

Rutland Local Plan

Regulation 19 Consultation Representations

On behalf of Bowbridge Land Ltd

Date: 21 November 2024 | Pegasus Ref: P24-1788

Author: Richard Brown



Contents.

1. Introduction.....	1
2. Spatial Portrait.....	2
3. Vision and Objectives.....	3
4. Climate Change.....	4
5. Spatial Strategy.....	7
6. Housing.....	10
7. Environment.....	12
8. Site Assessment.....	13

Appendices contents.

Appendix 1 Concept Masterplan at Main Street, Barleythorpe, Rutland

Appendix 2 Appeal Decision APP/A2470/W/22/3312763

Appendix 3 Site Assessment



1. Introduction

- 1.1. These representations are submitted by Pegasus Group on behalf of Bowbridge Land Ltd in response to Regulation 19 consultation the Rutland Local Plan and are in relation to our client's interests at Main Street, Barleythorpe, Rutland. The site location is included at Appendix 1. Our client has previously submitted representations concerning this site to the Regulation 18 consultation on the Rutland Local Plan in January 2024.
- 1.2. Our comments are framed in terms of the legal requirements and tests of soundness that are set out in paragraph 35 of the National Planning Policy Framework, specifically whether the plan is positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy.
- 1.3. Consultation Respondent Details:

	Client's Details	Agent's Details
Title		Mr
First name	Nikki	Richard
Surname	Beers	Brown
Job Title	Consultant	Principal Town Planner
Company/Organisation	Bowbridge Land Limited	Pegasus Group
Email	nikki@bowbridge-group.com	Richard.brown@pegasusgroup.co.uk
Address	Unit 4 Shieling Court Corby NN18 9QD	4 The Courtyard Church Street Lockington Derbyshire DE74 2SL
Telephone		07788 393871

2. Spatial Portrait

2.1. It is noted that the spatial portrait states that:

"[Rutland] is one of the least affordable areas in the region with median house price to median workplace earnings ratio of 9.53 in 2023 compared with 7.59 across the East Midlands".

2.2. For the reasons set out later in this representation, we consider that the spatial strategy for housing does not respond adequately to this acknowledged issue of affordability as it fails to provide sufficient housing land.

3. Vision and Objectives

3.1. It is noted that Strategic Objective 3 Meeting housing needs is:

“Meeting Rutland’s identified current and future diverse housing needs, including the affordability and adaptability of housing, through the provision of well-designed, energy efficient and low/zero carbon new homes”.

3.2. For the reasons set out later in this representation, we consider that the spatial strategy provides insufficient housing land and so this spatial objective will not be achieved.

4. Climate Change

Policy CC1 – Supporting a Circular Economy

4.1. Policy CC1 – Supporting a Circular Economy requires:

“All developments (with the exception of householder applications for extensions and alterations) should be accompanied by a statement setting out their approach to site waste management and how construction waste will be addressed following the waste hierarchy together with 5 Rs of waste management: Refuse, Reduce, Reuse, Repurpose, Recycle”.

4.2. The policy is ambiguous and therefore does not comply with paragraph 16 (d) of the NPPF. In particular, it is not clear on how a decision maker should react to development proposals that submit a statement setting out the approach to site waste management and construction waste. What are the measurable principles that need to be achieved?

4.3. Also of note, outline applications submitted by promoters or landowners who will not necessarily develop the site, will not know how waste management will be dealt with during the construction stage and therefore it would be unreasonable to request this information with the submission of the outline application.

Policy CC2 – Design Principles for Energy Efficient Buildings

4.4. Policy CC2 – Design Principles for Energy Efficient Buildings requires amongst other things that *“Development proposals are expected to meet the highest possible energy efficiency standards.”* It is not clear on what is meant by ‘highest possible’ energy efficiency standards.

4.5. The Regulation 19 Viability Note (September 2024) outlines at paragraph 5.7 that

“The Council has confirmed that its policies in this regard are not seeking standards that are over and above Building Regulations and that, whilst it is seeking Zero Carbon development, it is not mandating Zero Carbon standards”

4.6. Accordingly, if the policy aims are to duplicate the requirements of Building Regulations, then it should be deleted.

