

SGB/NLPC WG

1 July 2018

See Distribution

### **ST GEORGE'S BARRACKS – REVIEW MEETING – 22 JUN 18**

1. On 11 Jun, following the end of the “Masterplan Consultation Document” and a swathe of letters of objection to the proposed development in the local press, Sir Alan Duncan MP called a meeting of Parish Council representatives, RCC Leadership and Executive, a selection of County Councillors, MoD and Regency to share views and identify a more positive way forward. The meeting was scheduled for Fri 22 Jun 18 in the King Centre, Barleythorpe. The Calling Notice for the meeting is attached.
2. To prepare for the meeting Cllr Gale Waller chaired a pre-meeting on 21 Jun that was attended by representatives from local Parish Councils, including myself.
3. A list of those that attended the meeting and a copy of the Agenda is attached. I had hoped that prior to our PC Meeting on 2 Jul that the official Minutes of the meeting taken by Alan Duncan's Parliamentary Assistant and RCC's SGB Project Officer would have been published, however to date (4 Jul 18) this has not happened and therefore I am publishing below my personal notes from the meeting. These should not be taken as an official record, but do go some way to cover the key points and the 'feel' of the meeting.

PBG CUMMINGS  
Chair NLPC

#### **Attachments:**

- Sir Alan's Calling Notice
- PC's Notes from the Meeting
- Agenda – St George's Barracks Development Meeting – 22 Jun 18
- List of Attendees – St George's Barracks Development Meeting – 22 Jun 18
- RCC's Indicative Timetable for SGB Main Site for 2018

#### **Distribution:**

Parish Council Members  
NLPC SGB Working Group  
NLPC Clerk  
Chair EWPC

Cllr Ed Jarron – EWPC  
Cllr Gale Waller  
Cllr Ken Boole  
Andrew Robinson – ‘Right for Rutland’  
Gerry Robinson – ‘Right for Rutland’

## **NOT TO BE TAKEN AS AN AUTHORITY**

### **POINTS FROM A MEETING CHAIRED BY SIR ALAN DUNCAN MP TO SHARE VIEWS AND IDENTIFY A MORE POSITIVE WAY FORWARD**

1. **Style:** The meeting was held in the King Centre in Barleythorpe and was chaired very positively and firmly by Sir Alan. The meeting lasted for over 2 hours. NLPC and EWPC led the way in questioning some of the statements made by Sir Alan, RCC, MoD, and ReGenco. Surprisingly, most of those present from other PC's contributed little to the discussion. RCC, MoD and Regenco played the meeting very carefully and restricted their comments largely to facts that had already been played out in other forums. Their answers to questions were extraordinarily guarded, allowing little scope for challenge and changes to previously identified policy.

2. **Comment:** *Though MoD were asked to explain what they could and what they could not accept in terms of the numbers of houses, they did not.*

### **SIR ALAN DUNCAN - OPENING STATEMENT**

3. In his opening statement Sir Alan commented that:

- SGB will close in 20/21 it was sizeable brownfield site which in broad terms was pretty unattractive.
- He questioned why the Thor Missile Site had been listed, however MoD confirmed that it was not their intent to challenge the listing or to seek to have it lifted.
- He advised that there was strong pressure from Government for MoD to sell redundant military bases. He confirmed the Govt's requirement for the release of land for home building – The MoD target is 55,000 new homes on redundant military bases. This was Govt policy and was supported by all political parties.
- In addition there was clear and long-standing policies (Treasury Driven) that were in place to ensure that MoD (and other Govt Depts) obtained best value for the taxpayer in the release of any assets.
- He supported the Public/Public Partnership that had been agreed between MoD and RCC as being the best approach to the future management of the estate. He felt that the Partnership would ensure that the County Council maintained a significant influence on the development of the site for the future.
- Whilst accepting the benefit of the PPP and the role of RCC in achieving such a relationship, he was aware that profound concerns had been raised about the proposed development.
- He accepted that the proposed scale of the development had created understandable outrage across the County.
- He felt that the title "Masterplan" was both clumsy and inappropriate – he felt that in reality the published Masterplan was at this stage nothing but a draft concept rather than a fait accompli. (*RCC nodded sagely!*)

