

No.	Policy Ref.	Description	Agree?	Feedback / Key Points	
SP		The Spatial Portrait	No	a	Strategic Objective 2 talks about two vibrant market towns. It is good to see a strategic objective that legally requires RCC to support Uppingham
				b	Strategic Objective 9 confirms RCCs commitment to public transport. This is important to Uppingham in respect of the 747 bus and the Hopper Bus.
				c	Strategic Objective 10 reinforces the point at a) above and is welcomed.
				d	Welcome the support to both Market Towns.
				e	There are concerns about the viability of Uppingham Gate (UPP02) if employment land expands in the remainder of the county.
V&O		Vision & Objectives	Yes	a	In general UTC supports this section
1	RLP1	Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development	Yes	a	In general UTC supports this policy
2	RLP2	Sustainable Development Principles	Yes	a	In general UTC supports this policy
3	RLP3	Spatial Development in Towns & Villages	No	a	UTC objects strongly to the imposition of sites for development when these should be dealt via the refreshed Neighbourhood Plan.
	RLP3			b	The planned limits of development for Uppingham should not be amended by RCC but should be a matter for the refreshed Neighbourhood Plan.
	RLP3			c	The areas for development within Uppingham should not be imposed by RCC, but be a matter for the refreshed Neighbourhood Plan where the east of the town should be considered and put to the community for feedback.
	RLP3			d	Delete the word moderate in relation 'Uppingham should be a focus for growth'.
4	RLP4	Built Development in Towns & Villages	Yes	a	In general UTC supports this policy
5	RLP5	Residential Development in Towns & Villages	Yes	a	In general UTC supports this policy
6	RLP6	Development in Countryside	No	a	The planned limits of development for Uppingham should not be amended by RCC but should be a matter for the refreshed Neighbourhood Plan.
7	RLP7	Non-Residential Development in the Countryside	Yes	a	In general UTC supports this policy
8	RLP8	Re-Use of Redundant Military Bases & Prisons	Yes	a	In general UTC supports this policy
9	RLP9	Use of Military Bases & Prisons for Operational & Other Purposes	No	a	There are concerns about the viability of Uppingham Gate (UPP02) if employment land expands in the remainder of the county. Uppingham Town Council would like to be engaged fully in the possible direction the St. Georges Barracks site takes in the future.
10	RLP10	Delivering Socially Inclusive Communities	No	a	Whilst UTC generally agrees with this policy we would like to see banks included in the list of key assets where alternative use would not be supported.
	RLP10			b	A key part of social inclusivity is community and public transport and it's disappointing that the Local Transport Plan won't be available until late 2017.
11	RLP11	Developer Contributions	Yes	a	In general UTC supports this policy

12	RLP12	Sites for Residential Development	No	a	UTC supports UPP/04, UPP/06 (A), UPP 08 and UPP 11
	RLP12			b	UTC does not support UPP/05 (A) without an independent review first being produced to demonstrate safe access to the site and no adverse impact on local employment site opposite.
	OAK/04	Oakham, Land South of Brooke Rd	Not Applicable	f	UTC does not feel it appropriate to comment on this site
	OAK/05	Oakham, Land off Uppingham Road	Not Applicable	g	UTC does not feel it appropriate to comment on this site
	OAK/08(A)	Oakham, Land off Stamford Rd & Uppingham Road	Not Applicable	h	UTC does not feel it appropriate to comment on this site
	OAK/13	Oakham, Land off Burley Road (part mixed use development)	Not Applicable	i	UTC does not feel it appropriate to comment on this site
	UPP/04	Uppingham, Land South of Leicester Road	Yes	j	UTC supports allocation of this site for housing
	UPP/05(A)	Uppingham, Land off Ayston Road	No	k	UTC does not support UPP/05 (A) without an independent review first being produced to demonstrate safe access to the site and no adverse impact on local employment site (UPP/02) opposite. This also impacts the northern entrance to the town in terms of 'townscape'. This is currently outside of the permitted area of development to the North.
	UPP/06(A)	Uppingham, Land off Leicester Road	Yes	l	UTC supports allocation of this site for housing as already in the Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan
	UPP/08	Uppingham, Land North of Leicester Road	Yes	m	UTC supports allocation of this site for housing as already in the Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan
	UPP/11	Uppingham, Land South of Leicester Road	Yes	n	UTC supports allocation of this site for housing as already in the Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan
	COT/13	Cottesmore, Land off Mill Lane	Not Applicable	o	UTC does not feel it appropriate to comment on this site
	EDI/02(A)	Edith Weston, The Yews Well Cross	Not Applicable	p	UTC does not feel it appropriate to comment on this site
	EMP/01(A)	Empingham, West of 17 Whitwell Road	Not Applicable	q	UTC does not feel it appropriate to comment on this site
	GRE/01(A)	Greetham, Part of Greetham Quarry, Stretton Road (as part of mixed use site)	Not Applicable	r	UTC does not feel it appropriate to comment on this site
	GRE/02	Greetham, Land South of Oakham Road	Not Applicable	s	UTC does not feel it appropriate to comment on this site
	KET/02	Ketton, Land Adjacent to Empingham Road	Not Applicable	t	UTC does not feel it appropriate to comment on this site
	KET/03(A)	Ketton, Land West of Timbergate Road	Not Applicable	u	UTC does not feel it appropriate to comment on this site
MAR./04	Market Overton, Main Street	Not Applicable	v	UTC does not feel it appropriate to comment on this site	

	RYH/04	Ryhall, River Gwash Trout Farm, Belmesthorpe Lane	Not Applicable	w	UTC does not feel it appropriate to comment on this site
	RYH/06(A)	Ryhall, Between Meadow Lane & Belmesthorpe Road	Not Applicable	x	UTC does not feel it appropriate to comment on this site
	WHI/06	Whissendine, Land off Melton Road	Not Applicable	y	UTC does not feel it appropriate to comment on this site
	WHI/09(A)	Whissendine, South Lodge Farm	Not Applicable	z	UTC does not feel it appropriate to comment on this site
13	RLP13	Cross Boundary Development Opportunity	Not Applicable	a	UTC does not feel it appropriate to comment on this site
	LIT/01	Little Casterton, Land at Quarry Farm (Stamford North)	Not Applicable	f	UTC does not feel it appropriate to comment on this site
	LIT/02	Land at Quarry Farm (Stamford North)	Not Applicable	g	UTC does not feel it appropriate to comment on this site
14	RLP14	Housing Density & Mix	No	a	This is currently in conflict with the Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan and will be addressed in the refresh.
	RLP14			b	UTC is not convinced that all new developments should provide a mix of property types and would wish to see RCCs evidence to support this policy before committing ourselves further.
15	RLP15	Self Build & Custom Building	No	a	Whilst UTC generally supports the policy of self build we do not agree with para 2 requiring 5% of new build to be allocated to self build.
16	RLP16	Affordable Housing	Yes	a	In general UTC supports this policy
17	RLP17	Rural Exception Housing	Yes	a	UTC supports this policy.
18	RLP18	Gypsies & Travellers	Yes	a	In general UTC supports this policy
19	RLP19	New Provision for Industrial & Office Development & Related Issues	Yes	a	In general UTC supports this policy
	OAK/13	Oakham, Land to Northeast of Oakham off Burley Road	Not Applicable	f	UTC does not feel it appropriate to comment on this site
	GRE/01	Greetham, Greetham Quarry	Not Applicable	g	UTC does not feel it appropriate to comment on this site
	UPP/02	Uppingham, Land at Uppingham Gate	No	h	Whilst UTC supports the use of this site for employment land we are conscious that it has not been fully occupied for some time. For this reason we would support joint use for employment and some residential development.
	KETT/11	Ketton, Land at Pitt Lane	Not Applicable	i	UTC does not feel it appropriate to comment on this site
20	RLP20	Expansion of Existing Businesses & Protection of Employment Sites	No	a	Please see comments above re site UPP/02 and possibility that this site becomes mixed employment and residential development land.
21	RLP21	The Rural Economy	Yes	a	In general UTC supports this policy

