

Appendix 1 – Summary of Officer Responses

Section Title 1 Introduction
Number of responses 7
Summary of main points <u>Statutory Consultees:</u> Sport England <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Support majority of sites identified.• The Kettering Playing Pitch Strategy dates from 2003 and would not be considered robust and is out of date having regard to paragraphs 70, 73 and 74 of the NPPF. Natural England <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Provision of generic advice on key natural environment considerations.• The assessment of potential housing sites should be informed by the landscape character approach. Landscape Character Assessments (LCAs) identify the different landscape elements which give a place its unique character and can help inform the location and design of new development. Further information on LCAs is at Landscape Character Assessment.• Care should be taken to avoid harm to the international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity, priority habitats, ecological networks and priority and/or legally protected species populations.• Where Nature Improvement Areas (NIAs) are identified they can provide a focal point for creating more and better-connected habitats. Where housing allocations are proposed in the environs of NIAs the potential to contribute to habitat enhancement should be considered. Further information on NIAs is available here NIAs.• The Housing Allocations Background Paper should consider the availability of Green Infrastructure and opportunities to enhance Green Infrastructure networks when considering sites for development.• Development should avoid Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land.• Opportunities to enhance public rights of way and accessible natural green space should be sought.• Accessible natural greenspace should be provided as an integral part of development. NCC Archaeology <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Support discounting of DE/142 due to the identification of the potential significance of ridge and furrow earthworks.• The HER records up standing earthworks (ridge and furrow) within RA/117 Pytchley. If these are present then the proposed development would have a major impact which is unlikely to be mitigated. In light of the decision for DE/142 suggests RA/117 be potentially omitted from

the allocation.

- KE/011, BL/042, BL/052, BL/058, BL/180, DE/067, RO/088, RA/128, RA/094, RA/146, RA/115, RA/174, RA/117, RA/172 have been identified as being within areas in which development is likely to have a significant negative impact on the historic or cultural environment. Further information regarding archaeological significance will be required in advance of any development in line with paragraph 128 of the NPPF. The results of the archaeological assessment will provide information on the extent, preservation and significance of any archaeological within the proposed development area. It is only after this has been undertaken that decisions regarding development and master planning if appropriate can be made.
- A number of other sites have been identified in which development is likely to have a negative impact on the historic environment however these can reasonably be dealt with by appropriate archaeological mitigation.

Other Consultees:

- Concern expressed regarding consistency and transparency of the site assessments carried out for sites in rural settlements. The Housing Allocations Background Paper includes site assessment scoring for sites in urban areas but not for rural areas. The document now being consulted on publishes site assessment scoring for sites which have been updated or revised but there remain a number of sites which have not had their assessments published. This inconsistency does not provide any transparency to the assessment process and it is not possible to identify why sites have been included or discounted as allocations.
- Support for robust position the Council is taking with regard to the level of new housing provision. However, the context for considering additional sites fails to present a consideration of the balance between employment and strategic infrastructure requirements. The inclusion of additional land at the Rothwell SUE should be considered as a further site allocation.
- Query as to type of housing to be built and who will benefit, will there be affordable housing, what investment will be made to local services and infrastructure, what investment will be made to provide employment opportunities. Develop brownfield sites in preference to green spaces.

Summary of officer comments

- Comments from Sport England and Natural England will be used to inform the next iteration of the plan.
- Development Principles for RA/117 will include criteria requiring further archaeological work in light of the comments received from NCC Archaeology.
- In relation to KE/011, BL/042, BL/052, BL/058, BL/180, DE/067, RO/088, RA/128, RA/094, RA/146, RA/115, RA/174, RA/117, RA/172 the development principles formulated for the sites will include a provision highlighting archaeological concerns. It is likely that an

assessment of archaeological significance is submitted with any future planning application to develop the above sites.

- The scoring of the sites in the rural settlements, along with those in the urban areas, was published in the Interim Sustainability Appraisal of the Site Specific Proposals Local Development Document Options Consultation (Kettering Borough Council, February 2012). This document is available to view on the Council's Consultation Portal under supporting documents associated with the Site Specific Proposals LDD Options Paper.
- Additional land at Rothwell SUE will need to be assessed against the criteria set out in the Background Papers.

Section Title

2 Kettering and Barton Seagrave

Number of responses

8

Summary of main pointsStatutory Consultees:

Barton Seagrave Parish Council

- Proposals for Barton Seagrave are fully supported.

English Heritage

- Supports the discounting of KE/182, which if developed would harm the significance and setting of the Grade I registered park of Boughton House.
- Supports the discounting of other sits in the vicinity of Boughton House.
- Supports discounting of amended site KE/032a which could have a considerable impact on Barton Seagrave Conservation Area and other heritage assets.
- Also supports the discounting of sites KE/027, KE/029 and KE/032 due to their likely impact on heritage assets in Barton Seagrave including the Grade II* Hall and Grade I Church.

Sport England

- Concerned over allocation of KE/003 and loss of football facility. Will the site be replaced?

Nene Valley Nature Improvement Area

- Concerned about the increased yield of KE/011 which lies within the Nene Valley Nature Improvement Area and as such will be expected to deliver a net gain in biodiversity.
- This part of Kettering is deficient in Accessible Natural Greenspace (ANG) as defined by Natural England. Given the lack of alternative space, development will need to provide a substantial amount of ANG to meet the Accessible Natural Greenspace Standard.

NCC Archaeology

- KE/011 is identified as being within an area in which development is likely to have a significant negative impact on the historic or cultural environment. Further information regarding archaeological significance will be required in advance of any development in line with the guidance within the NPPF paragraph 128. The results of the archaeological assessment will provide information on the extent, preservation and significance of any archaeological within the proposed development area. It is only after this has been undertaken that decisions regarding development and master planning if appropriate can be made.

Other Consultees:

Housing Allocations

- KE/001 is preferable for residential development than a gypsy and traveller site. (2)
- Support potential sites KE/003, KE/051 and KE/153. Dwellings on KE/003 should be mid range homes. There is space for affordable housing and flats on KE/151 and KE/153. (1)
- It would make sense to develop KE/152 when Kettering East has been developed but the garden centre use should not be forced out of business. (1)
- KE/184 is at risk of flooding and subject to noise from the A14. (1)

Discounted Options

- Disagree with discounting of KE/154. (1)
 - Site name is land to the rear of 30-52 Cranford Road but site being promoted is land to the rear of 32-50 Cranford Road.
 - Pleased to note the site is potentially suitable for allocation once Kettering East urban extension has reached the site.
 - KBC is currently considering a reserved matters application by Persimmon Homes for the erection of 308 dwellings in the land parcels south of Cranford Road and to the west of the existing ribbon of development (ref. KET/2013/0232). This will physically link the existing ribbon of development with Barton Seagrave.
 - The draft North Northamptonshire Interim Housing Policy Statement August 2013 anticipates delivery of 1532 dwellings from the Kettering East urban extension in the period 2014 to 2019, with 41 delivered in 2014/15, 282 in 2015/16 and 325 in 2016/17. It is feasible that the urban extension will have reached the existing ribbon of development by the time the site allocations LDD is ready for examination. At the very least, an implementable planning permission will be in place for it to do so, in the form of the Persimmon development.
 - It is premature to adopt the stance that the allocation of KE/154 should be deferred to a future review of the site allocations LDD.
 - Relative to the urban extension and all the facilities it will provide, the site is a highly sustainable location for development.
- Disagree with discounting of Site 95, including KE/182
 - Disagree with the reasons for discounting KE/182 at paragraph 2.2 and Table 1.1, Appendix 1 of the consultation document.
 - Site 95 and KE/182 could accommodate 2-3000 dwellings and will enable the towns longer term development needs to be met.
 - Allocation of the site is supported by the Council's LDF evidence base, the "Kettering Urban Extension Strategic Design Guidance" and the "Environmental Sensitivity Assessment".

