

# **RUTLAND WATER PARTNERSHIP MEETING**

Friday 16<sup>th</sup> November 2012, 10.30am at Rutland Sailing Club

## **1. Introduction and Apologies for Absence**

- |     |  |  |     |
|-----|--|--|-----|
| 1.1 | Those present were:  | Initials:                                |     |
|     | Cllr Edward Baines   | Ward Member (Chair)                      | EB  |
|     | Jake Williams  | Anglian Water                            | JaW |
|     | Peter Gooding  | Parish Council Representative            | PG  |
|     | John Williams  | Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) | JoW |
|     | John Maitland  | Rutland Fly Fishers                      | JM  |
|     | Michael Barsby   | Rutland Sailing Club                     | MB  |
|     | Brett Culpin   | RCC Planning Policy                      | BC  |
|     | Sally Killips  | RCC Team Manager Transport Strategy      | SK  |
|     | Mary Copley  | Tourism                                  | MC  |
|     | Katy Lynch   | Partnerships Officer                     | KL  |
| 1.2 | Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Bool, Paul Tame, Cllr King |  |     |

## **2. Minutes of the last meeting September 2012**

- 2.1 The minutes of the meeting held in September were accepted as a true record.
- 2.2 JM noted a correction at point 8.2 which should read 11 not 4. The youth day in July saw 84 young people attend demonstrating a good take up, this is significantly more than the figure of "more than 20" that was noted in the minutes. **KL**

## **3. Matters Arising**

- 3.1 PG noted that the screening has been removed but the poles are still there.

## **4. RCC Site Allocations & Policies DPD – Preferred Options**

- 4.1 BC was in attendance to update partners on the preferred options consultation. The document sets out the more detailed policies of the planning area. The consultation period ends on 22<sup>nd</sup> November 2012, BC invited organisations to comment before this date. **All**
- 4.2 The planning policy team has attended numerous meetings and carried out exhibitions, BC noted that there haven't been many responses yet and so far the team is not getting a feel for any contentious issues especially in relation to Rutland Water.
- 4.3 PG noted that last time BC advised that it's helpful to know when the community agrees with the policy and not just responses that disagree with the policy. BC confirmed that evidence in support is always helpful.
- 4.4 There was considerable discussion relating to caravan sites:
- PG noted that there is limited need for touring Caravan sites as the existing sites rarely get full. SP 24 provides no background around this and there is nothing to suggest there is demand for such sites.
  - BC said it aims to suggest that there is demand from landowners and site developers.
  - MC commented from a tourism view, there is a demand for "quality" camping sites as Greetham and Whissendine are the only graded sites; there are no graded sites close to the water. Discover Rutland gets enquiries about where there are good quality caravan sites to stay, MC is unable to recommend to

## **RUTLAND WATER PARTNERSHIP MEETING**

tourists any sites currently allocated near Rutland Water.

- In the core strategy, policy CS 24 is already adopted, for the Rutland Water area it states that caravan sites are only allowed in the defined recreation area thus this is the guiding policy.
- SP 24 in the preferred options document has the more detailed planning policy criteria to be applied when considering planning applications for caravan and camping sites elsewhere across Rutland.
- JoW feels that sites are needed in Rutland such as the small sites with the caravan club, usually put in places where there is screening etc. For example the site at Wing doesn't impose on the landscape or Wing Hall.
- MC noted that complaints about the sites around the water are received from visitors, Rutland doesn't promote them and has no say, and the view of the Tourism Committee is that we need to look to clamp down on sites that are not operating to a good standard.
- JM – when you are on the water the context of the setting is important to visitors, residents and recreational users.
- EB asked how we can “clamp down”? MC responded - The licensing department is aware of the sites that are an issue and they are looking at what can be done to restrict some of the activity, some complaints are official and some are hearsay however where there are quality issues these proceed to enforcement.
- The chair asked whether it would help if the policy states a need for “high quality licensed campsites”; by this definition MC means legal and operating to represent Rutland in a positive light and gives off a good impression. MC to feed this into the consultation.

MC

### **5. Rutland Water Area (RWA) Boundary Review**

- 5.1 BC noted that the planning policy team had received comments and suggestions in response to the Issues and Options consultation and had decided to publish a paper on the suggested boundary changes and the Council's response. RCC was asked to consider boundary changes to the RWA at Edith Weston and Manton and to the Barnsdale Hall Recreation Area (RA). It had been decided that there was no requirement to change these boundaries with the exception of one change at Edith Weston to recognise the army housing that sits outside of the barracks (on the left hand side coming from Manton), so it's not in the protected RWA policy area.
- 5.2 The suggested changes to Barnsdale was to create a much larger recreation area, this request was exactly the same as a suggestion made in the 1990s. BC went back to the Inspector's report on why it was originally rejected, the same reasons are applicable today and therefore BC took the decision to decline the suggestion.
- 5.3 Edith Weston parish was concerned about the large housing site suggested for the village; their wish to change the boundary might have been due to the threat of the housing near to Rutland Water.
- 5.4 Manton PC's suggestion was to increase the boundary so that it falls back

## **RUTLAND WATER PARTNERSHIP MEETING**

from the road between Manton and Edith Weston; BC noted that the road is a good divisional boundary and there are already highly restrictive countryside policies protecting other suggested areas from development to the west of Manton.

