



Rutland Local Plan Review 2015-2036 Issues and Options Consultation November 2015-January 2016

Response Form

Please use this form for submitting comments to the Council. When completed it should be submitted to the Council by **Tuesday 12 January 2016**. A separate Site Submission form is available if you want to put forward a site for development for inclusion in the Local Plan. The address to which forms should be sent is shown on page 8 of this form. You may photocopy the form or obtain more copies free of charge from the Council on request.

Data protection: 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.

1. Contact detail	1. Contact details			
Title	Mr			
First Name	ne Neil			
Last Name	Wedge			
Job Title (where relevant)	Town Clerk			
Organisation (where relevant)	Uppingham Town Council			
Address Line 1	Town Hall			
Line 2	49 High Street East			
Line 3	Uppingham			
Line 4	Rutland			
Post Code	LE15 9PY			
Telephone Number	01572 822681			
Email address	Click here to enter text.			

2. Agent's conta	ct details (if applicable)		
Title	Click here to enter text.		
First Name	Click here to enter text.		
Last Name	Click here to enter text.		
Job Title	Click here to enter text.		
Organisation	Click here to enter text.		
Address Line 1	Click here to enter text.		
Line 2	Click here to enter text.		
Line 3	Click here to enter text.		
Line 4	Click here to enter text.		
Post Code	Click here to enter text.		
Telephone Number	Click here to enter text.		
Email address	Click here to enter text.		

Please note: You may answer as many or as few questions as you wish.
Question 1 - How should the Local Plan Review play a coordinating role in the preparation of neighbourhood plans?
 □ Option A: Continue the current approach showing an overall figure for the amount of development to be accommodated across the Local Service Centres? □ Option B: The Local Plan Review to specify the amount of development to be accommodated in each of the Local Service Centres?
☐ Option C : The Local Plan to specify the amount of development to be accommodated in each of the Local Service Centres where there is a current or proposed neighbourhood plan and an overall figure for the remaining Local Service Centres? ☐ Option D : Another option? (Please specify with reasons)
Continue the current approach showing an overall figure for the amount of development to be accommodated across the Local Service Centres in consultation with the Neighbourhood Plan's authorised body.
Question 2 - Do you agree with the spatial portrait, objectives and vision as set out in the Council's current development plan documents?
☑ Yes □ No
If no, please state specify any changes that you consider necessary, giving reasons for your comments Click here to enter text.
Question 3 - Do you agree with the proposed grouping of villages in the settlement hierarchy in terms of the services and facilities available in those villages?
□ Option A: To include villages in the groups as shown in the proposed settlement hierarchy in Option A?
☐ Option B :To include villages in the groups as shown in the proposed settlement hierarchy in Option B?
☑ Option C:To include particular villages in different groups to those shown in Option A and Option B
If so, please specify the changes to the proposed settlement hierarchy that you consider necessary, giving reasons for this.
We suggest that Barrowden should join the other listed Local Service Centres and that Caldecott is added to the Accessible Villages with Limited Facilities.

Please note: You may answer as many or as few questions as you wish.
Question 4 - How much new housing should the Local Plan Review provide for over the next 21 years 2015-2036:
☑ Option A : Provide for the level of growth indicated in the SHMA (average of 173 dwellings per year)?
☐ Option B : Provide for a higher level of growth than identified in the SHMA Update? (Please specify with reasons)
□ Option C : Provide for a lower level of growth than identified in the SHMA Update? (Please specify with reasons) Click here to enter text.
Question 5 - Do you consider that any additional sites for employment, retail or other types of
development should be allocated in the Local Plan Review?
✓ Yes□ No
If yes, please state what additional sites will be required giving reasons. Any additional sites should be taken account of as part of the Neighbour Plan and any subsequent reviews.
Question 6 - How should the future mix of new housing in Rutland be planned?
 □ Option A1: Specify in detail the mix of dwellings types, sizes and tenures (including specialist provision) across Rutland and to specify a requirement for affordable housing; □ Option B1: Specify in broad terms the mix of dwellings types, sizes and tenures (including specialist provision) across Rutland with and to specify a requirement for affordable housing; □ Option C1: Do not specify of the mix of dwellings types, sizes and tenures allowing the market to decide, but to specify a requirement for affordable housing.
 Another option? (If so, please specify) Do not specify the mix of dwelling types, sizes and tenures allowing the market to decide, but to
specify a requirement for affordable housing and always deferring to the local Neighbourhood Plan.
Question 7 - Do you agree that the distribution of growth between the towns and villages in
Rutland should:
☐ Option A : maintain the current apportionment of new development between the towns and villages?
 Option B: provide for a higher proportion of growth at Oakham? Option C: provide for a higher proportion of growth at Uppingham?
 Option D: provide for higher level of growth at the Local Service Centres? Another option, for example a new settlement or the use of previously developed land outside
the towns and villages? Please specify giving reasons for this option. Provide for a higher level of growth at the Local Services Centres, Smaller Service Centres and
Villages with Limited Services.

