



Rutland
County Council



**Rutland Local Plan Review
Consultation Draft Plan
Incorporating St George's into the plan
RESPONSE FORM**

Please use this form for sending comments to the Council on the Focused Consultation about the Local Plan Review. Comments may also be submitted using the on-line survey on our website www.rutland.gov.uk/localplanreview or sent by e-mail to localplan@rutland.gov.uk.

Please send your response to arrive by 4.45 pm on **Monday 24 September 2018** to the address given on page 4 of this form.

For further information, please see our web page at www.rutland.gov.uk/localplanreview, email localplan@rutland.gov.uk or telephone 01572 722577 and ask for the Planning Policy section.

*Please note that any information supplied to the Council on this form **cannot be kept confidential**. Copies of all responses will be available for inspection at the Council Offices and may be included in a summary schedule of responses to be made available at public libraries in Rutland and on the Council's website. The Council will enter responses on a computer database, to be used by the Council for the purpose of recording and collating comments and for contacting people and organisations about their responses.*

For further information regarding your data protection rights and how the Council processes your data can be found at: www.rutland.gov.uk/my-council/data-protection

Please complete your details and those of your agent if applicable.

Name: Neil Wedge (Town Clerk)	Agent's Name: (if applicable)
Address: Town Hall, 49 High Street East Uppingham Rutland	Agent's address:
Postcode: LE15 9PY	Agent's Postcode:
Organisation: Uppingham Town Council	Agent's organisation
Telephone: 01572 822681	Agent's Telephone:
Email: townclerk@uppinghamtowncouncil.co.uk	Agent's Email:
<i>*Required information</i>	

The Consultation document sets out how the Rutland Local Plan might be changed if the proposal for a new garden village at St. George's is included within the Local Plan as a development proposal. Please use this form to tell us your views about the changes proposed in each section of the consultation document.

Section 1

Implications for the Spatial Portrait, Vision and Objectives

Can you suggest any amendments to the Vision?

Uppingham Town Council is in broad agreement with the items added in bold letters.

In addition it would ask that a further vision is included addressing the impact across both the site and remainder of the county in terms of road usage and volumes.

Can you suggest any amendments to Objectives 1 and 12?

We would ask that the following are included:

Objective 1 – Where there is an established or emerging Neighbourhood Plan the allocation of locations and sites should be delegated to such plans if they include such measures.

Objective 12 – To minimise negative environmental effects of development a co-ordinated vision for handling additional traffic should be established in the rest of the county.

Can you suggest any amendments to proposed Objective 2a?

We would ask that the following are included:

Objective 2a –

Suitable policies to be introduced to mitigate the effect of additional traffic on the rest of Rutland.

An emphasis should be placed upon affordable homes to rent for the people of Rutland.

Can you suggest any amendments to the statement about Delivering Sustainable Growth to 2036?

In order for Uppingham to benefit from this Local Plan the additional economic footfall will require Rutland County Council to provide and fund suitable additional town centre parking and public transport links. The impact of the additional 30 hectares of employment land should not adversely impact the Market Towns in the county.

Section 2
Implications for the Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy

Can you suggest any amendments to the Settlement Hierarchy?

The following observations have been made:

It is unclear whether the new settlement will be designated as a 'smaller town' or 'local service centre' in the lifetime of the plan.

We would like to see evidence of a contingency plan if the scale of development at St. Georges does not proceed as envisaged.

We would prefer to see Oakham and Uppingham referred to as Market Towns.

Can you suggest any amendments to Policy RLP3?

Uppingham Town Council is particularly pleased to see formal acceptance of the importance of respecting the intentions of the existing and emerging Neighbourhood Plans. However, we would like to see this go further and formally delegate the allocation of sites in Uppingham to those plans.

We would also like the wording 'Uppingham is a thriving small town' changed to 'Uppingham is a thriving market town'.

The spatial strategy for development should acknowledge the development immediately adjacent to the county boundaries, for example – Corby.

Section 3
Implications for Housing Requirements across Rutland

Do you support the proposed changes to the distribution of housing development set out in Table 1?

Yes	✓
No	

Can you suggest any amendments to the distribution of housing development?

Whilst we support Rutland County Council in its proposal we note that 300 properties for Uppingham is a minimum and should not preclude the Neighbourhood Plan from allocating land for more properties should we so choose.

Again, we would like to see a contingency plan if the scale of development at St. Georges is less.

Do you support the proposed changes to housing requirements set out in Table 2?

Yes	✓
No	

Please use this space to tell us your views about these changes

We reiterate our comments to the question above (Section 3) and reserve the right to do more.

Additional feedback: Both tables 1 & 2 should more clearly reflect that the numbers are minimum requirements, possibly being stated in the table heading/title.

Section 4
Implications for minerals and waste issues

Please use this space to tell us your views about these proposed changes

The key issue for Uppingham is that adequate measures are taken to manage any additional traffic that changes to the Mineral Safeguarding Area may cause.

Section 5
Proposed new policy for St. George's

Can you suggest any amendments to the proposed new policy for St. George's?

There is a need to strengthen the requirement of new county wide infrastructure to alleviate difficulties caused by this development.

We would strongly recommend that any development over 25 units is subject to an independent design review. Furthermore, a contingency plan should be established in case housing numbers on this proposed site are not delivered as the overall Local Plan is now heavily dependent upon St. Georges location.

We would welcome more clarification and information on the community governance of the new location.

Other feedback:

RLPXX (P.27) – A community owned eco-friendly power generation scheme should be considered for this site to benefit the whole community.

11. Delete 'as far as possible'

Please send your response to arrive by 4.45 pm on Monday 24 September 2018 to:

**The Planning Policy Manager,
Rutland County Council,
Catmose,
Oakham,
Rutland
LE15 6HP**

Thank you for your comments.

The Council will consider all responses before preparing the Submission Draft Local Plan Review. This will be subject to a 6-week formal period for representations early in 2019.

For official use only

Respondent number:

Date received:

Date acknowledged: