

**Consultation responses and Officer Comments**

<b>Consultation Question</b>	<b>Response Ref No.</b>	<b>View</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>KBC Officer Comment</b>
<b>1. PURPOSE OF FORUM</b> <i>(as outlined in Section 2 of the Consultation document)</i>	1		<i>(Alan Wordie, Endurance Property Ltd)</i> An underlying thread connecting the EKLF through the years has been the opportunity for exploration of collectively designing and procuring for Kettering an exemplar SUE where there is a desire to live, work and play. I do not see this on the proposed purposes of the forum. The 2 <sup>nd</sup> item might refer but it implies a reactive rather than a proactive approach by the forum. In parallel with this it remains important for all those wishing to partake in discussion and shaping delivery be encouraged to attend and their contributions welcomed for wider consideration.	There is some merit in revising the Terms of Reference of the Forum and the report to the Committee will reflect changes for consideration.
	2	Agree	<i>(Churches Together in Kettering and District)</i> We agree with the proposed purpose of the Forum, and have no suggested additions.	
	3	Agree	<i>(Burton Latimer Action Group)</i> The principles are the aims of the current forum; therefore there is no reason for change.	
	4		<i>(Mr Jeff Baynham)</i> Why is it necessary to change the title? The Forum is supposed to provide communication with the Public, but to do this there must be more detailed information to answer the public concerns. If it isn't broken don't fix it.	
	5		<i>(Poplars Farm Action Group – a member of the Kettering Residents' Alliance)</i> The Forum is the only means available to local residents, and the Action Groups they established, to monitor and receive updates on the activities of both the council and developers, voice concerns and express opinions, which is the core of each of the four	

Consultation Question	Response Ref No.	View	Comment	KBC Officer Comment
	5 (cont'd)		<p>bullet points summarising its purpose.</p> <p>There can be no sound reason to change the existing Terms of Reference other than to reduce residents' access to information.</p> <p>Given the fragmented nature of land parcels' development by different companies and the Council not being the project manager the Forum's ToR need to include:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 'To monitor the implementation and impact of the development on the economic, environmental and social well-being of the area' (ie the ToR's 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet point).</li> </ul> <p>The Council is still referring publicly to the Urban Extension with the prefix 'Sustainable'.</p> <p>The three pillars of sustainability are mitigation of negative economic, environmental and social impacts The proposed removal of this element of the original bullet point is therefore not only ironic but also concerning.</p> <p>The Brundtland Report, which established a benchmark for sustainability, defines:</p> <p><i>“Sustainable development is development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.”</i></p> <p>That this is delivered for Kettering, its residents and those in the wider community who use its facilities and services such as the General Hospital, surely remains a key aim for all parties, and, as such, the Forum</p>	<p>The purpose of seeking to clarify the Terms of Reference of the Forum was to stress the respective roles of the Council as planning authority, and the developers as project managers.</p> <p>Certain aspects of these roles had appeared to have become confused and misinterpreted by both members of the Forum and the wider public. Therefore the revised Terms of Reference will explain this distinction more clearly.</p>

Consultation Question	Response Ref No.	View	Comment	KBC Officer Comment
	5 (cont'd)		<p>should play its role in monitoring activities and ensuring all are parties are working towards this.</p> <p>This requires the addition of the following element to the ToR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To facilitate public scrutiny of developers' and the Council's activities in relation to the development.</li> </ul>	
	6	Agree	<p><i>(Burton Latimer Town Council)</i> Developers and public agencies should be included.</p>	
<b>2. PRINCIPLES OF THE REVIEW</b>	7	Agree	<p><i>(Alan Wordie, Endurance Property Ltd)</i></p>	
<p>(i) The distinction between core and associate membership should be abolished</p> <p>(ii) where there is a parish council there is no need for a separate local residents' or action group</p> <p>(iii) political representation should be increased</p> <p>(iv) meetings in public with right to</p>	8		<p><i>(Mr Jeff Baynham)</i> Why is there need for modification? Why should KBC require the change and approve the new format? The Forum should be independent of the Council.</p> <p>The Forum was established as a conduit to inform local residents about the progress of the East Kettering Development. The current format should adequately be able to perform this task, provided sufficiently reliable information is emerging from the interaction between KBC and the developers, leading to clarity of vision about current and future activities. The fact that the same questions which were raised five years ago are still being discussed and have not yet been finalised is surely evidence that the desired flow of information which the forum could have been able to pass on has not materialised. This cannot be attributed to the composition of the forum, and it is hard to see how the provided changes would make any difference since the role of the forum is not to interact with the developers on a day by day basis, but to rely on the information flow coming from KBC.</p>	<p>The East Kettering Liaison Forum is not independent of the Council as it is a vehicle for public engagement by the Council and its partners.</p> <p>There is no intention by the Council to change this aspect of the purpose of the Forum.</p>
	8 (cont'd)			

