an application ‘anticipate climate change’ – what does this mean in a practical sense for applications?</p>	<p>The TC agrees that this would be an appropriate amendment.</p> <p>The policy should apply reasonably and proportionately to all development as far as can be achieved through the planning system. This would be an appropriate addition.  Noted, it may be necessary to amend this reference.</p> <p>This is important to the TC and the Dec. 2023 NPPF increases the emphasis on the importance of pre-application work. The TC wishes this to remain as a policy requirement.  This is part of a general principle which in detail relates to space for sustainable drainage, EV charging, biodiversity net gain etc. as specified on the detailed policy OH5</p>
<p><b>H1 Overall Housing Numbers</b>  Needs Evidence to support the density requirement of 25, It would be helpful if density was set on a site-by-site basis in the development principles with evidence to support this linking back to the character and</p>	<p>See comments on density related to the examiner clarification point on policy H1 (table 1 above).</p>

<p><b>H2 Associated Infrastructure</b></p> <p>Rationale; Need to explain how CIL works, we operate CIL and so developers will expect the impact of development to be secured through CIL contributions. This policy is not in line with national policy and guidance.</p> <p>Policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is covered by CIL. RCC can't ask for more than is required by CIL, and CIL sets the level that developers have to provide.</li> <li>• Include cycle infrastructure</li> <li>• Second paragraph (private sector investment) – not clear how this relates to new housing – need to be set out clearer.</li> <li>• Not in line with national guidance</li> <li>• Not appropriate as a planning policy, maybe a community aspiration</li> <li>• No reference to green and active travel infrastructure and provision – only roads. To include walking and cycling provision as well as public transport and electric vehicle charging provision.</li> </ul>	<p>The TC acknowledges that CIL is the principal mechanism to achieve direct infrastructure provision or funding related to a specific development. The TC believes that RCC should involve it in infrastructure planning and the creation of an Infrastructure Development Plan (IDP) for Uppingham on a collaborative basis.</p> <p>Other agencies can provide infrastructure more widely associated with new housing, either anticipating service needs of by plugging infrastructure gaps. The policy has applicability beyond CIL.</p> <p>The TC agrees that references to cycling and other green/active travel infrastructure could be added to the policy.</p> <p>The TC is extremely concerned that any infrastructure necessary to address the needs of the existing and growing population is provide for in association with new development, both through CIL and direct investment by service providers. The concern relates to this policy (H2) and to CF2 (New and Improved Community Facilities)</p>
<p><b>H3 The timing of development</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (A) 'Timely manner' –this can't be quantified. Time limits for commencement are set by planning conditions. Once commenced permissions are extant.</li> <li>• (B) – Can't do this – Developers are within their rights to submit different types of applications. If (B) was used as a reason for refusal this would be likely to result in costs being awarded at any appeal.</li> <li>• (C) – The wording binds the neighbourhood plan group to do this (i.e. 5 year ticking clock unless all sites have been commenced?) The development could have outline consent.</li> </ul>	<p>As noted in response to the examiner clarification point (see Table 1) great effort has gone into site selection, liaison with landowners and developers and consultation with RCC. The NP is based on a strategy to manage how sites come forward so as to enable, rather than prevent, future development. It is, therefore, important that the principle of this policy remains in place.</p> <p>The TC would acknowledge, that it could be reworded with some detail moved into the rationale.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall, this isn't a land use policy and is something for monitoring and review</li> </ul>	
<p><b>H4 Proposed new housing sites (Policies U-HA1 to U-HA5)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RCC has undertaken their own site assessments following 'a call for sites' including sites that were submitted for Uppingham the site submissions were forwarded to UTC. As part of the RCC assessment of the sites – the report concludes that none of the proposed UNP sites are suitable for allocation due to them all grade 1 or 2 agricultural land.</li> <li>• RCC recognise in this situation that some BMV land would need to be allocated to meet the housing need. It is not clear whether this has been picked up by the UNP in their site assessment – if not this should be acknowledged as part of the site selection process.</li> <li>• RCC Site appraisal for the Uppingham sites can be made available to the Examiner if required.</li> <li>• The Plan would benefit from having a set of development principles for each proposed site derived from the site assessments undertaken</li> </ul>	<p>It is acknowledged that some of the preferred sites include areas of Grade 1 and Grade 2 land, but Grade 3 is also present and so, the categoric comment made by RCC is incorrect. It should also be noted that farmland adjoining and within settlements is constrained in terms of farming practices. Notional land quality is not the only issue. This constraint has been reflected in site allocations/development around Uppingham, as outlined in the existing LP and NPs</p> <p>As explained in the introduction to this report and in other responses, it simply not possible to achieve new development on brownfield sites and greenfield options are the only ones available. The question of quality was considered in the SEA prepared by AECOM in general terms and in relation to each of the preferred sites. It is noted (P43) that: <i>“Whilst the development of greenfield sites (as proposed through both options) would not promote the most efficient use of land within the neighbourhood area, it is recognised that opportunities to deliver housing via the redevelopment of brownfield land is limited due to the lack of availability of such land within Uppingham. It is also acknowledged that whilst the available site options are greenfield, they are all located adjacent to (or within proximity to) the existing built-up area of Uppingham town.”</i></p> <p>In the SEA conclusion, Para. 5.47 states: <i>“Whilst the development of greenfield sites does not promote the most efficient use of land within the neighbourhood area, it is recognised that opportunities to deliver housing via the redevelopment of brownfield land is limited due to the lack of availability of such land within Uppingham. It is also acknowledged that through allocating greenfield sites closer to</i></p>



	<p><i>the existing built-up area, the UNP minimises as best as possible the impacts to the open countryside and natural environment, which will help to safeguard land, soil, and water resources. Nevertheless, the preferred approach will likely result in the permanent loss of agricultural land that cannot be mitigated.”</i></p> <p>This matter is also acknowledged in the Site Assessment Report, where the Locality template was used which includes the question: <i>“Is the land classified as the best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 or 3a)”</i> and scoring was carried out accordingly.</p> <p>Appendix 1 to these responses is a more detailed statement on Agricultural Land Quality.</p> <p>The comment regarding development principles is addressed in relation to the first comment RCC comment on General Principles.</p>
<p><b>Housing Strategy Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submission draft plan retains requirements for affordable housing to be provided 'working with local providers', despite previous comments by RCC. It is not clear what is intended by this. There is only one registered provider based in Rutland and this is an almshouse provider.</li> <li>• There are no other registered providers of social housing based in Rutland. Even the housing association with the largest stock in Rutland, the Longhurst Group (formerly Spire Homes) do not have a housing management office in Rutland for its 1,460 properties in Rutland.</li> <li>• We are happy to encourage organisations such as community land trusts, but these have not demonstrated that they have capacity to take on more than a small number of dwellings at present and there</li> </ul>	<p>The capacity of new, locally based, providers may develop over the plan period. The TC wishes to retain the references in the NP to enabling the involvement of local providers.</p> <p>See comments/responses for OH1 below.</p>

are a very large number of affordable homes to be allocated by the Neighbourhood Plan.

