

Appendix 2

Section	ID	Full Name	Organisation Details	Reason for comment	KBC response
1	12	Mr Nicholas Peck		<p>If this huge housing expansion program was to take place, what kind of housing would be build and who would benefit, the existing local community or would this be to house the next influx of migrants?. Will this be affordable housing for local young families to buy and make their own homes or large luxury homes that few can afford? What investment will be made to local industry and businesses to provide employment opportunities for the new residents? How will our overstressed transport networks and infrastructure will cope with the extra volume of traffic? Where will the children be educated? The schools are already at full capacity. Who is going to police these new neighbourhoods considering the year-on-year budget cuts and ever shrinking numbers of the police service? What investment will be made into the health service? Will the hospital be extended? Will the ambulance and fire services be expanded? Will KBC be sneaking in more plans to build waste gasification plants (like you did at Desborough) to provide power and heat for these new sites and poison the borough with the resulting toxic emissions? If you must build more houses, redevelop some of the existing brown sites and leave the green spaces alone Building more houses is not the answer to this country's problems, getting migration under control and balanced is one of the major answers to the problems. We are already overcrowded!</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which have been noted. Development of larger sites will be required to contribute towards improvements to the highway network via a s.106 agreement. Provision of schools and adequate medical facilities are an important consideration when planning for future growth. Kettering Borough Council will work with NCC Education and health care providers to ensure adequate provision is available for residents of new development. Contributions to education and medical facilities and affordable housing can also be secured via a s.106. The Site Specific Proposals LDD also allocates land across the Borough to meet employment requirement up to the period 2031. 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.</p>

4	7	Mr Simon Taylor	<p>The three sites DE/072, DE/189 & DE/173 have already seen amenity removed from the area with the closing of the leisure centre on the site and the children's football field on DE/072 as well as the adjacent skateboard park, leaving the children in the area no place to play or gather safely. These sites are also used as recreation and dog walking facilities as well as providing the area with its limited open space for the residents to enjoy. In addition it seems foolish to allocate further locations for housing when the new site at The Grange has not seen house sales to the expectations of the developer, and that is in an area that has the newly built leisure centre and children's play park, how then will it make sense to build further houses in an area that has been stripped of these amenities?</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The Site Specific Proposals LDD 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 loss of open space has been recognised in the assessment of the site, if the site is development then open space will be provided in accordance with the Open Space SPD. The Site Specific Proposals LDD identifies allocations for growth to 2031. Therefore, growth will be staggered across the plan period rather than an immediate increase in the number of households.</p>
---	---	-----------------	--	---

4	8	Mr Gareth Parton		<p>I find it incredible when looking at the amount of accommodation in and around Desborough, Rothwell and Kettering that remains unlive in for so many years that the council can even consider allowing the build of yet more new houses on land at the bottom of Broadlands which has remained an area of natural beauty for so long.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The Site Specific Proposals LDD identifies allocations for growth to 2031. Therefore, growth will be staggered across the plan period rather than an immediate increase in the number of households.</p>
4	9	Mr John Steel		<p>With Reference to proposed build areas DE 072 / 189 / 173: Adjacent to a recognised wildlife area. A public amenity for walkers including dog walkers which helps contain dog activity away from housing, pathways, park areas (including children's play areas). Improving safety and hygiene, dogs attacking children, dog excrement kept away from children. Encroaching onto a recognised flood plane, houses in Ise Vale, Leys, Broadlands, Cedar and Pine Close all of which are in danger of flooding. The existing houses in these roads currently have gardens that flood in heavy rain. Building in DE / 072 / 189 / 173 will restrict natural rain water drainage into the Ise River increasing the likelihood of flooding.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The assessment of the site recognises proximity to a wildlife area and development of the site would need to provide mitigation for any harm and would be required to provide a net increase in biodiversity. The identified sites do not fall within a flood zone. They are adjacent to a flood zone and this has been recognised in the assessment of the sites. Any planning application for a site located within a flood zone would need to consider flood risk in accordance with Part 10 of the National Planning Framework and would be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment.</p>

4	10	Miss Rebecca Richards	Re: DE 072 / 189 / 173: The land is adjacent to a recognised wildlife area. It's a public amenity for walkers including dog walkers which helps contain dog activity away from housing, pathways, park areas (including children's play areas). This improves safety and hygiene, dogs attacking children and dog excrement is kept away from children. New housing would encroach onto a recognised flood plane, houses in Ise Vale, Leys, Broadlands, Cedar and Pine Close are all in danger of flooding. The existing houses in these roads currently have gardens that flood in heavy rain. Building in DE / 072 / 189 / 173 will restrict natural rain water drainage into the Ise River increasing the likelihood of flooding.	Thank you for your comments. The assessment of the site recognises proximity to a wildlife area and development of the site would need to provide mitigation for any harm and would be required to provide a net increase in biodiversity. The identified sites do not fall within a flood zone. They are adjacent to a flood zone and this has been recognised in the assessment of the sites. Any planning application for a site located within a flood zone would need to consider flood risk in accordance with Part 10 of the National Planning Framework and would be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment.
---	----	-----------------------------	--	--

4	11	Mrs Carole Preen	<p>On no account should any housing be considered below Lower Steeping. This is an area of natural beauty where families walk their dogs and pick blackberries etc. People have adapted their homes to take account of the beauty of the Ise Valley and any further development would lower the value of these homes. The area is full of wildlife; this summer I have watched hawks, owls and bats in the area and there is a large family of magpies and other birds who nest in the trees surrounding the fields. It would be an absolute tragedy to build on this stunning location and to ruin Desborough any further than has already been done over the last few years. Despite extra building in the North of the town, we still have little infrastructure to support the population with schools and shops. The bus service is poor and expensive. Before you think of any more housing, these problems need to be addressed.</p>	<p>Your comments in relation to development to the south of Desborough have been noted. The assessment of these sites recognises proximity to a wildlife area. Development of the site would need to provide mitigation for any harm and would be required to provide a net increase in biodiversity. Provision of schools is an important consideration when planning for future growth. Kettering Borough Council works closely with NCC Education to ensure adequate provision is available for residents of new development. The Options Paper (March 2012) identified opportunities aimed at improving the town centre. If adopted the identified options would ensure the town centre was redeveloped alongside any residential development. Improvements to the bus service can be secured through s.106 contributions.</p>
---	----	------------------	---	--

4	13	Ms Nyair Barclay	<p>Disagree with DE/210. There is enough housing at Broadlands, we dont want any more additional houses. The land floods and the old sewer works used to be located here. Developing this site will result in the loss of open countryside. We have already lost open countryside at the Grange. This is a nice area and people like to walk their dogs on this land. It is nice to look at and people dont want more houses in Desborough. The Leisure Centre should have been kept for a school. There are no facilities in Desborough besides the Co-Op. There is no train station in Desborough. We need to travel to Corby for facilities and there is no way to get home if we miss the last bus because there is no train station. There are no public toilets anymore in Desborough and there is only 1 butcher, the Co-Op, jewellers and one or two newspaper shops. If Desborough had a train station it would bring more business to the town.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments in relation to DE/210. The Site Specific Proposals LDD identifies allocations for growth to 2031. Therefore, growth will be staggered across the plan period rather than an immediate increase in the number of households. The identified sites do not fall within a flood zone. They are adjacent to a flood zone and this has been recognised in the assessment of the sites. Any planning application for a site located within a flood zone would need to consider flood risk in accordance with Part 10 of the National Planning Framework and would be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment. The Options Paper (March 2012) identified opportunities aimed at improving the town centre. If adopted the identified options would ensure the town centre was redeveloped alongside any residential development. Improvements to the bus service can be secured through s.106 contributions.</p>
---	----	---------------------	---	--

4	14	Mr Richard A King	<p>DE/189, DE/173, DE/072 - DE/210 Assessing the three sites, referred to above, comprehensively is totally unacceptable. DE/189 is used daily by local people for recreational purposes, and has been for a number of years. The Ise Valley should not be encroached upon any further as flood water on several occasions has reached these fields. The finding of the Department of the Environment in the 1990's are still valid today - even more so with land for housing more suitable to the north of the town. There are certainly no mitigating circumstances to warrant the loss of this natural amenity.</p>	<p>Your comments in relation to development of comprehensive sites DE/210 are noted. The identified sites do not fall within a flood zone. They are adjacent to a flood zone and this has been recognised in the assessment of the sites. Any planning application for a site located within a flood zone would need to consider flood risk in accordance with Part 10 of the National Planning Framework and would be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment.</p>
---	----	----------------------	---	--

4	15	Mr Grenville Wm Leesing	<p>Observation for consultation of potential development DE/173 of the Council Field off Lower Steeping, Desborough Our use of the above land started in the 1970s when we liaised with the late Roger Howes, whose father, Norman, had an Agricultural Tenancy on the field. We agreed to put a gate in our boundary fence to provide easier access, so we could maintain the boundary, monitor his grazing animals and use the field for recreational purposes. From 1980 we had regular correspondence with the KBC, plus with a view to purchasing the field for paddocks and preserving this part of the beautiful Ise Valley. We have enjoyed and monitored the use of these fields continually since that time as our home faces onto them. When we purchased our home the field was originally intended as a sports facility but those plans were not implemented and they remained as pasture, so we trimmed the hedges and maintained fences over the decades. Obviously this amenity for use and for all the Walkers who use it, many with pet dogs, will be a loss and a further loss in the devaluation of ours and others properties due to this proposed change. Therefore, naturally we are not in favour of the housing development of DE/173. As responsible citizens we realise that more homes are required in the Kettering area and our part of Desborough is at present a pleasant place to reside with current manageable traffic volumes. The roads including Lower Steeping leading to the proposed development could provide access and egress for foot and vehicular traffic, but the potential use would have to be realistically assessed and</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments in relation to highway safety. Development of this site would require improvement to the highway network to mitigate any potential problems. The identified sites do not fall within a flood zone. They are adjacent to a flood zone and this has been recognised in the assessment of the sites. Any planning application for a site located within a flood zone would need to consider flood risk in accordance with Part 10 of the National Planning Framework and would be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment.</p>
---	----	----------------------------------	---	---

			<p>designed to cope with the density of traffic at peak times to ensure road safety. A single access may not solve such problems, plus it could result in pedestrians trespassing on adjacent properties to access the nearer Desborough Town facilities. This is an ongoing problem so at least alternative pathways are required. Thus a vehicular access to the Rothwell Road is very desirable. What is the impact of additional housing on the lower adjacent field which is a flood plane where water usually rises in the old course of the River Ise? We have recorded these floods on film including an area of the proposed DE/173 development. If this development is ever approved and there is an access over our land at the end of Lower Steeping we doubt whether any compensation could make up for our loss, but we trust that you will at least take note of the Public Safety and Water course points we have raised for consideration in this consultation process.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

4	19	Mr Tim Kay	<p>I strongly disagree with the developments DE189, DE173 and DE072. Any development could affect Tailby Meadow which is a rare and precious wet grassland. It is also very popular with the inhabitants of Desborough for walks. Further building could well cause flooding issues because the whole area is a flood plain. There are plenty of other options for building which would not have such a great impact.</p>	<p>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. The identified sites do not fall within a flood zone. They are adjacent to a flood zone and this has been recognised in the assessment of the sites. Any planning application for a site located within a flood zone would need to consider flood risk in accordance with Part 10 of the National Planning Framework and would be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment.</p>
---	----	------------	---	--

4	22	Mr Andrew Mair	<p>I live in Brookside, Desborough and I am writing to register my opposition to the proposed housing allocations in the Ise Valley (RefDE189/DE173). I have viewed the range of allocations considered for Desborough and I am at a loss (and your team at Marlow House on 11 November were also unable to explain) why these would be seen as preferred options to develop. Having lived here for over 25 years we are accustomed to regular flooding in these fields and, even at times of lower rainfall, they still remain waterlogged for long periods of time. It therefore appears to me that the costs of developing, impact on the new householders gardens in winter and increased risk of the development creating flood risks in Brookside, need to be taken into consideration and would indicate the costs of developing these fields are uneconomic . The town plan seem to include a number of alternative sites on higher ground? However, many of these seem to have been discounted although no one could tell us why at the meeting on 11 November. I would urge you to reconsider these alternative sites again and at the very least justify the earlier decisions to the residents of the town. Further, these fields are important open areas for the residents of this side of Desborough, used for walking dogs and general exercise and I am concerned about the environmental impact on vegetation and wildlife. I am also concerned that the rate of expansion of the town has outstripped the capacity for our local doctors, dentists and shops. The high street is in need of serious regeneration in order to bring the facilities up to a standard to support a town of the current size, let alone after any</p>	<p>The identified sites do not fall within a flood zone. They are adjacent to a flood zone and this has been recognised in the assessment of the sites. Any planning application for a site located within a flood zone would need to consider flood risk in accordance with Part 10 of the National Planning Framework and would be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment. The assessment of the site recognises its proximity to a wildlife area and development of the site would need to provide mitigation for any harm and would be required to provide a net increase in biodiversity. Medical facilities are an important consideration when planning for future growth. Kettering Borough Council will work closely with health care providers to ensure adequate provision is available for residents of new development. 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 was redeveloped alongside any residential development.</p>
---	----	----------------	--	--

further new houses are built

4	23	Mrs Tracey Mair	<p>I am writing to register my strong opposition to the proposed housing allocations in the Ise Valley (RefDE189/DE173). I believe that these fields are unsuitable for development as they are prone to flooding and, even at times of lower rainfall, they still remain waterlogged for long periods of time. Downsides of development include the costs of developing, impact on the new householders gardens in winter and increased risk of the development creating flood risks in Brookside and these suggest development would be uneconomic and is certainly opposed by me. These fields are important open areas for the residents, used for walking dogs and general exercise and I am concerned about the environmental impact on vegetation and wildlife. There seem to be a number of alternative sites on higher ground which seem to have been discounted although no one can tell us why. I would urge you to reconsider these alternative sites again. I am also concerned that the rate of expansion of the town has outstripped the capacity for our local doctors, dentists and shops. The high street is in need of serious regeneration in order to bring the facilities up to a standard to support a town of the current size, let alone after any further new houses are built</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The identified sites do not fall within a flood zone. They are adjacent to a flood zone and this has been recognised in the assessment of the sites. Any planning application for a site located within a flood zone would need to consider flood risk in accordance with Part 10 of the National Planning Framework and would be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment. The assessment of the site recognises its proximity to a wildlife area and development of the site would need to provide mitigation for any harm and would be required to provide a net increase in biodiversity. Medical facilities are an important consideration when planning for future growth. Kettering Borough Council will work closely with health care providers to ensure adequate provision is available for residents of new development. 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 was redeveloped alongside any residential development.</p>
---	----	-----------------	--	---

4	24	Mr Rupert Smith	<p>I am writing to voice my objection to the proposed development of the land where the old Leisure Centre was situated and along the Ise Valley near Broadlands and Valley rise. I was under the impression that this land would never be built on as it is frequently waterlogged and because of the natural habitat and wildlife. It was reported in the 1990's by the Town Council "that this land should not be built on for all time". Building more houses is likely to alter the water table and I understand the pumping station is already working beyond the capacity it was designed. There will probably be a high increase in traffic down most of the roads leading off Dunkirk Avenue. With so much building work will the facilities in Desborough cope such as the Schools, the Doctors Surgery, etc. Looking at plans for the surrounding towns and villages it would appear Desborough is taking the brunt of any development.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments in relation to development to the south of Desborough. The site does not fall within a flood zone, it is adjacent to a flood zone and this has been recognised in the assessment of the site. Any planning application for a site located within a flood zone would need to consider flood risk in accordance with Part 10 of the National Planning Framework and would be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment. The impact on wildlife has been considered in the assessment of the site. Development of the site would need to provide mitigation for any harm to wildlife and would be required to provide a net increase in biodiversity. 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. The Site Specific Proposals LDD identifies allocations for growth to 2031. The growth strategy as set out in 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 the expansion at Kettering. Development in rural areas must be based on identified local need that cannot be met more sustainably at a nearby larger settlement. Therefore sites have been identified for allocation on the basis of this growth strategy with Kettering providing the main focus for</p>
---	----	-----------------	--	---

					<p>growth supported by the market towns and then by growth in rural areas where there is an identified local need.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

4	26	Kevin & Sally Woodward	<p>Proposed Development of Sites DE/072, DE/189 and DE/210 in Desborough We feel that it is important for us to write to you concerning the development of the above land into a residential area. As residents of Cedar Close, which backs onto the proposed site, we feel that we must inform you of the environmental issues that concern us, some of which you may not be aware. We have resided in Cedar Close for the past 23 years and are also long term members of the Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire and Northamptonshire Wildlife Trust. The Ise River valley is a particular haven for local wildlife with the valley forming a transit route for many forms of wildlife. This transit route depends upon there being a significant buffer of land on both sides of the river, which the proposed development would remove. In recent history, we have noted a number of key wildlife species in the area immediately associated with the river along the proposed development. These include the following:- Birds: Short Eared Owl - these being winter migrants to Northamptonshire, which is a noted area for them. Barn Owl - these are increasingly suffering from reduced areas of habitat. Tawny Owl Cuckoo - every summer they arrive. They are now under threat in the UK due to migration issues over the Sahara. Corn Bunting - this species is critically endangered in the UK. Snipe - wading/damp meadow bird with reducing habitat. Woodcock - a shy and very secretive game bird easily disturbed from its habitat. Kingfisher - a beautiful bird that relies upon habitat such as the River Ise for survival. Green Woodpecker - relies upon unploughed pasture. In total we have seen nearly 90 species</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The assessment of the site considers impact on wildlife and development of the site would need to provide mitigation for any harm to wildlife and would be required to provide a net increase in biodiversity.</p>
---	----	------------------------	--	--

			<p>of birds in the area of proposed development. Mammals Regular visitors also include Pipistrelle bats in our garden each evening in the summer months, which are, of course, a protected species. The river Ise is also a suitable environment for water voles and otters both of which are species that are actively being encouraged back into their natural habitat in the UK by various wildlife organisations. Butterflies In recent years we have seen 19 species of butterfly in our garden, this is around one third of all species that can be seen in the British Isles and fifty percent of all the species found in the Northamptonshire and when one considers that many species are only found in localised pockets and specific habitats such as quarries and woodlands this is significantly higher than would be found in many areas. Whilst you may have consulted environmental organisations such as the Wildlife Trust about the impact of the environment in the vicinity, they will not have had the benefit of long term and regular observation of wildlife activity in the locality, therefore, their perspective on the matter will be limited. Whilst we appreciate the need for housing development, should we not all remember that we are merely custodians of this planet and in particular, the local countryside? Do we not owe it to future generations to protect our wildlife?</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

4	27	Kevin & Sally Woodward	<p>Proposed Development of DE/210, DE/189 and DE/072 in Desborough. We wish to raise our concerns about the above development and in particular three factors that will have an adverse impact on the local community. (We have also written to you separately about our environmental concerns). 1) We are concerned about access to this proposed development. None of the possible accesses at the Hawthornes or Valley Rise are suitable for bi-directional traffic and we understand that the council is considering an access route off the B576 (the former A6) adjacent to the bridge over the River Ise. Whilst the former A6 has been downgraded and the speed limit through Desborough has been reduced from 40mph to 30mph, this does not stop motorists speeding out of Desborough down the hill past the proposed entrance. Indeed, we have seen many do it seemingly out of frustration at being constrained by the 30mph speed limit that is quite rightly set in Desborough. Neither does it stop them from speeding down the hill from Rothwell. Many pupils from Montsaye School use the footpath that would cross this entrance instead of using the bus. This, coupled with the fact that this area floods across the road when the water table is high, could lead to a road traffic disaster particularly in wintery conditions and/or when the A6 bypass may be closed and traffic rerouted through Desborough which certainly happens. 2) Whilst there has been discussion on building another primary school in Desborough to cater for the educational needs of the residents, nothing has been proposed about another secondary school that this would feed</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The assessment of the site considers impacts on the highway in terms of access and capacity. Development of the site will require improvements to the highway network to mitigate any potential problems. 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. 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 was redeveloped alongside any residential development.</p>
---	----	------------------------------	---	---

				<p>into. This means that even more pupils will transit from Desborough to Rothwell for their secondary education creating even more congestion at this entrance point. 3) Desborough now has a population in excess of 10,000 people with a very poor infrastructure to support it. The danger is that it will become a sprawling mass of housing and little in the way of community within it. If Desborough was being planned as a "new town", government legislation would not allow it to be built without a comprehensive infrastructure plan to support its proposed population. As residents are we not at least owed the same? We currently have overfull primary schools, only one doctor's practice, no mainstream supermarket or fuel filling station that can service the population at reasonable market prices. Our concern is that this development is being considered out of desperation as a number of other sites have been discounted for seemingly far less valid reasons. Please do not ruin our countryside and community based on a short-sighted and short term view.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

4	28	Mr & Mrs D Gage	<p>Q1. Comments on DE/189, DE/173 Q2. Comments on the merits of the sites identified? We can see no merit to us at all! A quiet residential area will be spoilt and a beautiful part of Desborough will be spoilt forever. Q3. Comments on detail for development: Access via Lower Stepping will completely spoil a very quiet road, and during construction the noise will be horrendous. Q4. What infrastructure will be necessary to support development of the sites? An already inadequate hospital services, doctors, parking, shops, garage, schools and road maintenance. How will Desborough cope with so many more residents? Q5. Any other comments: The Leisure Centre was taken from us, and an inadequate one was built further away from the traditional centre of Desborough. In spite of residents objections the Magnetic Park Energy Centre has been approved. Does the council ever listen?</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which have been noted. The assessment of the site considers impacts on the highway in terms of access and capacity. Development of the site will require improvements to the highway network to mitigate any potential problems. 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. 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 was redeveloped alongside any residential development. The Options Paper also 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.</p>
---	----	--------------------	--	---

4	29	Mr & Mrs D Woods	<p>May we admit, at the outset, that we have a personal interest in the proposed building of houses on the land at the foot of Lower Stepping. It would have an obvious effect on any number of personal interests such as the present linked access, house values, tranquillity and a huge increase in traffic volume. However, my major concern is that the proposed houses would be built on a known flood plain. Every time there is a heavy rainfall, the land is flooded, even to the extent of the Ise River swelling to block the Rothwell-Desborough road. The number of new houses clearly has implications for additional stress on local amenities. The new houses in the Grange development have provided evidence of this already but this development, if completed, would be even larger. Neither Loatlands nor Havelock Schools can cope at their present size. When it comes to the availability of shopping facilities, we are dependent on, at most, three supermarkets, even if we include the "controversial" Tesco development. While we have other small shops, nobody would think that they make any meaningful contribution to an expanding population. Apart from the land being unsuitable for this huge proposed development, it would utterly destroy the peaceful aspect along a whole swathe on this south perimeter of Desborough. It would lead to a huge increase in road traffic. We and many of the people we have contacted believe it to be a very bad proposal, detrimental to all those already living in the "access areas" and for Desborough as a whole.</p>	<p>Your comments in relation to development to the south of Desborough have been noted. The identified sites do not fall within a flood zone. They are adjacent to a flood zone and this has been recognised in the assessment of the sites. Any planning application for a site located within a flood zone would need to consider flood risk in accordance with Part 10 of the National Planning Framework and would be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment. Provision of schools is an important consideration when planning for future growth. Kettering Borough Council works closely with NCC Education to ensure adequate provision is available for residents of new development. 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 was redeveloped alongside any residential development.</p>
---	----	------------------	--	--

4	30	Mr & Mrs D Woods	<p>Q1. DE/210 Q2. Comments on the merits of the sites identified? No obvious merits. Would be building on an obvious flood plain. Huge increase in traffic. Massive offset on schools, shops, local amenities and quality of life. Q3. Comments on detail for development: Access would be restricted to what are at present minor residential roads. Would tend to become its own town with no obvious connection with existing facilities. Q4. What infrastructure will be necessary to support development of the sites? Huge implications for education, shopping, leisure facilities and additional infrastructure i.e. sewerage, gas, electricity and water. Would require expansion of existing schools on limited sites. Q5. Any other comments: Informal consultation has shown no support and active hostility to what is considered to be an ill conceived and detrimental plan.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. DE/210 does not fall within a flood zone, although the site is located adjacent to a flood zone and this is recognised in the assessment of the site. Any planning application for a site located within a flood zone would need to consider flood risk in accordance with Part 10 of the National Planning Framework and would be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment. Kettering Borough Council works closely with NCC Education to ensure adequate provision is available for residents of new development. 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 was redeveloped alongside any residential development.</p>
---	----	---------------------	---	---

4	32	Ms Elizabeth Tate	<p>These comment are for DE72 DE173 DE189 DE210 This site is a very beautiful area, it would be criminal to build on this site. When there are so many ugly brown sites that could be transformed into pleasant housing sites, in many areas. The impact of building on this site would be disastrous for wildlife. I have seen otters, deer, kingfishers, hares, red kites, owls and my partner spotted a water rail which is a very rare bird. All these creatures would lose their habitat. The schools and doctors are over subscribed at the moment. The town does not have enough employment to accommodate extra people. The site frequently floods and is impassable, so these houses would be very expensive to insure.</p>	<p>Brownfield sites have been considered as potential allocations throughout the Borough. The impact on wildlife has been considered in the assessment of the site. Development of the site would need to provide mitigation for any harm to wildlife and would be required to provide a net increase in biodiversity. 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. The Site Specific Proposals LDD also allocates land for employment. The site does not fall within a flood zone. The site is adjacent to a flood zone and this has been recognised in the assessment of the site. Any planning application for a site located within a flood zone would need to consider flood risk in accordance with Part 10 of the National Planning Framework and would be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment.</p>
---	----	-------------------------	--	--

4	33	Mrs Beryl Norman	<p>I write to express my concern over the proposed development along the Ise Valley in Desborough. I attended the consultation session on the 11th November, but did not get satisfactory answers to my questions and we were told by Simon Richardson of the planning department that even a petition of 10,000 would hardly make any difference - now this sounds as though a decision has already been made and the consultation was a paper exercise only. I do hope you can prove me wrong on this. There was an area on the map, designated as site 33 on the west of Desborough which was a designated strategic site, although it had apparently been discounted as an area for development I could gain no answers as to why it had been discounted as on the surface it appears a much more suitable site than the strip you actually wish to develop along the Ise Valley. I would support the idea of more housing in this area rather than compromise the Ise Valley. There are several good reasons not to develop that area of which I am sure you are aware, but to re-enforce that awareness - firstly the area floods, the proposed access onto the Desborough Road near the bridge we feel would be a very unsafe proposition, not to mention the strong feelings about protecting open spaces and our beautiful countryside. There are several agencies interested in maintaining the area as an area of natural beauty. The Tailby meadow is a unique area which has not been ploughed for hundreds of years and is an area of rare grassland. Now whilst I am aware that you may not wish to build directly on that area - any development in the area would impinge on the</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As you mention Site 33 is a strategic site which has been considered and discounted through the Joint Core Strategy. A smaller element of Site 33, to the north of Federation Avenue has been promoted for development through this consultation process. The site will be assessed against the criteria set out in the Housing Allocations Background Paper to determine its suitability as a potential housing allocation prior to the next iteration of the plan. In terms of DE/210, the site does not fall within a flood zone, although it is located adjacent to a flood zone and this is recognised in the assessment of the site. Any planning application for a site located within a flood zone would need to consider flood risk in accordance with Part 10 of the National Planning Framework and would be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment. 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.</p>
---	----	------------------	---	---

			<p>natural grassland. The Wildlife Trust is very keen to preserve this natural area as are the residents of Desborough who regularly use the area for walking and enjoying the local green spaces. I understand the need for the proposed further housing, but feel strongly that the Ise Valley proposals are badly conceived and definitely not the right area for developing over 300 houses with the footfall and traffic increase, without mentioning the increased pressure on already overstretched services in the local health provision. Please reconsider this very bad proposal and listen to the folks of Desborough who feel so strongly about their local area.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

4	34	Ms Mary Mcneally	<p>Re: Proposed development of Ise valley behind old leisure centre I would like to make my feelings known about the above site. This has always been an area of natural beauty and health and leisure for the people of Desborough and as such should be left undisturbed for all who use it as a means of health and recreation pursuits whether it be walking dogs, getting exercise as I do or just getting the health benefits of destressing in nature. As often is the case in our modern world some developments are seen as progress but often as not it is not real progress as our quality of life is affected negatively! There must be other areas where this development can take place, because there is a risk to wild life and natural beauty of the banks of the Ise and the wild grasslands and flower meadows which have been preserved so well up to now. Remember what we lose cannot be got back, and I urge you to reconsider this awful idea and act in a common sense way for the good of all, rather than the monetary gains of a few. There are more than sufficient housing developments in Desborough and not enough infrastructure for present needs as it is! Please listen to the people of Desborough and surrounding areas,</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. This site, along with many others, has been assessed for development in Desborough. The Site Specific Proposals LDD identifies allocations for growth to 2031. Therefore, growth will be staggered across the plan period rather than an immediate increase in the number of households. The assessment of the site takes account of the impact on Tailby Meadow and is an important consideration of the site is progressed as an allocation. Development of this site will need to provide mitigation for any harm to Tailby Meadow and would also need to provide a net gain in biodiversity.</p>
---	----	------------------	--	--

4	35	Ms Diane Williams	<p>Ref: Plans to build 304 houses - Ise Valley, Desborough I wish to register my objection to the proposals to build houses on the above area. We moved to Desborough about 9 years ago, because of the open spaces and countryside. Some of this has already been built upon (The Grange). We enjoy walking our dog on the fields as well as taking our grandson to enjoy the fresh air and help him to enjoy being outdoors - something that is sadly lacking in many of our young people. Our house is not worth as much as houses in other areas because Desborough is not the prettiest town and does not have great access to jobs. This is something that people accept when they decide to move here - this is the compromise for having access to the Ise Valley fields and river. I would like to understand how the council think that there is sufficient infrastructure to meet the needs of an additional 300+ families when the infrastructure is sadly lacking now: 1. can't get to see a doctor in Desborough 2. waiting lists for primary schools are two years long 3. No proper facilities for young people - the old leisure centre replaced by one that is no bigger but has to cater for more people - the kids skate park and tennis courts allowed to deteriorate and taken down 4. The roads are in dreadful disrepair In addition, about 6 years ago the whole of the valley was flooded so I cannot think how it can be safe to build in this area. If these houses are built the council will have a 'tick in the box' to say they have met their targets and the builders will have made money - but will these houses become permanent family homes - no - they will become rental properties - just like the houses on the</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The provision of schools and 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. The Site Specific Proposals LDD 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. Development of this site would require improvement to the highway network to mitigate any potential problems. The identified site does not fall within a flood zone. It is adjacent to a flood zone and this has been recognised in the assessment of the site. Any planning application for a site located within a flood zone would need to consider flood risk in accordance with Part 10 of the National Planning Framework and would be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment. 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.</p>
---	----	-------------------	--	--

				<p>Grange. I am sure there are plenty of brown field sites that can be built upon and old derelict buildings that could be renovated - if the council really wants to make a difference for the community without taking away the countryside that can be enjoyed by all then this is the option to take. I look forward to hearing from you.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

4	36	Ms Yvonne Starkey	<p>I am writing to show my concern about the proposed 304 houses planned for the Ise Valley Desborough. This an area of natural beauty where lots of families go for walks and enjoy time in the countryside. Wild life abound here and is a natural habitat for them. Although Desborough is in a rural setting there are not many places where you can go for a walk that does not mean walking along a busy road. Also Desborough has not got the infrastructure to accommodate such a large building site. It's already difficult to get an appointment at the Doctors Surgery. Our roads are busy and we do not have the shops or retail outlets to deal with amount of houses. Our schools would also struggle. But above all please do not build on green field sites when there are plenty of brown field sites in Desborough that need developing, that look ugly and bring the down. Be more thoughtful for our environment, we will never get our pleasant and important open spaces back again.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments in relation to DE/210. Impacts on wildlife have been considered in the assessment of the site and development of the site will need to mitigate any harm to wildlife and provide a net gain in biodiversity. The provision of schools and 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. In terms of shops and retail 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 was redeveloped 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.</p>
---	----	-------------------	---	--

4	37	mrs Rose Giles	<p>I am writing with ref to DE/072, DE/189 and DE/073 proposed building site to strongly object to this. We have moved from the London area to this wonderful part of countryside of Desborough. We have started a family here and this year we became parents to our son, which we walk these beautiful fields, pushing him around and watching him take everything in..... nothing but nature. Then I hear that you want to build on this natural space? How will children learn? when schools are over flowing. How will parents earn money to pay the mortgages on these new house when there is no employment ? How will houses be insured when its comes within the flood plain?? Desborough is a small town which can not cope now Doctors - its a mission to get an appointment, schools are full and no employment. Then there is the most important part wildlife and our environment. There are birds badgers rabbits otters etc which live within Isle Valley which is full of so much wildlife. Families walk these fields with their children and dogs every day. These fields have been used for over 40 years by families, dog walkers, residents and wildlife and you want to take away this beautiful part of natural habitat.</p>	<p>Your comments in relation to development to the south of Desborough have been noted. These sites are not located within the flood zone, they are adjacent to the flood zone and this has been recognised in the assessment of the site. Any planning application for a site located in a flood zone would need to consider flood risk in accordance with Policy 10 of the NPPF and would be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment. Provision of schools is an important consideration when planning for future growth. Kettering Borough Council will work closely with NCC Education to ensure adequate provision is available for residents of new development. Provision of medical facilities is also an important consideration and work will be undertaken to ensure there is adequate provision for new residents. The assessment of the site also considers impact on wildlife. Development of the site will be required to mitigate any potential harm.</p>
---	----	-------------------	---	--

