

# Rutland County Council Officer comment on draft Reg 16 Edith Weston NP



Reference	Comment on draft NP
<b>3.0</b>	<b>Sustainable Growth</b>
Policy EW-SG01: Development within the Settlement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The RCC Housing Strategy Officer considers this policy rules out the principle of the development of a hypothetical modest cul-de-sac of affordable housing within the PLD, which would help to meet local housing need.</li> </ul>
Policy EW-SG02: St George's Barrack's Officer's Mess	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support for the inclusion of a policy relating to St George's Barracks Officers' Mess                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reference to materials doesn't seem to indicate a preference for materials appropriate to the historic context of the village. Suggest para 6 could do with a caveat that recycled and green materials will be supported where they don't result in harm to village character.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>4.0</b>	<b>Green Environment</b>
Policy EW-GE01: Natural and Green Environments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proviso e) Needs to explain what designation applies to 'ridge and furrow' landscape?</li> <li>Also applies to figure 5 map of ridge and furrow, what is the designation</li> </ul>
Policy EW-GE02: Local Green Spaces	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The play areas and amenity open space 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>NPPF paragraph 102. Sets out that the Local Green Space designation should only be used where the green space is:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves;</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

# Rutland County Council Officer comment on draft Reg 16 Edith Weston NP



Reference	Comment on draft NP
	<p>b) demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and</p> <p>c) local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.</p>
<b>5.0</b>	<b>Design and Heritage</b>
Rutland Landscape Character Assessment 2003	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The NP could also refer to the Landscape Sensitivity &amp; Capacity Study (2012) which includes landscape around Edith Weston and the Rutland Water Area Review (2019)</li> </ul>
Design Guidelines for Rutland November 2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggest refer to Core Strategy Policy CS19 Promoting Good Design and Site Allocations Policy SP15 Design and amenity</li> </ul>
Policy EW-DH01: Sustainable Design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to consider whether this policy adds anything to the Design Guidelines and needs to be more locally specific to Edith Weston</li> <li>Part 5, is proviso b) necessary? Are apartments likely to complement the village and the wider village character</li> <li>Under ‘Examples of positive design features to reduce carbon use are.’ It may be useful to define what are photovoltaics.</li> </ul>
DH02: Planned Estates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Part 2) A number of amenity open space have been identified as LGS, although suggest they need to demonstrate why they should be. It might be helpful to clarify what is meant by this? Play areas and amenity open space are safeguarded under Local Plan policy CS23</li> </ul>

# Rutland County Council Officer comment on draft Reg 16 Edith Weston NP



Reference	Comment on draft NP
EW-DH03	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The RCC Conservation Officer, from the perspective of the coverage of the Historic Environment comprising the identified Conservation Area and important Non-designated Heritage Assets is satisfied that the Neighbourhood Plan for Edith Weston has covered the Heritage and built Conservation aspirations for the settlement in line with Local and National Planning Policies. Therefore, the NP identifies the importance of preserving features within the settlement.</li> </ul>
DH04: Non-designated Heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It's unclear / how should they be protected. Suggest retained?</li> <li>Still consider it would be helpful to have supporting text/justification to explain why they should be protected and their settings</li> <li>The RCC Conservation Officer states it is necessary that the plan puts the emphasis on those important Non-designated Heritage Assets which will be afforded weight for future preservation in any development considerations within the settlement during the duration of the Neighbourhood Plan.</li> </ul>
<b>6.0</b>	<b>Transport and Movement</b>
Policy EW-TM01: Transport and Movement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Part 3a) Already covered by Local Plan Policy SP15 section L) – Doesn't add to this policy, Suggest needs to be more specific and set out parking standard or be in accordance with council's adopted standards</li> <li>Part 3b) Does the garage class as secure cycle parking for dwellings?</li> <li>Part 4) Already covered by SP15 section L) – Doesn't add to this policy</li> <li>Part 6) suggest already covered by SP15 section m) most highways works would not need planning permission,</li> </ul>