- It is really difficult for developers working in Rutland to find any registered providers (for-profit or not-for-profit) to take properties on reasonable terms for section 106 sites at the moment, regardless of whether or not they are local and of the number of properties they have in Rutland. Any restriction on the ability of developers to select providers, other than the standard clause in RCC's section 106 agreements giving it the right to approve the provider, in the policies could really hamstring RCC's ability to enable affordable housing for local people.
- If the Parish Council wished to encourage local providers this should be in the supporting text rather than in the policy. The previous suggestion from RCC of developers using 'reasonable endeavours' to select providers if possible, with a minimum of 50 properties in Rutland, or (not 'and') providers based in Rutland could be in the supporting text but I would caution strongly against using it at all. It is certainly not now suitable for the policy.
- First Homes, generally brought forward by the site developers, would also need to be excluded from any 'reasonable endeavours' test as First Homes are unlikely to be provided through providers based in Rutland (they are normally brought forward by the private developer) but are still a requirement of national planning policy.
- Section 106 agreements ensure that local housing needs are met, regardless of where the provider is based.

Rationale – Para 1 What consultation has taken place with highways, ecology or heritage?

Table 1 – U-HA1 How is the 'future link road' referenced and evidenced in the plan?

Town Council rather than Parish

There has been direct contact between landowners/developer on some sites. There has been liaison with RCC Planning Policy throughout the preparation/review of the NP including site identification/assessment, housing numbers and the SEA/HRA. RCC Planning Policy, Highways, Heritage and other departments were consulted formally at the Reg. 14 (Draft NP) Stage.

This possible road has no formal status and is not in a current programme. However, the TC has commissioned feasibility studies for such a route, which suggest it is achievable. The policy is intended to

<p>Table 1 – U-HA2 Where is the evidence for the need of bungalows and why on this specific site?  Table 1 – U-HA4  Where is the evidence for the need of bungalows and why on this specific site?  Table 1 – U-HA5 See highway comments.  Table 1 – U-HA6 See highway comments.  Policy H4 Numbers – needs to be less prescriptive e.g. ‘at least/up to 110 dwellings, plus or minus’.  Doesn’t give any room for less/more than exactly 330 homes.  Inconsistent with other housing policies where ‘up to’ is used.</p>	<p>ensure that sites are developed/access is provided in such a way that part of the route could be enabled and, critically that site layout does not prejudice future provision. Landowners and developers support this approach. The TC notes that the Highways comments recognise the benefits of a bypass being provided, even if this is at some time in the future.  This stems from community consultation and a recognition from population analysis that there is a significant aging population in Uppingham which requires traditional single level dwellings rather than apartments. Such provision is supported by developers.</p> <p>Noted, the TC accepts that the housing requirement/site capacities do not need to be expressed in such precise terms.</p>
<p><b>U-HA1 Site Allocation: Land in front of Cricket Club, off Leic. Road</b>  Rationale – Para 2 How are open space requirements determined?  Needs justification for the ‘possible future investment...’  Rationale – Para 3 Need to explain the status and likelihood of the proposal of the bypass  Policy  a) Justification required for including single storey dwellings  b) Unreasonable for a policy to specify local providers, the use of a local provider is a community aspiration and not appropriate in this planning policy which needs to promote viable development.  e) Unreasonable and unjustified to include this within the policy</p>	<p>As noted in the rationale; <i>“Open space provision reflects RCC policy, matching overall needs <b>and also takes into account the character and location of the site.</b>”</i>  See comments on the bypass/link road immediately above.  See comments on bungalows, immediately above.  See comments on H4 above.</p>

<p>110 dwellings - below the 25 dwellings target density in Policy H2 – density is 22 dwelling per hectare.  (f) ‘include access’ - to what? Without a full transport assessment – Unclear whether this site will be deliverable.  Highway Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A full Transport Assessment will be required to assess the impact on the surrounding road network, identify the type of junction necessary on Leicester Road and identify any mitigation for any unacceptable impact (both capacity &amp; safety) beyond the access.</li> <li>• Existing speed limit/vehicle speeds along Leicester Road also need consideration, which will not necessarily be appropriate once the new development is in place.</li> <li>• A reduction in speed limit combined with measures to ensure a reduced speed limit is self-compliant is likely to be requested by the LHA.</li> <li>• A Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) will be required to regulate any changes to the current speed limit</li> <li>• Whilst a secondary access is not necessary for this development on its own, should there be any intention for future development beyond this site, consideration may need to be given to a secondary access off Leicester Road (if the indicated bypass on plan UP-NP-DS-U-HA1 does not come to fruition).</li> <li>• Whilst this development land on its own would not warrant a bypass, nor would it be viable, land could be set aside for a future scheme although at present there are no plans for such a road.</li> <li>• It is not clear why the indicative bypass route including a very large roundabout is required or why it is located in such a way as to sever the proposed development land leaving two strips remote from the remainder of the development. Whilst acknowledging that this is an</li> </ul>	<p>See comments on the bypass/link road above and on density related to the examiner clarification point on policy H1 (Table 1).</p> <p>Noted, this should read “access arrangements,...”</p> <p>This (and other) site allocation policies were amended, following Reg. 14 comments by RCC Highways, to include specific requirements for transport assessments.</p> <p>Noted and agreed.</p> <p>Noted and agreed.</p> <p>Noted and agreed.</p> <p>Noted, this can be discussed in due course.</p> <p>The agreement that land could be set aside for future provision is welcomed. It is acknowledged however, that this could be mapped more diagrammatically in the NP.</p>
---	---