4	38	Mrs Kim Buckley	<p>With regards to plan DE189 and DE073 along Ise Valley. I moved here only 1 year ago almost to the day...I just can't believe it. I moved from a village in south Leicestershire and chose our house in Desborough as it was next to beautiful fields and views. I have 2 dogs which I walk every day along these fields, along the way I see young and old enjoying the open air and nature, getting out and keeping fit. I see much wildlife including green woodpeckers and buzzards to name a couple. In my short time here I've found there is little to do in Desborough as amenities are sparse, the GP surgery is bulging at its seams and the schools appear to be the same. Please, how on earth can the infrastructure cope if there is another influx of houses built on this beautiful piece of countryside? What about the impact to the risk of flooding? I went to the drop in exhibition at Marlow house on 11 November.....I left under the impression that decisions were already made and it was pointless to fight. My British spirit kept me going to voice my concerns and my pleas. I can however, understand the desire to build upon DE072 the old site of the leisure centre as it has become an eyesore with broken bottles strewn in the 'car park' area along with broken concrete from the dismantled skate park. While I do understand it, it does not take away the shortage of amenities and will clearly impact on the adjacent Tailby Meadow but where there was once a building can another not be built? Maybe another GP surgery would be of more use or a school to take advantage of the playing field? Please no more housing.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments in relation to potential allocations to the south of Desborough. The site is 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. In planning for future growth, adequate school provision and provision for medical facilities is a key consideration. Kettering Borough Council is committed to working with NCC Education and health care providers to ensure adequate provision to accommodate future development. The assessment of the site recognises its proximity to Tailby Meadow. If the site were to be developed there would be a requirement to mitigate any potential harm and to provide a net increase in biodiversity.</p>
---	----	-----------------	--	--

4	39	Mrs Kim Buckley		Please not ID comment 38 Should have read DE173 and not DE073	Noted.
4	40	Mrs Kim Buckley		<p>With ref to DE173 and DE189, I walk my dogs daily on these fields, I see young and old enjoying the fresh air and taking in the beautiful country views getting out and keeping fit. I worry more housing especially on these fields will bring greater risk to flooding in an already boggy landscape. I see herons, buzzards and green woodpeckers enjoying the same tranquillity that I savour. Desborough can't support further housing and influx of families with an already straining GP surgery, school and shops, the roads are already in a dreadful state of repair. Please reconsider, keep some green space near our Ise Valley for the whole of Desborough and surrounding villages to enjoy. Perhaps a GP surgery or School would be better use of DE 072 where the old leisure centre and skate park was.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The site is adjacent to a flood zone and not within a flood zone. A planning application for a site within a flood zone would need to consider flood risk in accordance with the NPPF and would need to provide a Flood Risk Assessment. It is noted that the site is located adjacent to a wildlife site. Should the site be progressed development will need to mitigate any potential harm and to provide a net gain in biodiversity. Development of a site of this size will be required to contribute towards improvements to the highway network via a s.106 agreement. The Options Paper (March 2012) identified opportunities of redevelopment of the town centre to enhance the current retail offer. If this option is adopted this will ensure the town centre is redeveloped alongside any residential development. Kettering Borough Council will work with NCC Education and health care providers to ensure there will be adequate provision of schools and medical facilities to support the proposed development.</p>

4	42	Mr Richard Turner	<p>I strongly disagree with the suggestion that housing development should take place on site DE210 (DE/072, DE/173 and DE/189). This is part of Desboroughs green infrastructure and is regarded as an amenity by the people of this part of Desborough. It is part of a continuous green strip which runs from Desborough Church to Millenium Bridge. It is used extensively by local residents. Development of these sites would mean that residents of Desborough could only access the Tailby Meadows site via the Hawthorns. There are reports of flooding on this land. Examination of the Environment Agencys Risk of Flooding map shows that this is an area liable to flooding. There is evidence that this flood risk was historical. The 1884 Ordinance Survey map of the area labels the land suggested for development as liable to flooding . Climate change is likely to increase the risk of flooding. The roads to the north of the proposed developments, Lower Steeping, Valley Rise and Brookside, are totally inadequate to accept the vehicles associated with the additional 304 houses proposed for DE210. The same is true for the junction between Dunkirk Avenue and Lower Street and the junction between Lower Street and Rothwell Road. The western end of Dunkirk Avenue, which would inevitably be used by an increased number of vehicles, is already congested. The existing population of Desborough already puts great pressure on the doctor's practice and there is considerable discontent about the provision. Additional population due to these developments will only increase the pressure on medical provision. Development of these sites cannot, in</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. DE/210 is adjacent to a flood zone and not within a flood zone. A planning application for a site within a flood zone would need to consider flood risk in accordance with the NPPF and would need to provide a Flood Risk Assessment. Any development of the site will be required to contribute towards improvement to the highway network via a s.106 agreement. Additional work will be required to ensure there is adequate provision of medical facilities to accommodate the growth proposed. However, it is important to note that the document identifies growth to 2031 and growth will be staggered over the plan period rather than there being an immediate growth in the number of households in Desborough. The Site Specific Proposals LDD also identifies opportunities for employment development throughout the Borough. The Options Paper (March 2012) identified opportunities of redevelopment of the town centre to enhance the current retail offer. If this option is adopted this will ensure the town centre is redeveloped alongside any residential development.</p>
---	----	-------------------	---	---

			<p>any way, be described as being sustainable . Many Desborough residents travel outside the town for shopping, entertainment and employment. It is likely that this will be the situation for new residents on DE210 and indeed any other new developments within Desborough. Previously, Kettering Borough Council has taken a much more sympathetic view towards this site. In 2009, Kettering Borough Council consulted on the Rothwell and Desborough Urban Extension AAP. Para 9.8.4 of their position statement acknowledges the importance of green infrastructure and lists its benefits. Objective 3 of 4.4 Plan Objectives is to minimise harm to the natural, historic and cultural environment and to seek a net gain in biodiversity, And includes Protecting and enhancing existing biodiversity resources including..the Ise valley Delivering a net gain in green infrastructure through the plentiful, multifunctional open spaces and a network of accessible links to new and existing resources such as the Ise Valley, If the protection of the Ise Valley was part of KBCs plans in 2009, why is it considered as being suitable for development in 2013? This site is unsuitable for residential development as it is part of Desboroughs, green infrastructure, because it is situated on a flood plain, because access to the site will be unsuitable and because existing facilities in Desborough will not support an additional 304 houses. If this site is adopted for housing against what is clearly the wishes of the people of Desborough, they will rightly feel betrayed.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

4	44	Mr Brian Smith	Q1. Re: DE/072, DE/189, DE/210 Q2. Comments on merits of sites identified: Loss of countryside for walks and wildlife. Q3. Comments on detail for development: Extra traffic on Dunkirk Avenue already very busy. Q4. What infrastructure will be necessary to support development? Schools, doctors surgery	Thank you for your comments which have been noted. The assessment of the site recognises the site is adjacent to a wildlife site, development of the site will mitigate any potential impacts on wildlife and will require a net gain in biodiversity. Development of the site will be required to contribute towards improvements to the highway network via a s.106 agreement. Kettering Borough Council will work closely with NCC Education and health care providers to ensure adequate provision of schools and medical facilities to accommodate future growth. However, it is important to note that that the document identifies growth to 2031 and growth will be staggered over the plan period rather than there being an immediate growth in the number of households in Desborough.
---	----	----------------	--	---

4	45	Marjorie Smith	Q1. Re: DE/072, DE/189, DE/210 Q2. Comments on merits of the site: Loss of countryside for walks and wildlife. Q3. Comments on detail for development: Extra traffic on Dunkirk Avenue already very busy. Q4. What infrastructure will be necessary to support development of the site? Schools, doctors surgery.	Thank you for your comments which have been noted. The assessment of the site recognises the site is adjacent to a wildlife site, development of the site will mitigate any potential impacts on wildlife and will require a net gain in biodiversity. Development of the site will be required to contribute towards improvements to the highway network via a s.106 agreement. Kettering Borough Council will work closely with NCC Education and health care providers to ensure adequate provision of schools and medical facilities to accommodate future growth. However, it is important to note that that the document identifies growth to 2031 and growth will be staggered over the plan period rather than there being an immediate growth in the number of households in Desborough.
---	----	----------------	---	---

4	46	Mrs Wendy Turner	<p>I have great concerns about the Councils proposal to consider the sites DE/072,DE/173 and DE/189 (DE/210) as appropriate for development. Little regard appears to have been paid to either the letter or the spirit of the Governments National Planning Policy Framework, and I would like to draw the Councils attention to the aims behind those paragraphs most relevant to Desborough. The wording in italics paraphrases the wording contained in the Framework. Core Planning Principles. Paragraph 17 - planning should empower local people to shape their surroundings, finding ways to enhance and improve the places in which they live their lives. Comments already registered suggest that building on these sites would be entirely at odds with the wishes of local residents. - the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside should be recognised. Tailby Meadow, a Wildlife Trust Local Nature Reserve is a demonstration of the value already afforded to this stretch of the Ise Valley. To allow further housing to intrude towards the river would degrade it both visually and as a wildlife corridor. Does the Council not recognise this? - planning should contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment. Retaining these sites and enabling access to them - just as they are - would go a small way towards fulfilling this Framework requirement; planning to build 304 houses on them would not. - full account should be taken of flood risk. This site is a river valley. Has this Council really not understood the (now confident) predictions about climate change? As others have pointed out, this area is already</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. 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. The identified sites do not fall within a flood zone. They are adjacent to a flood zone and this has been recognised in the assessment of the sites. Any planning application for a site located within a flood zone would need to consider flood risk in accordance with Policy 10 of the National Planning Framework and would be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment. 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. At this stage further work will be required to address the issues raised through the consultation process and the impacts of development will need to be considered in detail before progression of the site.</p>
---	----	------------------	--	---

			<p>known to flood. Promoting Healthy Communities Paragraph 73 - access to high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and recreation can make an important contribution to the health and well-being of the community. This open space is modest in character, yet it meets the needs of walkers, runners, dog-owners and nature lovers. Local residents have not asked for the provision of expensive sporting facilities here only that the area should at least be maintained and kept accessible. Paragraph 74 existing open space should not be built on, unless the land is surplus to requirements. With an already increasing population, the land cannot be considered to be surplus to requirements (in terms of sports and recreational provision), particularly for people living on the south of the town, away from the new Leisure Centre. The consequences of building on the site would therefore be that the community would require alternative open space to be provided. Where..? Paragraph 76 - Local communities should be able to identify for special protection green areas of particular importance to them. Many commentators have made it abundantly clear that these three sites, particularly DE/173, are treasured. Previous Plans have acknowledged the importance of the green areas along the Ise Valley and have not proposed extending into them. Under threat from the current proposals, however, it is clear that they do need now to be specially protected if only because the river and its surrounding landscape are one of Desboroughs few natural attractions. Being in close proximity to the community it serves, it qualifies to be designated as a Local Green</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

				<p>Space. In conclusion, I believe the three sites under consideration must be rejected on the grounds that they do not accord with the way in which the National Planning Policy Framework is expected to be applied.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

4	52	Ms Mary Mcneally	<p>I am a health professional promoting optimum health and wellbeing by helping people balance body and psyche. An enlightened society preserves its green spaces and access to nature and wildlife, knowing full well that it directly affects the health and well being of its members. We know without a shadow of doubt that medically; the mind and body are linked 100%. Many physical and mental illnesses are directly correlated to lack of exercise and insufficient de stressing. For many of us there is no finer way of getting rid of that stress than by being regularly in a natural green space! All types of walking can reduce the risk of many diseases-from heart attack and stroke to hip fracture, glaucoma, depression and mental illness. It's a great way of relieving tension, from the stresses and strains of life, breathing fresh air and getting closer to nature. Mental health issues diminish when individuals can exercise freely and enjoy mindfulness in a green space. We need more not fewer of these spaces, especially as Desborough already has challenging developments. Obesity and mental health problems proliferate but access to the natural environment can play a vital role in efforts to reduce the burden on our NHS which at the moment in these areas costs billions of pounds! One in four people will visit their GP for mental health problems. Walking in nature can help diminish these problems. That is a fact. If we abandon these recreational areas the statistics will get worse. What we have here in "The Ise Valley is a ready- made "wildlife and nature reserve with woodland walk at the folly - a magical place - rare wild grasses and meadow</p>	Thank you for your comments which have been noted.
---	----	------------------	--	--

			<p>flowers, insects and endangered birds, kingfishers, otters and roosting bats in one of the trees sited in the hedgerow between two of the fields in question. Most towns would be envious of this habitat which has been a public amenity historically and currently, used winter, spring and summer, hail rain and shine, morning, noon and night, ideally placed between two towns and used by potentially almost 20,000 people! In my opinion it would be utter madness to lay waste to this in favour of a few hundred houses that could go somewhere else. A space of quiet contemplation would be lost to us and our future generations forever! I personally have walked regularly in the Ise Valley since I moved to Desborough 13 years ago and I have enjoyed its tranquillity and wildlife and the changing palette of the seasons. This land is not lying derelict and indeed when linked to the millennium green and the dammes it makes a marvellous walk. It has been well used for years as a habitual right of way for health and recreation for many people. These very people will be adversely affected and future generations to come. If you think in terms of intrinsic value, it would cost a king's ransom to create the Ise Valley from scratch using architects and landscapers etc. However we have it ready made and on our doorstep within easy reach and perfectly placed for two towns to enjoy! We also have to remember we are custodians for future generations. To take it away is to say, I don't care about your health! I don't care about your psyche! I don't care about your well being! If a group of people turned up at East Carlton park or indeed any other park in Kettering and were faced with a notice that their</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

park was going to become another housing estate, the expletives would be heard, from here to Westminster! OUR SITUATION IS NO DIFFERENT HABITUAL LONGSTANDING USE FOR HEALTH AND RECREATION So I go back to my original point "is this an enlightened community?"

4	53	Eleanor Nelson	<p>Objection to proposal to include DE072, DE173, DE189, and consolidated land as DE210 in the local plan as land for development Having viewed the proposed sites for potential development around Desborough I note that the land from the old Hawthorn Leisure Centre site to the old A6 is being considered to be joined up, with DE072, DE173, DE189 being consolidated as DE210 - taking in that beautiful area in the Ise Valley - at present used by so many walkers and dog walkers and children. To have fields and space is a wonderful thing for health and wellbeing - that development would use up all the land on this side of Desborough. Just to provide a footpath among housing development is totally inadequate and should not be considered. I STRONGLY OBJECT to the proposal for this area to be developed for housing for the following reasons: 1. Biodiversity: I've lived in Desborough since 1968 and these fields have never been ploughed. They are therefore considered to be a priority habitat of Principle Importance included in the England Biodiversity List published by the Secretary of State under section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006. Ie. Arable field margins, Hedgerows, Rivers and Lowland Meadow. It provides an important habitat connecting wildlife populations. This is an important habitat for wildlife such as Badgers, foxes, birds such as Starlings, Sparrows, Blue Tits, Blackbirds, Kingfisher, the rare cricket warbler, gold finch, dunnock, owls, butterflies such as the Orange Tip, bats. 2. Health: I walk in the area 3 times a day. It's the only open and accessible countryside available to me. At the</p>	<p>The assessment of the site recognises issues in relation to wildlife. Any development of the site would be required to mitigate potential harm to wildlife and would be required to provide a net increase in biodiversity. The loss of open space has also been recognised in the assessment of the site, if the site is development then open space will be provided in accordance with the Open Space SPD. The site is located adjacent to a flood zone but not within one. Any future planning application for a site within a flood zone would be required to consider flood risk in accordance with the Policy 10 of the NPPF and would need to provide a Flood Risk Assessment.</p>
---	----	----------------	---	---

			<p>age of 85 this free form of exercise has kept me fit and provided me with a positive attitude. It provides me with a social life which I otherwise would not have. The Church pensioners group walk these fields on a regular basis to improve health, wellbeing, community spirit and to provide a social aspect for the elderly in our community. Ramblers and Macmillan Cancer Support strongly believe in the health benefits of exercise, in particular, walking. See their current campaign called "Walking for Health". "Physical inactivity could be costing the economy up to Â£10 billion a year in healthcare, premature deaths and sickness absence". The National Planning Policy Framework says that you should consider Health and wellbeing and take into account barriers to improving health and wellbeing. This development would provide a barrier to the community in the south of Desborough as this is the only green space and countryside we have left for health, recreation and social activities. 3. Pollution: This development would seriously affect the pollution in the area. The air quality would be reduced through increased traffic emissions and the noise levels would increase to an unacceptable level. The traffic leaving the development would have to travel through Desborough and Rothwell Towns, increasing pollution and traffic congestion in the towns. The A6 was built to relieve the towns of the traffic issues. The surface water would not be clean and would affect the River Ise negatively. It would contain run off from vehicles, oils, surfactants from car washing, metaldahyde from slug pellets in gardens to name a few. 4. Flooding: Increased building and surface water</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

				<p>would increase the risk of flooding and affect the way the River Ise currently flows to the detriment of the local community. Being at the bottom of the valley we already suffer from surface water running down and flooding our streets. When the river is high, water can't drain into the river and floods the fields as well. If you did develop the fields none of this amenity and important habitat would be available to us for health, children, exploring nature and the countryside. I sincerely hope and request that you reconsider this recommendation for this development in these fields and do not include them in the local plan.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