Consultation Question	Response Ref No.	View	Comment	KBC Officer Comment
<p>speaking contributions from non-members and an open 'Question and Answer' slot for the wider public</p>			<p>There does seem some merit in removing the distinction between the core and the associate members, although the entire associate group are Councillors, and at present there are only a few members of the core group that are not Councillors. But this is to change. It appears that representatives of the residents in the form of Action Groups are to be removed under this proposal. I strongly oppose this move. It was deemed a requirement when the Forum was set up for KBC to invite residents and action groups to be part of the core group, what has changed? It must be remembered why action groups are set up; there is a compelling need for representation. As the East Kettering development progresses and residents realise the impact on their community more and more action groups may emerge that have a right to be represented at the Forum.</p> <p>My fear is that the public will be relegated to only being able to comment in a three minute slot at the beginning of the meeting which will not be acceptable; we must have the right to question the proceedings.</p> <p>At present there are only two action groups that regularly attend the Forum, and it may appear like 'sour grapes' for me to object to the proposed changes, but I consider it essential that residents are represented in a form that allows a voice for their concerns.</p> <p>Therefore I see no need to change the Forum, apart from provision for more action groups to have a say what happens in their community.</p>	<p>The Executive Committee is asked whether it wishes to recommend to Council that Principle (ii) in column 1 be adopted. <i>[Where there is a parish council there is no need for a separate local residents' or action group]</i>. This would effectively rule out membership of the Burton Latimer Action Group (BLAG).</p> <p>The proposal to include a 'Question and Answer' session on the agenda of meetings of the Forum is in addition to the provisions of the Council's Right to Speak Policy. However, there will be a need for Question and Answer sessions to be structured to enable sensible debate and understanding, and a balance will need to be struck between open questioning and being able to communicate progress with the development.</p> <p>There are only two Action Groups in being at the present time.</p>
	9	Agree	<i>(Churches Together in Kettering and District)</i>	

Consultation Question	Response Ref No.	View	Comment	KBC Officer Comment
			<p>We agree with the principles behind the review. With regard to the Council's conclusions, we agree with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. the abolition of the distinction between core and associate members</li> <li>b. increasing the number of Councillor representatives</li> <li>c. maintaining the holding of meetings in public</li> <li>d. including a public question and answer session at all meetings</li> </ul> <p>However we:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>e. ask that BLAG retain its seat (one representative only having the right to full participation)</li> <li>f. suggest that the right to speak by members of the public (including additional attendees from groups that have an appointed representative) become more formalised, to match that in use at other meetings of, or facilitated by, the Council</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>e. Please see officer comment in respect of Response Reference No. 8 above in relation to the BLAG.</li> <li>f. This is a good point.</li> </ul>
	10		<p><i>(Mr Jeff Baynham - Burton Latimer Action Group)</i>  Point (i) is currently in operation under the direction of the Chairman.  Point (ii) may exclude emerging Action Groups that will inevitably establish as the impact of the development is recognised.  Point (iii) there is no need for political representation.  Point (iv) is very desirable, but 'normal' right to speak should be defined.</p>	<p>'Right to Speak' is defined as the right to attend any public meeting of the Council and speak for up to three minutes on an item on the agenda, subject to the approval of the Chair. Separate right to speak arrangements exist for Planning Committee meetings.</p>
	11		<p><i>(Poplars Farm Action Group)</i>  The paucity of public consultation and communication in arriving at KBC's granting Outline Permission for the development in April 2010, of which large swathes of the local population are still unaware, is highlighted by the comment that there is "a consequent need for intensified consultation and communication."</p>	