<p>indicative sketch, the bypass shown looks over-designed and excessive in size.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is our view, if a bypass is warranted for reasons (other than this site alone) an indication of the entire bypass route should be provided and it would be better located to encompass any and all future developed land, rather than siting within.</li> <li>• The indication of a bypass cannot be construed as any form of approval from Rutland County Council at this stage, or until due process is followed.</li> <li>• The LHA are relatively satisfied that this development (not the bypass) could be acceptable in capacity and safety terms subject to detailed assessment and the implementation of suitable mitigation.</li> <li>• Should Uppingham Town Council (UTC) have an aspiration for a bypass (as partly indicated on this plan) it is strongly recommended that this is progressed first in order to identify a suitable route which can then be used to design within.</li> <li>• However, UTC should note that the LHA would not wish to see a connecting link road from Leicester Road through to a bypass within a housing development.</li> </ul>	<p>The TC could provide an indicative map, based on the ARUP study, but in the past RCC has resisted such a plan being presented in the NP.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>This acceptance in principle is welcomed by the TC.</p> <p>See above comments on the potential to use the ARUP report.</p> <p>The TC does not necessarily agree with this and discussion with RCC is required.</p>
<p><b>U-HA2 Site Allocation: land off Ayston Road</b></p> <p>Rationale – Para 1 Justification required along with evidence of consultation with the Highways authority.</p> <p>Rationale – Para 2 Justification required for the bungalows.</p> <p>Rationale – Para 3</p>	<p>See comments on U-HA2 in Table 1 (above) is response to the examiner question.</p> <p>This stems from community consultation and a recognition from population analysis that there is a significant aging population in Uppingham who require tradition single level dwellings rather than apartments. Such provision is supported by developers.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Justification for the inclusion of a retail site – Benefit from a specific retail policy or development principles</li> <li>• Where is the landscape impact assessment? The northern part is an area of high landscape sensitivity.</li> <li>• New up to date Landscape evidence for the Local Plan has been published: <a href="https://www.rutland.gov.uk/planning-building-control/local-plan/new-local-plan/local-plan-evidence-base/landscape-evidence">https://www.rutland.gov.uk/planning-building-control/local-plan/new-local-plan/local-plan-evidence-base/landscape-evidence</a></li> </ul> <p>Policy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Density is only 13 dwellings per hectare, not according with NPPF most efficient use of land</li> <li>• a) If the dwellings are market homes, how can the policy specify this, it is superfluous - ‘catering for first time buyers, families and older persons’ – very broad – covers the vast majority of homeowners – therefore why exclude the rest?</li> <li>• b) Unreasonable to specify local providers, the use of a local provider is a community aspiration and not appropriate in this planning policy which needs to promote viable development.</li> <li>• c) Justification required, how big? What type of play area? LEAP or LAP? – Public open space - why isn’t this a requirement on the previous site? (U-HA1). Also, if this is covered by RCC standards, why is this needed in the NP?</li> <li>• f) – The Highway Authority currently are objecting to a new access. Forestry Officer – object to removal of RCC trees to facilitate access.</li> <li>• g) Justification required – what type of retail development? How has the juxta-positioning of employment and residential uses been assessed?</li> <li>• Without a full transport assessment – Unclear whether this site will be deliverable based on Highways comments</li> </ul>	<p>See comment on the examiner question on Policy OR1 9in table 1 above).</p> <p>It is a requirement that landscape is taken into account.</p> <p>This is noted and is due to landscape considerations and the need to achieve a satisfactory relationship between new housing and any retail, commercial or community development.</p> <p>See earlier comments on affordable housing and the role of local providers.</p> <p>This can be discussed as part of implementation based on the application of RCC standards, design and landscape considerations. The TC agrees and note that a POS clause needs to be inserted into U-HA1 (it is only referred to in the Rationale as currently drafted).</p> <p>The preferred point pf access is not off the island, but further south off Ayston Road, improving an existing agricultural access.</p> <p>The need for a transport assessment has been accepted and included in the policy.</p>
---	---

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to keep development away from the mature trees along the northern boundary. To keep development out of the narrow and ecologically sensitive strip of land in the west. To sensitively work with the levels and avoid unsightly retaining features.</li> </ul> <p><b>Highway Comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LHA agree that this land can only be accessed by a single access, given its frontage, however its location and type must be given very careful consideration with detailed design. An access between the arms of Ayston Road roundabout and Northgate would NOT be acceptable due to the constricted length between. Access 'may' be possible opposite Northgate; however the design must ensure vehicles are not backed-up up to/on to the A47 junction/A47.</li> <li>• A full Transport Assessment will be required (including the other 3 parcels both sides of Ayston Road, should they be included in the final neighbourhood plan) to assess fully the impact of this and neighbouring development locally and within the surrounding road network, the extent of which is to be agreed with the LHA.</li> <li>• The LHA cannot at this stage give any indication as to the acceptability of development on this site without further work.</li> <li>• It is also worth noting that it is highly unlikely that a spur off the A47 roundabout would be possible due to the existing layout of the roundabout, topography of the land and the fact that the roundabout already has 5 arms.</li> </ul>	<p>The site excludes trees and hedges adjoining the Ayston Road/A47 junction and does not include land to the north up to the A47. It is a policy requirement to take account of the slope and landscape.</p> <p>It is noted by the TC that an access may be possible opposite Northgate.</p> <p>The need for a transport assessment has been accepted and included in the policy. It is understood that Allison Homes are currently in discussion with RCC Highways.</p> <p>Note, the TC is not promoting an access off the roundabout.</p>
<p><b>U-HA3 Site Allocation: Land at Uppingham Gate</b></p> <p>Rationale Para1. Refers to a proposed food retail store. Is this in addition to the proposed commercial/retail use referred to in Policy U-HA3? There is a new retail study which supports a retail site to come forward in Uppingham based on qualitative need but would</p>	<p>As drafted, the NP suggests a potential convenience store on U-HA2 and U-HA3, but it is accepted that both/either should be subject to access and retail impact considerations based on whatever data is available. The TC hope that one site will include such a store and/or</p>

<p>require an Impact assessment and meet the sequential test. Evidence available here:  <a href="https://www.rutland.gov.uk/planning-building-control/local-plan/new-local-plan/local-plan-evidence-base/economy-employment-evidence">https://www.rutland.gov.uk/planning-building-control/local-plan/new-local-plan/local-plan-evidence-base/economy-employment-evidence</a></p> <p>Rationale Para 2. Refers to there may be potential for a nursing home or extra care facility – this may impact on the overall housing numbers if housing not delivered unless this is intended as part of the mixed-use business and employment.</p> <p>Rationale Para 3. Without a full transport assessment – Unclear whether this site will be deliverable.</p> <p>Policy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy U-HA3 – density is 18 dwellings per hectare</li> <li>• a) If the dwellings are market homes, how can the policy specify this, it is superfluous– too prescriptive (35 houses 25 bungalows makes exactly 60, whereas first section says ‘up to 60’) - a percentage would be better.</li> <li>• c) Does this need specifying in the policy? See highways comments Transport assessment/affordable homes already covered by RCC Highway Authority/affordable homes policies.</li> <li>• d) This is not a land use policy</li> <li>• e) Unreasonable to specify local providers, the use of a local provider is a community aspiration and not appropriate in this planning policy which needs to promote viable development.</li> <li>• Need to retain mature trees and create features out of them within the layout.</li> </ul> <p><b>Highways Comments:</b> A full Transport Assessment will be required (including the other 3 parcels of land both sides of Ayston Road, should they be included in the final neighbourhood plan) to</p>	<p>that there may be other appropriate commercial or community proposals which emerge.</p> <p>This point is noted by the TC, but it is considered that specialist provision could be part of a mixed-use development, providing care and supported living facilities for the aging population.</p> <p>The need for a transport assessment has been accepted and included in the policy.</p> <p>The TC is willing to consider this suggestion.</p> <p>This is necessary to enable longer term development of site U-HA4</p> <p>It is land use and reflects earlier comment made by RCC Highways. See other comments on affordable housing and local providers.</p> <p>Noted and agreed, this could be added to the policy.</p> <p>Noted, the requirement for a Transport Assessment has been written into the policy following RCC comments at Reg. 14.</p>
--	--



<p>determine the impact of this and neighbouring developments on the junction of Northgate with Ayston Road and the surrounding road network. There is likely to be a need to upgrade the junction of Northgate and Ayston Road, but without the benefit of a Transport Assessment the LHA cannot predict what this is likely to consist of.</p>	
<p><b>U-HA4 Site allocation for land east of the Beeches</b>  Rationale. Preamble says Highway Authority suggested a secondary access only (not main) could be possible through The Beeches –but if the main access can only be only allowed through U-HA3, then the ‘development should not commence until’ doesn’t add anything?  No site area given.  <b>Highways Comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same comments as U-HA3 above.</li> <li>• It is noted that this site abuts The Beeches, which would be an excellent secondary connection. However, whilst The Beeches is adopted public highway there is third party land between the public highway and the site edge red for U-HA4.</li> <li>• Further investigation would be necessary to identify the owner of said land and to see if this land could be used as a point of access.</li> <li>• At minimum pedestrian connectivity would be welcomed. Should this be possible, the area between would need to be re-configured to meet adoptable standard of a housing estate road.</li> <li>• Concerns about the deliverability of the site due to access</li> </ul>	<p>The TC, based on local knowledge and community consultation is strongly opposed to any access from The Beeches, other than for emergency vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>The site area can be added.</p> <p>See comment immediately above.</p>
<p><b>U-HA5 Site Allocation: Land off Goldcrest/Firs Avenue</b>  No site area given.  Access –, would be better to say, ‘primary access must be through U-HA2, including construction traffic’, and site U-HA2 reworded to say that there must be access through to site U-HA5 (rather than ‘access considered’).</p>	<p>Noted, the site area can be added.  The TC, based on local knowledge and community consultation is strongly opposed to any primary access from the existing estate, other than for a very small number of new dwellings, emergency vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists.</p>

