

Warning: This email originates outside of Rutland County Council.

Do **NOT** click on links or attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Please report any issues or concerns to the IT Service Desk.

>>

>> REG 19 Representation.

>>

> Dear Planning

>> I am sorry but I am out of the country and have no access to word and /or a computer - and despite many attempts, it's impossible to do this on the online platform from a phone.

>> Given the circumstances, please can you ensure that my representation is sent to the inspector. I would also be happy to assist the inspector further with any aspects of my comments and I am happy to attend the hearing.

>

> Many thanks

>

>>

>> Soundness OBJECT

>> Legal Compliant OBJECT

>>

>> Soundness.

>> The whole plan is premature given the government had announced its intention before this consultation started that it is going to change the process of determining housing requirement's. This plan will

>> Imminently be superseded. The decision to proceed rather than wait a few weeks cannot be deemed sound. Furthermore much of the evidenced used to support this proposed plan is still being completed and many reports have been gathered since regulation 18 of which the public have not been able to comment on.

>>

>> Legally Compliant

>> I have objected as I believe that RCC has totally ignored the Edith Weston's Neighbourhood Plan in its decision to include the Officers Mess site at larger numbers. H1.2

>> The Neighbourhood plan carries legal weight. The Parish Council consulted with RCC throughout this long process and their plan was informed by the number RCC gave them for 51 houses.

>> The parish council had commissioned its own professional report from Aecom that stated 21 houses given its rural location. But with the advice from a planning consultant it was agreed to use and work with the figures RCC had proposed.

>> For RCC to ignore this and then allocate 85 houses on the site is simply unacceptable and there is NO evidence to demonstrate the need to deviate from ten agreed numbers

>> At the point of this consultation starting the NP was in its final stages and approved and commended upon by the inspector with a just few minor wording changes.

>> The Neighbourhood plan is now fully adopted and despite a huge amount of community work it has been totally ignored.

>> Edith Weston's Neighbourhood Plan has legal weight and for this reason the allocation of an access of housing in this location renders the plan unsound.

> Since the figure of 51 was given by RCC - 6 further houses have been built so I believe the number of houses in this site should be reduced to 45 to be legally correct.

>>

>> POLICIES.

>> SS1 - Not justified

>> To have a vision for Rutland from which the strategic objectives follow - that say the majority of the built environment will be focused on the two main towns to create sustainable living and then to largely ignore this and focus on putting a third of the county's allocation into just 3 of the 21 larger villages makes no sense and can't be deemed sound or justified.

>> There is no evidence to support this decision in the sustainability appraisal.

>> RCC needs to have a more balanced approach to growth- it's either the majority in truly sustainable locations where there are jobs and transport, that does not rely on the car or if rural housing is considered to be acceptable then the allocated numbers need to be considered across the county - not all of it placed in 3 villages. There are plenty of sites available and most do not join a conservation village or a triple SSSI.

>

> Policy H1.2 Not Sound or Justified

> The allocation of 85 houses at the Officers Mess in Historic Edith Weston is not justified

> This needs to be adjusted to 45 houses to reflect the Neighbourhood plan. Edith Weston takes its responsibility to the environment seriously and the policy should also refer to carbon positive building, the reuse of the tennis court, the reusing of materials to be a circular economy and serious consideration to the flood & surface water - of which there are many unresolved issues in the village already.

> It may be worth noting that NO consideration has been evidenced to reuse some pretty impressive buildings.

>

> Furthermore there needs to be consideration as to the impact of the main SGB site especially given there is evidence to suggest there may be a protected nature area here/triple SSI of which the buffers are not yet known. This site borders open countryside which may well be a wildlife corridor to the main site. To date there has been little reporting of evidence to consider this priority.

>

> ST George's Barracks Not justified.

> The principles below this policy are woefully inadequate and should be removed. They are also premature given the site is under consultation for an SSSI.

> It would be better just to say - that should this site NOT be classed as a triple SSSI it would be subject to a full exemplar master planning process with a full, genuine & transparent consultation. The details of which would exceed best practice and be carbon positive. Any new build on this site would not coalesce with either neighbouring village but have its own identity.

> Lastly RCC know the site has insufficient power for 350/500 houses - equally they know that this number of houses is not viable - indeed there is no substantive evidence to say this site should be included at all as it would be an over provision of housing in a very rural location.

> For these reason I think this policy is not effective or justified and should be completely reworded.

>>

>> Julie Gray

>>

Sent from my iPhone