22	RLP22	Agricultural, Horticultural, Equestrian & Forestry Development	Yes	a	In general UTC supports this policy
23	RLP23	Local Visitor Economy	Yes	a	In general UTC supports this policy
24	RLP24	Rutland Water	Yes	a	In general UTC supports this policy
25	RLP25	Eyebrook Reservoir Area	No	a	UTC would like to see the evidence base upon which RCC seeks to ban camping and caravan sites at this location.
	RLP25			b	The same general policies that apply to Rutland Water should be applied to Eyebrook Reservoir.
26	RLP26	Caravans, Camping, Lodges, Log Cabins, Chalets & Similar Forms of Hol. Accommod	No	a	This policy does not seem to address caravan and camping sites and again UTC would wish to see evidence from RCC as to the stance being taken.
	RLP26			b	In general terms UTC wishes to see policies that support growth in tourism in support of RLP23.
27	RLP27	Town Centres & Retailing	No	a	UTC welcomes the general policy of supporting retailing in Uppingham but challenges the recommendations of the Retail Capacity Assessment Update 2016 which seeks to downgrade some of Uppinghams primary shopping area in direct defiance of the Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan.
	RLP27			b	UTC gives notice that it intends to commission its own independent retail assessment and requires that RCC await the outcome of this before moving this matter forward.
	RLP27			c	UTC considers it undemocratic of RCC to restrict development in Uppingham in favour of Oakham and considers RCC to be failing in its duty to represent the interests of all Rutland residents fairly.
	RLP27			d	The redesignation of High Street West, Orange Street and Queen Street is not supported in the RCC retail assessment 2016 update which suggests "no change to the primary shopping frontage in Uppingham town centre is recommended". (page 41)
28	RLP28	Primary & Secondary Shop Frontages	No	a	UTC gives notice that it intends to commission its own independent retail assessment and requires that RCC await the outcome of this before moving this matter forward.
29	RLP29	Site for Retail Development	No	a	Again UTC considers the Oakham centred approach being taken by RCC to be failing in its duty to all residents of Rutland and asks to see firm evidence to support RCCs proposed policy.
	R1	Tim Norton, Long Row	Not Applicable	f	UTC does not feel it appropriate to comment on this site
30	RLP30	Securing Sustainable Transport & Accessibility Through Development	No	a	UTC awaits with interest the publication of the Local Transport Plan (LTP) before it can comment on this policy.
	RLP30			b	UTCs initial view (subject to sight of the LTP) is that this policy is at variance with RLP27 which seeks to restrict the development of shopping amenities in Uppingham.
	RLP30			c	Following recent government announcement regarding mainline electrification from Corby public transport links from Uppingham to Corby take on a greater importance.
31	RLP31	Electric Car Charging Points	Yes	a	In general UTC supports this policy
32	RLP32	High Speed Broadband	No	a	We would like to see evidence that alternative service providers are being encouraged by RCC to ensure that Rutland receives the very best deal.

