

Notes on Local Plan January 2020

Executive Summary

- A massive document and its very size may deter the average citizen from reading it; a pity given its importance and implications.
- Despite the size of the document so far there are no Strategic Policies separately identified (which has a key importance for the Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan).
- This draft Plan, if approved by RCC council members, will fundamentally change Rutland and Uppingham for the next generation of residents.
- The only feedback required under the legislation is whether or not the Local Plan is “Sound” and/or Legally Compliant.
- There is good news for Uppingham in that there is written confirmation in Policy H1 Sites for Residential Development that these are to be allocated in Uppingham’s refreshed Neighbourhood Plan subject to a minimum figure of 200 dwellings and a maximum figure of 240 (we are currently working on a figure of 225). We must make these allocations within 3 years of the Local Plan being adopted by RCC or else they will go back to imposing sites upon us.
- There are still some areas that we will be less pleased with (listed in the summary at the end of this document) in particular interference with Uppingham Shopping Areas, lack of a relief road strategy, potentially issues around the Planned Limits of Development and the on-going favouring of Oakham regarding future business development in the county.
- At the end of this briefing note is a proposed formal communication to be sent from Uppingham Town Council to the Chief Executive at RCC and our three Ward Councillors.

5.7 A breakdown of housing completions, commitments and proposed sites by settlement category is set out in Table 2 below:

	Minimum Requirement @ 130 per annum	Net Completions (2018-19)	Commitments (as at April 2019)	Capacity identified in the Land Plan	Total supply
St. George's brownfield site*		0	0	1,000	1,000
Windfalls**				300	300
Oakham		99	409	382	890
Uppingham		34	85	200	319
Local Service Centres		66	53	249	368
Other Villages		12	53	0	65
County Total	2340	211	600	2131	2942

* Assumes rate of delivery for the Garden Community of 100 per annum over the period 2025-36, (with the first 100 split 25 in 2025/26 and 75 in 2026/27 and any remaining development occurring beyond the plan period)

** Assumes 20 per annum for 15 years 2021-36

Summary of pros and cons for Uppingham

It is likely the Uppingham community will be pleased by:

- Strategic objectives 3,5,6,7,8,9 and 10 and 13 to 16
- Support for the Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan (4.13)
- Site allocations to be done by UNP (5.8)
- Promoting Uppingham as a destination (6.47)
- Policy E10 – Protecting shop frontages
- Possibility of a second supermarket (6.67)
- Use of Article 4 to protect shops (6.63)
- Section on good design (Policy EN3)
- Sustainable building and construction (Policy EN4)
- Environmental protection (Policy EN9)
- The historic and cultural environment strategic policy (Policy EN15)
- Advertisement restrictions (Policy EN17)
- Securing sustainable transport (Policy SC2)
- Five year review period

It is likely the Uppingham community will be concerned about:

- Wanting clarification that there is sufficient capacity in the County for waste water treatment plants given the proposed rate of expansion.
- Strategic objective 2 (specifically concerning the scale of development, hierarchical impact on Uppingham and concerns about infrastructure and traffic rather than the principle of developing this site).
- The favouring of Oakham growth in preference to Uppingham (6.50)
- Limiting Uppingham growth (6.52) “ The strategy does not preclude development opportunities from coming forward in Uppingham, but any schemes will be expected to be relatively small-scale appropriate to the role and function of the town, and should not detract from the focus of the strategy being on Oakham as the higher-order centre”
- Policy E9 – Not only Oakham but also Uppingham serves **all of Rutland** (and parts of Leicestershire and Northamptonshire too) – Uppingham does not just serve its hinterland
- Comparison goods priority given to Oakham (6.70)
- We would welcome more appropriate broadband targets (Policy SC3)
- Map Inset 59: **Uppingham Local Plan Pre-Submission Policies Map town centre** – Seeks to override the UNP for Queen Street
- Lack of a relief road strategy

Recommendation of the Local Plan Working Party to Neighbourhood Plan Advisory Group (NPAG)

The following communication should be sent to the Chief Executive RCC and our three RCC Ward Councillors:-

Heading: Pre-official consultation feedback on Draft Local Plan

Purpose: Queries and clarifications to aid Uppingham NPAG in making its formal response when the official consultation period opens.

Overall NPAG finds much to be commended in the draft Local Plan documents that we have seen so far. We are particularly pleased to see the proposal for site allocations in Uppingham to be delegated to the refreshed Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan. We believe that this is entirely appropriate with the spirit of local involvement with the Planning Process in an area with both an existing Neighbourhood Plan and an emerging refreshed Neighbourhood Plan. We note the requirement to come forward with appropriate site allocations within three years of the Local Plan being formally adopted and for a minimum allocation of 200 homes to be made within the Neighbourhood Plan.

1. We would however seek clarification within the Local Plan that for Uppingham the Planned Limits of Development should be set by the Neighbourhood Plan (provided that they do not extend beyond the boundaries of the Neighbourhood Plan area itself).
2. The matter of the A6003 (and indeed a relief road for Uppingham) needs referencing within the Local Plan especially given the significance of additional traffic likely to be generated from developments to the north and south of Uppingham. Uppingham Town Council intends to investigate funding the costs of formally surveying the route of a relief road in Uppingham and supporting its inclusion within the refreshed Neighbourhood Plan.
3. For Policies E1 and E3 Employment Land we seek flexibility for the Neighbourhood Plan to designate a more mixed use for sites in Uppingham.
4. For 6.52 RCC should remove the words “and should not detract from the focus of the strategy being on Oakham as the higher order centre” and replace them with “or as determined in the Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan”.

5. Policy E9 needs to be challenged as it gives the idea that Uppingham somehow doesn't serve the whole of Rutland. Given that the strategy of RCC is stated as supporting the two Market Towns there is no need for such a statement within this policy.
6. For 6.76 we refer to our previous feedback and do not see why RCC won't leave the designation of primary and secondary shop frontages in Uppingham to the Neighbourhood Plan especially as the RCC proposals conflict with the already made Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan.
7. We would welcome clarification of Policy EN13 Local Green Spaces as to whether all sub-points a) – f) have to apply in order to designate a Local Green Space or if it simply needs one or more of the sub-points.