4.7. The policy also does not provide measurable principles for the decision maker to assess the proposals. Nottingham City and Broxtowe Councils introduced similar policies in 2014, and evidence from planning permissions indicate that the policies have been ineffective in improving the energy efficiency of new buildings.

4.8. The policy is therefore ambiguous and does not comply with paragraph 16 (d) of the NPPF. It should therefore be deleted.

Policy CC3 – Resilient and Flexible Design

4.9. The policy sets out that

“In order to ensure new development is resilient and flexible to future change, developers should set out in an Energy Statement (that is commensurate with the scale and type of development proposed)...”

- 4.10. It is not clear on what is meant by ‘commensurate with the scale and type of development proposed.’ The policy needs to clearly define what information is required for certain scales of development for it to comply with paragraph 16 (d) of the NPPF.
- 4.11. Criteria a) and c) in relation to minimising overheating and mitigating risks to wind exposure in respect of building integrity duplicate Parts O and C of the Building Regulations, respectively.
- 4.12. Criterion d) requires “the proposal is flexible to future social, economic, technological, and environmental requirements in order to make buildings both fit for purpose in the long term”. This criterion is ambiguous as it is not clear on how a decision maker should react to development proposals and assess how proposals are flexible.
- 4.13. Criterion f) requires “the potential to incorporate a green roof and/or walls to aid cooling, add insulation, assist water management and enhance biodiversity, wherever possible linking into a wider network of green infrastructure.” This policy criterion has not been tested within the Regulation 19 Viability Note (September 2024). For example, any roof would need to be designed for the increased dead load and so there would be additional cost associated with the design and additional structural and foundation supports for this.
- 4.14. The policy duplicates Building Regulations includes additional policy burdens that have not been viability tested and is also ambiguous and therefore does not comply with paragraph 16 (d) of the NPPF. It should therefore be deleted.

Policy CC4 – Net zero carbon (operational)

- 4.15. Policy CC4 requires *“All development proposals and all residential development proposals should provide for the maximum generation of renewable electricity as practically and viably possible on-site (and preferably on-plot).”*
- 4.16. The Regulation 19 Viability Note (September 2024) outlines at paragraph 5.7 that

“The Council has confirmed that its policies in this regard are not seeking standards that are over and above Building Regulations and that, whilst it is seeking Zero Carbon development, it is not mandating Zero Carbon standards”
- 4.17. Accordingly, if the Council are not mandating Zero Carbon standards, then this policy should be deleted. The viability of such standards should not be deferred to application stage as this will delay development proposals coming forward and also potentially undermine the Local Plan.

Policy CC11 – Carbon Sinks

- 4.18. The policy states that where development is proposed on land containing peat soils or other identified carbon sinks, including woodland, trees, hedges, orchards, and scrub; open habitats and farmland and rivers, lakes, reservoirs and wetland habitats, the applicant must submit a proportionate evaluation of the impact of the proposal on any form of identified carbon sink as relevant.



- 4.19. The policy goes on to state that proposals that will result in unavoidable harm to, or loss of identified carbon sinks will only be permitted if it is demonstrated that the site is allocated for development or there is not a less harmful viable option for development of that site.
- 4.20. As currently drafted the loss of a single hedge, tree or shrub and all major developments on agricultural land will be caught by this policy and therefore is in direct conflict with the presumption in favour of sustainable development in the NPPF, particularly with reference to any unallocated site for major development that comes forward. The policy is therefore not consistent with national policy and should be deleted.

5. Spatial Strategy

Scale of Development

- 5.1. Given the acknowledged issue of affordability for homes in Rutland, and the Council's clear objective to meet current and future diverse housing needs, the scale of new homes proposed in the Local Plan is critical.
- 5.2. The scale of housing proposed in the Rutland Local Plan is based upon the current local housing need figure of 123 dwellings per year. However, the Council's own [Housing Market Assessment August 2023](#) concludes at paragraph 48 that:

"Taking account of a range of factors (including recent demographic trends, economic growth and past housing delivery) it is concluded the Standard Method housing need should be considered by the Council as very much a minimum figure with other data typically (but not universally) pointing to a higher figure"
- 5.3. Moreover, the figure of 123 homes per year contrasts starkly with the Government's proposed standard method of 264 homes per year which represents an increase of 115%. This is a very significant difference and, in the context of a clear direction of travel in terms of housing numbers for Rutland, this is concerning.
- 5.4. It would appear, however, that the Pre-Submission Draft of the Rutland Local Plan is simply deferring decisions about housing provision where decisions could be made now to increase housing provision to address the obvious current housing challenge in the County. The current proposed Local Plan will be out of date as soon as it reaches five years old. The Council's proposal to prepare a review of the Local Plan at the same time as the hearing sessions for the currently emerging Local Plan does not represent positive planning – it is an implicit admission that the plan that is being prepared now is out of date.

Assessment of Reasonable Alternatives for Scale of Development within Spatial Strategy

- 5.5. Paragraphs 6.9 to 6.10 of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) sets out the scale of growth that have been assessed as part of the development of the Local Plan, and these include options for 123, 160, and 210 homes per annum. It is noted that 210 homes per annum represents 4,200 homes over the plan period. Tables 6.3 and 6.4 of the SA set out options in more detail and it is noteworthy that the largest scale of development that has been tested is 3,985. This requires explanation because it calls into question the robustness of the process and the justification for the scale of development in the Local Plan.
- 5.6. The SA process is ongoing and iterative and should be updated throughout the plan preparation. Given the Government's recent consultation on standard method figures, it would appear that 264 dwellings per year or 5,280 over the plan period is a reasonable option for the scale of growth and therefore should be assessed to understand the sustainability effects of this scale of development.

Options should be tested through the SA which include a combination of sites or location within the settlement hierarchy which amount to 5,280 homes per year. Without doing so there is a risk that not all reasonable alternatives will have been properly assessed which raises questions about the legal compliance with the SEA / Directive and also means that the spatial strategy is not properly justified and fails this test of soundness.

Housing Trajectory

- 5.7. The Council has not published a trajectory for each of its proposed allocations and so it is not possible to properly interrogate the Council's assumptions for its housing trajectory.
- 5.8. The development strategy relies very significantly on the Stamford North SUE, a site that does not benefit from an implementable planning permission, and the Council does not appear to have published a trajectory for this site with supporting evidence from the developer and other stakeholders. The Council needs to provide evidence which demonstrates the deliverability and developability of sites that are included within its spatial strategy.

As currently presented the Spatial Strategy is not currently justified as it is not supported by a sufficiently detailed housing trajectory. The Plan is therefore unsound. The Council need to submit information showing the contribution that each site makes to the housing supply supported by clear evidence from developers and promoters. Should the Council publish further evidence concerning its housing trajectory, we reserve the right to make further representations on the evidence.

Scale of Buffer

- 5.9. Policy H1 sets out draft housing allocations and includes sites to provide a contingency buffer of 10% to aid delivery of the minimum housing requirement.
- 5.10. The Local Plans Expert Group report, 2016, set out recommendations for a 20% allowance of developable reserve sites to provide extra flexibility to respond to change. A Leicestershire Authority close to Rutland, Harborough District Council, includes a 15% contingency in their Local Plan, over and above their minimum housing requirement which the Local Plan Inspector specifically commented was to provide resilience.
- 5.11. It is suggested that at least a 20% buffer is used in the case of Rutland given the reliance on a single site to meet a significant proportion of housing needs across the County.

Policy SS1 should be modified to include sufficient housing land in appropriate locations to provide 264 dwellings per annum, sufficient for 15 years from the anticipated adoption of the Local Plan and, additionally, includes 20% buffer.

Policy SS1 – Spatial strategy for new development

- 5.12. It is noted that at Background Paper Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy report refers to "main urban areas" which include Oakham (with Barleythorpe) (paragraph 1.2). Policy SS1 – Spatial strategy for new development does not however refer to "main urban areas" and the status of Barleythorpe is not clearly expressed. The Plan does not therefore provide and effective framework for decision making as the status of Barleythorpe is unclear.

Policy SS1 should be modified to set out the main urban areas as a specific tier in the settlement hierarchy and include Barleythorpe within main urban areas alongside Oakham.