- He felt that talk of 3,500 new homes on the site was a huge number and had created real concern for many.
- He felt that pace and staging of the project required very careful consideration and that in his opinion the proposed plan was not adequate in this respect.
- He was very concerned that we should not build a dormitory town to maximize revenue for the MoD, he considered that this was an area that needed to be addressed in much more detail.
- The project would have a significant impact upon the local community and indeed the whole of Rutland. Scale and pace were key issues that needed to be addressed.
- He was concerned about the environmental impact and the impact upon ecology.
- He indicated that this was a so-called 'Garden Village' but was not convinced as to what this means and that he would ask ReGenco to explain.
- He expressed concern about the possible style and aesthetics of the proposal that he felt needed to match the 'style' of the County.
- He then asked that MoD should explain what it could, and what it could not agree in respect of number of homes and income generation.
- He asked that RCC address some of the concerns that had been raised in the consultation process.

**MOD STATEMENT – JAMES REILLY**  
**PROJECT DIRECTOR – MoD DEFENCE INFRASTRUCTURE**  
**ORGANISATION**

4. As a MoD Senior Civil Servant, James gave a very guarded presentation, which largely covered issues that had been previously addressed. In his short presentation he commented that:

- SGB was part of the MoD's Estate Rationalization Programme which was encapsulated in the 2016 publication "A Better Defence Estate" – <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/better-defence-estate-strategy>
- The disposal of SGB in 2020/21 fits into the Better Defence Estate programme.
- The development of the PPP enabled MoD and the LA to work closely together to develop a proposal before a formal planning application was submitted. This ensured that MoD's plans were reflected in the needs of the County and would expedite the overall planning process
- The MoD wants "what is best value for the taxpayer".
- He confirmed that MoD would not challenge the Thor Missile Site listing and in response to a specific question, confirmed that the site had not been listed because of previous contamination.

Sir Alan sought clarification on whether or not, there was a clear policy steer on the value that the site must realize, and sought an acceptance

from MoD that through the development process there was a clear requirement to preserve the special nature and values of Rutland.

Andrew Johnson – Morcott PC suggested that the mineral content of the site could dwarf the housing value. He commented that whole site was limestone and there was potential for whole site mineral extraction with no housing.

5. James Reilly responded and summarized the MoD's position as:

- As a Government Department MoD (DIO) must on behalf of the Treasury (UK Taxpayer) achieve best value for the site.
- MoD could not dictate what the future site should be.
- It was felt that the development of a Quarry and Housing could co-exist but accepted that timing was a significant issue
- Mineral extraction would be managed as a separate process within the national minerals strategy, requiring separate planning consent etc.
- The MoD's aim was to achieve best value and that the income recovered through the Better Estate Initiative would be reinvested in MoD infrastructure.
- MoD were not trying to maximize the number of houses to be built on every site and that the final number of houses "will be what the number will be". (*Comment – this appears to contradict RCC's core message that 3,500+ homes must be built to meet MoD's requirements.*)

## **RCC STATEMENT – OLIVER HEMSLEY – LEADER RCC**

6. Oliver Hemsley commented that:

- He was at the meeting to listen to the concerns raised by our MP and local Parish representatives.
- Delighted by the responses received to the consultation:
  - On line – 350 Responses
  - 612 Survey Forms
  - 73 emails
  - In total some 1240 responses, which included the EW survey results.
  - 3,815 Printed questionnaires had been circulated.
- It would take time to consolidate the responses received.
- From the responses received, the overwhelming number were opposed to the plan as published.
- Key areas of concern related to the scale of the development and the proposed speed of the development (The proposal contained no phasing of the development)
- RCC were committed to taking note of the concerns raised.
- There were significant concerns relating to infrastructure developments and RCC needed to flesh out their proposals.

