RYHALL PARISH COUNCIL
RESPONSE STATEMENT
22 September 2017

RYH/06/A (Meadow Lane, 82 homes)

Ryhall Parish Council reject the submission for this site allocation and call on Rutland County Council to withdraw RYH/06/A from its list of preferments.

The area (covered previously with other land under the title RHY06) has twice been declared an Area of Local landscape Value (1995 and 2006) and the council fully endorse these findings. The reasons for the area being declared an ALLV have if anything become more necessary.

The status of Area of Local landscape Value was put in place after lengthy debate and consultation. The site RYH/06/A is a significant section of RYH06 and the council disagree with the statement by RCC that it has "the least landscape around the village" and "development would be less sensitive to further small scale housing."

The area is sound agricultural land and invaluable green space maintaining a rural aspect along a section of the A6121 that is a gateway to the village and an attractive buffer between dwellings off the Rutland Way estate and the Belmesthorpe Road.

The encroachment of housing in the neighbouring areas of Stamford and South Kesteven make this green field area even more precious and one to safeguard.

The council stress that with regard to future development proposals, it is crucially important that respect must be paid to the ALLV title. The regulations on this important site should be reinforced and maintained.

Full documentation is available but in summary the inspector had declared: "I am convinced that this river valley possesses very considerable landscape character and importance in its own right and that this importance is enhanced by the vital role it plays in creating the character and inter-relationship of the two villages. I consider that the river valley has a unique quality and I can think of no better example of an Area of Local Landscape Value since it is fundamental to the character of the whole area comprising the two villages and the intervening open space."

The submission for such a large development on the edge of the village is out of proportion to the site and geographic centre of Ryhall and equates to an enlargement of the housing stock in the village by more than 10 per cent. Such an estate would run contrary to planned limits of development that have had to encompass the 1970s Rutland Way estate.

The council questions the suitability of building any development on what is a proven floodplain; there is also the issue of such a large development causing a considerable run-off from rainfall.

The provision of 82 homes would inevitably lead to increased vehicle usage with subsequent levels of pollution, access and road congestion. The major and minor roads in the area have already seen substantially increased levels of use over the years and this would have a greater damaging impact.

Ryhall consider that Rutland County Council's submission would flout the guidelines set out in the Government's National Planning Policy Framework regarding the safeguarding of the environment and the submission being viable with a positive outcome.

The council notes with disappointment and regret the fact that Rutland County Council ignored the two previous findings by a Government inspector on the site; there are other sites on offer which are worthy of consideration.

The council note the rejection of the submission by all the villagers who attended the parish council meetings of 18th September and 20th September.

The parish plan, which was issued to 740 households in the parish, records that those who replied specifically objected to the Meadow Lane submission by a clear majority of 68 per cent.
There was also a clear indication recorded in the parish plan that the majority of respondents (responding on a level of 1-5 with 5 the highest) overwhelmingly voted at the highest level the importance of preserving green space between Ryhall and Belmesthorpe (72 % in favour) and green space between Ryhall and Stamford (77 %).
The council endorse these findings.

The council would note that it is in favour of low cost housing being considered for the parish but at a sustainable rate and in a manner sympathetic to the identity of the village.

It points out that Rutland's housing stock requirements would be more than met with the military site at North Luffenham being considered for housing and the scale of the South Kesteven / RCC proposals to develop land for some 600 homes between North Stamford and the two Casterton villages.

RYH04 Trout Farm (14 homes)
This is an acceptable submission. The parish council urge Rutland County Council to consider that housing at the lower end be stipulated in the planning permission, say starter size houses of 2 or 3 bedrooms as it is essential that the young and those of moderate income be given an opportunity to get on the housing ladder.
The response to the parish plan also recorded a 66 per cent approval for the submission.