- 5.13. Since the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan was published, Policy SS1 has been amended and no longer includes the clause:

“Proposals for housing development on greenfield sites adjoining the Planned Limits of Development of Oakham and Barleythorpe, Uppingham and the Larger Villages will only be released in exceptional circumstances where it is demonstrated that they are needed to maintain a sufficient supply of deliverable and developable land”.

- 5.14. The removal of this clause from the policy is a retrograde step as Policy SS1 no longer provides a policy framework to consider housing proposals where the authority cannot demonstrate a 5-year supply of deliverable housing land, and therefore the Plan loses the policy mechanism to direct development to sustainable locations. However, the reference to “exceptional circumstances” in the originally drafted text should be removed as this is the test for Green Belt and is not appropriate for Rutland where this national designation is not present.

Policy SS1 should be modified to include the clause: “Proposals for housing development on greenfield sites adjoining the Planned Limits of Development of Oakham and Barleythorpe, Uppingham and the Larger Villages will only be released where it is demonstrated that they are needed to maintain a sufficient supply of deliverable and developable land”

Policy SS7 – Residential development in the open countryside

- 5.15. Policy SS7 sets out very restrictive circumstances when new-build open market housing will be permitted in the open countryside.
- 5.16. It is considered that Policy SS8 when read alongside Policy SS1 does not provide the necessary policy framework to consider housing proposals where the authority cannot demonstrate a 5-year supply of deliverable housing sites.

Policy SS7 should be deleted.

6. Housing

Policy H4 – Meeting all housing needs

- 6.1. The policy seeks to tie the market and affordable housing mix as outlined within the latest Housing Market Assessment or other up-to-date evidence of local housing need. Other factors that could affect the most appropriate mix for a site should be considered such as housing market evidence, economic conditions, viability and site-specific circumstances like character.
- 6.2. The requirement for all new housing sites to make provision for specialist housing across all tenures including extra care and other forms of supported housing is not viable. This type of provision will only be viable to run by providers at a certain scale, this part of the policy needs to be revisited.
- 6.3. It is also not clear whether the implications criteria a-d within this policy have been tested by the viability appraisal supporting the Local Plan.

Policy H5 – Accessibility standards

- 6.4. The policy requires *“All new dwellings are required to be adaptable and accessible as defined in part M4(2) Category 2 Accessible and adaptable dwellings of the Building Regulations, unless, by exception only, where M4(2) is impractical and unachievable.”*
- 6.5. Paragraph: 009 (Reference ID: 63-009-20190626) of the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) outlines that accessible housing requirement needs to be based on evidence of need, viability and a consideration of site-specific factors. Chapter 6 of the Council’s Housing Market Assessment (August 2023) considers the needs of older and disabled people. The report identifies that Rutland is following nationwide trends of an ageing population, however it fails justify the requirement for 100% M42 given that the population profile of those occupying the dwelling will not all require this accessibility standard. Notwithstanding the Government’s announcement that the normal minimum accessibility requirement will be M4(2), the evidence does not provide clear justification that all new dwellings should be built to M4(2) standards at this moment in time.
- 6.6. The policy also requires sites of 50 or more dwellings, to deliver a minimum of 2% of all dwellings to meet part M4(3) of the Building Regulations. This is not caveated with respect to taking account of site-specific factors such as vulnerability to flooding, site topography and any other circumstances that would prevent step free access. This needs to be included with reference to M4(3) requirements.
- 6.7. It is considered that to provide certainty in meeting the need for self/custom build, the Council should allocate specific sites or self/custom build housing and also provide a criteria-based approach to provide flexibility for more sustainable sites outside settlement boundaries to come forward and boost the supply of self/custom build within the District. Pockets of land within a strategic site are simply not an appropriate nor desirable location for those who want to construct their own home. The evidence base at paragraphs 7.20 and 7.22 of the Housing Market Assessment (August 2023) supports this approach.



Policy H7 – Affordable housing

- 6.8. The policy duplicates policy within the NPPF and PPG with respect to viability assessments and therefore these elements should be removed.
- 6.9. Criterion d) outlines that affordable housing must
- “achieve a minimum of 25% of all affordable homes secured through developer contributions as First Homes (with the exception of Oakham and Barleythorpe whilst they are covered by [their Neighbourhood Development Plan](#) which was 'made' on 24 June 2022), unless a contrary approach is justified by the relevant paragraph of the NPPF”*
- 6.10. There is no justification provided for this exception.