- **He advised that RCC proposed to set up an “St George’s Barracks Advisory Group” which would help to develop the proposed plan and would provide a forum for views from Parish Councils and the County as a whole.**
- He provided a timeline for 2018 and indicated that the Advisory Group might meet monthly. (We made it very clear that the Advisory Group needed to inform proposals as they were developed, rather than comment on proposals once they had been promulgated. The timeline needed to reflect this. There was strong support for such a Group).
- The MoU was developed using the concept of a Garden Village and identified what could and could not be achieved.
- He opined that the Nov 2016 MoU, created a non-binding agreement on how RCC / MoD (DIO) would work together. The MoU had drawn on the advice of the Government’s One Public Estate organization.
- He confirmed that the MoU was not a legally binding agreement but was a Partnership, which was aimed to manage MoD and RCC objectives.
- The MoU allowed RCC to challenge MoD thinking and it was the County Council’s view that it was better to work in Partnership which enabled RCC to develop and agree binding agreements.
- He advised that the development would need to be driven by the demand of the proposed updated 2018 Rutland Local Plan, which would be circulated for consultation in the coming months.
- There had been no agreement with MoD on Max / Min number of homes that would be built on the site.
- There needed to be sufficient ‘affordable homes’ – Social, Private Rented and affordable purchase price homes for the long-term future housing needs of the young people in Rutland. (*However the debate on what is an affordable home in this day and age rumbles on – See: <https://www.theguardian.com/housing-network/2014/feb/03/affordable-housing-meaning-rent-social-housing>*)

## **REGENCO (EAST HAMPSHIRE COUNCIL) – STEVE PEARCE**

7. Steve Pearce gave a very guarded presentation in which he stated:
  - Experience of East Hants Council was that the usual planning process provided very blunt tools to manage a major development and that Partnership with MoD allowed both parties to work together to shape and influence large scale development.
  - Bordon (School of Electrical and Mechanical Engineering – SEME) had been due to close. The site was 350 Hectares in size. They planned to build 3,000 homes on the site. The LA (East Hants Council) worked closely with DIO to develop the specification / scale and pace of the development.
  - From the outset there was an intent to deliver infrastructure developments early.
  - DIO worked closely with the LA and provided some funding.

- Initial scepticism of working in partnership was overcome and LA / MoD were able to approve proposals for the development which were in accord with the principles of a Garden Village.
- The Partnership provided confidence that the LA got what it wanted and created much greater certainty of an agreement at the planning application stage.
- The Garden Village concept created a community sustainable within its own communities providing jobs, homes and facilities without the need to travel. There was a strong sense of community and stewardship in the new development.

*(At this point I intervened, to describe my experience of Bordon (Having first served there in 1972). It is a large urban area, with significant light industry and a significant road and rail infrastructure. It is a town larger than Oakham and has a population of some 16,000 with shops, hospitals, superstores, out of town stores, old peoples homes, garages etc and should not, in any way, be compared to North Luffenham / Edith Weston. Photographs of some of the Bordon development were circulated to show what a soul-less development RegenCo had created.)*

- RegenCo stated that the quality of the development was suited to its setting and that it aimed to create a multi-generational community.

At this stage Sir Alan asked Norman Plummer (Barleythorpe) to comment on that development.

### **NORMAN PLUMMER – BARLEYTHORPE**

8. Norman stated that Barleythorpe was now working very hard to create a new community and to integrate the new and old villages. He commented on the need for rigorous internal consultation within the community and that he felt that they were now in a position to influence any future development. He advised that RCC had taken no account of the health and education requirements of the new community.

### **SIR ALAN DUNCAN – FUTURE NEED OF YOUNG PEOPLE**

9. Sir Alan drew the attention of all present to the need to consult widely with the young people of Rutland to help identify what they wanted in the future development of the County.

### **HELEN BRIGGS – RCC**

10. Helen's comments included:

- Key issues arising from the consultation were clearly Scale / Development and Infrastructure, **She felt that there was a need for further consultation and there was a need to identify compromise solutions.**

- She highlighted the commitment made by RCC and contained in the Masterplan that infrastructure must come first and that enhancements needed to be both appropriate and commensurate.
- The development needed to be viewed in a Rutland wide and Young Rutland context. That the development needed to be a balanced multi-generational community and not be simply a retirement community.
- A sustainable community needed to have substantial and varied employment opportunities.
- A bid had been put in place for Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF) funds, which would enable appropriate infrastructure to be put in place. A full business case was now being developed for HIF. Should the HIF bid be unsuccessful, a commitment would be placed on the developer to put the required infrastructure in place.
- In response to a question from Sir Alan, she commented that if fewer than 3,000 homes were to be built the potential reduction in HIF funding might mitigate the impact of the development and reduce the level of infrastructure.