Summary of officer comments

Housing Allocations

- Barton Seagrave Parish Council's support is noted.

- Support for allocation of KE/001 is noted however it is important to note that this is also being considered for potential allocation as a gypsy and traveller site.
- Development principles prepared for KE/003 will require replacement of the football facility in accordance with Policy 13 of the North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy.
- Development principles formulated for KE/011 will include a provision highlighting archaeological concerns. It is likely that an assessment of archaeological significance is submitted with any future planning application to develop the above sites.
- Development principles prepared for KE/011 will also ensure the Accessible Greenspace Standard is met.
- Impacts of development, in terms of design and character, will be considered in the determination of a planning application.
- Latest flood zone mapping from the Environment Agency indicate KE/184 is no longer in the flood zone. Nevertheless any planning applications on sites in the flood zone would need to provide a Flood Risk Assessment in accordance with the NPPF and technical guidance.

Discounted Options

- English Heritage's support for discounted sites KE/182, KE/032a, KE/027, KE/029 and KE/032 is noted.
- Site name of KE/154 will be amended to reflect the land being promoted. The site was discounted at the initial Stage 1 of the assessment process as set out in the Housing Allocations Background Paper as it was physically detached from Kettering. In light of the comments received the site will now be assessed according to the detailed site assessment criteria. Should it score well development of the site will need to be phased in line with development at Kettering East.
- Site assessment for KE/182 has been confused with assessment for KE/158. KE/158 was discounted as it is physically detached from Kettering and as such it will only be suitable for consideration as an allocation once development at Kettering East has taken place.
- Site 95 and KE/158 could accommodate 2-3,000 dwellings. The Site Specific Proposals LDD only allocates sites below a threshold of 500 dwellings and as such the site is considered to be a strategic site to be considered through the Joint Core Strategy.

Next steps

- Progress KE/003, KE007, KE/011, KE/151, KE/152, KE/153, KE/156 and KE/184 as housing allocations.
- For KE/011 include a design principle relating to Accessible Natural Greenspace, potential to link with development to the south.
- Amend assessment of KE/184 to reflect that the site is no longer within the flood zone.
- Amend site name of KE/154. Progress site for detailed assessment and relevant consultation.

Section Title

3 Burton Latimer

Number of responses

8

Summary of main pointsStatutory Consultees:

English Heritage

Housing Allocations

- The reduction of the yield of site BL/044 should help to lessen impacts on heritage assets but will require appropriate design principles.
- BL/047 will also require appropriate design principles, English Heritage are happy to comment on emerging wording.

Discounted Options

- Note that BL/181 has been discounted which is located within the conservation area.

NCC Archaeology

- BL/042, BL/052, BL/058 and BL/180 are identified as being within an area in which development is likely to have a significant negative impact on the historic or cultural environment. Further information regarding archaeological significance will be required in advance of any development in line with the guidance within the NPPF paragraph 128. The results of the archaeological assessment will provide information on the extent, preservation and significance of any archaeological within the proposed development area. It is only after this has been undertaken that decisions regarding development and master planning if appropriate can be made.

Other Consultees:*Housing Allocations*

- BL/042 is not subject to any constraints and is available and deliverable. (1)
- Yield of 35 dwellings for BL/042 is too high given flooding constraints, increasing the yield further is unacceptable. Developing the area of land outside the floodplain will result in a cramped overdeveloped site. (1)
- BL/042 is not appropriate for development due to loss of amenity space and impacts on local infrastructure. (1)
- Support for comprehensive development of BL/180. (2)
- Boundary of BL/180 should be extended to the north to follow field boundary resulting in a potential increase in yield of 30 – 40 dwellings. (1)
- Housing Allocation Background Paper February 2012 states “Development of this site [BL/058] would result in the requirement for a new primary school”. Support the principle of an education contribution

towards a new school, but believe an extension is more appropriate. This requirement should be on a pooled basis, along with other sites coming forward. The above statement should be removed or altered (1)

Discounted Options

- Disagree with exclusion of BL/048a. The site has no constraints, is deliverable and is actively being promoted. A larger site is being promoted than that identified in the consultation document, the site is 10ha but provision of a green infrastructure corridor to the south reduces the developable area to 6ha, delivering 180 dwellings at 30dph. (1)
 - A Landscape and Visual Appraisal and Ecological Appraisal have been submitted in support of allocation of the site. Request that the Assessment Matrix is updated to reflect this information.
 - Housing targets for Burton Latimer have not been finalised through the emerging Joint Core Strategy and may be revised upwards to meet objectively assessed housing need.

New Sites Promoted

- Support for inclusion of land to the northwest of BL/180 and to the south of the discounted option BL/050 as a potential housing allocation. Appropriate end use for land that would potentially become landlocked and unmanageable. (1)

Summary of officer comments

Housing Allocations

- Comments from English Heritage in relation to design principles are noted.
- Support for BL/042 is noted. The yield of 35 dwellings reflects planning application KET/2013/0597. A transport assessment and flood risk assessment have been submitted as part of the planning application. Any impacts on local infrastructure could be mitigated by the development through obligations secured via S106. Design and layout are being considered through the planning application process.
- Support for BL/180 is noted. The boundary of the site will be extended to the north to follow the field boundary and to reflect the current planning application on the site (KET/2013/0714).
- Development principles formulated for sites BL/042, BL/052, BL/058 and BL/180 will include a provision highlighting archaeological concerns. It is likely that an assessment of archaeological significance is submitted with any future planning application to develop the above sites.
- Consultation response received from NCC Education in relation to development at Burton Latimer states that, cumulatively, development of the sites identified in Burton Latimer will require the construction of a new primary school.

Discounted Options

- Comments in relation to BL/048a have been noted. Site assessment

will be updated to take account of technical information provided. Allocations will be reviewed once housing targets for Burton Latimer have been finalised in the Joint Core Strategy to ensure sufficient land is allocated to meet the housing requirement for Burton Latimer.

New Sites Promoted

- Site to the northwest of BL/180 and to the south of discounted BL/050 will be assessed according to the assessment criteria set out in the Housing Allocations Background Paper.

Next steps

- Progress BL/038, BL/039, BL/042, BL/044, BL/047, BL/057 and BL/180 as housing allocations.
- Extend boundary of BL/180 to the north.
- Update assessment of BL/048a to take account of the additional information provided.
- Assess site to the northwest of BL/180 and to the south of discounted BL/050 according to assessment criteria set out in the Housing Allocations Background Paper.
- Review allocations once housing targets for Burton Latimer have been finalised.

Section Title

4 Desborough
35 Appendix 3: Desborough

Number of responses

170

Summary of main pointsStatutory Consultees:

Desborough Town Council

- Clarification as to the definition of the term 'discounted' is required along with the time span of a 'discounted housing option'.
- Agree with allocation of DE/063 and DE/188 but request that a lower density be considered.
- Agree DE/065 should be discounted; propose that the site be identified as a Historically and Visually Important Open Space.
- Object to allocation of DE/067 as the area will be overdeveloped with the resolution to grant planning permission on DL/073.
- Strongly objects to allocation of DE/072. If site were to be developed it should contain amenities such as a car park, multi-use games area, skate park, amenity/leisure field and adequate access to Millenium Bridge.
- Object to allocation of DE/173. Consider the site to be part of a Historically and Visually Important Open Space, issues regarding access and land is incorporated with the Ise Valley flood plain, adverse impact on wildlife.
- Strongly objects to allocation of DE/189 in principle. If development jointly with DE/072 then development should include amenities such as a car park, multi-use games area, skate park, amenity/leisure field and adequate access to Millenium Bridge.
- Query regarding yield of 304 for comprehensive site DE/210 when individual sites amount to 262. If permission was granted for any or all of the sites, the time scale for construction would have an adverse impact on the bio diverse ecosystems along this ecologically sensitive land.
- KBC has previously stated that the Ise Valley is a site for designation of proposed Historically and Visually Important Open Space – HVI/055.
- Constraints for DE/065 should apply to DE/173 given their proximity to each other.