4	54	Mrs Hilary Connelly	<p>With regards to DE/173 - We paid a premium price for this location and was originally told the land would not be built on as it was a flood plain and a green area, houses in this area would ruin the countryside. We bought this house with the thought of our retirement, the views, the fresh air, the space, even when the river banks swell and flood the fields the scenery is breath taking. Desborough has already gone through so much development, the high street can't cope with the volume of traffic we have already. We need to leave what greenery we have left, alone. It fills me with dread that after 31 years of living in Desborough and 22 at our present location, that everything will disappear and we will be in the middle of one vast housing estate. Let us retain some of our breath-taking scenery and allow us to take a deep breath for the little space and beauty we have left.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Impact on property values and loss of view are not material planning considerations. The site is adjacent to a flood zone but not within one. Any future planning application for a site within a flood zone would be required to consider flood risk in accordance with the Policy 10 of the NPPF and would need to provide a Flood Risk Assessment.</p>
---	----	---------------------	---	---

4	55	Mr Alex Connelly	<p>Re DE/173 - Desborough has grown vastly since we came here 30+ years ago. The once small village has become an overcrowded town, with no change to schooling fire service police patrols etc, we have in fact grown beyond the capacity we need, in the last few years houses in Desborough have increased by nearly 1000 new houses if not more, this increase probably accounts for somewhere around the 4000-5000 increase in population. this is too much already, and there is no need for any more, we do not have the infrastructure for the population of Desborough as it stands. Already too much green land has been stolen and built upon. We bought our house we presently live in before the house was even built here, we bought when there was only a plot of land. We paid a premium price for the views, which we were assured would remain, there would never be any more houses built in the valley as this area was considered a flood plain and a "Green Belt Area". This was to be our last home where we could relax in our final years and enjoy the views. Please do not build on any more of the land at Ise Valley, as this is a place of natural beauty where all residents can walk, all year round, enjoying the country side, please do not destroy Desborough any more....</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The Site Specific Proposals LDD identifies growth to 2031. Growth will be staggered over the plan period rather than there being an immediate growth in the number of households in Desborough. The site is adjacent to a flood zone but not within one. Loss of view is not a material planning consideration and the site is not designated as a Green Belt. Any future planning application for a site within a flood zone would be required to consider flood risk in accordance with the Policy 10 of the NPPF and would need to provide a Flood Risk Assessment.</p>
---	----	------------------	--	--

4	56	Jane Elliott	<p>Dear Kettering Borough Council I have recently read about, with some dismay, the plans Kettering Borough Council have to build over 300 homes in Desborough wiping out a huge part of a beautiful valley. My partner and I spend a large amount of time each weekend walking these fields with our dog. It is a beautiful, peaceful area where we have seen a very varied selection of wildlife. There are badgers, I have seen foxes and a Green Woodpecker. I've also seen bats at dusk on summer evenings. We meet so many other people along these fields. People who are taking in the countryside, enjoying the views and the exercise. I moved to Desborough just over 6 years ago and I can honestly say that I have met so many people in Desborough through walking this area. These are people I now chat to when shopping in the town, so this green space adds to the community spirit of Desborough. We are also very concerned about the impact 300 homes will have on our small town. We simply do not have the roads to accommodate the extra traffic, assuming at least one car per household but in most cases two. As Desborough town is fairly old the roads are small and narrow. The influx of more people will affect services such as the Doctors, schools and shops. We have already been let down by Kettering Borough Council with regards to the old Lawrence Factory site. Despite campaigning against the sale of the land to Tesco this went through. This will cause another huge problem with traffic. We petitioned for Sainsbury's to be allowed to build a large supermarket on the outskirts of town which would alleviate traffic problems but this was</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The Site Specific Proposals LDD identifies growth to 2031. Growth will be staggered over the plan period rather than there being an immediate growth in the number of households in Desborough. Development of the site will be required to contribute towards improvements to the highway network via a s.106 agreement. Kettering Borough Council will work closely with NCC Education and health care providers to ensure adequate provision is available for residents of new development. 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 was redeveloped alongside any residential development.</p>
---	----	--------------	---	--

				<p>turned down for no apparent, legitimate reason. Desborough seems to be deemed a second class town by Kettering Borough Council. Several traveller sites have been placed on the outskirts of Desborough by KBC - out of sight of Kettering, out of mind of Kettering. More houses are now needed and so they will be built in Desborough, wiping out beautiful greenspace and the wildlife therein. Come on Kettering Borough Council, think again. Do the right thing! Do not allow any construction on this lovely area.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

4	57	Mrs Marie Thomas	<p>Re DE/072, DE/189, DE/210 I strongly object to any housing development along the Ise Valley. We moved to Desborough 9 years ago and regularly enjoy walks throughout this green area with our young family and friends who live nearby. We are disheartened to hear plans for developing more housing. Desborough has been expanded enough with The Grange and the Council needs to focus its efforts on developing the infrastructure and shopping/facilities for the significantly increased population. We have seen no change in the latter in the past 9 years we have lived here and for the Council to consider expanding housing provision is ridiculous. Families benefit from this green area whether avid walkers, leisurely family walks and/or walking their dogs, therefore do not take this luxury away that Desborough has enjoyed for many years, longer than we ourselves have lived here. We trust the Council will take serious note of the all the feedback of similar vein posted to date regarding these planning applications.</p>	<p>Your comments in relation to DE/210 have been noted. The Site Specific Proposals LDD identifies growth to 2031. Growth will be staggered over the plan period rather than there being an immediate growth in the number of households in Desborough. The provision of schools and medical facilities is an important consideration in 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. 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 provision was redeveloped alongside any residential development.</p>
---	----	------------------	---	--

4	58	Mr Darren Tebbutt	<p>I have lived in Desborough for 36 years since I was 4 years old. As a child I enjoyed all the green areas to play football, tracking, camping, sledging in the snow etc with all my friends keeping us off the streets. These areas included Cheaneys field with tennis courts - now a housing estate, The Plenze from Harborough Road to Pipewell road - now a housing estate, Jay wood - now a housing estate. All of these lovely green areas included trees & bushes containing lots of different wildlife. During my childhood in one of the woods I saw a Badger, Fox, Deer along with Pheasants, Owls, Hawks & many other birds. Now these areas have been used for housing the natural habitat for these animals has disappeared & the children growing up today have not had the chance to enjoy seeing these animals in their natural habitat. Some of these green areas also housed Horses, Sheep & cows that we could walk in the fields with & these animals became so timid that we could approach them to feed grass & stroke. This interaction looking back now was invaluable growing up as it made me respect wildlife & realise that these animal areas were here long before us residents. Now I am older I still enjoy interacting with the wildlife whilst walking with my dog & wife. Unfortunately now the only place for us to take these walks is the Ise Valley. As we walk through the fields I can again interact with the wildlife & enjoy the feeling of escaping the Town & feel at one with nature. As we take our daily walks around the fields of this area it is refreshing to see families & other dog walkers enjoying & respecting this wonderful countryside. Looking back I now realise that I took the</p>	Thank you for your comments which have been noted.
---	----	-------------------	---	--

				<p>countryside for granted as it was all around me growing up but now having seen most of it disappear to be replaced with housing it makes me think that we are not protecting our natural areas for the wildlife that lives there & our young that aren't enjoying the pleasures that I had as a child which is really sad. It would be a disgrace for Desborough (our town) to lose the last of it's green areas to be destroyed for yet more housing when areas that have been built on have no occupants due to the fact that the properties are not being bought (the grange). Without our wildlife Desborough will turn into a Concrete Town with its future generation growing up to think this is how it's always been which I know it is not.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

4	62	Mr Paul Steadman	<p>As with so many people in Desborough, who may let it be know or not officially to yourselves, I'm in agreement with those who disagree strongly with the purposes housing in the Ise valley, but I'm also sure you will not listen to those that live in Desborough or to common sense. You will no doubt carry on regardless as you have done with the Hawthorns leisure centre and are continuing to do so over the Lawrence site, and we all know why SOMEONE IS LINING THEIR POCKETS, we have enough housing on the grange we do not need to loose the green space in the valley, we could do with a supermarket at the Grange, all be it not too large as to compromise any shops in the old town. A supermarket on the Grange with fuel station could be serviced by lorries which would not have to come up from Rothwell and endanger school children walking to school, the Lawrence site could be used for housing and some small businesses or shops e.g. Bakers, Fishmongers, Green Grocers and sit in eatery not take away. The grange is not too far to go to from almost anywhere in Desborough and as the Grange grows a shop there would not be too far off centre of the town, also as in many other towns major retailers could be let in with small stores which should not compromise any independent outlets. I do hope that someone listens to the people of Desborough but I fear you will not, hopefully we will have the last laugh by voting you out of office for you are there to serve us.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which have been noted. The growth strategy set out in the CSS directs development towards urban areas. Kettering is identified as a growth town which provides the main focus for growth in the Borough. The market towns of Desborough, Rothwell and Burton Latimer provide the secondary focus for growth in the Borough in meeting its requirements for housing to 2031. As the document identifies allocations to 2031 growth will be staggered over the plan period rather than there being an immediate increase in the number of households in Desborough.</p>
---	----	------------------	---	--

4	63	mrs Jane Buckley	<p>I chose to live in Desborough due to the beauty and tranquillity of Ise valley. To have nature so close is precious and rare these days and with working in the city my health would be dramatically affected if the open space in which to exercise breath in fresh air and share nature at its best with others in my community was destroyed. The cul-de -sac on which I live has a great neighbourly feel to it everyone helps and supports each other and all of us are dog walkers, nature lovers and often find ourselves admiring and enjoying the enriched area around us. I pass walkers including walking groups from Leicestershire and Northamptonshire where the visits to the triangular lodge and Rothwell are accomplished by walking through the Ise Valley, there are athletes, jogging, power walking, cycling all of them enjoying what the environment has to offer. The wildlife is amazing families, children and my grandchildren adore coming to visit to be educated and have their minds filled with information and beauty , taking them to the river to understand erosion, currents, fish, newts, herons, take them to the fields teach them about cattle, sheep, buzzards, kites, green woodpeckers, jays, and obviously tending to the land understanding crops, grasses, wild flowers, bees, insects and most importantly learning to respect what is around them to help them grow and protect it for future generations to enjoy. The only motivation behind this proposal is money. Enough housing has already been allocated and land remains available with no houses as there is no value in terms of an entire Desborough offering - infrastructure, congestion, commercial strength are significant weaknesses and all this</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The growth strategy set out in the CSS directs development towards urban areas. Kettering is identified as a growth town which provides the main focus for growth in the Borough. The market towns of Desborough, Rothwell and Burton Latimer provide the secondary focus for growth in the Borough in meeting its requirements for housing to 2031. As the document identifies allocations to 2031 growth will be staggered over the plan period rather than there being an immediate increase in the number of households in Desborough. Impacts on wildlife have been considered in the assessment of site DE/210. Development of the site will need to provide mitigation for any harm and will be required to provide a net increase in biodiversity.</p>
---	----	------------------	--	--

				<p>will do is push Desborough deeper into despair. This valley is the gem of Desborough its natural, untouched , respected, appreciated and unsurpassed in the surrounding areas of the borough. Please do not underestimate the genuine value of this land if you make the wrong decision it can never be overturned back to its natural wonderment. Please get this right and choose elsewhere.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

4	65	Millie and Haidee	<p>Please please can you save our green fields!!!!!!! My sister and I walk my dog with my mummy all the way from Pioneer avenue and all the way round the fields. I love doing this and enjoy running around in the fields with my dog. I also enjoy seeing the cows and horses and sometimes paddle in the stream. If you build lots of houses along the Ise valley, I won't be able to do this anymore, as I can't walk through a building site to get to the fields. It's really unfair to be taking away all the green fields from us and our future and you should be protecting the environment.....not killing it. That's what everyone keeps teaching us!!!!</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which have been noted.</p>
---	----	----------------------	--	---

4	66	Anne Killah	<p>I understand it is proposed to build over 300 new houses on land in the Lse Valley area of Desborough. I am, as a Desborough resident of over 40 years, concerned that this development will badly affect wildlife etc and would deny Desborough people a safe and beautiful country walking area (sadly lacking hereabouts). Once built on, it would be lost forever. The town's facilities at present would be totally inadequate to cope with 1000-1500 new residents. The schools are full, and it is difficult to get appointments at the surgery. There are very few shops - although the Co-op does its best it is hardly comparable to the Sainsbury's which was denied us, although most Desborians were in favour of this. We have to go onto the A14 or to Market Harborough for petrol. The existing sports centre was demolished and although a new one is now built, it does not have all the facilities of the old one. Also the skate park was closed and not replaced. People who will buy these new houses should be aware of the possibility of flooding, thus making it difficult to get insurance for this property. Please reconsider this proposal!! P.S. Some years ago many of us donated or raised money for a swimming pool for the town. Needless to say this did not materialise. I often wonder what the money was used for!</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments in relation to DE/210. The impact on wildlife has been considered in the assessment of the site. Development of the site will need to mitigate any impact on wildlife and will be required to deliver a net increase in biodiversity. In terms of shopping facilities the Options Paper (March 2012) identified options for aimed at improving the town centre and retail offer through the identification of sites for redevelopment and through environmental improvements. If adopted these options would ensure the town centre was redeveloped alongside any residential development. In terms of school provision and medical faculties the Council will work closely with NCC Education and health care providers to ensure there is sufficient school and medical provision for new residents.</p>
---	----	-------------	---	---

4	67	Jean Watts	<p>I am very concerned regarding the proposed 304 housing development in the Ise Valley Desborough area. The impact on our area will be fer-nominal with regard to access to the site the schools and our shops and doctors surgery as Desborough is overflowing now but if this amount of new houses are built Desborough could not cope with all the extra traffic as well. I am very concerned with the flooding in this area and were we live in Valley Rise which is only a service road to the Waterboard therefore there is no proper access to the area you are proposing to build. Could you please send full details of the proposed site and access according to the freedom of information act.</p>	<p>Your comments in relation to DE/210 have been noted. Development of the site of this size will be required to contribute towards improvements to the highway network via a s.106 contribution. The site is adjacent to but not within a flood zone. Any planning application for development of a site within a flood zone will be required to consider flood risk in line with Policy 10 of the National Planning Policy Framework and will be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment. In terms of school provision and health care Kettering Borough Council will work with NCC Education and health care providers to ensure there will be adequate school provision and medical facilities to accommodate new residents.</p>
---	----	------------	---	---

4	68	D Watts	<p>I am writing to voice my concern about the proposed residential development at Desborough Ise valley. when building on green land it means of course that a precious piece of countryside is lost forever not just for us but for future generations to enjoy. Also of concern is the impact on the infrastructure of the town which I feel is already stretched to its limit and the fact that part of the proposed site is susceptible to flooding I would be grateful if you would therefore send me full details of the proposed site including access roads to be used under the freedom of information act</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The site in question is adjacent to a flood zone and not within a flood zone. Any planning application for development of a site within a flood zone will be required to consider flood risk in line with Policy 10 of the National Planning Policy Framework and will be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment. In terms of infrastructure improvements the Options Paper contained a proposal aimed at enhancing the town centre through redevelopment and environmental improvements. The Council also works closely with NCC Education and health care providers to ensure adequate provision of schools and medical facilities to accommodate future growth.</p>
---	----	---------	---	--

4	71	B Walter	<p>As a resident of Desborough for over 50 years I feel it is in our interest to draw to your attention our thoughts on the continued expansion of our already overburdened country town. When we moved to Desborough it was an up and coming town with shops of every kind from shoe shops - clothing etc. Now what is there 8-9 takeaways. We now have our dentist and opticians doctor surgery which are over burdened. Somehow KBC have lost the balance in the continual expansion of the town. The infrastructure has been stretched beyond recognition. The shopping experience in Desborough has definitely been reduced due to shop closure and despite all this happening the Council are still giving further planning permissions. We appreciate that building are needed in some areas but the proposed building in the Ise Valley along by the River is a disaster. The area is boggy most of the year we feel new housing is totally unsuitable also what about the wildlife it will affect and the walk ways don't these count at all. We strongly object to these proposals.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which have been noted. The Site Specific Proposals LDD Options Paper (March 2012) identified options 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 redeveloped alongside any residential development. In terms of DE/210 to the south of Desborough the assessment of the site took account of impacts on wildlife. Development of the site will be required to mitigate any potential harm and will also be required to deliver a net increase in biodiversity.</p>
---	----	----------	---	---

4	72	Mr & Mrs D Coe	DE/210 When we heard of this proposal we were absolutely staggered. The only, and about the last, decent green space was to be developed. Have not the people of this town suffered at the hands of KBC. There are already about 900 houses with planning permission. The effect on local infrastructure is already under pressure - no more please	Thank you for your comments which have been noted. The growth strategy as set out in North Northamptonshire Core Spatial 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 the expansion at Kettering. Therefore sites have been identified in Desborough to meet housing requirements to the period 2031. It is important to note that the growth period is up until 2031 and as such growth will be staggered across the plan period rather than there being an immediate increase in the number of households.
---	----	-------------------	---	--

