

Minutes

South Kesteven District Council and Rutland County Council Joint Strategic Planning Board

27 February 2024 at 2:00pm

SKDC Council Offices and Teams

Issued to:

- Councillor Ashley Baxter– SKDC, Leader
- Councillor Richard Cleaver – SKDC, Deputy Leader
- Councillor Phil Dilks – SKDC, Cabinet Member for Housing and Planning
- Councillor Gale Waller - RCC, Leader
- Councillor Patricia Bradwell – LCC, Deputy Leader
- Emma Whittaker – SKDC, Assistant Director for Planning and Growth
- Shaza Brannon – SKDC, Planning Policy Manager
- Adam Murray – SKDC, Principal Development Management Officer
- Gil Curtis – RCC, Head of Learning and Skills
- Penny Sharp, RCC, Strategic Director of Places
- Councillor Paul Browne, RCC, Cabinet Portfolio holder for Planning, Property and Economic Development
- Roger Ranson – RCC, Planning Policy Manager
- Justin Johnson - RCC, Development Management Manager
- Councillor Tim Smith – RCC, Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Children and Families
- Dawn Godfrey – RCC, Strategic Director for Children and Families
- Jayne Sowerby- Warrington – LCC, Assistant Director of Corporate Property at Lincolnshire County Council
- Juliet Slater – LCC, Head of Property Strategy and Business Operations for Corporate Property
- Sam Barlow – LCC, Strategic Development Officer

Apologies:

- Councillor R Butroid – LCC, Executive Member for People Management, Legal, corporate, Property and County Farms

	Item
1.	Rutland Local Plan and South Kesteven Local Plan Updates (SKDC/RCC)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RR & SB updated on Local Plan progress. Both indicated intention to publish for Regulation 19 consultation during 2024.
2.	<p>Monarch Park Application Update (RCC)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aiming for May/June committee – could delay if National Highways put in a holding objection
3.	<p>Stamford North Application Update (SKDC)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aiming for May/June committee
4.	<p>Education Provision Update (RCC/LCC)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LCC: Scale of development requires a 2 form entry primary school across the two sites. Financial risk sits with LCC to deliver the school and so LCC needs to come up with a long-term solution. RCC: primary school provision is not seen as a pressure. (Health provision is the pressure for RCC. Empingham has a physically constrained site with limited parking and cannot extend on current site. RCC is exploring options with the practice.) RCC Primary SCAP analysis shows existing capacity at Great Casterton and Ryhall. The next nearest school is in Exton, Empingham, Ketton. Secondary education is the pressure point across Rutland. Casterton College takes significant numbers of students from out of county (Lincolnshire) and children on Quarry Farm would be nearer and therefore expect to be accommodated at Casterton College. Currently, 74% of children at Casterton primary are also from out of the County. As such, given proposed capacities at Rutland primaries there is not a case for RCC to allocate CIL monies towards a new primary school for Stamford North. LCC: Casterton college takes in Stamford students so LCC would not be asking for secondary school contribution. RCC has capacity but at some distance to the site which is a risk. The ask from LCC is £1million contribution from RCC towards a two form entry primary school. This is a small sum in context of total cost for a new school. LCC: Sixth Form– prioritise Stamford Welland as they want a sixth form otherwise Bourne (but distance is an issue) RCC: Reiterated that health is the pressure, not schools. Draft Local Plan Infrastructure Delivery Plan will assess the impact of proposed development on existing infrastructure.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SKDC requested formal comments from RCC regarding the education situation. It has been assumed previously that new infrastructure will meet the needs of the entire development, if this is no longer the case alternative locations could be considered for the new school to meet the needs of Stamford. • Development trajectory for the site indicates that Quarry Farm is to be built out faster than the new school is required (650 home trigger) and therefore children from the Quarry Farm development will already be going to Casterton before the new school is built. • Build out rates for each development to be clarified. • SKDC: SK application is not deliverable if entire site isn't delivered. Part of the Quarry Farm in Rutland site is identified as a candidate wildlife site and would not normally be considered appropriate for development. However, the wider economic and social benefits arising from a comprehensive development in this location which delivers this new road connection is considered to outweigh the potential impact of development on wildlife in this instance.
	<p>Health Infrastructure Update:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RCC: Empingham GP has amended its catchment area boundary to exclude Stamford and the Quarry Farm site due to current capacity issues. • Empingham has ambitions to expand but not keen on a satellite centre they want a single, larger surgery. • Joint response received from the two ICBs to the planning applications, however this is quite vague in terms of the detail of future provision. Developer contributions requested have been calculated on a population basis. In Rutland, there is a request for a CIL contribution of £450k and leaves it open how it can be spent (facility on site a Quarry Farm, or Empingham or existing sites in Stamford). The preference is for this to be delivered through increased provision at Empingham but this is dependent on the timing of both the development and the future expansion of the medical practice. It is expected that the Empingham boundary will be re-drawn to the County boundary if additional capacity can be delivered by the practice. • RCC: CIL is received as and when houses get built and then decision making as to how that money will be spent is with the County Council. It is expected that RCC will receive approx. £5 million over time (£4 million net for strategic projects allowing for 15% to go to parish council and 5% for management and administration) Decisions on the use of these receipts will be made by either Cabinet or full Council depending on how much CIL is to be invested into particular projects. • RCC agreed to give formal CIL position statement.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarification needed as to what money will come from Rutland for health as patients arising from Quarry Farm will need to be accommodated in Lincolnshire now that Empingham has restricted the catchment area. • Patricia to arrange a meeting with CE of ICB with Cllr Cleaver
5.	<p>Any other Strategic Matters</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LCC: Wants a mechanism in place to ensure that there won't have rival bus services. • RCC: Will work with LCC to plan provision. RCC doesn't currently jointly commission routes with Lincolnshire County Council but they do with Leicestershire County Council. Rutland will shortly be changing the transport model. No cross-funding relationship at the moment with LCC but happy to have the conversation.
6.	<p>AOB</p> <p>Another meeting to be scheduled</p>