<p><b>Highways Comments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same comments as U-HA2 above.</li> <li>• It would appear that this land is only going to be accessible through the above-mentioned U-HA2 site. Given this and in order to future proof any connection on to Ayston Road, this land and use must be factored into an overall assessment for both sites as well as the two sites on the opposite side of Ayston Road.</li> </ul>	<p>The TC accepts this point.</p>
<p><b>All Sites/Overall Map</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safe and convenient pedestrian connectivity is fundamental and serious consideration must be given to public transport provision as some of the sites are of significant size or geometry that would render any existing services too difficult or too far in our view.</li> <li>• This later point would however depend also on whether the public transport providers consider a route through these sites viable.</li> <li>• The proposal for all of these sites within close proximity to one another will undoubtedly result in a significant increase in traffic leading to a potentially severe impact which must be fully assessed and fully mitigated against. Whilst the main impact will be at the junction of Northgate and Ayston Road, given the amount of development, the impact will occur further afield and similarly will need to be assessed and any unacceptable impact mitigated against.</li> <li>• Under no circumstances will all or any parts of the development be allowed to impact on the A47 or the roundabout by way of queuing. It may transpire that not all sites are developable due to capacity of the road network and impact on highway safety, in which case a decision will need to be taken to decide which sites come forward and which do not.</li> </ul> <p>Allocations Map</p>	<p>The TC agrees that it is important for public transport provision to be made as part of new development but notes the point made that actual levels of service provision are dependent on operator commitment/capacity.</p> <p>The TC is also committed to maximising connectivity for pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>The TC notes that cumulatively there will be an increase in traffic resulting from the new development and will support measures to mitigate this. In the longer term the TC will continue to promote the need for new roads, as “safeguarded” in the NP as drafted.</p> <p>This point is noted, but the TC wishes to highlight the extent to which traffic in the town centre originates from further afield (Oakham, Peterborough, Corby etc.) and the direct increase in traffic related to the development proposed in the NP will be small in relation to overall figures.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Route appears to come to an abrupt end</li> <li>• Need to include some commentary on the likelihood of the possibility of the route</li> </ul>	<p>As noted above, the whole route can be shown diagrammatically, based on the ARUP study commissioned by the TC.</p> <p>See other comments above and below.</p>
<p><b>OH1 Affordable Housing</b></p> <p>The second sentence is contrary to paragraph 64 of the NPPF as the Parish of Uppingham is not in a 'designated rural area'. The policy should also require 'at least' 30% affordable housing, in line with the wording in the allocation policies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The last sentence needs to be strengthened; it is suggested that a similar wording is used to that currently in Policy SP9: "The Council may refuse development proposals which, in its opinion, seek to under-develop or split sites in a way that is likely to reduce the affordable housing contribution and/or promote off-site provision."</li> </ul> <p>Rationale – Para 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This would be best addressed as a community aspiration. An alternative could be, for instance, to seek that the developer use reasonable endeavours to select a provider having at least 50 dwellings (including shared ownership) in management in Rutland or being based in Rutland.</li> </ul> <p>Policy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• b) How will this be achieved?</li> <li>• Final sentence is not a land use policy</li> <li>• This should include a provision for lettings to be supported by an appropriate nominations agreement with Rutland County Council as Local Housing Authority. This is the normal practice in Rutland and recognises the Council's duties under the Housing Act 1996 (as amended), such as maintaining the statutory housing register and tackling homelessness.</li> </ul>	<p>The TC accepts that the policy wording and rationale could be amended to ensure consistency with RCC evidence and policy stances.</p> <p>The TC considers strongly that local management arrangements should be put in place wherever this is possible and agrees that a Community Proposal could reflect this aspiration. However, the TC disagrees with the continued references by RCC to a threshold of at least 50 dwellings for providers. This would prevent new, locally based, entrants providing affordable housing in Uppingham.</p> <p>(b) This can be achieved through the consideration of local intelligence and data.</p> <p>This is acknowledged, but nomination by RCC should be made based on liaison with local providers and organisations, including the TC.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As a small town in the settlement hierarchy, Uppingham is expected to help meet the needs of the surrounding area within Rutland and well as meeting its own needs.</li> <li>• The Town Council should not have a veto over management arrangements. An alternative could be, for instance, for Rutland County Council to seek that the developer use reasonable endeavours to select a provider having at least 50 dwellings (including shared ownership) in management in Rutland or being based in Rutland.</li> <li>• The Policy should include this or a similar phrase: "Rutland County Council may refuse development proposals which, in its opinion, seek to under-develop or split sites in a way that is likely to reduce the affordable housing contribution and/or promote off-site provision."</li> </ul>	<p>It is acknowledged by the TC that Uppingham has a wider role to play in addition to meeting local needs.</p> <p>See comments above. The TC does not seek a veto, it simply wishes to be involved in the process and to be able to influence outcomes, in accordance with the principles of Localism.</p> <p>The TC agrees that the final sentence of the policy could be amended to reflect this point</p>
<p><b>OH2 Meeting Local Needs and providing flexibility</b>  Rationale – Para 1 RCC Strategic Housing Market Assessment has been updated: <a href="https://www.rutland.gov.uk/sites/default/files/2023-08/Rutland_HMA_Final_Report_23-08-23_12pt_accessible.pdf">https://www.rutland.gov.uk/sites/default/files/2023-08/Rutland_HMA_Final_Report_23-08-23_12pt_accessible.pdf</a></p>	<p>Noted, the rationale can be updated accordingly.</p>
<p><b>OH3 Self-build and custom housebuilding</b>  Rationale para 1 - There is not a shortfall in self-build plots, it is more a case of planning for future needs. RCC monitoring reports show that we are meeting the requirement to provide sufficient serviced permitted sites to meet numbers on the self-build register  Based on the RCC approach but what approach is that?  Rational para 2 Not sure how helpful this paragraph is, it seems to contradict Policy OH3?  It is the Council’s view that proposals for self-build will be supported by the Council where they are in conformity with all relevant local and national policies</p>	<p>The TC notes that the principle of this policy is accepted and considers that it should be retained in the NP.  The references to RCC monitoring reports and other wording in the rationale could be updated accordingly.</p>

<p><b>OH4 Infill Housing</b>  Rationale – Para 3 Why is 9 or less considered when Policy OH4 refers to 10 dwellings or less not 9.  Policy OH4 refers to new housing on infill sites as 10 dwellings or less and contradicts para 3 above</p>	<p>This inconsistency is acknowledged by the TC and reflects different drafting in earlier versions of the NP. The text may be amended to refer to 10 dwellings or less in both cases.</p>
<p><b>OH5 Design and Access Standards</b>  b) Be of an appropriate scale, density and massing, using high quality materials reflecting the area;  d) BNG will require biodiversity enhancements and preference is for on site provision as much as possible – so enhancements should always be made - so could remove, where possible;  f) perform positively – could mention the RCC design SPD and also Building for a Healthy Life and the national Design Guide. Cover green blue infrastructure and SuDS best practice</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is this appropriate? Not sure this paragraph should be included within the policy as it cannot be used a consideration to determine a planning application. Better placed in the supporting text.</li> <li>• Suggest add the design process (as set out in the Design SPD) – undertake a site and contextual analysis and response to context at the beginning of the design process.</li> <li>• Does the NP want to retain the concept of houses clustered around green spaces from the previous NP? (a strong/simple design concept)</li> </ul>	<p>The TC welcomes these positive comments and would be happy to see the policy wording amended accordingly.</p> <p>This concept could be added to the policy.</p>
<p><b>C&amp;H2 Other designated heritage assets, including Listed Buildings, Important Open Spaces &amp; Frontages, and archaeological sites.</b>  (1) Not necessary to include this in the policy  (2) Does this add anything to Policy SP20?  (3) Does this add any additional protection to Policy SP20?</p>	<p>The conservation area, listed buildings and the settings are fundamental to the character of Uppingham, reflecting a unique local juxtaposition of an historic market town with a renowned educational institution also present in and around the centre. Uppingham is a high-quality visitor destination based on bespoke shops and hospitality creating a character very much related to heritage. It is important, therefore, that heritage policies in the NP</p>

