

# Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan

Task Group – Wednesday December 18<sup>th</sup> and Friday 20<sup>th</sup> 2013

Venue 1 – The Falcon Hotel – 2pm Venue 2 - Uppingham Town Hall 10am

## In Attendance

David Ainslie (Day 2 only), Edward Baines (Chair), David Casewell, Andrew Dighton, Christine Edwards (Day 1 only), Robin Schlich (Day 1 only,) Stephen Taylor (Day 1 Only),  
Project Lead Officer – Ron Simpson

### 1. Opening Remarks

Edward welcomed everyone to the meeting which, he announced, would be adjourned at the end of day 1 and reconvened on day 2 in order that last minute responses to the Amended Draft Plan could be received and considered.

### 2. Apologies for Absence

Chris Merrick, Dick Reeves, Mark Shaw, Lucy Stephenson, Phil Wignell.

RCC Liaison Officer – Brett Culpin

### 3. Declarations of Interest

Andrew Dighton & Stephen Taylor (Development site south of Leicester Road); Edward Baines (Retail Centre Development)

### 4. Budget and Grant Update

Ron confirmed that a grant had been secured to cover the cost of printing and distribution of the Revised Plan.

N Plan expenditure invoices reclaiming costs incurred by Uppingham First up to the end of December 2013 of £22-95 and £555.68 were approved for re-imbusement.

Club on July 31<sup>st</sup>. Site UPP 05 on the north side of Leicester Road is to be the subject of study with the collaboration of landowner representative, Marrons.

Two outline options for site UPP 10 south of Leicester Road had been received from Oxalis Planning. These were to be discussed later in the agenda.

### 5. Interim Meetings and Discussions

The Chair and Lead Officer both reported on productive discussions with members of the Scott family and their representatives concerning sites on the North and South of Leicester Road. Following considerable dialogue they were now happy to support the revised Draft Plan.

The Lead Officer and Uppingham School representatives reported on significant progress made in discussions with Bloor Homes regarding south of Leicester Road. It was now possible to include update plans and text in the final draft of the N Plan.

### 6. Timeline Update

The Chair confirmed that RCC were hoping to adhere to the proposed May target date for the Plan referendum.

### 7. Consultation Feedback on Revised Draft Plan

#### Resident Responses

- a) Brett & Tania Durden - 'Professional and High Quality' comment noted. Comment about 'Sites A,B & C providing sensible options' noted, Concern about the limited number of sites chosen noted. Missed opportunity to spread sites comment noted. **Action – Explain limitation of sites choice available to comply with RCC strategic plan. Also limited number of houses required within life of Plan. Economy will determine pace of development**
- b) Mr & Mrs Ind – two letters – Concern about urban sprawl noted. Cllr Ind's declared interest noted. Concern about neighbours' views noted but not consistent with limited number of negative responses received or positive views repeatedly expressed at Neighbourhood Forum meetings. Concern about maintaining quality

of approach to town noted. **Action - Write stating that Task Group does not accept that their proposals represent urban sprawl. Agree about need to ensure that any development enhances character of town and has regard for neighbours during construction phase. Advise that windfall housing allocations will help distribute development around town**