33	RLP33	Delivering Good Design	No	a	Whilst UTC is in general agreement with this policy we feel that it does not go far enough. We strongly recommend to RCC the adoption across the county of the policy in the Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan that requires developers to submit to an independent architectural review on every site of more than 25 dwellings.
34	RLP34	Accessibility Standards	Yes	a	In general UTC supports this policy
35	RLP35	Advertisements	Yes	a	In general UTC supports this policy
36	RLP36	Outdoor Lighting	Yes	a	In general UTC supports this policy
37	RLP37	Energy Efficiency & Low Carbon Energy Generation	Yes	a	In general UTC supports this policy
38	RLP38	The Natural Environment	Yes	a	In general UTC supports this policy
39	RLP39	Sites of Biodiversity & Geodiversity Importance	Yes	a	In general UTC supports this policy
40	RLP40	The Historic & Cultural Environment	Yes	a	In general UTC supports this policy
41	RLP41	Protecting Heritage Assets	Yes	a	In general UTC supports this policy
42	RLP42	Green Infrastructure, Sport & Recreation	Yes	a	In general UTC supports this policy
43	RLP43	Important Open Space & Frontages	Yes	a	In general UTC supports this policy
44	RLP44	Provision of New Open Space	Yes	a	In general UTC supports this policy
45	RLP45	Landscape Character Impact	Yes	a	In general UTC supports this policy
46	RLP46	Spatial Strategy For Minerals Development	Yes	a	In general UTC supports this policy
47	RLP47	Mineral Provision	Yes	a	In general UTC supports this policy
48	RLP48	Safeguarding Rutland's Mineral Resources	Yes	a	In general UTC supports this policy
49	RLP49	Development Criteria for Mineral Extraction	Yes	a	In general UTC supports this policy
50	RLP50	Site Specific Allocations for the Extraction of Crushed Rock	Not Applicable	a	UTC does not feel it appropriate to comment on this policy
	M4a	Greetham Quarry North West Extension	Not Applicable	f	UTC does not feel it appropriate to comment on this site
51	RLP51	Site Specific Allocations for the Extraction of Building Stone	Not Applicable	a	UTC does not feel it appropriate to comment on this policy
	M5a	Hooby Lane Quarry Extension	Not Applicable	f	UTC does not feel it appropriate to comment on this site
52	RLP52	Safeguarding of Minerals Development	Yes	a	In general UTC supports this policy

53	RLP53	Borrow Pits	Yes	a	In general UTC supports this policy
54	RLP54	Development of Criteria for Other Forms of Minerals	No	a	UTC does not feel that sufficient evidence has been provided by RCC to allow such a wide ranging policy (which lacks detail) to be adopted without such evidence being first provided.
55	RLP55	Waste Management & Disposal	Yes	a	In general UTC supports this policy
56	RLP56	Waste Related Development	Yes	a	In general UTC supports this policy
57	RLP57	Sites for Waste Management & Disposal	Not Applicable	a	UTC does not feel it appropriate to comment on this policy
	W1	Cottesmore, Burley Road	Not Applicable	f	UTC does not feel it appropriate to comment on this site
	W2	Greetham, Wood Lane	Not Applicable	g	UTC does not feel it appropriate to comment on this site
	W3	Ketton, Ketco Avenue	Not Applicable	h	UTC does not feel it appropriate to comment on this site
58	RLP58	Restoration & Aftercare	Yes	a	In general UTC supports this policy
Implementation and monitoring framework:					
59	App 1	List of Strategic Policies		a	
	App 1			b	
	App 1			c	
60	App 2	List of Replaced Local Plan Policies		a	
	App 2			b	
	App 2			c	
61	App 3	Local Plan Evidence Base Studies		a	
	App 3			b	
	App 3			c	
62	App 4	Agricultural, forestry and other occupational dwellings		a	
	App 4			b	
	App 4			c	
63	App 5	Parking Standards		a	
	App 5			b	
	App 5			c	
64	App 6	Areas of Biodiversity and Geodiversity Importance		a	
	App 6			b	
	App 6			c	
65	App 7	Designated Heritage Assets in Rutland		a	
	App 7			b	
	App 7			c	
66	App 8	Open Space Standards		a	
	App 8			b	
	App 8			c	
67	App 9	Permitted Sites for Minerals Extraction & Recycled Aggregates		a	
	App 9			b	
	App 9			c	
68	App 10	Waste Management Needs		a	
	App 10			b	
	App 10			c	
69	App 11	Glossary		a	
	App 11			b	
	App 11			c	

Section 2 - Additional Comments & Feedback					
70		Other Comments	No	a	The community and UTC feel strongly that the planned limits of development should be set by the process to refresh the Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan.
				b	In delivering the consultation version of the Local Plan, RCC have excluded site UPP/09 and as part of the Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan refresh we will undertake and commission a review of the site viability such that it could at least supply 49 dwellings to match those under site UPP/05 which is currently not supported by UTC pending an independent review into the access and other issues.
				c	In delivering a refreshed Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan we will potentially look at the site viability for one containing 55+ single storey accommodation.
				d	RCC have excluded the Welland Vale site (UPP/10) from the Local Plan and this is now considered very much part of the retail offer in Uppingham. This will be reviewed as part of the Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan refresh.