Please note: You may answer as many or as few questions as you wish.
Question 8 - Do you agree that the distribution of new development between Oakham and Uppingham should?
 ☑ Option A: maintain the current apportionment of new development between Oakham and Uppingham. ☐ Option B:Provide for higher growth at Oakham. ☐ Option C: Provide for higher level growth at Uppingham ☐ Another option? ☐ Yes ☐ No
If yes, please specify giving reasons for this option. Click here to enter text.
Question 9 - Which are the most suitable directions for growth in and around Oakham (please select as many as apply)?
 □ Option 1:Previously developed land and buildings within the built-up area of the town. □ Option 2:South-east of Oakham (between the bypass and the railway) □ Option 3:South of Oakham (between the railway and Brooke Road) □ Option 4:South of Oakham (between Brooke Road and Cold Overton Road) □ Option 5: West of Oakham (between Cold Overton Road and Barleythorpe Road) □ Option 6:North of Oakham (between Melton Road and the railway, outside the bypass) □ Option 7:North east of Oakham (between the railway and Burley Road, outside the bypass) □ Option 8: East of Oakham (between Burley Road and Stamford Road, outside the bypass)
☑ Another option? (Please specify with reasons) This is for Oakham Town Council to determine through their Neighbourhood Plan.
Question 10 - Should future growth at Uppingham continue to be focussed on allocated sites to the north and west of the town?
□ Yes ☑ No
Another option? (Please specify with reasons) Future direction of growth should be determined by the Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan.

Please note: You may answer as many or as few questions as you wish.
Question 11 - Do you agree with the proposed approach to providing for a steady and adequate supply of minerals by:
 identifying a provision rate for limestone of 0.19 Mtpa based on the average aggregate sales for the most recent ten year rolling period (2004 – 2013); maintaining a sufficient stock of permitted reserves for limestone and clay in order to supply the Cement Works at Ketton at the existing output of 1.4 Mt of cement production per annum not identifying a provision rate for other forms of mineral extraction and aggregate production?
 Option A) Identify the provision to be made for minerals as proposed above. Option B) Identify the provision to be made for minerals through another method.
If so please specify the changes to the proposed approach that you consider necessary, giving reasons for this. Click here to enter text.
Question 12 - Do you agree with the proposed approach that would see the current spatial strategy and locational elements taken forward into the Local Plan Review (including the designated areas for future minerals extraction and area of search); the development criteria being combined into fewer policies and refining these to also address minerals specific planning requirements (where appropriate); and continuing with the approach of not including site-specific allocations.
 ☑ Option A) Include the spatial strategy and locational elements as proposed above. ☐ Option B) Alter the currently adopted spatial strategy and locational elements to be taken forward into the emerging plan.
If so please specify the changes to the proposed approach that you consider necessary, giving reasons for this. Click here to enter text.
Question 13 - Do you consider that any additional sites for minerals extraction and aggregate production need to be allocated to ensure a steady and adequate supply of aggregates?
□ Yes ☑ No
If yes please state what additional sites will be required giving reasons and site-specific information. Click here to enter text.