4	73	J C Patmore	<p>I was appalled to read of the proposal to build housing on the Ise Valley in Desborough. 1. This land floods on a regular basis and building on a flood plain could extend this to other areas of Desborough. 2. Desborough is currently bordered by open countryside, this creates an attractive environment which allows for extensive vegetation, wildlife and open areas for children to play, residents to enjoy safe walking and exercise areas. Building on the Ise Valley site would obviously jeopardise all these benefits for Desborough residents. 3. The current infrastructure in Desborough does not cater for large scale housing development. 4. Our schools are full, already Loatlands is having to expand to accommodate children affected by the closure of Braybrooke School. 5. Our doctor's surgery is already struggling to cope with the present population of Desborough, resulting in long waits for appointments. 6. Shops and leisure facilities are limited already. Recent road closures around Desborough have caused horrendous problems for residents. An increase in traffic in the town would be difficult to absorb. I assume traffic access to this site would be via the existing Rothwell to Desborough road causing more traffic congestion and the potential danger of an access road off the already very busy congested main road. I genuinely feel that housing development of this land would adversely affect the quality of life for residents of Desborough. Residents of Desborough already get a poor deal from Kettering Borough Council who appear to ride roughshod over our needs and wishes in favour of financial gain for Kettering. Please think very carefully about the future of this site</p>	<p>The site is adjacent to but not within a flood zone. Any planning application for development of a site within a flood zone will be required to consider flood risk in line with Policy 10 of the National Planning Policy Framework 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. The Site Specific Proposals LDD Options Paper (March 2012) identified options 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 redeveloped alongside any residential development. The Options Paper also 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. Finally, development of a site of this size will be required to contribute towards improvements to the highway network via a s.106 agreement.</p>
---	----	-------------	--	--

				before potentially destroying our town and quality of life.		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

4	74	Mr Emrys Davies	<p>Re: Housing Allocations ‘ Assessment of Additional Sites and Update Consultation</p> <p>OBJECTION to proposal to include DE072, DE173, DE189 and consolidated land as DE210 in the plan as land for development I am writing in relation to the consultation for Housing Allocations proposed at the above referenced sites in the southern part of Desborough in the Ise Valley. I STRONGLY OBJECT to the proposal for this area to be developed for housing for the following reasons: Biodiversity: The biodiversity in the area has suffered over the years by inappropriate development being allowed to take place in the Ise Valley. Any further development will devastate an already fragile ecosystem. The example I refer to is the fishing lakes at Rushton Road. The constant works have disturbed the wildlife and over the years I have witnessed a decline in the Ise Valley of Red listed and Priority Species birdlife ‘ Red Kites, buzzards, barn owls, grey wagtails, lapwings, woodpeckers, starlings, swallows, swifts, woodcock, dunlin, snipes, egret, grey lags, sky larks, cuckoo, yellow bunting, reed buntings to name a few. Local authorities have a Duty to have regard to the conservation of biodiversity in exercising their functions. This Duty was introduced by the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006. How will you ensure you satisfy this duty if you remove this habitat and develop the land? Health and loss of Amenity: Over the past 10 years we’ve lost recreation and community facilities in the Southern part of Desborough. The Hawthorns Leisure Centre used to support a cricket team, a womens hockey team, adult and</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments in relation to DE/210 which have been noted. The impact on biodiversity has been considered in the assessment of the site. Development of the site will need to mitigate any impacts and will also be required to deliver a net increase in biodiversity. 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. The site is not located in a flood zone but it is adjacent to 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.</p>
---	----	--------------------	--	---

			<p>children football clubs, social events location, children and teenagers sporting facilities and play area. The health benefits that this site offered were immense and have been removed. All that remains is a beautiful area to walk, run, wildlife watch. This is all that remains for those residents at the bottom of the valley to enjoy. The amount of greenspace in Desborough is inadequate at present and your proposal will remove the only accessible countryside that we have. Any mitigation that you propose will not match what the untouched Ise Valley has to offer. See also flooding below. The park that was planned, proposed and started on the right hand bank of the River Ise, by the Millenium Bridge has not come to fruition and remains a grazing field which is devastated each year by the cattle and or sheep that graze the area. To my knowledge, the ponds no longer support the toad population that it once did and the frog populations have been reduced significantly by the disturbance. Yet again a promised area for recreation and enjoyment for the community that is not managed, looked after and promoted. This development would provide another barrier to the community in the south of Desborough as this is the only green space and countryside we have left for health, recreation and social activities. How will you remove barriers to improving health and well-being in the southern part of the town as required by the National Planning Policy Framework? Flooding: The fields and Tailby meadow, including the footpath to Rothwell flood regularly, cutting off any access across the river and reducing access to the fields for dog walking resulting in a loss of amenity.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>The alternative is an uphill walk to the green at Dunkirk Avenue. This is an uphill walk which forms a barrier for those less able bodied in the community. It is also a small playing field! I walk twice a day with my dog for an hour at time at least, sometime more. This is approximately 3-5 miles walking. Walking my dog in the playing field is inadequate for his and my health. The fields at the moment offer the opportunity for a longer walk even if the fields are flooded. Any development would remove this opportunity. As a retired person, where I can walk is limited, eg. Even surfaces, beautiful scenery, peace and quiet. All this benefits my mental as well as physical health. I urge you to reconsider your proposal. The Ise Valley should remain protected from development and should not be included in yours plans for proposed developments now or in the future. Once its gone, its gone forever! We need to protect it for our future generations.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

4	75	Ron Adams	<p>Ref: Proposed development of land South of Desborough in the Ise Valley for Housing development. Your ref: DE/210 Comprising DE/072, DE/189 and DE/173. Following the recent meeting where information regarding the above was held at Marlow House and I was able to study documents and speak to representatives from the planning department I have various objections and concerns to what appears to be a very poorly thought out plan for Desborough and its people. There are as follows; 1. Over all planning for the future Desborough schools. Havelock is full to capacity and has been for some time with Desborough children already travelling to schools in the surrounding villages, some in Leicestershire. There is no playing field at the school and the only green area for them to use is the Park nearby. (Great use of the Olympic legacy). Loatlands school is at present being extended, by taking away part of the playing fields. (Another great use of the Olympic legacy). I now begin to question to Quote from the school aims and objectives that state that they wish to develop a HEALTHY school and that they take the whole school approach, involving the whole school community, parents/carers, governors, staff and children in IMPROVING CHILDRENS HEALTH. Montsaye Academy, Rothwell. According to planning officers this also is expected to require expansion in the future. It will not be a problem however we are informed as they have Playing fields on which to build. (great Olympic legacy, should really aid developing the health of our children). Should we not be looking at the needs of the whole</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. It is important to note that this document identifies growth to 2031 and growth will be staggered over the plan period rather than there being an immediate growth in the number of households in Desborough. Nevertheless, 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. The Site Specific Proposals LDD Options Paper (March 2012) identified options 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 was redeveloped and its retail offer enhanced alongside any residential development. The provision of a safe and suitable access would be considered in detail at the planning application stage and development of a site of this size would be required to contribute to highway improvements via a s.106 agreement. The assessment of the site considers impact on wildlife and development will be required to mitigate any potential harm and will also be required to provide a net gain in biodiversity. The assessment of the site also recognises the loss of open space and recreation facilities but these have been provided elsewhere. If the site is developed then open space will be provided in accordance with the Open Space SPD. Furthermore, the Options Paper (March</p>
---	----	-----------	--	---

			<p>Desborough community of now and the future. Why cannot we have plans in place to build a new school on the old Hawthorns Leisure Centre site which would have a playing field already in place and which would serve the future needs of the South side of the town. Also to serve the North including the large Development on the Grange a new school alongside the partly developed Sports centre to be used as a joint venture. Then the town could develop/expand with educational requirements in place for the future needs of the community. 2. Doctors Surgery How can there have been NO plans to provide a car park for those who need to use the Surgery in Desborough? How was this passed through Planning? Where is the overall plan for developing a medical centre to the requirements of the population? It is not fit for purpose now so how can it ever accommodate the increased needs with the new housing. 3. Outdoor Market Many towns have their own outdoor market which encourages people to visit and use their town centres. We also have a small market cramped onto a pedestrian area with no car parking available. If we are going to develop and expand then facilities such as the market need to be embraced with a good site with good access and parking. There was talk of developing a large pedestrian area in the town centre. Where has that gone? There was also the promise of a pedestrian bridge over the railway from the Grange estate linking with the town centre. That appears to now have been lost to the residents of Desborough. 4. Ise Valley Access Vehicle access via. Redwood Close. Already congested traffic along Broadlands with narrow road and</p>	<p>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 site is not within a flood zone but is adjacent to one. Development of a site within a flood zone would be required to consider flood risk in line with Policy 10 of the NPPF and would be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment as part of a planning application.</p>
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>resident parking. Difficult for emergency vehicles to gain access to proposed estate. Other roads in Desborough are narrow and congested. Access from B576. Island/slip road we are not informed as yet but putting this junction at the lowest point on this road by the river Ise which does flood cannot be a safe planning strategy. Even more importantly many children walk/cycle to and from Montsaye Academy 5 days a week. This linked with the busy and fast nature of the B576 must be seen as a fatal accident waiting to happen. 3. Environment issues along the Ise Valley Desborough people and visitors from outside the Town are at present and have been for centuries able to see and enjoy a varied and extensive display of wildlife much of which is on the endangered lists. Development would destroy nesting sites, roosts and sets as well as feeding grounds for many if not all of these animals and birds. Destruction of these assets to the community should not be allowed to take place. This area is one of Desboroughs finest assets and must be preserved for the future generations of the Town and surrounding area. 4. Health of the people of Desborough Government at national level keeps encouraging the people of Britain to exercise more and to keep fitter going into old age. For many years local people of all ages have been using the open spaces that stretch from the Hawthorns Leisure field across the fields to the B576 and up to St Giles Church and the Millenium Green and to the town centre. This is a natural resource which if taken away will never be replaced. It is the last natural area that is accessible to a great many on a regular basis. The more adventurous</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>walk as far as Rothwell. Kissing gates and stiles are already in place as a recognition of the usage made of these areas over a long period of time. Rather than planning to destroy this wonderful Desborough asset should we all be looking at developing this area to encourage even more people to use these walks in natural surroundings. Access for the disabled would be an encouraging start so that they might also enjoy the wildlife and companionship with other users.</p> <p>5. Flooding and Sewage Even with the recent river work, that is the meander being reinstated there is still even more flooding and times when the River Ise bursts its banks and people can see at first hand why they are called wet lands. The fields where the proposed development is to take place are all very wet (boggy) at these times and for much of the year and I am concerned as to where the extra surface water will go to from the development. The river will not cope and as a result even worse flooding will be inevitable. As to sewage there is extensive building work going on at present to the pump house on the River Ise and neither the planning dept. nor Anglian water seem able or willing to explain exactly what is being done. As the station has not been able to function to its current capacity it would be interesting to know whether these latest works are to get the plant up to the current need or for the extra 304 houses or for the next 500, 900 or 1000 houses. The public of Desborough would like to know! In recent times there has been repeated instances of RAW SEWAGE being seen in the river and very recently there has been the poisoning of fish down river from the</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>plant. It is vital that the people of Desborough are made aware of any improvements that are being made to make the pump station workable for a). the existing development and b). proposed building planned for the future. In conclusion I would hope that K.B.C. would take seriously the very genuine concerns that the people of Desborough have with regard to the very needed redevelopment of our town centre, the upgrading of the Surgery, high street and market and schools with places and playing fields. It is also clear to those who listen that the proposed building of houses on the site DE/210 opposed by a very large number of Desborough residents and is viewed as an open space that for many years has been used and enjoyed by the local populace for recreation and enjoyment of a wide range of wild animals, birds and vegetation. Even today some of the land is used to graze cattle and to cut silage for winter feed. When the residents last voiced their opposition to the closing of the Hawthorns Leisure Centre they were ignored. Please do not do this again.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

4	76	Mr & Mrs Evans	<p>We are writing to register our protest of the proposed building of 300 houses on the Ise valley site in Desborough. We feel it would be detrimental to the area, there is little enough green area for people as it is, we have a small pocket park on Rushden Rd and another one on Dunkirk Ave which also has the only playing field in the area attached, do we really feel that approx 6 swings and a couple of roundabouts is adequate for the number of children already in the area. Where do you propose children are supposed to play there is little enough area as it is yet you are still considering more building. Since the Leisure Centre, skate park, tennis court and cricket pitch have been demolished there are absolutely no amenities for people at this end of town. We are now seeing children playing in the street roaming around in groups and generally hanging around. In fact this autumn local children decided to demolish a fence and part of the Shops roof on Broadlands to find wood and sticks to throw at the Horse chestnut tree for conkers, and then decided to throw them at peoples windows and cars, we will have even more of this kind of activity while there is nowhere for them to go, and then you want to add to the population in the area as well. It is not at all convenient for everyone to be able to go to the New leisure centre up at the other end of town. Building houses on the proposed land is also ludicrous at it has always been prone to flooding. Why on earth would we want to increase the population in an area that has little if any facilities for the people already living here, or are the houses going to be built for the incoming immigrants that we are expecting!!!</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The loss of open space has been recognised in the assessment of the site. If the site is developed then open space would be provided in accordance with the Open Space SPD. 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. The assessment of the site considers flood risk. The site is adjacent to the flood zone but not within it. Development of a site within a flood zone would be required to consider flood risk in line with Policy 10 of the NPPF and would be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment as part of a planning application. The provision of schools and adequate medical facilities is a key consideration in planning for future growth. Kettering Borough Council will work with NCC Education and health care providers to ensure there is adequate school provision and medical facilities to meet the requirements of new residents. It is also important to note that the plan identifies allocations for growth until 2031. Therefore, growth will be staggered over the period of the plan rather than there being an immediate increase in the number of households. The provision of a safe and suitable access would be considered in detail at the planning application stage and development of a site of this size would be required to contribute to highway improvements via a s.106 agreement.</p>
---	----	-------------------	--	--

			<p>Can the schools in the area cope with more children, and will there be more police to cope with a larger population. We already struggle to get to see a Doctor as it is and the doctors are struggling to find Doctors to come into the practice. The roads are all in an absolute dreadful state, if more houses are built they will get even worse, plus we will still be subject to heavy traffic from the builders. We will be joining any protest groups in the area that are against the proposed building of more houses, we think that if you feel the need for more housing then carry on building up at the other end of the town where you have put the new local amenities, although there does appear to be an abundance of empty properties in that area anyway, and building is still going on. Please leave us some green areas in the town not just a couple of postage stamp plots with minimal swings and roundabouts on them. We have been actively trying to encourage wildlife to our home, we now have a large amount of wild birds feeding and nesting, frogs newts and hedgehogs if you take away there natural habitat where are they to go. It would better serve the town to provide more facilities for the population that already lives in this area.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

4	84	Mr Alex Connelly	<p>with reference to DE / 173 DE / 210 This Flood Plain - has flooded to some extent nearly every year, and in a few of those years, it has flooded very severely, seems senseless to build houses on a regular flood plain. This would cause problems for everyone concerned. Natural beauty of Ise Valley would be spoilt forever, you cannot repair the damage done, once you have sold the land for development, even more of the green area would be gone forever. We already encroach too far into our green and pleasant land. Desborough needs to be protected, it is already too big now resembling a vast housing estate Thousands of people have already settled here but the infrastructure has not changed in the last 30 years, apart from a few less shops now than then. We have a great community which many already think has reached saturation level. It is time to say no more extra houses in Desborough.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which have been noted. In terms of flood risk the site is not within a flood zone, it is adjacent to the flood zone and this has been taken into account in the assessment of the site. Development of a site within a flood zone would be required to consider flood risk in line with Policy 10 of the NPPF and would be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment as part of a planning application.</p>
---	----	------------------	---	---

4	86	Mrs Patricia Stone	RE: DE/189 Have you joined the bandwagon to abandon the fight for rural England? Once land has been developed this beautiful and peaceful area will be lost forever. What about the noise the extra (and unaffordable) strain on doctors, schools, social services? This wonderful and rural ambience must be treasured please let us all think about those who will come after use before it is too late.	Thank you for your comments. In terms of impact on services the Council will work closely with NCC Education and health care providers to ensure there is adequate provision for schools and medical facilities for new residents. It is important to note however that the plan allocates sites for growth up until 2031. Therefore, growth will be staggered over the plan period as opposed to there being an immediate increase in the number of households.
---	----	--------------------	--	--

4	87	M Cole	<p>DE/072 If this site has already been designated on asset of community value under Localism Rights “ then that fact should be respected and the site utilised for the benefit of the whole community on this side of Desborough. DE/173 The gradients on this site are inappropriate for building “ either domestic or commercial. DE/189 Building so close to the River Ise is neither wise nor appropriate. It is bound to impact on the existing closes, none of which are wide enough to provide adequate access for increased traffic. Serious consideration should be given to the potential for flooding problems. DE/210 This is too near the sewerage pumping station. Consideration should be given to the inevitable noise and odour. Vehicular access is disruptive enough already, without extra residential traffic particularly where street parking is necessary.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which will be used to inform the next iteration of the plan.</p>
---	----	--------	---	---