7. Environment

Policy EN3 – Biodiversity Net Gain

- 7.1. The Environment Act 2021 requires all development schemes in England, from a date to be specified in January 2024, to delivery mandatory 10% biodiversity net gain to be maintained for a period of at least 30 years. It is therefore unnecessary for the local plan to set out a policy on this matter, requirements relating to matters such as Biodiversity Gain Plans and use of the DEFRA metric will all be covered by the Planning Practice Guidance.
- 7.2. This policy is not necessary, a single ecology policy should be prepared which should cross reference to the national mandatory requirement for 10% net gain.

Policy EN4 – Trees, woodland, and hedgerows

- 7.3. The policy repeats itself and contradicts itself with respect to how existing trees/hedgerows should be treated. The policy should be refined to state that trees of arboricultural/landscape/ecological value should be retained unless it can demonstrate that the need and/or public benefit of the proposed development outweighs the value of any trees or hedges removed.

Policy EN6 – Protecting agricultural land

- 7.4. Policy EN6 is not necessary as it repeats national policy set out in the NPPF.
- 7.5. The second bullet point includes the requirement to clearly demonstrate that there are no other more suitable and sustainably located sites available, this is too onerous and impractical to address on an individual site application in a scenario where, for example, additional housing land is needed to meet the five-year supply requirements.
- 7.6. This policy should therefore be deleted.

Policy EN12 – The historic and cultural environment

Policy EN13: Protecting heritage assets

- 7.7. There are many elements in both policies that repeat policy within the NPPF. These elements should be deleted.

8. Site Assessment

- 8.1. Our client submitted representations to the Regulation 18 consultation in January 2024, promoting the site at Main Street, Barleythorpe.
- 8.2. Officers have confirmed the sites that have been assessed as part of the preparation of the Local Plan. Despite being put forward to the Council for its consideration, the Council has not assessed our client's site. This is a significant shortcoming of the strategy and site selection process, as the Council has not assessed all reasonable alternatives for sites. In addition, no Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment supports the Local Plan and therefore the sites have not been sequentially assessed. The Local Plan is therefore not justified.
- 8.3. We have carried out an assessment for the site at Main Street, Barleythorpe using the Council's methodology, and it is clear from this work that the site passes stage 1 and 2a. It is also worth noting that the site at Main Street, Barleythorpe has no flood risk and is therefore preferable to the allocated site H1.1 at Stamford Road, Oakham, which contains land within flood zone 3.
- 8.4. Stage 2(b) involves the professional judgement of officers at the County Council which we do not have access to but given the location of the site in the most sustainable settlement in the County and its performance against stage 2(a), it would be at least as suitable and sustainable as allocations and commitments in the Local Plan. Its omission in the site assessment process is therefore a serious shortcoming.

The spatial strategy is not properly justified as it has failed to consider the reasonable site alternative at Main Street, Barleythorpe, and is therefore unsound. The site at Main Street Barleythorpe should be assessed using the Council's site assessment process and, in light of the findings, the spatial strategy should be reviewed, and amended as necessary to ensure it is the most appropriate strategy in light of the reasonable alternatives.

We have carried out a site assessment using the Council methodology and the site at Main Street, Barleythorpe is at least as suitable and sustainable as the allocations and commitments in the plan and should therefore be included as an allocation. Furthermore, the site in a single site ownership and is deliverable within 5 years of the Local Plan being adopted.

The site at Main Street, Barleythorpe

- 8.5. Our client's site is situated in Barleythorpe, a location that the Council's evidence: *"Background Paper Spatial Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy report"* refers to within the context of concentrating growth *"on the main urban areas of Oakham (with Barleythorpe)"* (paragraph 1.2). It is therefore located in the most sustainable location in the County.
- 8.6. A proposal for 150 homes on the site was considered at appeal (reference APP/A2470/W/22/3312763). at Appendix 2. It is important to note that the dismissal of the appeal was in the context of a then up-to-date Development Plan, where the Council could demonstrate a 5-year supply of housing land and where the site was outside settlement limits. The tests for decision making in this context are very different to those at plan making and do not rule out the site as suitable site for development.