- c) L Fenelon - Comments about merit of bungalows noted and supported. **Action – Bring to attention of developers**
- d) N Sudborough – Job well done comment noted. Roundabout at south entrance of town still in Plan. Street furniture and traffic calming points noted. **Action – Write advising roundabout still in Plan. Other traffic calming measures on London Road still possible even if not detailed in Plan**
- e) Karen Mellor- Rutland Access Group – Support in Plan for people with disabilities comment noted. Disabled parking provision comment noted. **Action – Advise that Town Council will be asked to pursue this issue as part of its parking strategy**
- f) G Maskell – ‘Congratulations to team who compiled document’ comment noted. Heavy traffic comment noted but as stated in Plan requires collaboration with other authorities. Action – **Write confirming Plan has no specific policy but UTC intends to pursue heavy traffic issue in collaboration with Highways Authority**
- g) RC & J Fisher – Ayston Road speed comment noted. Branson Road traffic comments noted. **Action – Write confirming Ayston Road speed view supported and will be monitored during development of Uppingham Gate. Advise that Branston Road traffic issues are being addressed as part of the Spire Homes development**
- h) R Boston – Support for Plan noted. Concern about scale of any future development noted.
- i) A Haigh – ‘Excellent work of all concerned in preparing Plan’ comment noted. Observations about schools, youth, affordable housing noted. Action - **Advise that all schools invited to participate but not all responded. Advise that flexible facilities may be part of community hub proposals. Advise that Branston Road development is outside of Task Group remit, but more affordable housing very much part of Plan**
- j) S Forsyth - ‘Congratulations to all who have been working on Neighbourhood Plan’ comment noted. ‘A clear and informative document’ comment noted and appreciated
- k) Mrs Deveraux – Concern about adequacy of policing following development noted. Action - Advise that this issue will be monitored by Town Council
- l) M & M McWhinnie – Approval of N Plan noted. Pedestrianisation comment noted. **Action – Advise of debate about and decision taken around Pedestrianisation of Market Place. Proposal carried little support!**
- m) K & W Edmond – Support for revised draft of N Plan noted. Also removal of North/South bypass line
- n) L Bennett – Concern about housing proposals impacting on school place availability noted. Action – Advise that RCC has reassured Task Group existing provision is adequate for current number of additional homes proposed
- o) Roy Seden – ‘Appreciation of work done and support for majority of Plan’ comment noted. Support for deletion of bypass route noted. Support for dialogue with developers and landowners noted. Detail of objection 1 discussed and noted. Detail of Objection 2 noted including concern about Site C and surrounding landscape. Call for greater housing dispersal noted. **Action – Advise of limitations put upon Task Group re housing site dispersal, rational behind red/pink areas. Explain dispersal required use of south of Leicester Road, also shared aspirations for additional recreation space. Explain dialogue with landowners has limited their aspirations but demonstrated sustainability and deliverability of proposals including much needed affordable housing. Landscaping of developments will be a key design issue to address environmental concerns and protect town’s heritage. Developers/landowners have been made aware of this.**

### Business Response

- a) Post Office – Concern about apparent downgrading of establishment in revised draft plan noted. **Action – Advise that change was no reflection on quality of staff, but reflected Access Group concerns about access for the disabled.**

### Developer/Landowner Responses

- a) Ancer Spa (Uppingham Gate) – The Task Group welcomes the positive comments on the revised draft of the N Plan and notes with interest the content of the possible master plan submitted. The support expressed for Proposal 6 concerning the Local Enterprise Partnership is welcomed. **Action - To assist this developer in their endeavours to attract employers to the site, the temporary amendment previously agreed to the list of prohibitions in Policy 7 on page 20 is now made permanent. The Task Group would welcome further dialogue with this developer.**
- b) Bloor Homes/Oxalis Planning (south of Leicester Road) – The Task Group welcome the positive comment on the revised Plan and is pleased with the progress of the deliverability discussions for this site. The updated maps with the more accurate line of division between housing land and recreation are approved for inclusion in the Plan as is the minor change suggested for Policy 4 and the textual changes for page 17. **Action – Update plans on pages 31 & 32. Amend Policy 4. Amend text where requested on page 17.**

- c) Larkfleet Homes (West of Ayston Road & North of Firs Avenue) – The Task Group considered this lengthy response carefully. It contains a number of untrue assertions and, in the opinion of some Task Group members, is potentially libellous. The Task Group notes the objections to Policies 1, 4, 9, and 11, but does not share the author’s views. The Task Group notes the argument about the legality of the N Plan but takes the view that this is a matter for RCC, DCLG and the External Examiner. **Action – That 1) The Chair of the N Plan Task Group write to Larkfleet’s representative outlining the Task Group’s arguments for not accepting Larkfleet’s objections (Copy letter attached to these notes) 2) The Task Group urge the Town Council to consult with partners and DCLG to arrange appropriate legal representation to support the Plan in the event of a legal challenge to the Plan submitted by Larkfleet at the External Examination.**

### **Rutland County Council Responses**

- a) The Task Group notes that the RCC Scrutiny Panel of November 28<sup>th</sup> 2013 considered the revised Draft N Plan without proposing any change
- b) The Task Group notes the helpful comments of the RCC Director of Places
- c) The Task Group welcomes the detailed advice and comment made for the post plan period by the RCC Climate Change Coordinator

### **National Agency Responses**

- a) English Heritage – This positive and supportive response is welcomed by the Task Group
- b) Environment Agency – This positive and supportive response is welcomed by the Task Group
- c) Natural England – The comment that “Natural England welcomes the Draft Plan and considers that it provides a strong framework for achieving the sustainable development of Uppingham” is welcomed by the Task Group.