English Heritage

- Support discounting of DE/071 as building is of local importance and should be retained in employment use.

Wildlife Trust

- Object to allocation of DE/072 due to the rarity of the grassland habitat on the adjacent Tailby Meadow Nature Reserve area.
- Strongly objects to allocation of DE/210 and any proposals to extend the residential envelope to the town on its southern edge in the valley

of the River Ise corridor and in proximity to Tailby Meadow.

- Object to allocation of DE/063 and the density of 81 dwellings. Further dwellings on this side will add to the pressure on the nearby “The Plens” Nature Reserve area.

Nene Valley Nature Improvement Area

- Objects to allocation of DE/210 due to projected visitor impact on Tailby Meadow LWS.
- Allocation of the site would contravene paragraph 118 of the NPPF and section 1.15 of the North Northamptonshire Biodiversity Supplementary Planning Document.

Sport England

- Object to the inclusion of DE/072 without replacement of the playing pitches or the area being identified as surplus in an up to date playing pitch strategy.
- Aware of the new Desborough Leisure Centre (Phase 1 and 2) but are unsure of the precise relationship of the new facility as a like for like replacement.
- As the new facility has a much wider catchment area than the playing pitches the pitches may still be required in the local area to meet local demand.

NCC Archaeology

- DE/067 is identified as being within an area in which development is likely to have a significant negative impact on the historic or cultural environment. Further information regarding archaeological significance will be required in advance of any development in line with the guidance within the NPPF paragraph 128. The results of the archaeological assessment will provide information on the extent, preservation and significance of any archaeological within the proposed development area. It is only after this has been undertaken that decisions regarding development and master planning if appropriate can be made.

Other Consultees:

General Comments

- No need for more housing in Desborough, there are still houses for sale at The Grange and throughout the town. (12)
- No employment in Desborough to support the residential development proposed. (4)
- Lack of town centre parking. (6)
- New leisure facilities have not been replaced like-for-like. (6)
- Development should be concentrated to the north of the town. (1)
- Support for controlled expansion of Desborough. (1)

Housing Allocations

- Strong opposition to allocation of DE/210:
 - Site is an area of natural beauty; development will result in the loss

- of open countryside and loss of a valued public amenity space. (113)
- Existing facilities and services already under significant pressure. (82)
- Flooding. (81)
- Development of the site will have an adverse impact on Tailby Meadow/wildlife. (69)
- No suitable access to the site; highway network does not have capacity to support development of the site. (66)
- Lack of open spaces, already lost the Leisure Centre and skate park. (11)
- Impact on house values, loss of views. (8)
- Pumping station is already operating beyond capacity. (7)
- There are other preferable brownfield sites that can be developed before loss of greenfield sites. (5)
- Loss of green belt land. (4)
- DE/072 should be developed for use as a school or GP surgery. (3)
- Will lead to coalescence with Rothwell, loss of identity. (3)
- The reasons for discounting DE/065 apply to DE/210. (2)
- Support consideration of DE/210. (1)
- Object to allocation of DE/067 and existing road infrastructure is inadequate to support development of the site and DE/073 which has been granted planning permission. (1)
- Support for allocation of DE/063 following reassessment. (1)
- Support for allocation of DE/188. (1)

Discounted Options

- It is not clear why Site 33 discounted. (1)
- Land between Federation Avenue and western housing perimeter (Site 33) should be considered for development. There is no risk of flooding and easy access can be gained to the bypass.
- DE/065 should be considered instead of DE/210 as it impacts on less people. (1)
- DE/064 should be reconsidered as an allocation, it is a sustainable and appropriate location for housing and is available for development. (1)

New Sites Promoted

- One new site promoted to the north of Federation Avenue (part of discounted Site 33). (1)

Summary of officer comments

General Comments

- Discounted sites are discounted for the period of the plan, i.e. to 2031, or until there is a review of the plan.
- The Site Specific Proposals LDD identifies land to meet housing requirements set out in the emerging Joint Core Strategy. The requirement for Kettering Borough in the Joint Core Strategy for the period of 2031 is 10,700 dwellings. The sites identified in this document will provide land for approximately 2,300 dwellings to 2031. The growth strategy set out in the Core Strategy identifies Kettering as a 'growth

town' providing the main focus for growth in the Borough. The market towns of Desborough, Burton Latimer and Rothwell are identified as secondary focal points for growth to complement growth in Kettering, while sites will be identified where there is an identified local need. Sites therefore must be identified primarily in urban areas in order to meet the growth requirement.

- It is important to note that as the plan provides for growth to 2031 growth will be staggered over the plan period rather than there being an immediate increase in the number of households in Desborough.

Housing Allocations

- Comments from the Wildlife Trust and Nene Valley NIA in relation to DE/210 have been noted. Further ecological assessment of the impact on the site will be required before progression of the site.
- The level of opposition to development of DE/210 is noted. Further additional work is required to address the issues and concerns raised through the consultation process. The impacts of the development and mitigation measures will need to be assessed before progression of the site.
- Impact on Tailby Meadow is recognised in the assessment of the site and will be an important consideration if the site is progressed as an allocation. Development of the site will need to provide mitigation for any harm to Tailby Meadow and would also need to provide a net increase in biodiversity.
- DE/210 located adjacent to, but not within, a flood zone. Any planning application for a site within a flood zone would need to consider risk in accordance with Policy 10 of the NPPF and will be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment.
- Provision of schools and adequate medical facilities are an important consideration when planning for future growth. Kettering Borough Council will work closely with NCC Education and health care providers to ensure adequate provision is available for residents of new development.
- Phase 1 of Desborough Leisure Centre has been completed at the Grange. Planning permission has been granted for Phase 2 and the Options Paper (March 2012) contained an option to include a policy requiring development in Desborough to contribute towards Phase 2 of the Desborough Leisure Centre subject to the identification of need for a community facility. If this policy is adopted it would ensure additional community facilities are provided in Desborough.
- The Options Paper (March 2012) identified options for aimed at improving the town centre through the identification of sites for redevelopment and through environmental improvements. If adopted these options would ensure the town centre and its retail offer was improved alongside any residential development.
- The document has considered brownfield sites throughout the Borough and there are many instances where brownfield sites have been identified as potential allocations. However, the Site Specific Proposals LDD is required to identify housing allocations for growth to 2031 and

as such greenfield sites have to be considered in order to meet the growth requirement.

- Proposed yields will be reviewed while preparing design principles
- Further work will be undertaken in relation to DE/067 to determine the capacity of the highway network prior to progression of the site as an allocation.
- The development principles formulated for the DE/067 will include a provision highlighting archaeological concerns. It is likely that an assessment of archaeological significance is submitted with any future planning application to develop the above sites.
- DE/063 is separated from The Plens by existing development. The impact on The Plens will be considered in detail at the planning application stage.

Discounted Options

- The Site Specific Proposals LDD only allocates sites below a threshold of 500 dwellings. Site 33 exceeds this capacity and as such is a strategic site which was considered and discounted through the Joint Core Strategy. A smaller element of the site to the north of Federation Avenue has been promoted for development and this part of Site 33 will be assessed prior to the next iteration of the document.
- Support for discounting of DE/065 is noted. Working is ongoing in relation to Historically and Visually Important Open Spaces. The site will be considered against the assessment criteria set out in the Background Paper.
- Constraints to development of DE/064 in terms of highway capacity and access to the sites is limited to access being over the railway bridge. No evidence has been provided to demonstrate these constraints can be overcome. The site remains a discounted option.