- 8.7. The principle reason for dismissal by the inspector was for the “identified harm to the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside” could apply to any greenfield site on the edge of a settlement, including allocations proposed by the Council in the Pre-submission draft Local Plan. The Local Plan allocates sites to meet its identified needs and by necessity needs to include greenfield sites.
- 8.8. The appeal decision confirms that the site:
- is not located on the best and most versatile agricultural land.
 - is not in an area formally recognised for its landscape value.
 - not a valued landscape as referred to in paragraph 174(a) of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).
 - contribution to a wider landscape is limited due to its enclosed nature.
 - the development would be near to the built-up extents of Oakham and Barleythorpe and so it would not appear isolated.
 - All ... vantage points would be from private land.
 - Through sensitive layout and landscaping, the proposal would also avoid a dominating visual effect on Barleythorpe.
 - The southern part of the development away from the proposed access could be laid out and screened in a similar manner to the SUE (to the east of Main Road) so a perceived gap between Oakham and Barleythorpe would remain. The northern part of the development would be more obvious due to the proposed access. However, the houses opposite the appeal site already extend further in the direction of Oakham compared to properties on Pasture Lane. Therefore, development on the west side of Main Road that mirrors the line of houses opposite would avoid a sense of the separation between Barleythorpe and Oakham being reduced. As such, the development could be designed so as to prevent a harmful visual effect as a consequence of reducing the gap between the 2 settlements
- 8.9. The appeal decision also confirmed that there were no technical constraints to the site coming forward and also confirms the facilities that are accessible from the site:
- Catmose College and Primary School, Oakham town centre, the nearest convenience store and supermarkets, a hospital, a medical centre and a dental practice. Oakham railway station would also be within reasonable walking distance with a lit footpath along Main Road providing a convenient pedestrian route.
 - Bus stops that allow access to bus services to Oakham town centre are also near the site on Main Road. Consequently, the location of the development would promote opportunities to walk, cycle and to use public transport. In these respects, the proposal would accord with the aim to promote sustainable transport as set out in the Framework and CS policy CS1.



- 8.10. The level of technical work supporting the site is very detailed, which is likely to be much more detailed than other allocated sites, which provides a confidence with respect to delivery of the site within the next 5 years.

Conclusion

- 8.11. The site at Main Street, Barleythorpe is suitable and sustainable and would satisfy the Council's site selection process had it been included. It is also worth noting that the site at Main Street, Barleythorpe has no fluvial flood risk and is therefore preferable to the allocated site H1.1 at Stamford Road, Oakham which contains land within flood zone 3. A concept masterplan has been included at Appendix 1 which addresses the issues raised within the appeal decision and shows that the site achieves significant open space provision providing clear separation between Oakham and Barleythorpe and clear views from Main Street to the wider countryside.



Appendix 1

Concept Masterplan at Main Street, Barleythorpe, Rutland



Appendix 2

Appeal Decision APP/A2470/W/22/3312763



Appendix 3

Site Assessment

Name of site

Land at Main Road, Barleythorpe

Gross Site Area

5.8

Net Site Area

2.78

Type of site

Greenfield

Current land use/character of site (Please mark all that apply)

Agriculture

Indicative Number of dwellings

87

Indicative Floor Space

Please indicate the approximate timescale for availability:

Within 5 years

Stage 1

Is the site located adjacent to or within the built-up area of Oakham, Uppingham, Stamford or a Larger Village or capable of delivering a new stand -alone settlement?

Adjacent to Oakham PLD.

Planning permission in place for housing which is not yet implemented in full and is included in the Five-Year Land Supply Monitoring Report

No

Comments: 2022/0325/MAO- Outline application for up to 150 residential dwellings with all matters reserved except for access for the development of land off Main Road, Barleythorpe – was refused and dismissed at appeal APP/A2470/W/22/3312763.

Is the site wholly or predominantly within a SSSI or European Nature Conservation Site (SPA/RAMSAR)?

No

Does the site wholly or predominantly contain a Scheduled Monument?