4	89	Helen Smart	<p>I am writing to you regarding the proposed housing in the Ise Valley, Desborough. The area next to Tailby meadow is a beautiful natural spot where many local residents enjoying walking their dogs, playing with their children and generally enjoying the peace. It is unthinkable to propose housing on this much needed and much used, land. Since moving to Desborough 4 years ago this area appears to be one of a very few places to safely walk my dog away from traffic. All other routes consist of battling high speed cars, lorries and buses. I cannot foresee that this area will be good for housing and its partial to flooding. I am therefore further concerned that if there is to be drainage in this area, what the effect on my house will be as I am adjacent to it. I am very concerned that any drainage may lead to our street becoming water logged which would produce a huge domestic problem and devalue to our homes. The proposal of both housing projects would mean a further 400+ houses to Desborough. This would entail a greater demand on the already over stretched doctors and schools within Desborough. It is difficult to get a doctors appointment at present, with these additional households, it will be near on impossible. Please consider the people of Desboroughs views on this land. It is much loved and appreciated just how it is.</p>	<p>The site is adjacent to but not within a flood zone. Development of a site within a flood zone would be required to consider flood risk in line with Policy 10 of the NPPF and would be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment as part of a planning application. 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.</p>
---	----	-------------	--	--

4	90	P Pybus	<p>Re Hawthorns/ Ise Valley Objection Having lived in this area since 2000 I am dismayed at the way your council thinks it can demolish buildings without any site Public Notice of demolition and eventual intentions. Desborough already has approx twice as many houses now since 2000 with saturation of The Grange and various over developed sites which did not previously have a house on. If anything there are less facilities. I never did see a Public Notice on Hawthorns Leisure Centre of your desire to demolish it so quickly and have not been made aware from the Council of number of homes/house plans you desire to inflict/have built. I wish to Object to the rumoured plans for 100-150 new homes on the former Leisure Centre/Green field adjoining. Traffic levels into Desborough via High Street have risen most dramatically since 2000 and are at very high volumes after 9 am. The Green Field adjoining Hawthorns is a beautiful open space and should be kept as such as a most valuable Breathing space without many more new homes. There is only one GP surgery to cope with both Desborough and surrounding villages and only 1 NHS dentist. There may be two practicing dentists but I believe both are only part time. I consider stairs to the upper dentist so steep for me they would a serious health and safety risk after any adverse injection reaction. Roads in Desborough can already be quite busy with many parked cars and drivers who will not give way. Kettering BC. Your council seems to think many villages can expand dramatically with endless new homes but you take away public parking spaces at alarming rates in Kettering. Both in street and in your own car parks, and</p>	<p>No public notices have been put in place as this is a consultation document asking for peoples views on which sites should be identified as allocations to accommodate residential growth in the Borough to 2031. The document has not yet been adopted as formal Council policy and work is ongoing in this regard. The site DE/210 (comprehensive DE/072, DE/173 and DE/189) has been identified as suitable to accommodate 304 dwellings. However, work is ongoing to determine whether this site is a suitable housing allocation. A notice would only be placed on the site at a time when an application has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority seeking planning permission to develop the site. Your remaining comments in relation to development in Desborough have been noted and will be used to inform the next iteration of the document.</p>
---	----	---------	---	---

			<p>issue very high cost penalty tickets for too many trivial matters. I am dismayed your council even considered hiking penalties from Â£30 to Â£50 minimum. Since bus fares also have risen dramatically since 2000 and I believe I cannot have a bus pass despite being over 60, I normally limit my trips into Kettering to just 1 per week. Until around 2003 I made two. The accumulative affect is that businesses in Kettering do not have as much of my custom as they did. I do not need endless town centre coffee shops/restaurants which I cannot afford to use. Your Council is receiving far more in C Tax than it did in 2000 from many more homes, but appear to have a current disregard for any wishes of long term residents in Desborough who have to pay high cost of council tax. However you try to spin value my total bill has almost doubled since 2000 with very little to show for it. I cannot even have free bulky items removed by you unlike 2000.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

4	92	Mr Trevor Clarke	<p>Housing Allocation in Ise Valley Desborough - Ref DE/072, DE/173, DE/189 (Consolidated as DE/210) I write to register my objection to the above proposals on the following grounds: 1. Overstretched as Desboroughs existing infrastructure is I cannot believe that adding another 304 houses to this part of it will help in any way. Previous debates on the same subject in 2009 concluded that protecting the Ise Valley from any further encroachment was of vital importance to maintain a natural habitat for wildlife & birds. I cannot see any reason to change that conclusion. Surrounding Tailby Meadow with houses wont preserve it (particularly for wildlife) as it is intended to be. 2. A number of photographs I took as recently as last November show where the river encroaches when in full flood. The areas covered by DE/072 and DE/189 were particularly affected " part being completely impassable. Reference to minute 5.3 of Desborough Town Councils meeting on 18th April 2013 suggests that this problem is well known and views expressed by our local representatives indicate that this building proposal is in conflict with both Government policy and your own strategy. 3. Even if you overcame the obvious problems of access/egress to the area building here would surely negate the point of building the A6 bypass as vehicles from here would need to pass through Desborough and Rothwell to get to places of employment (there being little in Desborough itself). 4. With the transfer of some of the Leisure Centre facilities to the opposite end of the town there only remains the option to walk in these fields as many people have done</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Impact on Tailby Meadow has been considered in the assessment of the site. This will be an important consideration if the site is progressed as an allocation. Development proposals will need to provide mitigation for any harm and will also need to provide a net increase in biodiversity. Flood risk has also been considered in the site assessment. The site is adjacent to, but not within, a flood zone. Development of a site within a flood zone would be required to consider flood risk in line with Policy 10 of the NPPF and would be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment as part of a planning application. The provision of a safe and suitable access would be considered in detail at the planning application stage and it is likely that development of a site of this size would be required to contribute to highway improvements via a s.106 agreement. If the site was to be progressed sufficient distance would be retained between Desborough and Rothwell to prevent coalescence. 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.</p>
---	----	------------------	--	--

			<p>for a number of years, either with their dogs or to encourage their children to enjoy outdoor activities. I thought the idea was to retain a sensible gap between Rothwell and Desborough not encroach on what little land is left. 5. With the decision to develop the town to the North (The Grange) and out to the By-pass taken surely these are the areas to concentrate further development in, much of which is already agreed in principle. Until the town centre sees any of the regeneration proposed in many of the previous consultation documents, but never carried out, encouraging people to live in Desborough has very little to commend it. The schools are oversubscribed and due to the monopoly enjoyed by the only Medical service that also is poorly perceived by existing residents. Indeed encouraging a new medical centre to be built on the old Leisure Centre site would be a much better use of the location.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

4	94	Mr Chris Collins	<p>Site Reference DE/189, DE/210 and DE/072. I strongly disagree to the proposed use of this public area for the building of unnecessary houses Why is it necessary to build 300+ houses on one of the last areas of land in Desborough that is widely used for leisure and walking by the families and residents of Desborough? The old Hawthorns site is used as a village green/recreation area by families for walking, picnics, kite flying, family football and cricket and a host of other family activities all year round The area bordering the north of the river Ise is a natural flood plain and is regularly waterlogged after any rainfall With 900 extra houses planned for the north of Desborough it is essential that as much public green space as possible is kept for use by local residents. KBC has already carried out extreme acts of vandalism when it demolished the leisure centre, skate Board Park, tennis and football pitches. Please leave something for the residents of Desborough young and old.</p>	<p>Your comments in relation to identified sites to the south of Desborough have been noted. The assessment of the site recognises the loss of open space and recreational facilities. However, recreational facilities have been re-provided elsewhere 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. If the site is developed then open space would be provided in accordance with the Open Space SPD. The site is adjacent to the flood zone but not within it. Development of a site within a flood zone would be required to consider flood risk in line with Policy 10 of the NPPF and would be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment as part of a planning application.</p>
---	----	------------------	---	--

4	95	Mrs Janice Collins	<p>Apart from the obvious reasons not to build 300+ houses on this site (flood plain, continual use by residents of all ages and the wild life aspect, please consider the outcome of newbuilds such as the Grange. Whilst the houses and general layout of the estate is well thought out this has been to the detriment of the residents of the Grange and Desborough. It is so big but they have no common meeting place, no town notice board and they consider themselves and the people of Desborough consider the Grange residents not to be connected. The Grange is called Grangeborough by most of the locals in Desborough. Rather than do 'add-ons' to existing villages and towns why not create a complete new town or village, with all its own facilities and infrastructure? There must be a pocket of land in the Kettering Borough which would lend itself to this. Be the first and lead the way!!!</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which will be used to inform the next iteration of the plan.</p>
---	----	--------------------	---	---

4	96	Mr Martin Barrett	<p>We strongly disagree with the suggestion that housing development should take place on site DE210 (DE/072, DE/173 and DE/189. We have lovely countryside around us and to build on this land would be a travesty. The town centre is lacking in facilities already no decent supermarket, schools overcrowded, doctors surgery can't give you an appointment when you want one how will they cope with another 300+ houses. Access to this housing estate will cause problems on the already badly maintained roads.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which have been noted. The Site Specific Proposals LDD Options Paper (March 2012) identified opportunities aimed at improving the town centre and its retail offer. If adopted the identified options would ensure the town centre was redeveloped alongside any residential development. 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.</p>
---	----	-------------------	---	--

4	103	Mr Alan John Carter	<p>Re: DE/072, DE/173, DE/189 This is land formerly occupied by the Desborough Leisure Centre and is already owned by KBC. It's therefore the easy option for further housing as no extra outlay will be required. It is not suitable for housing development as it is on, or very close to, the River Ise flood plain. It should instead be earmarked as managed parkland and a wildlife sanctuary, along the lines of Market Harborough Welland Park. Further increase in the Desborough population will put yet more strain on already stretched schools and primary medical care. The shopping experience in Desborough is virtually non-existent and the town centre is still an unremitting shambles, forcing people to go elsewhere to shop. The facilities in Desborough at present simply cannot cope with any more residential property. If further housing is really needed in the future, surely the land between the western housing perimeter (Federation Avenue, etc) and the Desborough Bypass (A6) is the obvious choice: no risk of flooding and possible easy access to the bypass for a quick getaway.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The assessment of the site considers flood risk. The site is located adjacent to, but not within, a flood zone. Development of a site within a flood zone would be required to consider flood risk in line with Policy 10 of the NPPF and would be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment as part of a planning application. The Site Specific Proposals LDD Options Paper (March 2012) identified opportunities aimed at improving the town centre and its retail offer. If adopted the identified options would ensure the town centre was redeveloped alongside any residential development. 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. With regard to alternative sites for residential development a site to the north of Federation Avenue has been promoted for development through this consultation process. The site will be assessed against the criteria set out in the Housing Allocations Background Paper to determine its suitability as a potential housing allocation prior to the next iteration of the plan.</p>
---	-----	------------------------	--	---

4	108	Mr Peter de Liddiard	<p>Dear members of the development committee I have been a resident of Desborough now for some 12 plus years, and I feel I need to write with great concern and much regret about the recent decision to develop areas across the Ise Valley. I understand that the decision is being considered to enable some 300 new homes within Desborough. Has common sense died in Kettering borough council? If any of you would take the time and trouble to visit our town, and show your faces here, and engage with local residents in a manner fitting elected representative, you would soon realise that Desborough is in no place to accommodate further building and development as our town has had no money spent on improving and updating its infrastructure and services in years. How do you foresee our town coping with 300 new families moving into the town? The doctor's surgery can only just cope as it is, same with our town's Dental practice. As for Desboroughs town shops, there is no town centre or amenities to speak off. Surely common sense would tell you to invest firstly in the town as it is, in order to provide the much needed infrastructure we lack at present. I do not believe that the due consideration has been given to the many concerns, views or wishes of not only myself, but that of Desborough as a whole. We regard this as an area of historic and natural beauty, which is loved, used and valued by many of Desboroughs residents. This loved community recreational area is a natural area and can never be replaced. It provides an accessible, pleasant place for locals to walk, to jog and keep fit, local children to play and learn about nature etc. It</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments in relation to site allocations in Desborough. Provision of medical facilities is an important consideration when planning for future growth. Kettering Borough Council will work closely with health care providers to ensure adequate provision is available for residents of new development. In terms of the town centre the Site Specific Proposals LDD Options Paper (March 2012) identified opportunities aimed at improving the town centre and its retail offer. If adopted the identified options would ensure the town centre was redeveloped alongside any residential development. The assessment of the site has considered flood risk. The identified site does not fall within a flood zone but it is adjacent to a flood zone. Any planning application for a site located within a flood zone would need to consider flood risk in accordance with Part 10 of the National Planning Framework and would be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment. Provision of schools is an important consideration when planning for future growth. Kettering Borough Council works closely with NCC Education to ensure adequate provision is available for residents of new development. The provision of a safe and suitable access would be considered in detail at the planning application stage and development of a site of this size would be required to contribute to highway improvements via a s.106 agreement.</p>
---	-----	----------------------	--	--

			<p>also provides local people a place to meet and to enjoy the fresh air, the wide array of wildlife, and a tranquil picturesque natural historic landscape and environment. This is not just any old piece of wasteland, this is our town, and we are fed up with faceless people making decisions without first seeking our views in an appropriate and timely fashion. This area is well used and cherished. There is also a very real issue with flooding within the Lse valley area, and in the past three winters alone, there has been significant flooding along the proposed area of development. This flooding has been absorbed through the natural floodplain that this area provides, any building within this area will only lesson the effectiveness of this natural barrier between the river and houses, increasing the likelihood of damage to properties, should my and other residents homes be put at risk through any development to this fragile area, I will hold Kettering Council liable, as this issue and potential increase to flooding due to loss of natural soak away provided by the floodplain, has been brought to your attention. As things stand there is a perfect distance between the existing houses and river. This natural barrier provides not only protection to the existing homes but also a great haven for the abundant wildlife of the Lse valley area. There area other reasons which I feel need to be very carefully considered prior to any development of this area, the local schools are almost at capacity and further development within Desborough will only place further burdens and pressures on the local education. Our schools within Desborough can really do without these additional pressures. One</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>final worry I have and an issue of Health and Safety is of course the question of access to this proposed site of development. A development of this size would undoubtedly generate a substantial amount of additional traffic, exiting and joining along the A6, Kettering road, the road going up to Rothwell, an already busy road. This in itself would need costly extensive road redevelopment, possibly even a roundabout, on a section of road in a step dip, which again is prone to flooding during winter. This is a stretch of road used by many school children, as a route to and from the upper school in Rothwell. There would have to be careful and extensive provisions made to ensure that there was suitable consideration given to the continued safety of our children who use this route to school, this in itself will require more addition expense to ensure these school children have a safe well lit place to cross and are adequately protected from the increase in traffic on this stretch of road. On balance I do not feel that KBC has really given this proposal their full attention and consideration, I feel that KBC has made decisions based on costing alone and have opted for the cheapest solution, without considering the local community that this development will impact upon, as well as the points I have raised within this letter. I find this situation somewhat abhorrent, insofar, that money can come before the continued wellbeing of a close community and even more worrying that these decisions do not consider the wellbeing of our children etc. I strongly wish to oppose this development and find it obscene that anyone who has bothered to visit this area</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

of the Ise valley would even consider it for development. The councillors of KBC duly elected by the people, take the time to come knocking on our doors when canvassing for our votes, but when you propose to develop our community none of you are to be seen, none of you take the time to speak to the local community or even visit it, shame on the lot of you, you are all cowards, not even prepared to face one of the communities that have put you in your council seat. I await your reply and response to my concerns and comments.

