



**ANDREW BEARD**  
PLANNING

Rutland Council  
Local Plan Team  
Catmose  
Oakham  
Rutland  
LE15 6HP

Via email [localplan@rutland.gov.uk](mailto:localplan@rutland.gov.uk)

Date: 28<sup>th</sup> November 2024  
Ref: ABP/0516

Dear Sir/Madam,

**NEW RUTLAND LOCAL PLAN – REGULATION 19 PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION**

**SUBMISSIONS ON BEHALF OF CAVENDISH GOSPEL HALL TRUST**

The Cavendish Gospel Hall Trust is part of the Plymouth Brethren Christian Church and are responsible for the provision of places of worship to serve the congregation.

The halls fall within Use Class F.1(f) as a place of worship (church) and provides a community facility in planning terms.

The need for churches creates demand for smaller local halls, close to villages and towns serving 35-50 people and then there is a large main hall (serving the whole congregation at around 450, but with capacity for maximum 750) currently based close to Ketton.

The Trust has ongoing difficulties in finding sites for new churches due to the following factors: -

- Policies are interpreted to only support settlement sites, but these are in high demand for housing and commercial uses.
- The churches are low density, low uses which does not support the full and effective use of settlement sites.
- Many of the congregation are rural households where urban sites would increase travel distances.



## ANDREW BEARD

PLANNING

The Trust are disappointed that their representations on the draft Plan dated 5<sup>th</sup> January 2024 have not been taken on board in the Reg 19 plan.

**The key objection is the lack of inclusion of community uses alongside employment in policies.**

**The plan is deficient in dealing with community uses.**

Policies should reflect NPPF 85 to allow community facilities sometimes outside settlement boundaries.

“85. Planning policies and decisions should recognise that sites to meet local business and **community needs** in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements, and in locations that are not well served by public transport. In these circumstances it will be important to ensure that development is sensitive to its surroundings, does not have an unacceptable impact on local roads and exploits any opportunities to make a location more sustainable (for example by improving the scope for access on foot, by cycling or by public transport). The use of previously developed land, and sites that are physically well-related to existing settlements, should be encouraged where suitable opportunities exist.

This has not been taken through into the Rutland Local Plan.

**Community uses must be included as a suitable option within the countryside.**

**Also, weight should be given to the sensitive expansion of existing facilities within the countryside sensitive in scale and to its surroundings.**

The failure of the Reg 19 policies to support community uses alongside employment in rural areas fly against the objectives of NPPF 93.

“a) **plan positively** for the provision and use of shared spaces, **community facilities** (such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, open space, cultural buildings, public houses and **places of worship**) and other local services to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments;



## ANDREW BEARD

PLANNING

Policy SS1 sets out housing and employment targets and policy to be within planned limits, it does not specifically refer to other uses, but is then generally used against community buildings adjacent or beyond settlement boundaries.

It is very important therefore that other policies are worded to reflect NPPF 85 and 93.

**OBJECT** to lack of inclusion of community uses (F class) in **Policy SS8**

Criteria 1-10 does not include community uses

ADD new criteria –

11 new community uses growth comprising sustainable rural services where no acceptable alternative can be identified within existing permitted or allocated sites, or within or through redevelopment of existing commercial premises;

12 an extension of an existing community use which is of a size which is in keeping with the existing landscape character of its location;

Community uses must be referred to specifically within policy SS8 to align with the NPPF guidance and weight.

**SUPPORT SC6** “Development proposals and activities that protect, retain, or enhance the provision, quality or accessibility of existing community, education, leisure, and cultural facilities will be supported.”

This statement is why policy SS8 should reflect community uses.

The Trust would welcome amendments to policy wording to ensure that community facilities can be brought forward or enhanced/expanded as part of non-residential uses outside planned limits.

The current policies are not legally compliant or sound in that they do not align with NPPF guidance on community uses.

Please place these representations before the Examination.

Kind Regards

*p.p. PABeard*

**Andrew Beard MRTPI**  
**Consultant**

Attached – Draft Plan representations 05/01/2024