New Sites Promoted

- The site to the north of Federation Avenue will be assessed according to the assessment criteria set out in the Housing Allocations Background Paper

Next steps

- Progress DE/063, DE/073 and DE/188 as housing allocations.
- Further additional work is required in relation to DE/210 to address the issues and concerns raised. The impacts of the development and mitigation measures will need to be assessed before progression of the site.
- Further work is required in relation to DE/067 to determine the capacity of the highway network prior to progression of the site.
- Assess site to the north of Federation Avenue according to the assessment criteria set out in the Housing Allocations Background Paper.
- Consider DE/065 against assessment criteria for designation as Historically and Visually Important Open Space.

Section Title

5 Rothwell

Number of responses

6

Summary of main pointsStatutory Consultees:

Rothwell Town Council

- Prefer to defer the additional 300 homes at Rothwell North until first section of the development has taken place in order to monitor the effect of the development on the town generally and especially on the town centre and schools. Traffic generated by Rothwell North will lead to further congestion unless steps are taken to reduce the effect. As the extension does go down to the playing fields attached to Rothwell Infant and Junior Schools the Planning Application must include vehicular access to the rear of these schools with a car park large enough to provide a drop-off point for parents to bring their children to school. The town centre is already totally congested when the children are being taken to school in the morning and, to a lesser extent, when being picked up in the afternoon and the additional number of pupils generated by the Rothwell North development would make this intolerable. This can be part of the s.106 Agreement fund, the CIL monies, or the education element to be paid by the developer.
- The original 11 hectares of employment land much be retained at Rothwell North as the town has very few jobs for people to work locally. This allocation must be reinstated.
- The land immediately to the north of the A14, to the west of the existing Brachers Allotments and to the east of the new development by Morris Homes off Harrington Road must be allocated as a Green Space/Wildlife site for the benefit of this part of Rothwell and to ameliorate the adverse effect of the A14.
- Provision must be made for a suitable vehicular access to the Corinthians Football Ground with an adjoining car park. If necessary the pitch could be moved to an acceptable alternative site to provide an adequate access and a parking area. Development at Rothwell North will impact on the current pitch as there will be many more vehicles using Desborough Road which will adversely affect access and egress.
- Concerned that Kettering Borough Council did not respond positively to original comments made by the Town Council. We will put the above requirements in our Neighbourhood Plan which is in the process of being completed and with the Localism Bill our Plan will take precedence.

NCC Archaeology

- RO/088 is identified as being within an area in which development is likely to have a significant negative impact on the historic or cultural environment. Further information regarding archaeological significance will be required in advance of any development in line with the guidance within the NPPF paragraph 128. The results of the archaeological assessment will provide information on the extent,

preservation and significance of any archaeological within the proposed development area. It is only after this has been undertaken that decisions regarding development and master planning if appropriate can be made.

Other Consultees:

Housing Allocations

- Support the inclusion of RO/202. (1)
- Support for the allocation of an additional 300 dwellings within the current application boundary of RO/088 (Rothwell North). (1)
- The development principles formulated for the RO/088 will include a provision highlighting archaeological concerns. It is likely that an assessment of archaeological significance is submitted with any future planning application to develop the above sites.

Discounted Options

- Disagree with exclusion of RO/083. High quality design and reduced number of units would overcome concerns. (1)
- RO/085 should be included as a potential allocation. The site represents a logical rounding off of the settlement when considered in the context of Rothwell North (RO/088) and the planning permission on the opposite side of Harrington Road to the south. The site is available, suitable and achievable. (1)
- Illogical to exclude RO/203 from the sustainable urban extension currently being considered. (1)

New Sites Promoted

- Site off Rushton Road, adjacent to allotments promoted as a potential housing allocation. (1)
- Inclusion of additional land at Rothwell North. (1)
 - The context for considering additional sites, however, fails to present a consideration of the balance between employment and strategic infrastructure requirements. In particular, the reduction of the strategic employment site at Rothwell will lead to an unbalanced provision of homes and jobs; with the potential for increased commuting. The retention of the employment allocation would benefit Rothwell and the Borough in the longer term; and the requirement for additional new homes could be achieved through the allocation of further land, some of which forms part of the SUE and the Persimmon Homes planning application on the north side of Rothwell linking through to the Rushton Rd. It would also provide relief for the Town centre and an alternative link to the A6. Strategically, it would provide an important stage for an eventual link through to the Glendon Road and Kettering West.

Summary of officer comments

Housing Allocations

- The additional 300 homes at Rothwell North will not be accessible until

the initial phase of development has been completed. Concerns in relation to the element of the site can be dealt with through phasing.

- At the Planning Policy Committee meeting of the 16th September 2008 Members agreed that the findings of the Kettering Borough Employment Land Breakdown be used as a basis for preparing policy. This report identified a need for 4ha of employment land to be allocated in Rothwell. The report can be viewed here via the following link http://www.kettering.gov.uk/meetings/meeting/1067/planning_policy_committee. As a result the employment allocation for Rothwell North was reduced to 4ha in the Rothwell and Desborough AAP Position Statement and Proposed Submission Plan. Discussions have progressed on that basis.
- The Rothwell North application is on agricultural land around the football pitch. As the development would not result in the loss of the pitch there is no policy basis to require replacement of the pitch. In relation to access to the pitch, the pitch currently has no parking and I understand pedestrian access to the site is across the cricket pitch. If this is the case the application will not impact on the current situation. If this is not the case and the development would impact on the current situation this would need to be considered through the planning application.
- Comments in relation to land immediately north of the A14, to the west of the existing Brachers Allotments and to the east of the new development by Morris Homes off Harrington Road have been noted.
- Support for RO/202 is noted.

Discounted Options

- RO/083 would have a harmful impact upon the setting of various heritage assets in the vicinity of the site and remains discounted on this basis.
- Further work will be required in relation to RO/085 to determine whether it is suitable for allocation.
- RO/203 is physically detached from the settlement and built form and if it was to come forward in advance of the Rothwell North Urban Extension it would not be sustainable.

New Sites Promoted

- New sites promoted will be assessed according to the criteria set out in the Housing Allocations Background Paper.

Next steps

- Progress RO/084, RO/086, RO/088 and RO/202 as allocations.
- Further work will be required in relation to RO/085 to determine whether it is suitable for allocation.
- Assess new sites promoted.

Section Title

6 Ashley

Number of responses

3

Summary of main pointsStatutory Consultees:

Ashley Parish Council

- Supports the content of the document regarding Ashley.

Other Consultees:*Discounted Options*

- Supports recommendation to discount RA/137 and RA/162 both of which are inappropriate for development. (1)
- Ashley should be considered a 'small scale growth settlement' rather than a 'no growth' settlement as was identified in the Rural Masterplanning Report and SSP Options Paper. It appears that the only reason Ashley's status was revised to 'no growth' is due to objection to RA/162 rather than concerns with regard to the appropriateness of Ashley for small scale growth. Ashley's status should be revised to 'small scale growth' and then appropriate sites for should be considered. (1)
- RA/137 was discounted due to impacts on the linear character of the village, the setting of listed buildings and conservation area which cannot be overcome. The site was subject to an unsuccessful planning application and subsequent appeal. The appeal considered each of the reasons for discounting the site and the reasons have been demonstrated to be unsubstantiated. RA/137 is a suitable and appropriate site for limited small scale residential development. (1)

Summary of officer comments

- Ashley Parish Council's support is noted.
- Support for discounted options is noted.
- A settlement-specific housing needs assessment has not been conducted for Ashley and as such there is no identified need for growth, even at a small scale, in Ashley. This approach is consistent with the adopted CSS and the emerging JCS which requires development to be led by locally identified need.
- RA/137 is a greenfield site which contributes to the rural character and setting of this part of the village. Notwithstanding the Inspector's comments in relation to the effect of RA/137 on the setting of the conservation area, the Inspector concludes that development of the site would have a significantly harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Next steps

Progress no growth option for Ashley.

