

From: Richard S. Hurwood, Rutland resident

27th November 2024

Comments on Regulation 19 Rutland Local Plan

On the introductory page, under soundness the document reads::

- *positively prepared - provides a strategy which, as a minimum, seeks to meet our objectively assessed needs. **Have the needs been objectively assessed?***
- *justified - an appropriate strategy... based on proportionate evidence. **Is this volume of potential renewable energy sites appropriate? Where is this evidence?***

CC2: A typical home EV charger is rated at 7kW, and you must have a power supply that is large enough for the EV to operate at its rated capacity. An installer told me that this isn't a requirement for new homes build. **If so, why not?**

CC7: Pot and kettle: look at the council offices!

CC8: The interactive map shows potential wind and solar farms all over the place; as you say in this paragraph many of these sites will be inappropriate. **Did no-one do a common-sense objective assessment of this?**

CC10: Makes no mention of small nuclear reactors.

CC13: See CC2.

CC14: Mentions only new developments. Drainage in Lyddington is currently inadequate and houses have been repeatedly flooded in recent years. Residents of long standing have been lobbying RCC about this for years. On Tuesday 25th November 2024 RCC and Leicestershire & Rutland Fire Service emergency teams attended flooded houses in the village, a significant reason for which was leaves blocking the drains. **This issue needs addressing now, and any future development must be preceded by a thorough inspection of the drains and flood risk.** Parish Council observations on this topic are well informed and highly relevant: and please read Annex A (below) on this topic.

SS1: I disagree with how RCC has defined larger villages; purely arbitrarily in my view, and please note my comments at CC14. **The latest plan has altered Lyddington's PLD. Why?**

SS2: As I previously wrote (see Annex B below) **I have been told that Uppingham holds Lyddington's allocation for social housing: where are the details of this in the plan?**

H2: Of the 2000 house planned for Stamford north; **can you confirm only 650 are geographically within Rutland?**

E4 and E5: runs counter to the map showing where wind and solar farms might be put (see CC8 comments).

E9: I remember when Empingham Reservoir was being proposed in the 1970s that the county was assured it would never become a tourist attraction.

SC1: **Why doesn't this cover wind and solar farms?** I think it should.

SC2: **Again why does CC8 trump this?** It's all the same landscape!

INF 4: The document mentions Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Integrated Health Board; **should that read Integrated Care Board?**

Attached is a potentially out of date policy document about NHS primary care estates; as it was written by now decommissioned CCGs, **is it still relevant?**

And **what about care closer to the patients** and development of investigation facilities e.g. MRI scanners in the county?

I may have made some errors in my reading of this very bureaucratically formed document, which I found user-unfriendly in the extreme, but I hope my points come across clearly.

Thank You

ANNEX A

Statement by Councillor Gale Waller, Leader of Rutland County Council on 18th January 2024

“Storm Henk led to the worst flooding in Rutland for over a generation. Our officers have worked tirelessly to mount a response, within the existing policies of the Council, and we are continuing to provide help and support to people who’ve been affected. We are also lobbying national government to release extra funding for flood-hit areas.

“Tonight’s Special Meeting has given Councillors and residents a chance to discuss the issue of flooding and I would like to thank all those who took the time to read questions and deputations.

“It’s clear that severe weather incidents like Storm Henk and Storm Babet are becoming more common and having a bigger impact on communities. While the previous Council declared a Climate Crisis in 2021, this has not been matched with sufficient resources, until now. Our new Administration has made this a priority and set money aside in its first budget to achieve meaningful objectives in response to climate change.

“A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment was completed in October of last year and will help to inform a review of the Council’s current Flood Risk Management Strategy. Our new strategy will be developed in consultation with residents and key stakeholders and will need to reflect the growing risk of flooding to homes and business premises in the County – not just the kind of surface water flooding we’ve seen in the past.

“We have also taken steps to commission a detailed investigation into the causes and circumstances of this month’s flooding. This is a thorough process which can take significant time, as we know from other councils who’ve carried out the same kind of review. Once complete, it will provide firm recommendations for all those who have responsibility for managing and responding to local flooding.”

ANNEX B

My comments on the previous draft plan submitted on 3rd January 2024

I did not find the on-line format easy to follow, and may have missed some of the answers to these queries. So that I can respond properly to the consultation in time, please could you reply by close of play 5th January. Many thanks.

1. Housing

(1) Developers

(a) It appears that in the plan there is an over allocation of houses being built of Rutland’s requirements. Despite this, it seems one developer is encouraging RCC to increase even further the numbers of houses to be built; (William Davis Representation ID 4921 received by RCC on 28/12/23). I object to Rutland planning for more houses than are legally required.

(b) Is there a list of “land banks” held by developers that already have planning permission but haven’t yet been developed?

(2) St George’s Barracks (RAF North Luffenham)

(a) The military sites at North Luffenham and Cottesmore (apart from the Officers Mess at Edith Weston) are excluded from the housing requirement plan. Why?

(b) RAF North Luffenham was one of the UK bases holding the thermonuclear warheads for Thor missiles (Project Emily) between 1959 and 1963. Is there a report showing radioactivity levels at and under the site, and any run off channels?

(3) Social Housing

I have been told that Uppingham holds Lyddington’s allocation for social housing: where are the details of this in the plan?

2. Traffic

(1) HGV limits

Somewhere in the document I read that new roads can only be built in conjunction with new developments, which would appear to preclude an Uppingham bypass anytime soon. To protect both Caldecott and Uppingham, I suggest a 7.5-ton weight limit on the A6003 from the roundabout at the top of Rockingham Hill to the A47 north of Uppingham. HGVs would travel from Corby on the A43 to Duddington and then on to the A47. As there is new development of business parks etc at the northern edge of Corby, HGV movements will (and probably already are) increasing along the A6003. This would need coordination with North Northamptonshire Council.

(2) School Transport

Why aren’t there more school buses? Better provision might reduce traffic congestion at drop off and pick up times: Uppingham Community College has considerable issues with this.

3. Slide 3 of the online presentation

At slide 3 of the presentation: I can’t find speech bubbles to talk about health: where are the 4 GP surgeries? Is the medical centre at Kendrew Barracks included? What is the future for Oakham Hospital? What about the proposed MRI scanner?

4. Slide 6 of the online presentation

in the short term our increasing population needs more food; we are importing ever increasing food materials, much of which (I understand) has been grown under less stringent conditions than the UK’s regulations. Slide Farming: “protection of agricultural land”

5. Infrastructure

(1) Energy

I can’t see mention of the proposed solar farm at Woolfox: where is mention of this in the document?

(2) Crime and Policing

Where is mention of this in the document?