No

Comments: Oakham motte and bailey castle and medieval gardens Scheduled Monument – 1,025m

Is residential site lying wholly or mostly (more than 50%) within Flood Zone 3?



No – site is entirely within flood zone 1

Is the site excluded from further analysis?

No

Stage 2a

SSSI Impact Risk Zones

AMBER = Site is within a Natural England Impact Zone – Impact Zone indicates that Natural England required to be consulted on likely risks.

Comments: The ecology report supporting the application and appeal for proposals on the site identified that the survey area sits within a number of IRZs, however these do not apply to residential development. In addition, no issues were raised by statutory consultees during the determination of the application in respect of being within the Impact Zones.

Proximity to a Local Wildlife Site

GREEN = not within Local Wildlife Site

Proximity to a BAP priority habitat

GREEN = >50m

Biodiversity

GREEN = 100m watercourse

Landscape Sensitivity

RED = High Sensitivity

Landscape sensitivity Comments

The Landscape Sensitivity Study 2023 identified this site in parcel OAK17 and is considered high impact/sensitivity to development. Site was further considered during appeal decision APP/A2470/W/22/3312763 which found that the site is not in an area formally recognised for its landscape value, and development could be accommodated so a perceived gap between Oakham and Barleythorpe would remain.

Proximity to a Registered Park or Garden

GREEN = >50m

Proximity to a Scheduled Monument

GREEN = (1200m)

Proximity to a listed building

GREEN = >50m

Tree Preservation Orders

GREEN = site does not intersect with TPO

Agricultural Land Quality

GREEN = not located on the best and most versatile agricultural land

Fluvial flood risk

GREEN = Flood risk zone 1



Surface water flood risk

AMBER = Limited areas of medium surface water flood risk are present in the site

Groundwater Source Protection Zones

GREEN = not within a SPZ

Open Space

GREEN = No loss of public open space

Minerals

GREEN = does not intersect with a Minerals safeguarding Area

Employment Site

GREEN = no loss of employment land

Primary Schools

GREEN = Catmose Church of England Primary School – 1000m

Secondary Schools

GREEN = Catmose College adjacent to the site

Topography

GREEN = flat with no topographical constraints

Biodiversity- International and National Designations (SSI, SAC, SPA and Ramsar)

AMBER = Site is within a Natural England Impact Zone – Impact Zone indicates that Natural England required to be consulted on likely risks.

Comments: The ecology report supporting the application and appeal for proposals on the site identified that the survey area sits within a number of IRZs, however these do not apply to residential development. In addition, no issues were raised by statutory consultees during the determination of the application in respect of being within the Impact Zones.

Biodiversity – Local Designations

GREEN = No significant on local wildlife sites, protected sites and BAP priority habitats

Settlement Planned Limits of Development

GREEN = Site is bound on 3 sides by settlement boundary/limit to development

Heritage Assets

GREEN = No impact on heritage asset

Archaeology

No impact on scheduled monument

Green Infrastructure

GREEN = not a public open space/recreation facility- no loss/impact

Important open space

GREEN = not designated

Water Conservation and Management- Flood Risk



GREEN = no flood risk

Access

GREEN = Satisfactory access can be achieved

Impact on wider road network

GREEN = No significant impact on the wider road network

Rights of Way

None

Suitable?

Yes

Does the Site pass the stage 2a screening process

Yes

Proximity to a Conservation Area

RED = Intersects or is adjacent

Previously Developed Land

RED = Greenfield

Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)
Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004

East Midlands

4 The Courtyard, Church Street, Lockington,
Derbyshire, DE74 2SL
T 01509 670806
E EastMidlands@pegasusgroup.co.uk
Offices throughout the UK.

Expertly Done.

DESIGN | ECONOMICS | ENVIRONMENT | HERITAGE | LAND & PROPERTY | PLANNING | TRANSPORT & INFRASTRUCTURE

Pegasus Group is a trading name of Pegasus Planning Group Limited (07277000) registered in England and Wales.

Registered office: 33 Sheep Street, Cirencester, GL7 1RQ
We are ISO certified 9001, 14001, 45001



Pegasus_Group



pegasusgroup



Pegasus_Group

PEGASUSGROUP.CO.UK