Section Title 7 Brampton Ash
Number of responses 0
Summary of main points No comments received.
Summary of officer comments N/A
Next steps Progress as scattered development in the open countryside.

Section Title

8 Braybrooke
38 Appendix 6: Braybrooke

Number of responses

13

Summary of main pointsStatutory Consultees:

English Heritage

- Sensitivity of Site RA/128 adjoining a Grade II listed building and partly lying within the conservation area. Note that part of RA/128 is shown as a discounted housing option (to the west of the listed building), with the remainder to the south of the listed building shown as a potential housing option. It is not clear why the site has been divided in two. If the site is taken forward for allocation, the design principles in the final draft version of this document will need to acknowledge the heritage asset issues and how they should be addressed.
- Previously commented on conservation area issues in relation to RA/185, RA/186 and RA/187. Note that RA/185 and RA/186 have been discounted and RA/187 now has planning permission.

NCC Archaeology

- RA/128 is identified as being within an area in which development is likely to have a significant negative impact on the historic or cultural environment. Further information regarding archaeological significance will be required in advance of any development in line with the guidance within the NPPF paragraph 128. The results of the archaeological assessment will provide information on the extent, preservation and significance of any archaeological within the proposed development area. It is only after this has been undertaken that decisions regarding development and master planning if appropriate can be made.

Other Consultees:*General Comments*

- No established need for housing in Braybrooke. (2)
- If there is no established need for housing in Braybrooke all sites should be discounted according to other criteria against the time when there is a need. (1)
- There is a need for affordable housing in Braybrooke. (1)

Housing Allocations

- Object to allocation of RA/128. (9)
 - The proposed reduction in numbers of housing for RA/128 is not a new consideration; the reasons for removing this site from further consideration are as valid as ever. (1)
- Strongly support allocation of RA/128 and strongly disagree with the discounting of the remainder of the site. (2)

Discounted Options

- Discounted site RA/185 should be allocated. (1)
- Support discounting of sites RA/185 and RA/186. (4)
- Support discounting of RA/143. (1)

New Sites Promoted

- School site should be allocated. (6)

Summary of officer comments

- If RA/128 is progressed development principles formulated for the site will include a provision highlighting archaeological concerns. It is likely that an assessment of archaeological significance is submitted with any future planning application to develop the above sites.
- The school site will need to be assessed according to the criteria set out in the Housing Allocations Background Paper prior to any conclusions on an appropriate option for Braybrooke.

Next steps

Assess the school site according to criteria set out in the Housing Allocations Background Paper. Consider options for Braybrooke following outcome of the assessment.

Section Title

9 Broughton

Number of responses

8 comments

Summary of main pointsStatutory Consultees:

Broughton Parish Council

General Comments:

- In the emerging strategy from the JPU, Broughton is not featuring as a principal village for development and parish councillors are of the opinion that the level of proposed development in a rural area is unacceptable given this status alongside the fact that the Site Specific document acknowledges that the preferred option for Broughton is for small scale growth. 114 properties from the sites listed above constitutes a growth of 12.20% rising to 18.82% should the 2 applications in appeal on sites RA27 and RA95 succeed.
- This level of growth is very difficult to absorb and places considerable stress on the village and its structure. Services and facilities are low key and very localised which inevitably means that the majority of all household requirements are serviced by out of town facilities necessitating vehicle movements. To further load the village with housing developments at this level and of this type/scale will add nothing to its wellbeing but will simply add serious stress to local infrastructure and alter the character of the existing village irrevocably.
- The recent Housing Needs Survey demonstrates quite clearly and from a sound evaluation that Broughton is in real need of small style housing suitable for young people or older residents looking to downsize. 65% of households in Broughton are one or two person properties. There already exists a significant provision of larger properties (the number of 4/5 bedroom properties are 7% higher than for the Borough) and the Council cannot support development which does not respond to the specific local needs for residents in Broughton.

Housing Allocations:

- Object to progression of Site 50 which would have an impact on the village. This site is being called Kettering West however in reality it would be most definitely Broughton North. The potential scale of this site with up to 2750 houses would completely obliterate the village of Broughton in its existing context being nearly 3 times the size of the existing village.
- With regard to RA/098 and RA/127 the document states there is scope to overcome the constraint of the lack of capacity in Cox's Lane but no detail is given. What is the "scope" that is being considered?
- Object to allocation of RA/127
 - If RA/127 is developed the bund area would be inaccessible and would become an unsightly area of ground, detracting from the current attractiveness of the village.
- Object to allocation of RA/101

- It is proposed access to RA/101 will be from Bentham Close which will compound the chronic High Street traffic situation. In addition to this, although not noted in the document, there exist two further applications; KET/2005/1120 which was for the existing bungalow in front of site RA/101 to be demolished and 8 properties to be built and KET/2011/0062 for 1 property to be built so site RA/101 should not be considered in isolation and the cumulation comprises RA/101 considerably.

Discounted Options:

- RA/207 is discounted and planning permission for 67 houses and demolition of 2 sound properties refused. However, an appeal is lodged so it remains a possibility. The Parish Council agrees with the draft conservation area plan that the site is of significant importance for the village and should not be considered for development.
- RA/095 is discounted and planning permission for 4 houses refused. However, an appeal is lodged so it remains a possibility. 4 properties would open up the site to a significantly larger plot with the yield estimate given at 54 so in effect a further 50. This site has been extensively promoted as a full site for consideration for many years and the higher number remains very visible if the appeal is upheld. The Parish Council again agrees completely with the draft conservation area plan that the site is of significant importance for the village and should not be considered for development.

English Heritage

Housing Allocations

- The proposed designation of a conservation area for Broughton should result in a reassessment of relevant sites within the village. RA/101 and RA/127 would adjoin the proposed boundary.

Discounted Sites

- Comments have been made previously regarding RA/207 and its potential impact on listed buildings.

NCC Archaeology

Housing Allocations

- RA/094 is identified as being within an area in which development is likely to have a significant negative impact on the historic or cultural environment. Further information regarding archaeological significance will be required in advance of any development in line with the guidance within the NPPF paragraph 128. The results of the archaeological assessment will provide information on the extent, preservation and significance of any archaeological within the proposed development area. It is only after this has been undertaken that decisions regarding development and master planning if appropriate can be made.

Other Consultees:

General Comments

- Disagree with 'small scale growth' option in Broughton given its size and range of services. This is overly restrictive and a more flexible approach should be adopted. (1)

Housing Allocations

- Acknowledge NCC Highway recommendation to limit yield of RA/101 to 12 but concern regarding highway safety remains. (1)
- All of RA/094 should be allocated for development rather than just the frontage under site reference RA/094b. (1)
 - Easy access to strategic road network, within 800m to the school, development of the site will create a softer edge to the village with suitable boundary treatment; the site has capacity for approximately 50 dwellings.