Policy in the Local Plan Review Existing Policies replaced*

- RLP1 - Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development SP1, MCS1
- RLP2 - Sustainable development principles CS1, MCS10
- RLP3 - The Spatial Strategy for Development CS2, CS4, CS5,CS9
- RLP4 - Built development in the towns and villages SP5
- RLP5 - Residential Proposals in Towns and Villages SP5
- RLP6 - Development in the Countryside SP6
- RLP7 - Non-residential development in the countryside SP7, MCS2, MCS6
- RLP8 - Re-use of redundant military bases and prisons CS6
- RLP9 - Use of military bases and prisons for operational or other purposes SP11
- RLP10 - Delivering socially inclusive communities CS7
- RLP11 - Developer contributions CS8
- RLP12 - Sites for residential development SP2
- RLP14 - Housing density and mix CS10
- RLP16 - Affordable housing CS11, SP9
- RLP17 - Rural Exception Housing SP10
- RLP18 - Gypsies and travellers CS12
- RLP19 - New provision for industrial and office development and related uses CS14
- RLP20 - Expansion of existing businesses and protection of existing employment sites CS13
- RLP21 - The rural economy CS16
- RLP22 -Agricultural, horticultural, equestrian and forestry development SP13
- RLP23 - Local Visitor Economy CS15
- RLP24 - Rutland Water CS24, SP26, MCS8
- RLP25 - Eyebrook Reservoir Area SP27
- RLP26 - Caravans, camping, lodges, log cabins, chalets and similar forms of self-serviced holiday accommodation SP24, SP25
- RLP27 - Town centres and retailing CS17
- RLP28 - Primary and secondary shopping frontages SP12
- RLP29 - Sites for retail development SP3
- RLP30 - Sustainable transport and accessibility CS18, MCS9, MDC11
- RLP32 - High Speed Broadband SP14
- RLP33 - Delivering Good design CS19, SP15
- RLP35 - Advertisements SP16
- RLP36 - Outdoor lighting SP17
- RLP37 - Energy efficiency and low carbon energy generation CS20, SP18
- RLP38 - The natural environment CS21, MDC1, MDC6, MDC7,MDC8
- RLP39 - Sites of biodiversity and geodiversity importance SP19, MDC1, MDC6
- RLP40 - The historic and cultural environment CS22, MDC1, MDC3,MDC5
- RLP41 - Protecting heritage assets SP20, MDC1, MDC3, MDC5
- RLP42 - Green infrastructure, sport and recreation CS23, MDC1
- RLP43 - Important open space and frontages SP21, MDC1
- RLP44 - Provision of new open space SP22,
- RLP45 - Landscape character SP23, MDC4
- RLP46 - Spatial strategy for minerals development MCS3, MCS4,MCS11,MDC9,MCS6,MCS7
- RLP47 - Mineral provision MCS2
- RLP48 - Safeguarding Rutland's Mineral Resources MCS10, MDC10
- RLP49 - Development criteria for mineral extraction MDC1, MDC2, MDC3, MCS5, MCS6, MCS7, MCS8, MDC6, MDC7, MDC8
- RLP52 - Safeguarding of minerals development MCS10, MDC10
- RLP55 - Waste management and disposal CS25, MCS11
- RLP56 - Waste-related development SP28, MDC9
- RLP57 - Sites for waste management and disposal SP4
- RLP57 - Restoration and aftercare MCS12, MDC12

*Policy numbers refer to the following documents:

CS= Core Strategy DPD (July 2011)

SP= Site Allocations and Policies DPD (October 2014)

MCS= Minerals Core Strategy & Development Control Policies DPD (October 2010)

Existing policies not replaced and to be deleted

Policy

SP8 – Mobile homes and residential caravans

CS3 – The settlement hierarchy