## **PHASED DEVELOPMENT**

11. Sir Alan suggested that phasing of the development and the possible nature of phasing needed to be taken into consideration. He asked those present what would be an acceptable level of development, Ed Jarron (EW) suggested 1,500 homes but phased in at least 3 x 10 year phases, I suggested that, whilst not disagreeing with Ed Jarron, it was difficult to identify an exact number without knowing what the agreed requirement for housing in the County was. That level of need, to meet local and regional requirements should be firmly established in the local plan, which would then inform the requirement needed for any development in SGB. The development should not be considered as a windfall with proposals to build over and above the requirement identified through the local plan process.

## **AESTHETICS**

12. Sir Alan commented on the lack of any meaningful detail regarding how any development might look. It was agreed that a design code was needed in which important principles concerning the style, look and density of the development, which should conform to what we accept, is "A Rutland Style". Houses should be well built and should generally have gardens they should be of differing sizes and occupy differing space. He opined that a proper model was needed to illustrate density and layout. His view was that any new development should reflect a normal Rutland village layout and not be a mass of cul de sac developments

## **CONCLUSIONS**

13. At the close it was agreed that:

- **RCC would publish the Minutes of the meeting.**



- **RCC would publish the findings of the Masterplan consultation.**
- **RCC would develop proposals for an Advisory Group – PC commented that it was essential that all recognize that the development is taking within Edith Weston and North Luffenham villages and that as such our representative view needed to carry appropriate weight.**
- **Sir Alan agreed to consult with other Ministers in different Government Departments to address key concerns.**

## **PERSONAL PERCEPTIONS**

My final thoughts are:

- I think it is clear that RCC must revisit the plan and work with us on a development of a more appropriate number. There is clearly some wriggle room here. Our proposals should be in the region of 1,500 – 2000 new homes in a staged development. Phasing remains a very contentious issue which requires considerable thought.
- Appropriate job creation on site remains a significant black hole that was not addressed in any detail.
- The Advisory Group proposal needs careful consideration – I am concerned that a mass of PC's each reflecting their own individual issues, without looking at the big picture could be counter-productive. It is clear that Oakham / Uppingham Councils are really not concerned about this development, wrongly I believe considering that it will bring increased income to the 2 x towns. We should push for a role in helping to draft the Terms of Reference for the Group. I suggest that we continue to work with Empingham, Manton, Pilton, Ketton, South Luffenham and be able to represent their views in a much smaller group.
- I wonder if we should try to work with RCC to deliver a 'Youth Forum' for Rutland Sixth Formers to identify how they see the future development of the County. (Gale – Your thoughts !)
- I am not convinced that now is the time for an orchestrated County campaign against the proposed development – which could be counter-productive until we have a better idea of what the real planning requirement will be. For the moment we should concentrate on 'awareness' messages.
- The Bordon plan needs to be looked at carefully – they have built/are building a similar number of homes on a much larger site (when the quarry area is taken into account). What has been delivered to date is a fairly unpleasant housing jungle. I have contacted Bordon/Whitehill to arrange a meeting for Norman Milne and I to discuss lessons learnt.

- The Local Plan is gaining greater importance in trying to honestly identify what housing is needed to meet future demand on a local and regional level. This must include 'affordable' homes (which should be limited to the needs of the County). We should identify what, if any, money is available to Spire Homes to purchase new social housing stock.
- Sir Alan's comments were very much in line with his letter in the Mercury that was published in advance of the meeting.
- We should revisit our 'Concerns' paper and identify areas that need further consideration / development.



HOUSE OF COMMONS

LONDON SW1A 0AA

Mr John Willoughby  
Clerk of North Luffenham Parish Council

Sent by email at [nlparishclerk@outlook.com](mailto:nlparishclerk@outlook.com)

Monday 11<sup>th</sup> June 2018

Dear Mr Willoughby,

Over the past month I have held a number of meetings with both Rutland County Council and local Parish Councils to share views about the development of St George's Barracks. In order to enable a productive and meaningful discussion about a number of the big questions about the future of St George's Barracks, I have convened a meeting, which I will chair, between a number of affected parties.