Discounted Options

- If appeal on RA/207 is successful it will exceed the combined yield of the proposed sites. Until the appeal is decided it would be incorrect to formulate a plan for Broughton without making reference to potential development of RA/207.
- Disagree with discounting of site RA/207. (1)
 - Site refused planning permission on grounds of being outside the village boundary and site layout. No impacts on character of the area, access, ecology etc were identified.
 - Identified sites RA/101a and RA/094b have greater harm than RA/207
 - RA/101a has fundamental highway issues.
 - RA/094b results in inappropriate ribbon development and extends village further into open countryside.
- Disagree with discounting of RA/099, the size of the site gives a false impression of the level of development that will be provided and so a smaller area is now being promoted for development. The site is a better option for allocation than RA/094b. (1)
 - 1.4 ha providing for a small number of high quality dwellings, approx. 12-25 and/or small scale employment units. This is supported by the Rural Masterplanning Report.
 - Any development would ensure the existing allotments are maintained or relocated.
 - Site is located a similar distance from services and facilities as RA/094b which is proposed for allocation. The Rural Masterplanning Report states RA/094 scores poorly in terms of accessibility and would not bring benefits to the village.
 - Revised site RA/099 is available for development and can be brought forward in the short term. The assessment of RA/094b states the availability and market interest in developing the site is questionable. In view of such uncertainty RA/099 should be allocated in favour of RA/094b.
- Object to discounting of site RA/096. (1)
 - Site provides opportunity to resolve traffic problems at the school through widening of the access road, also provides opportunity to provide more parking at the school relieving traffic congestion in

Cransley Hill.

- Information demonstrating that there is scope to provide a suitable means of access to appropriate standards.

Summary of officer comments

Housing Allocations

- The assessments of RA/101 and RA/127 will be updated to reflect proximity to the proposed conservation area boundary. It is considered that any impact on the proposed conservation area could be overcome.
- NCC Highways will be consulted with information submitted in relation to access to RA/096.
- Site assessment of RA/099 will be reviewed to take account of the smaller site now being promoted for development.
- Should RA/094 be progressed development principles formulated for the site will include a provision highlighting archaeological concerns. It is likely that an assessment of archaeological significance is submitted with any future planning application to develop the above sites.
- Comments in relation to development at Broughton have been noted. Broughton is currently preparing a Neighbourhood Plan and two appeals decisions are outstanding at sites RA/095 and RA/207. Therefore, at this time additional work is required to determine which potential housing allocations will be progressed in Broughton.

Next steps

- Additional work required to determine which sites will be progressed as allocations.
- Assess smaller site RA/099 against assessment criteria set out in the Housing Allocations Background Paper.
- Consider access details provided in relation to RA/096 in consultation with NCC Highways, update assessment of the site as appropriate.

Section Title 10 Cranford
Number of responses 1
Summary of main points <u>Statutory Consultees:</u> English Heritage <i>Housing Allocations</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Design principles for RA/170 and RA/173 will need to acknowledge heritage asset issues and how they should be addressed. <i>Discounted Allocations</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Discounting RA/171 and RA/205 preserves the significance of heritage assets.
Summary of officer comments <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Comments in relation to design principles for RA/170 and RA/173 have been noted.• Support for discounting RA/171 and RA/205 is noted.
Next steps Progress option for small scale growth in Cranford for affordable housing on RA/170 and RA/173.

Section Title

11 Dingley

Number of responses

1

Summary of main pointsOther Consultees:

- Development of RA/204 will not impact on landscape, ecological features or settlement character. (1)
- Yield of the site should be amended to 4 – 6 dwellings.

Summary of officer comments

- Site was assessed according to the criteria set out in the Housing Allocations Background Paper. Assessment identified that the site has medium to high sensitivity to development. Western edge of the site, which provides the access to the site, is TPO Woodland and as such these features are unlikely to be retained.
- Dingley does not have a settlement boundary and is considered scattered development in the open countryside. National policy is to strictly control development in the open countryside, allocation of the site as a potential housing allocation would therefore be contrary to national policy.

Next steps

Progress as scattered development in the open countryside.

Section Title

12 Geddington

Number of responses

2

Summary of main pointsStatutory Consultees:

English Heritage

Housing Allocations

- Design principles for RA/107, RA/109 and RA/110 will need to acknowledge heritage asset issues and how they should be addressed.

Other Consultees:*Housing Allocations*

- Support allocation of RA/109 for residential development and RA/107 for mixed use development. (1)

Discounted Options

- As Geddington is identified as a principal rural settlement it is inappropriate for development to be restricted to 'small scale growth'. Therefore, discounting RA/102 does not accord with the growth strategy set out in the CSS. (1)
- RA/102 is located within the settlement boundary defined by the Local Plan, there are no constraints to development, site would provide high quality gateway to the north of the settlement and is a logical site for development. (1)

Summary of officer comments*Housing Allocations*

- Comments in relation to design principles are noted.
- Support for allocation of RA/107 and RA/109 is noted.

Discounted Options

- The CSS and emerging JCS requires allocations in rural areas to be made based on local need. The sites identified accommodate small scale growth to meet local need. RA/102 is a large site for the size of the village. Development of this scale would not be consistent with the growth strategy set out in the CSS. RA/102 remains a discounted option.

Next steps

Progress option for small scale growth on sites RA/107, RA/109 and RA/110.

Section Title 13 Glendon
Number of responses 0
Summary of main points No comments received.
Summary of officer comments N/A
Next steps Progress as scattered development in the open countryside.

Section Title

14 Grafton Underwood

Number of responses

2

Summary of main pointsStatutory Consultees:

English Heritage

Discounted Options

- Previously raised concern about impact of sites RA/113 and RA/114 on the conservation area and listed buildings, but we note that they have been discounted.

Other Consultees:*Discounted Options*

- Preferred option for no growth is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework and threatens the long term vibrancy and vitality of the settlement. (1)
- Development of RA/113 and RA/114 would lead to an improvement in the character of the conservation area, no justifiable reasons have been provided to warrant the removal of these sites as potential allocations. (1)

Summary of officer comments*Discounted Options*

- Comments from English Heritage have been noted.
- Concerned has been raised by English Heritage about the impacts of RA/113 and RA/114 on the conservation area and listed buildings. The CSS and emerging JCS requires allocations in rural areas to be made based on local need. As there is no identified need for additional housing in Grafton Underwood at this time the sites remain discounted options.

Next steps

Progress 'no growth' option.

Section Title 15 Great Cransley
Number of responses 1
Summary of main points <u>Statutory Consultees:</u> NCC Archaeology <ul style="list-style-type: none">• RA/146 is identified as being within an area in which development is likely to have a significant negative impact on the historic or cultural environment. Further information regarding archaeological significance will be required in advance of any development in line with the guidance within the NPPF paragraph 128. The results of the archaeological assessment will provide information on the extent, preservation and significance of any archaeological within the proposed development area. It is only after this has been undertaken that decisions regarding development and master planning if appropriate can be made.
Summary of officer comments <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The development principles formulated for the RA/146 will include a provision highlighting archaeological concerns. It is likely that an assessment of archaeological significance is submitted with any future planning application to develop the above sites.
Next steps Progress option for small scale growth in Great Cransley for affordable housing on RA/146.

Section Title 16 Harrington
Number of responses 0
Summary of main points No comments received.
Summary of officer comments N/A
Next steps Progress no growth option.

Section Title 17 Little Oakley
Number of responses 0
Summary of main points No comments received.
Summary of officer comments N/A
Next steps Progress no growth option.

Section Title 18 Loddington
Number of responses 1
Summary of main points <u>Other Consultees:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Strongly agree with no growth in Loddington due to limited services and facilities and accessibility via sustainable transport modes.• There are 2 important open spaces within Loddington to the north of Harrington Road which need their designations retained.
Summary of officer comments <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Support for no growth is noted.• The open spaces referred to were identified as potential Historically and Visually Important Open Spaces in the Site Specific Proposals Local Development Document Options Paper. This is being considered as a separate ongoing piece of work.
Next steps Progress no growth option.