**Following deliberation on the above responses and actions, it was agreed that:-**

**‘The Task Group commends the amended Plan to Uppingham Town Council for their formal approval’.**

### **8. External Examiner Update**

It was noted that RCC had now made a formal application to appoint an External Examiner.

### **9. SEA Refresh, Data Book and Statement of Consultation**

The Lead Officer confirmed that RCC had offered to refresh the SEA as soon as the final draft of the Plan had been approved by Town Council. Also that he would draft a Statement of Consultation for Town Council to approve. The Databook would be compiled first thing in the New Year from existing evidence.

### **10. Report on Planning Inspector’s Public Hearing on RCC Sites Allocation Document**

The Lead Officer reported on his attendance at the Planning Inspector Hearings on the RCC Sites Allocation Plan. The legality of the document had been challenged by Larkfleet representatives, as had the housing requirement calculations. The Planning Inspector would report in Jan/Feb 2014. Edward noted that if housing numbers were required to rise by the Inspector, the Draft Plan indicated where the additional housing should be built.

### **11. Work in other Parishes**

The Lead Officer reported that since the last meeting he had given N Plan presentations in Langham and Cottesmore Parishes. He was to undertake a further presentation in Greetham in early January.

### **12. Any Other Business**

None

### **13. Date of Next Meeting**

To be agreed as required.

*Ron Simpson*

Lead Officer

23.12.2013

# UPPINGHAM TOWN COUNCIL

[www.uppinghamtowncouncil.co.uk](http://www.uppinghamtowncouncil.co.uk)

## Neighbourhood Plan Task Group



**Chair: Edward Baines    Lead Officer: Ron Simpson    Town Clerk: Susan Awcock**

Neil Osborne  
Senior Director  
DLP Planning Ltd

23.12.2013

Dear Mr Osborne,

### **Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan (UNP) – 2<sup>nd</sup> Draft Consultation**

Thank you for your response of December 18<sup>th</sup> 2013 on behalf of Larkfleet Homes. I acknowledge your comments and confirm that they have been discussed at length by the Task Group.

I note that your main concerns are about the lawfulness of the UNP. In our opinion, this is a matter for the Inspector dealing with the Rutland County Plan and, in due course, for the External Examiner appointed to assess the UNP. It would appear that your response does not appreciate the wide-ranging implications of localism. In particular it ignores the considerable weight given to local opinion.

Your comments regarding evidence, accountability and community involvement are not accepted.

- a) Evidence – From the outset surveys, open meetings and developer engagement have formed the basis of our deliberations and discussion. Detailed records of these will be available to you when the Plan's Databook becomes publicly available in January 2014
- b) Accountability – The UNP Task Group was formed as a result of an Uppingham First (business led) initiative. From the beginning the group included representatives of business and voluntary sectors as well as Town Councillors. When the legislation required, the group became an official working group of Uppingham Town Council. All published documents have been ratified by the Town Council (UNP is always an agenda item). Minutes of all meetings have been kept and are publicly available either online or in the Databook
- c) Community Involvement – The Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) has commented with approval that formal consultations, as well as the myriad of other engagement initiatives (v.s. para a)), considerably exceed legal requirements
- d) General – DCLG has been actively involved from a very early stage and has been consulted frequently on process. Similarly, Rutland County Council has been involved throughout and an officer of the Council has attended numerous Task Group meetings.

In view of the Task Group's considerable efforts to engage developers in the process, it is disappointing that Larkfleet alone has chosen legalistic argument before constructive dialogue.

Yours Sincerely,

Edward Baines  
Chairman of the Uppingham N Plan Task Group writing on behalf of the Group

The Uppingham Neighbourhood Plan Task Group is a working group of Uppingham Town Council. Administration by Uppingham First  
[www.uppinghamfirst.co.uk](http://www.uppinghamfirst.co.uk)

#### **Task Group Membership**

Andrew Dighton: Uppingham School; Tony Fowell: Uppingham Business Forum; Chris Merricks: Uppingham Neighbourhood Forum; Mark Shaw: Beeches Residents Association; Lucy Stephenson; Phil Wignell: The Uppingham Town Partnership Ltd; Town Councillors: Richard Reeves and David Casewell; David Ainslie: Limes Firs & Spurs Residents Association.

Please address all correspondence to: Ron Simpson c/o 7 Hawthorn Drive Uppingham Rutland LE15 9TA  
Tel 01572 823465 Mobile: 07710 328469 E-mail: [secretary@uppinghamfirst.co.uk](mailto:secretary@uppinghamfirst.co.uk)