	<p>reflect this and are not absent, such that reliance has to be placed on national policies. The TC would welcome suggestions from the examiner as to how this policy can be made even more locally focused. That said, the support from Historic England and the comment made by LCC requesting more detail on heritage indicate the importance of including heritage policies in the NP.</p>
<p><b>TC1 Primary Retail frontages</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para d) what is intended by ‘will provide a direct service to the public’?</li> <li>• What is the justification for the extensions? Is there evidence to support this?</li> <li>• There is a new retail study which supports a retail site to come forward in Uppingham based on qualitative need but would require an Impact assessment and meet the sequential test. Evidence available here: <a href="https://www.rutland.gov.uk/planning-building-control/local-plan/new-local-plan/local-plan-evidence-base/economy-employment-evidence">https://www.rutland.gov.uk/planning-building-control/local-plan/new-local-plan/local-plan-evidence-base/economy-employment-evidence</a></li> </ul>	<p>The TC considers that the definition of shopping frontages is non-strategic and appropriate for consideration in an NP. Evidence has been provided in a topic paper and there is community/business support for this proposal.</p> <p>The TC notes the new retail study and that it will be relevant to the proposal for a new convenience store, but it does not need to be considered in relation to shopping frontages.</p>
<p><b>OR1 Preferred locations for convenience stores</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This policy is vague, what would be an appropriate scale and an appropriate site? As written this could be anywhere</li> <li>• Policy U-HA2 sets out the adjoining land to the north is proposed for community/retail development. U-HA3 also refers to retail use.</li> <li>• Sites unlikely to be able to have both come forward without subject to retail impact test and meeting sequential test – Needs to be clear.</li> <li>• See link above to up to date retail study</li> <li>• New up to date Landscape evidence for the Local Plan has been published and needs to be taken into account: <a href="https://www.rutland.gov.uk/planning-building-control/local-plan/new-local-plan/local-plan-evidence-base/landscape-evidence">https://www.rutland.gov.uk/planning-building-control/local-plan/new-local-plan/local-plan-evidence-base/landscape-evidence</a></li> </ul>	<p>The TC agrees that the policy wording could be made clearer, including reference to the sequential and impact tests.</p> <p>The TC notes new study and that it will be relevant to the proposal for a new convenience store.</p> <p>The 2023 landscape study, which was not available at the time that the NP was drafted, adds little to the 2017 study in relation to the sites at Ayston Road and Uppingham Gate. The TC considers that the existing cross reference to the 2017 study in the policy rationale is adequate. It is acknowledged, however, that a link could be included, and a clause could be added to the policy that requires development to reflect key elements in the 2017 and 2023 studies.</p>

<p><b>Community Proposal TC2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Note RCC can only make an area of special control order after it has been approved by the Secretary of State.</li> <li>• Before making an order and applying for approval from the Secretary of State, local planning authorities are expected to consult local trade and amenity organisations about the proposal.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted, the TC would welcome further discussion with RC on this matter.</p>
<p><b>BE1 Uppingham Gate business and related uses</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See earlier comments for Policy U-HA3 for mixed use and commercial including Highways comments.</li> <li>• a) How is this achievable?</li> <li>• d) Need to reference accessibility</li> <li>• Last paragraph of policy – See Highways comments</li> </ul>	<p>It is important that this development enables future access to site U-HA4, but the requirements set out in clause d could be incorporated into clause c on access requirements.</p> <p>The use of the existing access to serve part of the site is a matter for the highway authority, but a new junction to the east on the A47 is strongly preferred by the TC to enable other development on the site and access to site U-HA4.</p>
<p><b>BE2 Land at the junction of A47 and Ayston Road</b></p> <p>Rationale – Para 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The 2017 landscape study says a lot more than described here.</li> <li>• Note earlier link to up to date landscape study (2023)</li> </ul> <p>Policy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See policy and highways comments for U-HA2</li> <li>• Needs further detail to address landscape impact concerns</li> <li>• The site will be screened by the existing mature trees – which RCC would like to keep and protect – so the landmark building element is less relevant – better to say to retain the trees, keep development a distance away from them so as not to damage them and also to minimise impacts on the watercourse.</li> <li>• Views will be glimpsed in winter through the trees from the roundabout – so the building will be partially visible so could still mention the building – but more to fit with the rural character and mature trees and green gateway to the settlement</li> </ul>	<p>The 2023 landscape study, which was not available at the time that the NP was drafted, adds little to the 2017 study in relation to this site. The TC considers that the existing cross reference to the 2017 study in the policy rationale is adequate. It is acknowledged, however, that a link could be included, and a clause could be added to the policy that requires development to reflect key elements in the 2017 and 2023 studies.</p> <p>The site excludes existing mature trees and hedges along Ayston Road, the A47 roundabout and the A47 (west). This means that the impact of development on land which rises gently only 13m, is reduced. However, the term “landmark building” could be deleted, reinforcing the need for sensitive design.</p>

<p>BE3 Station Road Industrial Estate Rationale - Seems to be more a community aspiration.</p> <p><b>Highways Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no plan to identify the extent of the area in question, whether this is for redevelopment of the existing industrial area, or an extension to the existing industrial area.</li> <li>• There is no detail for any of the improvements listed so it is unclear if all or any of these can be achieved.</li> <li>• The policy refers to a new future point of access or egress from the eastern section of the industrial estate, however there are no details provided to show where this is envisaged or if it is achievable.</li> <li>• As a consequence, the LHA are unable to provide any meaningful response as to the acceptability of the proposals, and therefore are unable to support the proposals, primarily due to a lack of information at this stage.</li> <li>• Depending on the size of the development, any future application may need to be supported by a Transport Assessment or Statement.</li> </ul>	<p>The intent is to identify and protect Station Road as an important local employment site, to support appropriate development within it and also to ensure that potential future access improvements are not prejudiced. The policy will be used in part as a platform for external funding bids but, it is acknowledged that access improvements may not occur within the plan period.</p> <p>A plan could be provided showing the site area, with indicative arrows showing the existing access and the potential access improvements to the east.</p>
<p><b>BE4 Welland Vale Business Zone</b></p> <p>• Why would these proposals be accepted on this specific site?</p> <p>Highways Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no plan to identify the extent of the area in question, so it is difficult to understand the potential development size.</li> <li>• Depending on the size/type of development, any future planning application may need to be supported by a Transport Assessment or Statement.</li> <li>• It is not clear if it is intended to create an additional access (or use the existing) or even whether one would be possible within the site extent/frontage as it is not clear whether field to the east is included.</li> </ul>	<p>The policy establishes the principle that Welland Vale is an established employment/commercial site and provides for further development within the existing boundary, subject to highway and other matters. A site plan can be provided.</p>