4	109	mr mark goff	<p>DE 210 I appreciate the problems encountered when trying to identify new housing sites, especially when there are high degrees of 'nimbyism', but I do think this proposal is ill-considered. Unlike many of the commentators, my house does not overlook the site, and so it would not affect my outlook etc. However, it is an area of beauty and recreation which is well used, easy to access for local people and which harbours a lot of natural fauna and flora. In a small town which is already under-resourced and over-populated, this would represent a major blow. It would take away one of the only areas of beauty we have; after all, the town centre itself is very run down, and Desborough has already lost access to most of it's surrounding countryside. The proposal provides no specifics on how the existing access issues would be overcome, nor does it outline any improvements in infrastructure; on a simple reading, it appears that these concerns will be brushed aside, that a decision has already been reached, and that the plan will go ahead regardless of the feelings and views of those people who local politicians claim to represent. One can only hope that this is a meaningful consultation, and not one that merely takes place so that the correct boxes have been ticked.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments in relation to site DE/210. No details of access have been provided as this has not been determined at this stage. The provision of a safe and suitable access would be considered in detail at the planning application stage in consultation with NCC Highway Authority. The impact on wildlife has been considered through the assessment of the site. If the site is developed then proposals will need to provide mitigation for any harm and will need to provide a net increase in biodiversity. Further work will be required to address the issues raised through the consultation process and the impacts of development will need to be considered in detail before progression of the site.</p>
---	-----	-----------------	--	--

4	110	Paul and June Ringrose		DE/072 This valley is a beautiful place alive with wild life of all kinds. Please do not destroy this environment created for mankind to nurture and protect, it's a living breathing space. DE/210 Leave these breathing spaces for the community to enjoy. Plant trees and place seats. It's a wonderful space to behold. Please don't build on it.	Thank you for your comments which have been noted.
---	-----	------------------------------	--	---	--

4	111	H Gould	<p>1.Ise Valley Development 2.Comments on merits of sites identified? There is no merit to Ise Valley being built on. 3.Comment on detail for development? We have not seen any detail just the outline of the fields. It should not be built on. 4.What infrastructure will be necessary to support development of the sites? We do not have enough local facilities. The Doctors can not cope with the population now, neither can the dentist. Not enough schools. I could expand more. 5.Any other comments? We do not want the valley developed, it provides facilities for walkers, runners, cyclists and dog walkers. It has established wildlife and a natural beauty. Everyone along this valley does not want to see any more of our green space built upon. We need open fields. We do not need more houses. It floods in winter and is not suitable for development. This whole plan is short sighted and not for the benefit of existing residents. People living here want the valley left alone, and left for recreational use. 20 years ago Kettering Councils plans were to leave this area as a green field site, this should not be changed. LEAVE US OUR FRESH AIR!</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. In terms of impact on wildlife this has been considered in the assessment of the site. Proposals for development will need to provide mitigation for any harm and will also need to provide a net increase in biodiversity. The site assessment also considers flood risk and the site is adjacent to but not within a flood zone. Any planning application for a site located within a flood zone would need to consider flood risk in accordance with Part 10 of the National Planning Framework and would be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment. The provision of adequate medical facilities and schools are a key consideration and the Council will work with NCC Education and health care providers to ensure there is adequate provision to meet requirements of the population.</p>
---	-----	---------	---	---

4	112	Mr and Mrs Robertson	<p>2. Comments on merits of sites identified? Appalled and disgusted that the green site across the Ise Valley should even be considered for housing development, particularly the area DE/072 which readily floods. This area is in constant use for leisure and recreational activities and should be kept as green space as it borders important wildlife areas. Surely the area DE/065 should be reconsidered as this affects far fewer residents. 3. Comment on detail for development? Following the previously comments, this becomes irrelevant if the development is unacceptable. 4. What infrastructure will be necessary to support development of the sites? Any new housing in Desborough would require more schooling and larger health facilities. 5. Any other comments? We personally wrote to you on 17th April regarding our own position when only DE/072 site was proposed. (We have a copy). These new proposals extending all the way along the valley would be a disaster for residents and wildlife. PLEASE LISTEN!</p>	<p>The assessment of the site considers flood risk and the site is adjacent to but not within a flood zone. Any planning application for a site located within a flood zone would need to consider flood risk in accordance with Part 10 of the National Planning Framework and would be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment. The assessment also recognises the loss of open space and recreational facilities. If the site is developed then open space would be provided in line with the Open Space SPD. Furthermore, the Site Specific Proposals LDD 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 provision of adequate medical facilities and schools are a key consideration and the Council will work with NCC Education and health care providers to ensure there is adequate provision to meet requirements of the population.</p>
---	-----	-------------------------	---	--

4	113	Mr & Mrs Mellor	<p>DE/173 Opening up Lower Steeping as a through road. We were led to believe that this was supposed to be kept as a green belt. Houses will obstruct our view of countryside and the opportunity of walks. Risk of flooding.</p> <p>DE/210 Always thought this land was supposed to be left as a green belt “ is there now a covenant on this site. 304 houses would put a burden on doctors, schools etc. What about the risk of flooding to this area. Surely we don't need those extra dwellings in Desborough.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Loss of view is not a material planning consideration and neither site is designated as a Green Belt. The assessment of the sites considers flood risk and both site are adjacent to but not within a flood zone. Any planning application for sites located within a flood zone would need to consider flood risk in accordance with Part 10 of the National Planning Framework and would be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment. The provision of adequate medical facilities and schools are a key consideration and the Council will work with NCC Education and health care providers to ensure there is adequate provision to meet requirements of the population. The document identifies allocations for growth to 2031. There will not be an immediate increase in the number of households in Desborough as growth will be staggered across the plan period.</p>
---	-----	-----------------	---	---

4	114	Mr and Mrs G Crick	<p>I am writing about the possible housing development on the grounds of the old leisure centre at the southern end of Desborough. From a personal point of view we moved into the house 35 years ago which backs on to the once cricket pitch. We had the use of the nearby leisure centre for sport and a drink after (I've played badminton in the old and still play in the new centre for the last 30+ years). When our 4 boys were growing up we played all sorts of games in the field, football, rounders, sledging in the snow, they learnt to ride there bikes in there. Now they're grown up, our grandchildren are starting to do the same. The leisure centre itself may be gone but the field is still the same, flat and cut and kept nice. From a community point of view and because this field is flat and cut it is used by lots of different people. Model aeroplanes, early season football training, young lads playing cricket, dog walkers in this and the adjoining fields along the valley. These fields are the recreational fields for us at the bottom end of Desborough. Our recreational fields give direct access to the Tailby Meadow and on to bridge over the river, to the right of way leading to Rothwell lots of walkers use this route. The balance of the eco system in the Tailby meadow and in the river itself is bound to be affected by houses and humans with all they bring them, so close by 24-7. I would not see again the 3 curlew or the barn owl hunting in the fields if the housing is permitted. This river, the adjoining fields, the meadow, the playing fields, the birds and nature are all there for all of us to see and enjoy in different ways, and for the most part its natural. 1. We ask why build on land that is used</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The impact on Tailby Meadow has been considered in the site assessment. 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. In relation to DE/065 the southern element of the site is within the flood zone. The comprehensive site DE/210 is adjacent to the flood zone, not within it. The purpose of this document is to allocation sites to accommodate growth up to 2031. It is important to note that growth will be staggered over the plan period rather than there being an immediate growth in the number of households in Desborough. With regard to schools and doctors, the Council will work with NCC Education and health care providers to ensure there is adequate provision to meet requirements of the population.</p>
---	-----	-----------------------	--	--

			<p>everyday by people as apposed to land that is not used for leisure and pleasure. If more houses are to be built in Desborough there are pieces of land with far better access, such as off the bypass, and with good planning, further recreational and play areas could be incorporated in a site plan of a new development. KBC plan says are DE/065 is Discounted housing option for reasons of flooding and bypass noise. This field rises quickly from the river so the large percentage of the field does not flood and as for road noise KBC have approved development in Rothwell close to the A14/bypass roundabout with twice the noise if not more because of the A14. At a time when government are talking so much obesity and a lack of exercise we need more open spaces and recreational areas for the kids to play in, mum and dads, runners and walkers to use by the existing and new households. I'm told Desborough has already got its allocated amount of houses so why build more. The schools and doctors can't cope now. I think you nearly have to make an appointment first then be ill to suit the appointment to get to see a doctor, and as for parking it's a joke. Desborough town Football field may be an open space but is locked for most of the time apart for matches and the same can be said for the cemetery, an open space, but can only be used to respect our dead family and friends. These can surely not be counted in the areas of recreational use. We appeal to the council not to build on this beautiful, natural and much used valley and if developed would have poor and potentially dangerous access and leading to more traffic in</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

				<p>Desborough and Rothwell and consider fields near the bypass giving more scope for development and a direct access to the bypass leading on to the A14. A reply to my letter would be much appreciated.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

4	115	Mrs J King	<p>The proposed plans to build 300 houses along the Ise Valley would amount to vandalism. To spoil such a large area of natural parkland enjoyed by so many people, not just dogs walkers, but whole families and visitors. The impact on the wildlife would be devastating. Flooding would be worse than it is now and the access points would cause safety issues. To even suggest this site when others are available beggars belief.</p>	<p>The impact on wildlife has been considered in the assessment of the site. Should the site be developed the proposals will need to mitigate any harm and will also need to provide a net increase in biodiversity. Flood risk has also been considered in the site assessment. The site is adjacent to but not within a flood zone. Any planning application for sites located within a flood zone would need to consider flood risk in accordance with Part 10 of the National Planning Framework and would be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment.</p>
---	-----	------------	--	---

4	116	Sue Beard	<p>Dear Sirs, Residential Development Proposals Ise Valley Desborough To build on this Green Belt would be disastrous. The citizens of Desborough would lose not only the peace, tranquillity and beauty of the Ise Valley, but also the space to enjoy leisure activities such as cricket & football in the summer months and to run, walk, jog & walk their dogs all the year round. Desboroughs population enjoy very little green space within the town boundary and if this land is built upon its beauty will be lost to future generations forever. The area is humming with wild life “especially the vast variety of birds, including droves of sparrows which are protected under the Wildlife & Countryside Act of 1981. After many years of trying I have now attracted many beautiful Goldfinches, who live in the boundary hedges, into my garden to feed and I would be devastated to lose them if your massive house building proposal came to fruition! The wear and tear on our roads would be horrendous “something already taking place due to the constant stream of lorries conveying soil to the site just outside the town on the Rushton Road. We do not have the infrastructure in the town to cope with all this extra housing: we have one Doctors Surgery and one dentist (both bursting at the seams), both of our schools are full and some children already attend school in nearby villages. Don’t forget, will you, that planning permission has already been granted for a massive housing development to the western side of Desborough! Our shopping Centre has virtually no parking space other than at the Co-op Supermarket. The ground “especially in the area designated DE109 in your</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The impact on wildlife has been considered in the assessment of the site. Should the site be developed the proposals will need to mitigate any harm and will also need to provide a net increase in biodiversity. Development of a site of this size will be required to contribute to highway improvements via a s.106 contribution. The provision of adequate medical facilities and schools are a key consideration and the Council will work with NCC Education and health care providers to ensure there is adequate provision to meet requirements of the population. The document identifies allocations for growth to 2031. There will not be an immediate increase in the number of households in Desborough as growth will be staggered across the plan period. If the site was to be progressed as an allocation sufficient distance would be retained between Desborough and Rothwell to prevent coalescence.</p>
---	-----	-----------	--	---

Assessment Plan floods badly in the winter particularly in the Cricket Field area and seagulls come regularly from the Refuse tip at Rushton to sit on the water. The hedge which divides the Cricket Field from the land owned by the Co-op is Centuries old and is home to many sparrows, blackbirds, thrushes, varieties of finches and robins and wrens. It is a joy, all the year round, to hear and see them and the Dawn Chorus is wondrous. The calls of foxes can regularly be heard too. The proposed access to this estate could only bring further congestion. Desborough has no Secondary School. Consequently, schoolchildren who are obliged to attend Montsaye Acadamy in Rothwell opt to walk to school and would have to contend with an additional crossing or roundabout twice a day. And the proposed access from Sycamore Road is opposite a Convenience Store close to a bend in one of the busiest thoroughfares in the Town. The towns of Rothwell and Desborough have enjoyed their separate identities and histories for centuries and your proposals would leave these communities almost conjoined something neither would wish for! Please, please do not seek to develop the beautiful Ise Valley in this way you would ruin the lives of many people and countless animals. I have lived here for 14 years in peaceful retirement and the reason I bought my house was to enjoy the environment in which it stood. I retired here from Sussex and from its traffic and noise. The morning I came to view our house in Cedar Close it was very cold, raining and sleeting in Mid January. The house badly needed refurbishment but when I looked out across this beautiful valley I knew this was

where I wanted to live for the rest of my life.
Please KBC do not destroy this beautiful valley.

4	117	Mr Paul Beard	<p>Residential Development Proposals Ise Valley Desborough I totally and utterly condemn your proposal to develop the above area of beauty and recreation. Desborough cannot possibly sustain further development on the scale you are proposing. The schools are already full as are the doctors and dentists surgeries. There is virtually no designated car parking in the already congested town centre. The provisional proposals for access are awful one near to a bridge in a hollow on the old A6 and the other close to a bend on an already busy thoroughfare. The former is transversed daily by schoolchildren attending the Montsye Secondary School in Rothwell. The first thing to happen in such a development would be to tear out a centuries-old hedge which separates the old Leisure Centre sports field from the Co-op owned field adjacent. I enclose a photo, taken this morning, of the hedge from my bedroom window. It is alive with bird life at all times and must be over 15 feet wide in places. Predominately sparrows (a protected species) abound but there live numerous finches, tits, robins, wrens, blackbirds and thrushes as well. These fields offer the residents of Desborough almost their only green space as it is (Look at a map!) and are in constant use for exercise and dog walking. Children plan impromptu games of cricket and football when the weather is fair and, when the snow comes, families take full advantage of the towns only green slopes for tobogganing! I well realize that you are under Government pressure to find more sites for housing development and I don't have a problem with this. For a variety of reasons the country</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. School provision and the provision of adequate medical facilities is a key consideration when planning for future growth. The Council will work with NCC Education and health care providers to ensure there is adequate provision to meet requirements of the population. The access to the site has not yet been finalised. The provision of a safe and suitable access would be considered in detail at the planning application stage in consultation with NCC Highways Authority. The impact on wildlife has been considered through the assessment of the. Should the site be developed the proposals will need to mitigate any harm and will also need to provide a net increase in biodiversity.</p>
---	-----	---------------	--	--

needs more houses. But you have a clear duty to select only suitable sites having taken into account the impact such a decision may have on the area and its residents. You have already approved the building of a great number of houses to the north of Desborough of course. But to destroy the beautiful Ise Valley in this way is just wrong. Totally wrong.

4	122	Donna Henty	<p>I am writing to express my concern at your proposal to build another 304 houses in Desborough. Since moving to the area from Croydon, South London in 2008 I have seen nothing but the building of house after house after house. A complete loss of our beautiful countryside to stack houses upon. The population in Desborough must have quadrupled since I moved here, so has traffic which leads to noise and environment pollution also. I am dead against you building more houses in Desborough we have enough. What we do need are more schools, dentists, doctors, a hospital, a decent shopping centre, a decent petrol station, a bigger supermarket to accommodate the new people who have decided to live in Desborough with the new houses already built. We do not need more houses we need more infrastructure to accommodate the people already living here, not to have the place bursting at the seams. Where will all the jobs be for these people that are going to live in these house, where will their children go to school, where will people park their cars visiting Desborough for a special event or just going into town, where will the extra doctors, fire brigade, police, binmen come from. We are already descended into pitch black darkness as it is with you turning off half the street lights in the evening, making it a scary task trying to walk my dogs as you cannot see you hand in front of your face now. We want places to walk, to enjoy the fresh air, to have quality time with our family and friends and space to enjoy our surroundings. With your proposal we will all soon be stacked on top of one another vying for room, a disaster for any close community which Desborough</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which have been noted. Further work will be required to address the issues raised through the consultation process and the impacts of development will need to be considered in detail before progression of the site. 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. The Site Specific Proposals LDD also allocates land for employment throughout the Borough. 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. The Options Paper (March 2012) identified opportunities aimed at improving the town centre. If adopted the identified options would ensure the town</p>
---	-----	-------------	---	---

				<p>currently enjoys. PLEASE DO NOT BUILD MORE HOUSES IN DESBOROUGH ‘ DO NOT RUIN WHAT IS LEFT OF OUR LOVELY COUNTRYSIDE IN DESBOROUGH. PLEASE LISTEN TO US THE PEOPLE ON THE GROUND SEEM TO GET COMPLETELY IGNORED AND RUN ROUGH SHOD OVER WITH THEIR CONCERNS. Please show the people of Desborough that you are listening to them and what they want for their tight knit community do not turn us into another large town with nothing to back us up with ‘ just houses, houses, houses. I do hope you will reconsider and stop the development of a further 304 houses in Desborough and listen to the people who actually live in Desborough.</p>	<p>centre was redeveloped alongside any residential development. In terms of street lights this is outside the remit of Kettering Borough Council and comes under the remit of Northamptonshire County Council.</p>
4	123	Mr. Michael Wride		<p>Not a problem using this site as it is manly hard standing as long as it does not encroach on to green areas</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

4	124	Mr. Michael Wride	Why brown field sites can not be used instead of using green field sites? At the rate we are using green field sites there will be no more green fields in five years time. Theses sites DE/210 are in a very pleasant walking area for many people. Also the improvement to the pumping station does this mean the house are going to built on a flood plan and all the consequences this would mean?	Brownfield sites have been considered as potential allocations throughout the Borough. However, the Joint Core Strategy requires Kettering Borough Council to allocate sites to accommodate 10,700 dwellings to the period 2031. Therefore, in order to meet this requirement the Council needs to consider greenfield sites in conjunction with brownfield sites. The assessment of DE/210 considers flood risk. However, the site is not located in a flood zone but adjacent to one. Any planning application for a site located within a flood zone would need to consider flood risk in accordance with Part 10 of the National Planning Framework and would be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment.
---	-----	-------------------	--	--