Consultation Question	Response Ref No.	View	Comment	KBC Officer Comment
	11 (cont'd)		<p><i>How many responses has KBC received from members of the public on all SUE-related consultations in the last five years?</i></p> <p><u>Point 1:</u> Membership should be one tier.</p> <p><u>Point 2:</u> Is point simply seeks to exclude certain pre-existing and all future residents' groups representing those living in existing housing from the Forum. This is out of line with recent KBC statements to us that local engagement and communication is intended to be enhanced.</p> <p>The proposals make a general assumption that elected representatives communicate with any regularity with residents in their Parishes/Wards on EKLF matters. Such active engagement cannot be assumed. It must be demonstrated.</p> <p>See our comments under '5. Proposed membership'.</p> <p><u>Point 3:</u> The Forum should be wholly apolitical in its nature and management.</p> <p><u>Point 4:</u> It is vital for the credibility of the Council that meetings continue to be held in public.</p> <p><i>What is "normal right to speak"? Is this the meagre 3 minutes allowed at Planning Committee meetings, with no default requirement for the questioner to receive a written response from the Council? If so, that is inadequate given the scale of the development, which</i></p>	<p>This is not the rationale behind point 2.</p> <p>It is not suggested otherwise.</p> <p>Please see the definition under Section 2 for meetings of the Council other than Planning Committees.</p>

Consultation Question	Response Ref No.	View	Comment	KBC Officer Comment
	11 (cont'd)		dwarfs other planning applications by e.g. a neighbour seeking to extend their property.	
	12		<i>(Burton Latimer Town Council)</i> Point (i) Agreed. Point (ii) Disagree – local residents or action groups should continue to be represented, irrespective of if there is a parish council. Point (iii) Agreed – however it is important that members should attend Forum meetings. Point (iv) Agreed.	Please see officer comment in respect of Response Reference No. 8 above in relation to the BLAG.
	13		<i>(David Charlton-Jones, Chair of Campaign for the Protection of Rural England)</i> We have always had a representative at Forum meetings who reports back to our district committee meetings and we are keen to continue this association as core members.  You may imagine we have many local members who are seriously affected by this SUE and who are concerned by the 'planning blight' arising from the present uncertainty.	It is proposed that the CPRE be added to the Forum's membership.
<b>3. CHAIRMAN-SHIP</b>	14	Independent Chair	<i>(Alan Wordie, Endurance Property)</i> Managing the forward looking approach and encouraging adult communication requires an independent well-respected chairman.	
	15	Independent Chair	<i>(Burton Latimer Town Council)</i> Disagree. As this is not a decision-making body it is not necessary for the chair to be a Borough Councillor. However, if chaired by a Borough Councillor they should be totally independent, including not being part of KBC's planning process.	Agreed. No member of the Planning Committee should Chair the Forum.

Consultation Question	Response Ref No.	View	Comment	KBC Officer Comment
	16	KBC Chair	<i>(Churches Together in Kettering and District)</i> We agree that a Borough Councillor should take the Chair. We believe that having an experienced chair is more important than the ward they represent. We agree that the Deputy Chair should be a non-Borough Councillor.	
	17	Independent Chair	<i>(Poplars Farm Action Group)</i> The role of Chairman should be apolitical, ie no member of any political party should chair it.	
	18	Independent Chair	<i>(Burton Latimer Action Group)</i> There is no obvious need for the chair to be taken by a Borough Councillor, although the Chair should be independent.	
<b>4. STRUCTURE OF MEETINGS</b>	19	Agree	<i>(Alan Wordie, Endurance Property Ltd)</i>	
	20	Agree	<i>(Churches Together in Kettering and District)</i>	
	21	No view expressed	<i>(Burton Latimer Action Group)</i> The agenda and comprehensive minutes should be published at least two weeks after the previous meeting. 'Matters Arising' should be included.	
	22		<i>(Poplars Farm Action Group)</i> 'Matters arising' should be included.  A Public Q&A session is prerequisite. However, it is only meaningful if written answers are provided in a timely manner and reflected in the Forum's minutes.  <i>Will KBC confirm this is the intention, and if not, what is meant by this phrase?</i>	Written answers will be given to individuals or tabled at the next meeting.