Section Title

19 Mawsley

Number of responses

49

Summary of main pointsStatutory Consultees:

NCC Archaeology

- RA/115 and RA/174 are identified as being within an area in which development is likely to have a significant negative impact on the historic or cultural environment. Further information regarding archaeological significance will be required in advance of any development in line with the guidance within the NPPF paragraph 128. The results of the archaeological assessment will provide information on the extent, preservation and significance of any archaeological within the proposed development area. It is only after this has been undertaken that decisions regarding development and master planning if appropriate can be made.

Other Consultees:*Housing Allocations*

- Object to the allocation of RA/174.
 - Time for stability after years of continued construction. (18)
 - The village already well exceeds its intended size. (16)
 - Further development will impact on character and form of village. (14)
 - Further development will put facilities and services under even more pressure. (31)
 - School is at capacity and can not be extended further. (22)
 - Access to the site via Cransley Rise is inadequate and dangerous. (33)
 - Roads are nearing adoption standard, further development will prevent this. (12)
 - Highway network in village and to village/A43 is already under pressure. (12)
 - Pumping station, drainage and sewage system already overloaded. (10)
 - Broadband connection is slow. (6)
 - Impact on wildlife. (19)
 - Land running alongside the site is a SSSI. (5)
 - Flood risk. (12)
 - Loss of amenity space. (4)
 - Loss of agricultural land. (9)
 - Lack of car parking in the village. (6)
 - Public transport will need to be improved. (3)
 - Loss of view. (18)
 - Loss of light, overlooking and loss of privacy. (8)
 - Noise pollution both during and after development. (7)
 - Light pollution both during and after development. (8)
 - Impact on property values. (9)

- Brownfield sites should be developed first. (4)
- Improvement on original proposal but services and infrastructure will be unable to cope. (1)
- Limited employment in the village to support additional residential development. (1)
- Land near A43 roundabout should be developed as an alternative. (1)
- KBC already has a 5 year land supply. (1)

Discounted Options

- Support discounting of RA/115 due to inadequate access. (1)
- Support for allocation of RA/115. (3)
 - Site is well located in relation to the village core and associated services.
 - Development of the site offers potential to create community benefits in terms of improved Community Centre car parking, additional space for sports/allotment facilities, improved linkages to the open countryside and bungalow accommodation for the elderly.
 - Access can be achieved by bringing a roadway across the car park area of the Community Centre.
 - While RA/174 provides a suitable location for development at Mawsley there is scope for development of both sites with RA/115 following as a second phase allocation. This is consistent with Mawsley's principle village designation.

Additional Comments

Governors of Mawsley Community Primary School

- Currently there are 362 pupils on roll. There is room of 420.
- Pupil numbers will need to be accurately assessed and predicted at a time in the future when the need to provide additional housing is determined.
- The school can not extend further on its present site.

Summary of officer comments

- Should RA/115 and RA/174 be progressed development principles formulated for the sites will include a provision highlighting archaeological concerns. It is likely that an assessment of archaeological significance is submitted with any future planning application to develop the above sites.
- Objection to further development in the village, and in particular to development of RA/174, is noted.
- The emerging Joint Core Strategy identifies Mawsley as a Principle Village, a focal point for development to meet local need in the surrounding rural area. The Council made representation opposing the identification of Mawsley as a Principle Village nevertheless, small scale growth in Mawsley is considered an appropriate option.
- Further work will be required to address the issues raised through the consultation process before a decision is made as to whether RA/174 will be progressed as an allocation.

- Further work, in conjunction with Northamptonshire County Council Highway Authority, will be required to determine whether the information provided demonstrates that access constraints to RA/115 can be overcome before a decision is made as to whether RA/115 will be progressed as an allocation.

Next steps

Further work will be required on sites RA/115 and RA/174 to address the issues raised before a decision is made on progression of sites as allocations.

Section Title 20 Newton
Number of responses 1
Summary of main points <u>Other Consultees:</u> <i>Housing Allocations</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Support option for small scale growth in Newton.• Support identification of RA/130 as the preferred option to accommodate small scale growth.
Summary of officer comments <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Support for small scale growth and the allocation of RA/130 is noted.
Next steps Progress option for small scale growth in Newton and RA/130 as the preferred site to accommodate growth.

Section Title 21 Orton
Number of responses 0
Summary of main points No comments received.
Summary of officer comments N/A
Next steps Progress as scattered development in the open countryside.

Section Title 22 Pipewell
Number of responses 1
Summary of main points <u>Statutory Consultees:</u> Wilbarston Parish Council <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Supports the content of the document regarding Pipewell.
Summary of officer comments <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Wilbarston Parish Council's support is noted.
Next steps Progress as scattered development in the open countryside.

<p>Section Title 23 Pytchley</p>
<p>Number of responses 2</p>
<p>Summary of main points</p> <p><u>Statutory Consultees:</u></p> <p>English Heritage <i>Housing Allocations</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The element of RA/117 identified as a potential allocation is not likely to impact on heritage assets. <p><i>Discounted Options</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Note that RA/119, RA/175, RA/176 and RA/209 have been discounted which all would impact considerably on the conservation area and other heritage assets. <p>NCC Archaeology <i>Housing Allocations</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The HER records up standing earthworks (ridge and furrow) within RA/117 Pytchley. If these are present then the proposed development would have a major impact which is unlikely to be mitigated. In light of the decision for DE/142 could RA/117 be potentially omitted from the allocation. <p>Other Consultees: <i>Discounted Options</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to discounting of RA/176. (1) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The site has been discounted for access constraints but no detail is provided as to what the constraint may be. Half of the site has permission for residential development off a single access point; the remainder of site would continue to be used as a farmyard. The redevelopment of the remainder of the land for residential development would not cause additional harm to the surrounding road network. ○ There are no physical constraint to development of the site, e.g. flooding and ecology. Development of the site would provide a visible improvement to the site which can be viewed from within and outside of the village; the site is available for development.
<p>Summary of officer comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments from English Heritage have been noted. • Development Principles for RA/117 will include criteria requiring further archaeological work in light of the comments received from NCC Archaeology. • NCC Highway Authority were consulted on the site when the assessment was being carried out and advised that no more

development could be accommodated on the site as the highway is already unadoptable. The site is therefore discounted on this basis.

Next steps

Progress option for small scale growth on site RA/117.

Section Title 24 Rushton
Number of responses 1
Summary of main points <u>Statutory Consultees:</u> English Heritage <i>Discounted Sites</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Supports discounting of the four identified sites as all would impact considerably on various heritage assets, including the conservation area and registered park and garden.
Summary of officer comments <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Comments from English Heritage are noted.
Next steps Progress no growth option in Rushton.

<p>Section Title 25 Stoke Albany</p>
<p>Number of responses 5</p>
<p>Summary of main points</p> <p><u>Statutory Consultees:</u></p> <p>Stoke Albany Parish Council</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports the content of the document regarding Stoke Albany. <p>English Heritage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RA/120 and RA/160 would impact on the conservation area and other heritage assets; note that they have been discounted. <p><u>Other Consultees:</u></p> <p><i>Discounted Options</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to discounting of RA/160 which would provide for a small number of dwellings towards the 'small scale growth' being advocated by the proposed policy. Site is suitable for appropriately designed small scale infill development. (1) • Object to discounting of RA/120. The element of the site fronting Ashley Road benefits from planning permission, allocation of the remainder of the site will allow for significant landscape improvement. (1) <p><i>New Sites Promoted</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One new site is promoted to the south of Harborough Road. (1) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Site is suitable to meet local need for affordable housing identified in the Housing Needs Assessment, access is achievable, development would support the sustainability of the village, site could provide for an allotment. ○ Although outside the settlement boundary there is established housing to the north, east and west and contained to the south by main Corby to Market Harborough road.
<p>Summary of officer comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stoke Albany Parish Council's support is noted. • Comments from English Heritage have been noted. • The new site promoted will have to be assessed according to the assessment criteria set out in the Housing Allocations Background Paper. • RA/120 is sensitive to development. Concerns about the impact on this site on the open countryside and the character of the village remain. The site remains a discounted option. • RA/160 is sensitive to new development given its elevated position and potential impacts on the Conservation Area and Listed Buildings. The

site remains a discounted option.