<p><b>BE5 Information technology and Communications</b> BE5 – 1) &amp; 2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This provision is subject to the practicality of achieving this</li> <li>• The building regs RA1 now require dwellings to be gigabit-ready for electronic communications/broadband</li> <li>• The needs/preferences of the property owners and occupiers is not appropriate within a land use policy</li> <li>• Viability implications if the policy goes beyond the building regs.</li> </ul>	<p>The TC notes and agrees with some of these comments, but would wish to see the policy retained, even in a simplified form. Viability can be assessed on a case-by-case basis, but it will not necessarily be a barrier to installing the desired level of provision of IT.</p>
<p><b>BE6 Proposed tourism development</b></p> <p>Policy needs to accord with Local Plan policies as well as the neighbourhood plan.</p>	<p>The TC acknowledges that a cross reference could be made to LP policies.</p>
<p><b>TR1 Reducing town centre traffic</b></p> <p>Rationale – Para 2 The plan should comment on the likelihood of the ‘new relief road’</p> <p><b>Highways Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See highways comments made for all the allocations</li> <li>• Whilst generally the LHA acknowledge most of the content of this policy, the Arup report commissioned by the Town Council was found on the Town Council’s website and appears to be in draft format only. The report seems to be more of a costing exercise for the purpose of the Town Council.</li> <li>• Whilst it is clear a bypass would be beneficial; it is not clear where the funding would come from and at this time Rutland Local Highway Authority do not have any such funds. Individual major developments will be assessed by means of a Transport Assessment through the planning process in order to determine what, if any, off-site highway improvements are necessary.</li> <li>• Although a bypass would clearly be beneficial, it is unlikely in our opinion that any individual development could be required to</li> </ul>	<p>This possible road has no formal status and is not in a current programme. However, the TC has commissioned feasibility studies for such a route which suggest it is achievable. The policy is intended to ensure that sites are developed/access is provided in such a way that part of the route could be enabled and, critically that site layout does not prejudice future provision. Landowners and developers support this approach.</p> <p>The TC notes that the Highways comments recognise the benefits of a bypass being provided, even if this is at some time in the future.</p>

<p>mitigate the impact of their development by way of any of the bypass options proposed in the Arup report due to viability and costs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whilst the LHA would support the principal of a bypass and would agree that one would potentially ease the pressure within the town centre, this would be subject to funding, detailed design, land ownership, ecology, to name a few and is at a very early stage in its consideration.</li> <li>• With regards all major developments that come forward through the planning process, many will require a Transport Assessment to assess the effects on the surrounding road network and where applicable, highway improvements required to mitigate the developments impacts.</li> <li>• The LHA are mindful of the current stresses on the town centre and where reasonable and practical will require off-site highway improvements, including pedestrian improvements, to mitigate the impacts of developments, however this is unlikely to be a bypass.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>TR2 Providing safer walking and cycling and public transport</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to be more specific, will this apply to all development? What about household extensions?</li> <li>• Reference should be included within this section that ensures any new walking and cycling infrastructure is built in accordance with LTN1/20 - <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/cycle-infrastructure-design-ltn-120">https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/cycle-infrastructure-design-ltn-120</a> This is Department for Transport guidance for local authorities on designing high quality, safe cycling infrastructure.</li> <li>• Suggest make reference to Manual for Streets, Gear Change: A bold vision for walking and cycling and LTN 1/20.</li> </ul>	<p>This policy is not intended to apply to house extensions but should apply to larger conversions and commercial development. The TC agrees that reference could be made to these standards/sources of advice in the rationale, but without adding too much detail.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ideally all future cycle provisions should be built to this standard, thus any new development should meet the standards outlined within LTN1/20.</li> <li>• Reference should also be made to the Council’s newly adopted Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) which sets out the Council’s strategic priorities for walking and cycling improvements across the county. The LCWIP is now approved, but is not yet on our website, but will be in due course.</li> <li>• Inclusion will ensure future development does inhibit LCWIP scheme aspirations.</li> </ul>	<p>Subject to the above proviso on detail, the TC would welcome reference to the LCWIP.</p> <p>The TC also wishes to highlight the needs of people with impaired mobility, such that any routes or crossings provided can also meet the needs of wheelchair and mobility scooter users.</p>
<p><b>TR3 Town Centre Parking</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It would be beneficial for the plan to include a list of known areas of concern.</li> <li>• Inclusion of specific locations will help leverage any future potential funding.</li> <li>• Reconfiguring existing parking is not a land use policy.</li> </ul> <p><b>Parking Management Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comments relate to Policy TR3 and its rationale for Policy TR3: RCC has a Parking Policy which deals with wider issues but includes most of elements of TR3. Elements below may differ from RCC policy. There is already timetabling for reviews. RCC Parking Policy has primacy and Planning need to consult it.</li> <li>• Differences include: There is no Parking Policy element which refers to a hunt for a new car park, due to the fact that there are no real opportunities to create a new car park.</li> <li>• In terms of statement “number of parking areas do not have marked bays”, it is not in Parking Policy to have such and existing individual bay divides are not to be maintained.</li> <li>• Secondly there is some statement of opinion re: TR3 - which we</li> </ul>	<p>As part of the implementation of the NP, the TC will provide a priority list of areas of concern.</p> <p>Noted, but this is in the rationale rather than within the policy.</p> <p>The comments from the Committee are welcomed, but the TC considers that the detailed points are more appropriate to ongoing liaison/discussion rather than expanding policy wording in the NP. It is acknowledged that RCC as the Highway Authority has overall responsibility for car park policy, but the TC would contest the word “Primacy”. The retention of a formal policy in the NP provides a basis for the TC to promote needs and opportunities based on local knowledge, representing a core element of Localism.</p>

find needs clarifying as opinion (who, when, link to evidence and date/update of evidence) or needs better inclusion /signposting.

- We met with Ron Simpson recently and he explained where the statements might have originated and that statements like “fragmented nature of provision” and the need for “improved management” are not a criticism of RCC parking operations.
- Although we can appreciate comment “insufficient town centre parking at peak time” we feel this needs a note that about where the pressure is (car parks, onstreet restricted or unrestricted areas and which type of user – visitor, business or resident if affected.)
- Our October 2023 spot checks, although we do not disagree with the statement especially when events are on, show some frequent spare capacity in car parks.
- In terms of Seaton Road, for years there has been a process whereby Parish / Town Councils can submit a highways concern for issues to be investigated. Process: <https://www.rutland.gov.uk/roads-transport-parking/transport/report-road-safety-or-transport-issue>
- The issue of car park directional signage has been explored already – in terms of on street signage RCC are waiting on UTC to come back with locations about where they feel it needs improving, in terms of pedestrian signage from car parks to High Street East, there is an issue that foot alleys may not be RCC land nor public rights of way.
- There is also the fact that with the layout and small geographical spread of the town, there is argument that no further signage is needed for motorists or pedestrians.
- The NP refers to a signage section of the plan, linkage / better signposting. RCC Signs Policy and street clutter needs considering.
- The mentioned “cumulative approach” and “potential to refigure existing on and off-street parking” needs explaining further,