Consultation Question	Response Ref No.	View	Comment	KBC Officer Comment
	22 (cont'd)		The Council should view the Forum as part of its due diligence, publishing agendas and comprehensive minutes within two weeks of meetings.	This requirement is not reflected in the Council's Constitution.
	23	Agree	<i>(Burton Latimer Town Council)</i>	
<b>5. MEMBERSHIP</b>	24	Agree	<i>(Alan Wordie, Endurance Property Ltd)</i>	
	25	Agree	<i>(Churches Together in Kettering and District)</i> We agree with the proposed membership, except for the suggested retention of a place for BLAG, and remain committed to the forum and contributing to its work through our place on it.	
	26		<i>(Burton Latimer Action Group)</i> There must be representation for any Group or Council that is affected by the development.	
	27	Disagree	<i>(Poplars Farm Action Group)</i> The proposals are anti-democratic and unacceptable in that that actively seek to eliminate from the Forum all but one longstanding Action Group set up by existing residents.  <i>If the Council wishes its strapline 'Working with and on behalf of local people' not to become purely ironic it must allow Action Groups to be represented.</i>  In addition, the proposals are heavily biased in favour of those aiming to make money out of the development, i.e. the many developers.  There is also an underlying assumption in the proposals that elected representatives communicate with any regularity with residents in their Parishes/Wards on EKLF matters.	

Consultation Question	Response Ref No.	View	Comment	KBC Officer Comment
	27 (cont'd)		<p>We contend that good governance dictates that only those Councillors who can demonstrate a track record of meeting formally with their Parish/Ward residents on issues discussed at the Forum should be a) be granted and b) retain a place on the Forum, dependent on this track record being continued and attendance at the majority of Forum meetings in any one year.</p> <p><i>We hereby request records of each current and past Councillor's formal meetings with local residents regarding EKLf agenda items and related issues over the last five years, together with a schedule of any currently planned meetings.</i></p>	<p>There are no such records.</p>
	28		<p><i>(East Kettering Liaison Forum – 10<sup>th</sup> September 2013)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The changes which increased representation from elected members were welcomed.</li> <li>• In line with other fora, the chair should be a Borough Councillor and every borough councillor should be a member of the forum. Any properly constituted organisations should be entitled to attend. We should not be overly prescriptive over who is entitled to attend. It is counter-productive to reduce membership and it should be increased rather than decreased.</li> <li>• The Forum should accept membership from across the whole Borough not just the localities immediately affected by the outline consent.</li> </ul>	<p>The balance of elected members and 'community representatives' currently set out in favour of the latter in the membership would be upset by inviting more elected members onto the Forum.</p> <p>The inclusion of new community groups is not ruled out by these arrangements.</p>

Consultation Question	Response Ref No.	View	Comment	KBC Officer Comment
	29		<i>(Alan Wordie, Endurance Property Ltd)</i> I believe interested 'Observers' be encouraged to participate. Thus should they not be 'non-voting participants' rather than 'observer'?	Agreed. It is suggested that these agencies be described as 'Advisers'.
	30		<i>(Cllr Margaret Talbot)</i> There seems to be an omission of Boughton Estates and the Environment Agency in the landowners and other organisations.	Alledge Brook are the vehicle through which Boughton Estates have vested their land interest within the development, so we have taken Alledge Brook as their representative, but if they wish to be separately represented that could be accommodated.  The Environment Agency should be included in the membership list.
<b>6. OTHER RELEVANT COMMENTS</b>	31	Agree	<i>(Burton Latimer Town Council)</i> At the earliest opportunity, KBC should review the representation against the rationale for being a member of the Forum.	
	32		<i>(Comment from East Kettering Liaison Forum – 10<sup>th</sup> September 2013)</i>  Chairs of those the other geographical forums should have a report back from the EKLF as a standard item.	Agreed that the EKLF item can be put on the geographical forum agendas as a standard item if requested by each Forum.
	33		<i>(Poplars Farm Action Group)</i> None of the proposals are actually designed to enhance true public engagement. Kb/c instead appears to be attempting to shut down residents' communication routes and limit local involvement in and scrutiny of what is the biggest development in and around Kettering in decades and one of the biggest in the country. This, despite its own strapline ' <i>Working with and on behalf of people</i> '.	