Those invited to join this meeting are: Cllr Oliver Helmsley, Helen Briggs, representatives of the MOD, one representative of RegenCo, five County ward councillors, two representatives from the Parish Councils of Edith Weston and North Luffenham, and one representative from each of the Parish Councils of Empingham, Ketton, Manton, Barleythorpe, Oakham and Uppingham.

I think it important that this discussion happens as soon as possible, and, following conversations with the Council, I propose that the date is **Friday 22<sup>nd</sup> June at 3:30pm** in the **Caldicott Room at the King Centre, Main Road, Barleythorpe, LE15 7EE.**

As we will be a large number, I intend to keep discussion clearly focused. To that end, please send to me (by email or post) three topics or questions for discussion, and from these I will put together an agenda which I will circulate before the meeting. The deadline for sending me these discussion points is **Monday 18<sup>th</sup> June at 9:00am**, though I would be grateful to receive as soon as possible.

I hope you can make this.

Yours sincerely,

Rt Hon Sir Alan Duncan MP

Development of St George's Barracks meeting chaired by Sir Alan Duncan MP

Friday 22<sup>nd</sup> June 2018, 3:30pm at the King Centre, Main Road, Barleythorpe, LE15 7EE.

**Agenda**

1. Introductions
2. Alan Duncan statement
3. Ministry of Defence statement – James Ryley
4. Rutland County Council statement – Cllr Oliver Hemsley
5. Memorandum of Understanding between MOD and RCC – development of “garden village” concept vs alternative uses of the site
6. Scale of development and its effect on local area as well as Rutland as a county
7. The possibility of phasing development in stages
8. Infrastructure – the need for improved roads, bus services, schools, doctors’ surgeries and other local facilities
9. The importance of aesthetics – quality and style of housing
10. Employment and jobs on site
11. The future structure of consultation
12. Conclusions/Any Other Business

**Attendees of meeting re St George's Barracks, Friday 22<sup>nd</sup> June at 3:30pm**

Rutland County Council leadership	CLlr Oliver Hemsley CLlr Nick Begy Helen Briggs
Ministry of Defence	James Ryley
RegenCo	Steve Pearce
Normanton ward	CLlr Gale Waller
Normanton ward	CLlr Kenneth Bool
Ketton ward	CLlr Gordon Brown
Ketton ward	CLlr Gary Conde
Martinsthorpe ward	CLlr Edward Baines
North Luffenham Parish Council	Paul Cummings Tim Smith
South Luffenham Parish Council	Vic Bacon
Edith Weston Parish Council	Ed Jarron Nick Appleby
Normanton Parish Council	Christopher Renner
Empingham Parish Council	Victor Pheasant
Ketton Parish Council	Mary Cade
Manton Parish Council	Simon Aley

Morcott Parish Council	Andrew Johnson
Barleythorpe Parish Council	Norman Plummer
Oakham Town Council	Adam Lowe
Uppingham Town Council	Neil Wedge

## Indicative timeline for St George's Barracks Main Site for 2018

Dates	Action
15 <sup>th</sup> June 2018	Consultation on high level master plan closes
15 <sup>th</sup> June 2018 – 13 <sup>th</sup> July 2018	Analysis of consultation responses
15 <sup>th</sup> June – 11 <sup>th</sup> August 2018	Regenco complete the viability work, assess changes in response to consultation, complete feasibility report
22 <sup>nd</sup> June 2018	Meeting Chaired by Sir Alan Duncan – representatives from Parish & Town Councils, RCC, MOD and Regenco
3 <sup>rd</sup> July 2018	Informal Cabinet - update on the meeting Chaired by Sir Alan Duncan (22 <sup>nd</sup> June 2018)
9 <sup>th</sup> July – 13 <sup>th</sup> July Day and time to be confirmed	Informal Cabinet discussion on responses to consultation and options for revisions to the masterplan
16 <sup>th</sup> July	Cabinet / SMT away session to discuss Growth including St George's & Stamford North
By 31 <sup>st</sup> July	<b>St George's Advisory Group meeting</b>
31 <sup>st</sup> July	Report to Cabinet to progress Local Plan to consultation including St George's
31 <sup>st</sup> July – 3 <sup>rd</sup> December 2018	Developing the HIF business case
11 <sup>th</sup> August – 25 <sup>th</sup> August 2018	Regenco, MOD and RCC meet to discuss DOT for next version of the masterplan
7 <sup>th</sup> August 2018	Update to Informal Cabinet on St George's
14 <sup>th</sup> August 2018	St George's Project Board meeting
Mid August – 20 <sup>th</sup> September	Local Plan consultation
21 <sup>st</sup> August 2018	Update to Formal RCC Cabinet on consultation and process to progress to Master plan sign off
31 <sup>st</sup> August 2018	<b>St George's Advisory Group meeting</b>
4 <sup>th</sup> September 2018	Update to Informal Cabinet on Masterplan and HIF Bid preparation
11 <sup>th</sup> September 2018	St George's Project Board meeting
18 <sup>th</sup> September 2018	Update to Formal RCC Cabinet on process to progress to Master plan sign off and HIF bid preparation
September / October 2018	Scrutiny Panel to discuss the Masterplan
30 <sup>th</sup> September 2018	<b>St George's Advisory Group meeting</b>
1 <sup>st</sup> October 2018 – 26 <sup>th</sup> October 2018 (4 weeks)	Public engagement on the Masterplan for the St George's site
30 <sup>th</sup> October 2018	<b>St George's Advisory Group meeting</b>

