

REPRESENTATION No3
ON POLICY H2 ST. GEORGES GARDEN COMMUNITY

Legally Compliant: No

The Regulation 19 Plan submitted is substantially different to the evidenced Regulation 18 Plan. The process is one of iteration. Regulation 19 version is not informed by the consultation and evidence of the Regulation 18 Plan. The Sustainability Appraisal attached to the 2017 consultation is not relevant, the Sustainability Appraisal attached to the Regulation 19 Plan is too late for stakeholders to comment on the different spatial strategies. There was an Interim S.A report produced in August 2019 which surfaced in a Council Committee December 2019. According to the consultants the purpose of the Interim report was” to gain stakeholders views on the relative sustainability merits of different spatial strategies in Rutland ,**prior to Regulation 19 consultation on the Proposed Submission version of the Local Plan**” This was never actioned, the whole process is flawed.

Sound: No

Not justified as it does not take account of reasonable alternative strategies, see our representation on H4

Not positively prepared, no SoCG to demonstrate the treatment of the Stamford N site, see our representation on H4

Not consistent with national policy as probably the least sustainable of all the sites considered, and will be almost totally car dependant

Not consistent with national policy as it does not have local support as required by NPPF, see our representation on Vision and Objectives Chapter3

Comment

The first line of Policy H2 states that “a new garden community will be developed on the site of St Georges Barracks.”

This statement could have been written at any time since the clandestine signing of the Memorandum of Understanding between RCC and the MOD in September 2017. References to the wording of that MOU and subsequent iterations of the SGB masterplan such as “ we will jointly develop the site with between 1500 and 3000 homes” and “planning permission will be granted” do not brook any argument to the contrary.

We illustrate numerous events in later representations which demonstrate that evidence has been collected or manipulated to support the development of SGB, not inform a locally supported future for Rutland. For example, during the Plan period the Stamford N. site morphed from a sustainable site which would limit development elsewhere in Rutland, to a site which must be gifted to South Kesteven in accordance with a non-existent SoCG. See our representation on Housing for all and the manipulation of housing numbers.

It is just common logic that a large rural isolated housing estate will offend the basics of sustainability. Public transport in Rutland is almost non-existent and thus so is local bus company capacity. References to supporting and augmenting such services are just vague words with no commercial buy in.