

THE PROCESS AND PROGRESSION OF THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN IS UNSOUND

The progression of the Local Development Plan is an iterative process, the call for sites, issues and options, Regulation 18 consultation leading to Regulation 19 pre submission Plan.

The so called focus consultation on St Georges Barracks in August 2018 introduced a very fundamental shift in the proposed spatial strategy to that which was consulted on earlier and which resulted in the widely accepted 2017 draft Plan. The long standing organic growth of our towns and larger villages was over turned by introducing the concentration of future growth in a new "Garden Village". This was such a fundamental shift it was in effect an entirely new Plan and should have been accompanied by a new sustainability appraisal as required by the NPPF.

The second reason we consider the Plan to be fundamentally unsound is that we evidence in our opinion, in our detailed submissions which follow, numerous instances where we believe that information has been collected and slanted to fit the Council leadership's determination to proceed with a new settlement.

Since the clandestine signing of the Memorandum of Understanding with the MOD in September 2017 the leadership have had just one outcome in mind. The wording of documentation, "we will jointly develop St Georges Barracks with between 1500-3000 houses". "Planning permission will be granted " in the first iteration of the SGB masterplan. The numerous biased public statements by the leadership about affordability of housing, infrastructure will be in place before the development starts, the MOD want 5000 houses. The disdain with which the unprecedented response to the August 2018 consultation was treated. The manipulation of housing numbers, especially the

treatment of the large sustainable settlement north of Stamford. This site morphed during the Plan process from being a large site, which will limit the necessity to develop elsewhere in Rutland, to being gifted to South Kesteven to count in their Housing numbers via a mythical Statement of Common Ground.

Thus the Plan was not “shaped by early ,proportionate and effective engagement between plan makers and communities” as required by the NPPF.