## Indicative timeline for St George's Barracks Main Site for 2018

Dates	Action
15 <sup>th</sup> June 2018	Consultation on high level master plan closes
15 <sup>th</sup> June 2018 – 13 <sup>th</sup> July 2018	Analysis of consultation responses
15 <sup>th</sup> June – 11 <sup>th</sup> August 2018	Regenco complete the viability work, assess changes in response to consultation, complete feasibility report
22 <sup>nd</sup> June 2018	Meeting Chaired by Sir Alan Duncan – representatives from Parish & Town Councils, RCC, MOD and Regenco
3 <sup>rd</sup> July 2018	Informal Cabinet - update on the meeting Chaired by Sir Alan Duncan (22 <sup>nd</sup> June 2018)
9 <sup>th</sup> July – 13 <sup>th</sup> July Day and time to be confirmed	Informal Cabinet discussion on responses to consultation and options for revisions to the masterplan
16 <sup>th</sup> July	Cabinet / SMT away session to discuss Growth including St George's & Stamford North
By 31 <sup>st</sup> July	<b>St George's Advisory Group meeting</b>
31 <sup>st</sup> July	Report to Cabinet to progress Local Plan to consultation including St George's
31 <sup>st</sup> July – 3 <sup>rd</sup> December 2018	Developing the HIF business case
11 <sup>th</sup> August – 25 <sup>th</sup> August 2018	Regenco, MOD and RCC meet to discuss DOT for next version of the masterplan
7 <sup>th</sup> August 2018	Update to Informal Cabinet on St George's
14 <sup>th</sup> August 2018	St George's Project Board meeting
Mid August – 20 <sup>th</sup> September	Local Plan consultation
21 <sup>st</sup> August 2018	Update to Formal RCC Cabinet on consultation and process to progress to Master plan sign off
31 <sup>st</sup> August 2018	<b>St George's Advisory Group meeting</b>
4 <sup>th</sup> September 2018	Update to Informal Cabinet on Masterplan and HIF Bid preparation
11 <sup>th</sup> September 2018	St George's Project Board meeting
18 <sup>th</sup> September 2018	Update to Formal RCC Cabinet on process to progress to Master plan sign off and HIF bid preparation
September / October 2018	Scrutiny Panel to discuss the Masterplan
30 <sup>th</sup> September 2018	<b>St George's Advisory Group meeting</b>
1 <sup>st</sup> October 2018 – 26 <sup>th</sup> October 2018 (4 weeks)	Public engagement on the Masterplan for the St George's site
30 <sup>th</sup> October 2018	<b>St George's Advisory Group meeting</b>



30 <sup>th</sup> October 2018	Cabinet meeting to discuss the masterplan and HIF submission This will include consideration of an addendum report on the public engagement Cabinet consider the Local Plan Regulation 19 consultation
26 <sup>th</sup> November 2018	Council meeting to consider the Masterplan and HIF submission Council consider the Local Plan Regulation 19 consultation
3 <sup>rd</sup> December 2018	HIF submission (subject to Council approval to submit the business case)