5.5 BC states that the policy team still welcomes a response.

5.6 PG noted that Manton has decided not to pursue its suggestion further.

### **6. Lyndon Top**

6.1 SK introduced herself as she was in attendance on behalf of Dave Brown (Operational Director at RCC). SK reports directly to Dave Brown.

6.2 Lyndon Top went to formal cabinet in early November, this was granted and it will now go to formal cabinet on 20<sup>th</sup> November which will note the Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) intentions. SK reported that this can take up to 1 year for a CPO decision to be heard.

### **7. Tourism Bus**

7.1 SK updated partners on the tourism bus. Plans are progressing for the introduction of a tourism bus; this is still on track to be in place by April 2013. RCC is in the process of procuring 3 hybrid buses and a transport operator to run the service.

7.2 RCC still needs to arrange advertising on the buses; RCC will look to sell advertising space on the buses. RCC is tendering for a route around Rutland Water that goes between Oakham – Rutland Water – Uppingham, however a quote is being sought to see whether the service could also link Stamford into the route.

7.3 Cycle and bridleways that can link to the routes are also being looked at, particularly how they can extend these cycle routes so they link up to the tourism bus.

7.4 The intention is that the buses will stop to pick up and drop off at the Rutland Water car parks.

7.5 JoW suggested that if one doesn't include Stamford within the tourism route, would it possible to link carefully to the number 9 route so that it still aims to draw in visitors from Stamford. SK noted that the main issue with including Stamford is that it will extend the time that the bus takes to do a loop; it will also increase the cost. The proposal is that if the bus doesn't go to Stamford that RCC will link the bus to the Stamford route. The timetable for the buses is yet to be finalised, the same buses will be used for the employee shuttle bus. The bus will operate 7 days per week. MB recognised the potential for young users of the sailing club to utilise the bus service. SK to consider this.

**SK**

7.6 SK noted that to start with there will not be a separate winter and summer timetable; it will be a full belt and braces approach, RCC will then look to re work routes once the buses are established and running in accordance with demand.

7.7 JW noted that Anglian Water and RCC need to talk about the advertising, it was agreed that it would be better to discuss this now whilst still in the procuring of the bus phase. SK to set up a meeting.

**JW  
SK**

7.8 PG stated that there is no where around the water for the public to enjoy patio drinking, there is scope for a business to create somewhere for tourists to drink.

## **RUTLAND WATER PARTNERSHIP MEETING**

### **8. Welland Pilot Update**

- 8.1 EB updated partners; there are big lessons coming out of the pilot scheme, various agencies are collecting a significant amount of data that didn't have the mechanism for sharing it until this scheme was launched (e.g. natural England, NFU). The pilot allows for multiple agencies sitting around the table to share expertise and experience. The partnership is looking to persuade higher level government that this scheme is a worthwhile investment and will drive improvements; the group is lacking political influence which EB is trying to lobby.
- 8.2 JM recognised the worthiness of such a scheme, the water quality of a river can be affected by things that you wouldn't necessarily think of, for example farmers putting down slug pellets which then drain into the river. The chair agreed that this was the sort of issue that gets brought up and shared, it's a matter of communication and education. JW reminded partners that this is only a small part of the picture and balanced the view as the water quality of our rivers is good, JW doesn't want partners to think that farmers are polluting all of the rivers and therefore the water quality is poor as this isn't the case.

### **9. Any Other Business**

- 9.1 JoW queried the plan for a golf course at Lyndon Top; has this now failed or is this application still on the books? BC suggested that he could bring some information to the next meeting. EB noted that he wasn't aware of any formal application coming through the system. The planning department now offers applicants a formal pre planning meeting that RCC can then charge for, such discussions are not made public. **BC**
- 9.2 JW updated partners on the beach that is going to be at Sykes Lane, this will be a 100m stretch along the front of the grass towards the dam. It will not be a swimming beach, it will be a paddling beach, in reality there will be a buoy line to prevent swimmers, it is hoped that people will go and paddle at Sykes Lane where it is safe. JM is concerned that the reservoir is currently a "no swimming water" and by having the beach this would encourage swimmers. Triathlons will continue but such swims are controlled and planned.
- 9.3 PG noted the railway line which runs through Rutland; this is a main artery for freight and will be even more so in the future. The plans are to increase container traffic, PG further noted that the traffic coming through is already a lot higher than he realised.

### **10. Date of Next Meeting**

- 10.1 Friday 8<sup>th</sup> February 2013, Egleton Bird Centre

The meeting closed at 11.30am