Please note: You may answer as many or as few questions as you wish.
Question 14 - Do you agree with the proposed approach to be taken to safeguarding of mineral resources and related development that would see the Minerals Safeguarding Area (MSA) and planning requirements refined to address local circumstances (including identification of building stone resources) and align with national policy and guidance?
 □ Option A) Continue with the current approach to the MSA. ☑ Option B) The current MSA and planning requirements for development proposals within the MSA should be refined as proposed above. □ Option C) Alter the current approach to the MSA using a different method.
If so please specify the changes to the proposed approach that you consider necessary, giving reasons for this. Click here to enter text.
Question 15 - Do you agree with the proposed approach to identifying waste arisings and indicative waste management and disposal capacity requirements detailed in the Local Waste Management Needs Assessment 2015?
 Option A) Identify the indicative capacity requirements for waste management and disposal as proposed. Option B) Identify the indicative capacity requirements for waste management and disposal through another method.
If so please specify the changes to the proposed approach that you consider necessary, giving reasons for this. Click here to enter text.
Question 16 - Do you agree that a new policy addressing LLW management and disposal outlining local planning requirements should be prepared for inclusion in the Local Plan? ☑ Yes
□ No Click here to enter text.

Please note: You may answer as many or as few questions as you wish.
Question 17 - Do you agree with the proposed approach to be taken to the spatial strategy and locational elements of the Local Plan regarding waste management and disposal which would see the current spatial strategy taken forward into the emerging Local Plan; the development criteria refined to reflect national policy and guidance where necessary; and continuing with the approach of not including site-specific allocations for large scale advanced treatment facilities, new landfill site(s), hazardous waste management facilities or inert disposal not associated with restoration of quarries.
 Option A) Include the spatial strategy and locational elements as proposed above. Option B) Alter the currently adopted spatial strategy and locational elements to be taken forward into the emerging plan.
If so please specify the changes to the proposed approach that you consider necessary, giving reasons for this. Click here to enter text.
Question 18 - Do you consider that any additional sites for waste management use (in particular small scale facilities such as materials recycling facility, composting, anaerobic digestion, inert recycling/processing or other suitable processes) will be required to facilitate delivery of the indicative waste management capacity requirements over the plan period?
 □ Option A) Yes, additional sites will be required. If yes please state what additional sites will be required giving reasons and site-specific information (including land owner contact details). ☑ Option B) No, the existing allocations and enabling policies are sufficient to allow sites to come forward over the plan period. Click here to enter text.
Question 19 - Is there any additional infrastructure that will be required to support the new development in Rutland that will be required in the period to 2036?
If yes, please specify with reasons. a) Bypass b) Improved access road to Station Road c) cycle paths d) improved footpaths e) coach park f) car park (improved disabled, child/parent and a long stay car park on the perimeter g) internal bus service and external service to villages h) schools, healthcare and other infrastructure proportionate to the amount of development to 2036

Please note: You may answer as many or as few questions as you wish.
Question 20 - Are there any other issues that will need to be addressed in the Local Plan Review?
W Voc
⊻ Yes
□ No
If yes, please specify with reasons There needs to be proportionate sustainability as stated in Q19 – any supporting infrastructure needs to be planned and considered in advance. Additionally the amount of units develop per hectare should be determined by the Local Neighbourhood Plan. In section 3.4 of the supporting documents 'As the Review progresses, it will be important that any neighbourhood plans already under preparation should conform with its policies and provide for any new development that may be required in the period to 2036'. This statement in our opinion is misleading and it should read 'As the Review progresses, it will be important that any neighbourhood plans already under preparation should generally conform with its policies and provide for any new development that may be required in the period to 2036'.
Other relevant information – Please use the space below to provide additional information or further explanation of any of the topics covered in this form.
Uppingham Town Council is keen to work on a collaborative basis with Rutland County Council in the production of this Local Plan, but would like to emphasise that the Localism Act envisages much greater say by communities that have a Neighbourhood Plan, than was the case in the past.
Signature: Neil Wedge
Date : 07/01/2016
Places return this form by Tuesday 12 January 2016 to:

Please return this form by **Tuesday 12 January 2016** to:

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

or send by email to localplan@rutland.gov.uk

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY Reference: Click here to enter text.

Date received: Click here to enter text. Date acknowledged: Click here to enter text.

Rutland Local Plan Review – Issues and Options Consultation				
		9		