Next steps

- Assess site to the south of Harborough Road and determine whether it is suitable to accommodate small scale growth for affordable housing.
- Progress option for small scale growth.

<p>Section Title 26 Sutton Bassett</p>
<p>Number of responses 3</p>
<p>Summary of main points</p> <p><u>Other Consultees:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strongly agree there is no requirement for growth in Sutton Bassett. (1) • Occasional open spaces should be retained, e.g. (RA/196, RA/197, RA/198 and RA/199). (1) • Strongly agree with discounting of RA/194 and RA/195. • The grassed areas within the village, e.g. wide grass verges and the area around the Church, should be allocated as green spaces in the final Plan. (1) • Support for allocation of RA/197 which lies within the built environment of the village and is a natural infill village. (1) • Object to no growth approach in Sutton Bassett. Small scale growth identified in Weston-by-Welland to support village facilities and provide housing to meet local need. What facilities are in Weston-by-Welland that need to be supported? How can two villages in close proximity be treated so differently. (1)
<p>Summary of officer comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for 'no growth' is noted. • Comments in relation to green spaces will inform the next iteration of the plan. • There is no identified need for housing in Sutton Bassett, RA/197 has a significant number of constraints and has been discounted on this basis. • RA/136 identified as a potential housing option in Weston-by-Welland (RA/136) is a brownfield site where development could improve an otherwise unattractive site at a gateway into the village. Therefore there are some benefits in bringing this site forward for development.
<p>Next steps Progress no growth option in Sutton Bassett.</p>

Section Title 27 Thorpe Malsor
Number of responses 1
Summary of main points <u>Other Consultees:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Consultation document states no sites were identified to accommodate growth in Thorpe Malsor.• Representations submitted as part of the Options Paper consultation identified a site off Church Way, known as Dairy Buildings, as suitable for development.• Preferred option for 'no growth' in Thorpe Malsor should be revised as there is a suitable site to accommodate small scale sustainable growth.
Summary of officer comments <ul style="list-style-type: none">• No growth option has been identified as the preferred option in Thorpe Malsor as no suitable sites have been identified outside of the current developed area. Infill sites and conversions such as that proposed at the site off Church Way may be appropriate provided it complies with the National Planning Policy Framework and policies in the development plan.
Next steps Progress 'no growth' option.

Section Title 28 Thorpe Underwood
Number of responses 0
Summary of main points No comments received.
Summary of officer comments N/A
Next steps Progress as scattered development in the open countryside.

Section Title 29 Warkton
Number of responses 0
Summary of main points Not comments received.
Summary of officer comments N/A.
Next steps Progress no growth option.

<p>Section Title 30 Weekley</p>
<p>Number of responses 2</p>
<p>Summary of main points</p> <p><u>Statutory Consultees:</u></p> <p>English Heritage <i>Discounted Options</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although the sites have not been allocated as they are located within the settlement boundary they remain sensitive due to the conservation area, listed buildings and other heritage assets. Welcome the development of design principles for each site but it is not clear whether those principles will be displayed in this document or elsewhere. <p><u>Other Consultees:</u> <i>Discounted Options</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to option for 'no growth'. (1) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Object to discounting of RA/121 and RA/149 on the grounds that they are located within the settlement boundary. This does not give landowners/developers certainty in respect of the principle of development. This approach is contrary to the NPPF which states Local Plans should plan positively and allocate sites to promote development allowing development to come forward. ○ This approach is not consistent with that adopted in other settlements, e.g. Kettering and Burton Latimer. While there is a clear distinction between these settlements in terms of size, the approach to sites within the settlement boundary should remain consistent.
<p>Summary of officer comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments from English Heritage have been noted. • The CSS and emerging JCS require allocations in rural areas to be made based on local need. No growth has been identified as the preferred option in Weekley as no suitable sites have been identified outside of the current developed area. Infill sites and conversions within settlement boundaries will be appropriate where they comply with the National Planning Policy Framework, the development plan and may also be subject to specific design criteria/development principles. • The purposed of the Site Specific Proposals LDD is to allocate sites to meet identified need for housing. Larger sites have been identified within town boundaries, e.g. Kettering and Burton Latimer, as they make a significant contribution towards meeting the identified need. It is not necessary to allocate all small infill/conversion sites within boundaries of rural settlements.
<p>Next steps Progress no growth option.</p>

<p>Section Title 31 Weston-by-Welland</p>
<p>Number of responses 3</p>
<p>Summary of main points</p> <p><u>Statutory Consultees</u></p> <p>Weston-by-Welland Parish Council</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports the content of the document regarding Weston-by-Welland. <p>English Heritage <i>Housing Allocations</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design Principles for RA/136 will need to acknowledge heritage asset issues and how they should be addressed. <p><i>Discounted Options</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Note that RA/168 has been discounted. This site includes a large area of open space within the conservation area near to the church. <p><u>Other Consultees</u> <i>Housing Allocations</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support allocation of RA/136 but the yield should be amended to 8-11 dwellings with any proposed development required to provide evidence as part of an application to demonstrate that the proposals conform to the character and historic form of the settlement. (1)
<p>Summary of officer comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments from the Parish Council and English Heritage have been noted. • It has not been demonstrated at this stage that 11 dwellings can be accommodated on the site without adverse impact on the character and form of the village. The site is a prominent location on the edge of the settlement and a higher density would be out of keeping with the character of the surrounding area.
<p>Next steps Progress option for small scale growth on site RA/136 with a yield of 8 dwellings.</p>

<p>Section Title 32 Wilbarston</p>
<p>Number of responses 2</p>
<p>Summary of main points</p> <p><u>Statutory Consultees:</u></p> <p>Wilbarston Parish Council</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports the content of the document regarding Wilbarston. <p>NCC Archaeology</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RA/172 is identified as being within an area in which development is likely to have a significant negative impact on the historic or cultural environment. Further information regarding archaeological significance will be required in advance of any development in line with the guidance within the NPPF paragraph 128. The results of the archaeological assessment will provide information on the extent, preservation and significance of any archaeological within the proposed development area. It is only after this has been undertaken that decisions regarding development and master planning if appropriate can be made. <p><u>Other Consultees:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to exclusion of RA/200 and RA/201. (1) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There appears to be inconsistency in the approach that has been adopted to the scoring of the assessment criteria on which the additional sites have been considered. ○ Identified site RA/128, RA/170, RA/173, RA/109, RA/110 and RA/174 scores less favourably than RA/200 and RA/201 which have been discounted. ○ Impacts on landscape and settlement character can be mitigated. ○ Wilbarston is a sustainable location to accommodate new residential development. ○ RA/200 is logical site for development.
<p>Summary of officer comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support of Wilbarston Parish Council is noted. • The development principles formulated for RA/172 will include a provision highlighting archaeological concerns. It is likely that an assessment of archaeological significance is submitted with any future planning application to develop the above sites. • RA/200 and RA/201 have been discounted due to adverse impact on the landscape and settlement character. No evidence has been provided at this stage to demonstrate that these constraints can be overcome. As such there has been no change to the scoring of the assessments and they remain discounted options.

- There is an identified need for affordable housing in Wilbarston and of the sites identified to accommodate this growth site RA/172 scores most favourably. Given the landscape impacts of RA/200 and RA/201 this site remains the most appropriate option for meeting the identified need for affordable housing.

Next steps

- Progress option for small scale growth for affordable housing on RA/172.