<p>especially in light of parking services work with UTC (June meeting where no radical changes were desired). This applies to the mention of an action plan too.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In terms of bus situation further reviews of the interchange provision on North Street East may be considered in-line with public bus network review. Coach parking ideation is ongoing and is open to the highways concern process as mentioned above and well as private parties bringing forward opportunities.</li> <li>• Disabled parking off street is guided by car park layout guidance; on street there are only 2 bays which are out of action on market days. Blue Badges may remain with no time limit in the on street Blue Badge, residents and limited waiting bays, and may park free up to 3 hours in car parks (to be charged for longer than 3 hours).</li> <li>• The concern about aging population needs expanding as there are bays extremely close to shops and if Blue Badges are held, except where there is a loading ban, Blue Badges may remain for up to 3 hours on single and double yellow lines outside shops.</li> <li>• The statement “servicing and unloading cause congestion” needs expanding to be a helpful comment on the town centre situation where one would expect levels of loading and enforcement.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>TR4 Improved facilities for public transport and coaches</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A redesign of the bus interchange is a community aspiration not a land use policy</li> <li>• Uppingham bus interchange has previously been reviewed under the Council’s highway and transport working group. The concern was closed in spring 2021.</li> <li>• Any further review of the interchange provision on North Street East may be considered in-line with public bus network review.</li> <li>• May be of benefit to include suggested locations for coach parking.</li> </ul>	<p>This policy is based on local knowledge and community support, but it is agreed that it is, to some extent, aspirational and that it could be covered by a Community Proposal.</p> <p>The TC will continue to liaise with RCC and operators on this important matter.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is recommended that any development takes into consideration the Bus Service Improvement Plan &amp; Enhanced Partnership Plan and Scheme: <a href="https://www.rutland.gov.uk/busserviceimprovementplan">https://www.rutland.gov.uk/busserviceimprovementplan</a></li> </ul>	
<p><b>CF2 Investment in new/improved community facilities and services</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This policy cannot be used to determine a planning application, more a community aspiration.</li> <li>• Investment is covered by CIL therefore this policy is inappropriate</li> <li>• The final sentence is not clear what is intended.</li> </ul>	<p>The policy covers third sector and private community facilities and services as well as those provided by local authorities and refers to new provision and/or extensions. It is, therefore, a land use policy. Not all investment is covered by CIL.</p> <p>The final sentence, referring to population growth, is clear. Also see comment on Policy H2 (Associated Infrastructure) above.</p>
<p><b>OS2 Open space provision within new housing developments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a) Provision of larger open spaces, and their practicality/viability of is for the determination of RCC as the LPA and not the Town Council</li> <li>• b) Need to reflect that Policy SP22 will be updated</li> <li>• c) Needs clarification</li> <li>• New up to date evidence for the Local Plan has been published for open space assessment, green and blue infrastructure strategy and may need to be taken into account: <a href="https://www.rutland.gov.uk/planning-building-control/local-plan/new-local-plan/local-plan-evidence-base/environment-evidence">https://www.rutland.gov.uk/planning-building-control/local-plan/new-local-plan/local-plan-evidence-base/environment-evidence</a></li> </ul>	<p>As referred to in the latest NPPF (Dec. 2023), LPs should concentrate on strategic matters. Given the focus of the NP on engagement with landowners and developers and local knowledge of needs/aspirations, the TC regards open space provision and designation as non-strategic although it is acknowledged that cross reference to RCC LPs and evident documents is helpful.</p>
<p><b>OS3 Proposed Local Green Spaces</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allotments are already safeguarded by policy CS23 as they fall under the definition of green infrastructure on page 57 Para. 5.18) and as such it is difficult to see what added protections designation of the land as local green space (LGS) would bring even if the site would match the requirements of the NPPF.</li> <li>• Tod's piece is also identified as an Important Open Space and Frontage and subject to Policy SP21 in the Rutland Local Plan</li> </ul>	<p>During the Regulation 14 consultation, the allotment society, allotment holders and member of the public requested the designation of the two allotment sites as LGS. There is, therefore, explicit community support for the policy and, as demonstrated in the table on p57 of the NP, they meet the NPPF criteria for LGS designation. The existing LP protection for Tod's Piece is noted but that document is becoming increasingly out of date and, as referred to in the latest NPPF (Dec. 2023), LPs should clearly concentrate on strategic matters. The TC regards LGS designation as non-strategic.</p>

Clive Keble (Town Planner) 09/01/2023

## **Appendix 1 Note from NPAG on RCC Assessment of sites allocated for housing in the Reg. 16 Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan (UNP)**

As part of their comments on the UNP at the Submission stage, RCC have concluded from their site assessments, published in October 2023 “that none of the UNP sites are suitable for allocation due to them all grade 1 or 2 agricultural land”(sic). It seems that they intend to rely on this conclusion when responding to the developers of the sites as witness their response to Allison Homes request for pre-application advice which quotes the above conclusion.

The UNP planning advisor has prepared a detailed response to the RCC comments made in response to the Rule 16 consultation including quoting from the AECOM Strategic Environmental Assessment which deals specifically with this issue. I believe there are a number of additional points we can make in response, as set out below

- No detailed agricultural land assessments have been carried out. RCC have relied on the very small, crude plans prepared by Natural England. DEFRA describe these plans as “not sufficiently accurate for use in assessment of individual fields and any enlargement could be misleading.”
- Having said this it is clear from the plans that there is no Grade1 land in and around Uppingham, only the “likelihood” of Grade 2 and 3 land. The plans are only “predictive” in assessing the likelihood of best and most versatile agricultural land and should not be relied on for detailed assessments. It is clear that RCC have no understanding of how the plans work - see their assessment of the land which is proposed for travellers site in their Reg.18 Local Plan which they have assessed as Grade 1or 2 agricultural land when site inspection shows that this is a small wooded area incapable of being farmed
- The RCC brownfield land register does not identify any brownfield sites in Uppingham which could be used for housing development instead of greenfield sites.
- All of the UNP sites were considered “suitable” in the site assessments carried out by RCC in December 2019 when preparing the evidence base for their withdrawn Local Plan. They acknowledged that these assessments could be used in the preparation of Neighbourhood plans. These assessments were the only evidence available in the preparation of the UNP.
- In a number of their October 2023 assessments of the proposed UNP allocations they say that the loss of Grade 1 and 2 agricultural land (the best quality agricultural land) means that the sites are not appropriate for allocation “when weighed up against other sites within and adjacent to Uppingham”. They give no indication of what other sites, if any, they have weighed up. It is difficult to see what better sites they may have “weighed up.”

Prepared by N.Townsend (Member of the UNP Neighbourhood Plan Advisory Group). Approved by NPAG on 08/01/2023.