4	127	Mrs Suzanne Edwards	<p>Ref: Planned Housing Allocations for Desborough KBC Reference DE/210 (consisting of DE/072, DE/189, DE/173) With reference to the recent proposals of Kettering Borough Council to allocate the afore mentioned areas for housing, I must raise the following concerns and objections. My concerns and objections centre around key issues of safety, adverse environmental impacts, and the strain on the existing infrastructure of Desborough. Specifically I raise the following points: Issues of Safety My first concern over this proposal is the potential lack of safe and practical access to the proposed development. Considering such proposals could lead to some additional 600 vehicles utilising the local area I feel this is a material point. My concern would be how this additional volume of traffic could access such a development. I fear any utilisation of existing roads and residential areas could lead to safety concerns, particularly to the young and elderly residents, congestion issues, and noise pollution to existing residents. I also have concern over the location of any new access points, firstly for the reasons given above but also more specifically concerning the main road through Desborough, the B576. Should access be sought from this particular road I have serious concerns over the following points: Â· Firstly, from a safety point of view, access from this road would be in the vicinity of the crest of the hill into Desborough. Such a scenario could effectively lead to a blind spot a very short distance from an access point. Â· The pathway on this road is a pathway is frequently used by school children in attendance of the Montsaye Community College</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The access to the site has not yet been finalised. The provision of a safe and suitable access would be considered in detail at the planning application stage in consultation with NCC Highways Authority. Flood risk has been considered through the assessment of the site. The site is located adjacent to but not within a flood zone. Any planning application for a site located within a flood zone would need to consider flood risk in accordance with Part 10 of the National Planning Framework and would be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment. Impact on wildlife was also considered through the site assessment. Should the site be developed the proposals would need to provide mitigation for any harm and would be required to provide a net increase in biodiversity. With regard to school provision and medical facilities the Council will work with NCC Education and health care providers to ensure adequate provision is made to provide for new households. It is also important to note that the plan identifies growth to 2031 and as such growth will be staggered over the plan period rather than there being an immediate increase in the number of households in Desborough.</p>
---	-----	---------------------------	---	--

in Desborough. Clearly the position of such access would be the region of the bottom of a very steep valley. I am concerned over the practicalities and safety of having an access point in this area. In the winter periods it is conceivable that effectively bringing traffic to a halt in this area could lead to vehicles not being able to make it out of the valley and thus leading to a major congestion point. This could not only affect commuters but the ability of emergency services to navigate this route. Furthermore, I have concern over the general issue of congestion in this area when some potential 600 additional vehicles would need to be managed. Environmental Concerns I, like other residents of the local community, have concerns over the risk of flooding on the proposed sight. Clearly this is in close proximity to the River Ise, a major water channel through the county. I have already witnessed this river to flood. My concern as a local resident is toward the further risk of flooding, particularly given the additional pressure to the water table such significant development may have. The area in question, which I believe is known as the Ise Valley, is one of natural beauty. It is a site that is currently enjoyed by many residents of the community for healthy recreation. I feel such green spaces should be preserved not only for the utilisation and enjoyment of our community but to preserve the beautiful environment in which we are privileged to live. Around the area in question are significant banks of hedges and greenery. Such areas could home protected species of wildlife, specifically certain species of birds such as sparrows. I have concerns that any

				<p>development of this site could have significant consequence to these creatures. Existing Infrastructure and Services My final point is centred on this impact such development may have on the already stretched resources of the town of Desborough, specifically the provision of schooling and doctors. In my opinion the town has seen limited improvements to infrastructure since the significant development of the Grange Estate. I fear further development of this scale would lead to further exasperation of the situation. Given these points I object to the proposals for planned housing allocations for the site referred to as DE/210.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

4	128	Mr Richard Edwards	<p>Ref: Planned Housing Allocations for Desborough KBC Reference DE/210 (consisting of DE/072, DE/189, DE/173) I hereby raise my concerns and ultimate objection to the proposed housing allocation within Desborough at the sites referenced above. As a local resident, such a proposal leads me to the following concerns: 1. Proximity of River Ise From the plans it is clear that the River Ise is in close proximity to the proposed sites. Having witness this river burst its banks within this area, clearly I must raise concern for the health and safety impact of such a development. I have concern over the potential impact of the weight of some 300+ dwellings (and associated amenities/services) to the water table within the area. In relation to this matter, in the town council minutes of the meeting held on 18th April 2013, it is noted that the Ise Valley has been identified as a flood risk by the town council in the NCC Flood Risk Strategy consultation. Councillor Soans also stated that if an area has flooded in the last 200 years then it is government policy and part of the KBC strategy that these areas cannot be built upon. Surely we should be looking to reduce the impact from flooding of local hazards and avoid additional risks associated with both flooding and drainage. 2. Safe and Practical Access Upon review of the notes available on the KBC planning portal it is evident that access concerns have been raised in the past concerning these sites. I would again like to raise the concern over safe and practical access to such a development and the impact this would have on the existing environment and the overall safety of the community. These concerns are not only in</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The site is located adjacent to the flood zone and not within it. Development of a site within a flood zone would be required to consider flood risk in accordance with Policy 10 of the NPPF and would be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment. The access to the site has not yet been finalised. The provision of a safe and suitable access would be considered in detail at the planning application stage in consultation with NCC Highways Authority. It is likely that development of a site of this size would be required to contribute towards highway improvement through a s.106 agreement. In relation to DE/065 the southern element of the site is within the flood zone. The assessment of the site scores poorly in this regard and contributes to the site being discounted as a potential allocation. 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. Kettering Borough Council, via the Joint Core Strategy, is required to identify sufficient land for 10,700 dwellings to 2031. It is important to note that 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</p>
---	-----	--------------------	--	--

			<p>relation to the local access and egress points to these sites. Concern and objection is also raised regarding the constraints of the capacity of the existing highway network and connectivity to the rest of the town. It is my understanding that some of these routes already run at or close to capacity and thus this development would add further strain on the network. 3. DE/065 Again, with reference to the KBC planning portal I note that a previous allocation for housing at site DE/065 (land to the south of Pioneer Avenue and west of Rothwell Road) was discounted. The reason for such discounting was development of this site would have a negative impact on the Ise green corridor and has a potential flood risk and noise issues . Given the similarity and close proximity of the site under consideration here (specifically DE/173) I would argue similar causes for discount are apparent. 4. Area of environmental/bio diversity sensitivity Local to the proposed site is an area previously recognised as an area of environmental sensitivity. I understand this specific area is known as Tailby Meadow. Such areas of significance and beauty with its ecological features should be considered important and worth preservation. It is possible that such sites can be home to protected species and therefore in my opinion are worthy of protection or further consideration. It is also noted that the Town Council have previously expressed their view on protecting the Ise Valley and Tailby Meadow in consultation documents. 5. Area of natural beauty used by the community As a local resident I have witnessed the utilisation of this area by the local community for pursuit of</p>	<p>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. 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. While impact on property values is not a material planning consideration impact on existing development in terms of noise, loss of light and loss of privacy will be considered at the planning application stage.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

healthy recreation. I personally feel it is again important to protect these spaces that are both of beauty, and utilised and enjoyed by the existing community. Development of these areas would also have detrimental impact to the visual landscape and would erode the local cultural heritage. Further to objection concerning the areas natural beauty, the invasion of these green spaces could also have a direct negative impact on the quality of air enjoyed by residents. 6. Existing availability of property within and around Desborough From a recent search, it is evident that a large number of properties are already available within Desborough. Therefore I am led to question if there is a need for such a large housing development within the community. It is easy to conservatively estimate that even today there are some 150 - 200 properties available for sale within Desborough alone. This availability covers a significant price range, therefore, demonstrating coverage for different types of need. Further to this there are additional properties available to the rental market. This availability of property for sale or rent can be seen to double if you extend the radius to a modest 3 miles outside the town. Given this availability and the recent significant development within Desborough (namely the development known as The Grange I question if there is a need for further development to the town, particularly one at a cost to the beautiful countryside which surrounds it. 7. Pressure on local services Further to the objection concerning the need for additional housing, I raise concern of the pressure such development would exert on the existing services within the

			<p>town, such as medical facilities and schooling. The viability of such a development is questioned not only over concerns surrounding the primary school offerings within Desborough itself but the further strains that would be placed on the only local secondary school, the Montsaye Community College in Rothwell. We have seen recent development of the town through the Grange estate but with limited improvements to the towns infrastructure. 8. Assessment of sites individually and as a group With reference to the consultation portal per the KBC website, in particular in relation to the Assessment of Additional Sites and Update section per page 35, Appendix 3 Desborough, it is unclear to me how sites that are individually assessed with a high number of red categories under the traffic light system can be considered so much more favourably as a whole when you consider the nature of some of these individual concerns. For example, how can the issue of impact to noise or odour in site DE/173 possibly be limited by increasing the scale of the project across neighbouring fields? 9. Further considerations Further to the points raised above I feel I must raise objections based on factors linked not only to my property but to that of all other residents currently residing in properties which neighbour the proposed site. I have concern that such a development could have a negative impact on the light cast on our land, the privacy in which we currently reside, the noise pollution to our homes, and could have negative impact on the value of our properties. 10. Curtilage Can it be confirmed that this development falls within the curtilage boundaries</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

				<p>of Desborough? In summary, I object to this proposed allocation of these sites for housing based on the concerns illustrated above.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

4	130	Maureen Love	<p>Dear Sir or Madam I write to voice my concerns about the proposed housing development in Ise Valley Desborough. I have walked around this land for many years & have seen the flooding that occurs in heavy rainfall & snowy weather in this area. I live in Pine Close & one of my concerns is, if the land is developed how will this affect the properties in this close, will it lead to houses being subject to flooding if the developers do works that affect the flood plain. How will the pumping station cope with extra sewage in this area? Do we really need more housing in Desborough with all the houses that have been built on The Grange & the housing development that is on the road that leads to Corby (off Station Road) I don't think all these homes are occupied are they? How will the roads be affected for access to this proposed site with extra traffic on it? With more & more land being used for housing we will have no green space left for people to walk around, walk there dogs or for children to play on. It is a lovely quiet pleasant area to live in & this proposed development could change all that. It has been lovely to see the cattle & horses that have lived in the fields over the years making it a real countryside. I hope you will take all the concerns of the Desborough residents into consideration when the planning committee meets to discuss this. Thank you for your time.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Flood risk has been considered in the assessment of the site. The site is adjacent to, but not within, a flood zone. Development of a site in a flood zone will be required to consider flood risk in accordance with Policy 10 of the NPPF and will be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment. 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 however than as growth is identified until 2031 growth will be staggered over the plan period rather than there being an immediate increase in the number of households in Desborough. The access to the site has not yet been finalised. The provision of a safe and suitable access would be considered in detail at the planning application stage in consultation with NCC Highways Authority.</p>
---	-----	--------------	--	---

4	131	Rachel Dixon	<p>I am just letting you know that I do NOT agree with the proposal for another 304 houses to be built along the Ise Valley fields in Desborough. I am more worried about the impact on the wildlife in that particular area as it is next to the River Ise, and lots more animals and wildlife tend to be associated with living near river locations. There are lots of other reasons that I could give. But to be honest, we all know that whatever the residents of Desborough say or do to get their opinions over to Kettering Borough Council, over matters more recently and many from the past, then KBC will still go ahead with their proposed plans anyway as they always have done.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. All comments received are used to inform the preparation of the next iteration of the plan. Impact on wildlife was considered in the assessment. Development of the site will need to provide mitigation for any harm and will be required to provide a net increase in biodiversity.</p>
---	-----	-----------------	--	---

4	132	Oliver Crick	<p>Dear Sirs I am sending this email to voice my objection to the proposed additional 304 houses in the Ise valley in Desborough. Not only will it destroy even more green land, Desborough does not have the facilities to cope with more residents and I don't see KBC making any difference to that fact anywhere. The Schools are teetering with so many pupils, the doctors surgery is just a bad joke. And KBC still hasn't fulfilled its promise about the new leisure centre facilities being like-for-like with the old leisure centre...where are the squash courts - you've already conned the existing residents with a lesser service. And where is the new Tesco's supermarket? Please, just ask yourselves how the existing so called 'services' are going to cope with even more people, because lets face it you're not going to invest any money are you, because Desborough is at least five miles from Kettering and doesn't really exist does it? So please, no more new housing estates in Desborough.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. In planning for future growth, adequate school provision is a key consideration. Kettering Borough Council works with NCC Education to ensure adequate provision to accommodate future 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.</p>
---	-----	--------------	--	---

4	133	Mrs Jo Crick	<p>Dear Sirs I am sending this email to voice my objection to the proposed additional 304 houses in the Ise valley in Desborough. Not only will it destroy even more green land, Desborough does not have the facilities to cope with more residents and I don't see KBC making any difference to that fact anywhere. The Schools are teetering with so many pupils, the doctors surgery is just a bad joke. And KBC still hasn't fulfilled its promise about the new leisure centre facilities being like-for-like with the old leisure centre...where are the squash courts - you've already conned the existing residents with a lesser service. And where is the new Tesco's supermarket? More money should be spent on providing schools, secondary as well, supermarkets or even the swimming pool (which the money was left for by a member of the public, yet KBC has stolen that and not invested it back into Desborough as it was left for) Maybe you could even explain where that money has gone, along with the money raised by the people of Desborough for the pool?! Please, just ask yourselves how the existing so called 'services' are going to cope with even more people, because lets face it you're not going to invest any money are you, because Desborough is at lease five miles from Kettering and doesn't really exist does it? Its just more money for your pocket. So please, no more new housing estates in Desborough.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Provision of schools is an important consideration when planning for future growth and to this end Kettering Borough Council works with NCC Education 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.</p>
---	-----	--------------	---	---

4	135	Lynda Wilson	<p>Ise Valley Development Proposal 2. Comments on the merits of the sites identified? There is no merit entirely the opposite. It is a disgrace even as a proposal. 3. Comments on detail for development? This beautiful valley should not be developed. No thought has been given to this. 4. What infrastructure will be necessary to support development of the sites? None Desborough has no need to expand anymore. 5. Any other comments? I am appalled at the consideration of the potential destruction of the Ise Valley as being proposed. This valley should never have been proposed as a potential site for housing. We are fortunate to have this beautiful natural setting which contributes to a sound ecological environment. This valley is stunning. It sustains rare wild life. Can you imagine life without bird song? Who has the right to take away this natural habitat? Answer NO-ONE. Desborough has already had its fair share of houses both built and the new proposals already passed to build more houses. The populous is expected to accept man made green spaces as a consolation well we do not want this. We want to retain our natural environment. Nature is so special so leave it alone. The whole idea of houses being built on the Ise Valley is both uncaring, thoughtless and short sighted. Because: 1. Loss of a natural habitat once you loose it its gone forever no one with a conscience could accept the proposal. 2. Severe flooding and drainage issues. 3. Well being. Remember the 2012 legacy. Healthy body healthy mind. We are just letting this area go. A leisure centre not as good as the old one. The destruction of the skate park. And now stop</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The impact on wildlife has been considered in the assessment of the site. Development of the site would need to provide mitigation for any harm to wildlife and would be required to provide a net increase in biodiversity. The access to the site has not yet been finalised. The provision of a safe and suitable access would be considered in detail at the planning application stage in consultation with NCC Highways Authority. The site does not fall within a flood zone. It is adjacent to a flood zone and this has been recognised in the assessment of the site. Any planning application for a site located within a flood zone would need to consider flood risk in accordance with Policy 10 of the National Planning Framework and would be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment. 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 was redeveloped alongside any residential development.</p>
---	-----	--------------	---	--

			<p>people walking and running and exercising in a natural surrounding. The council should be encouraging this in fact I thought KBC had committed to doing so. 4. Infrastructure and roads. The present roads are a mess. The footpaths are a mess. Street lighting is patchy. The idea of this development creates even more pressure and long term will be very costly both financially and morally. 5. Logistics This area will suffer from the amount of vehicles supplying a building site. Just stupid. Leave the Ise Valley alone let us have and keep this natural beauty. Stop the building plans. Stop the builders from destroying this area. If the land belongs to Kettering Council then it belongs to us. For once support Desborough stop making it a dumping ground . In reality with any issue you would go to the root cause. This root cause is too many people. We need to stand up and protect our land. The saddest thing is that people are being worn down and becoming apathetic. Why? Because nobody listens. As a Council I am asking you to listen leave the Ise Valley as it is. Let us have our walks, our fields, our wild animals. Do not destroy this. I am not religious but everyday I walk the fields I thank God they are there. Please leave them there.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

4	136	R Nimmo	<p>Dear Committee, RE Proposed Development Ise Valley My family and I moved into Desborough in December 1980 some 33 years ago and found Desborough idyllic a small town for our children a good school Havalock, low crime, natural countryside, and a town with good community spirit. This proposed development of Ise Valley in my view would be a dreadful decision for the local community and the loss of greenspace, the environmental impact on vegetation, birds, bats, snakes, frogs, newts and foxes, what a loss! Our Ise Valley meadow has been used by generations of familys over a long period of time. This development is not what local people want. I also have concerns regarding infrastructure, traffic/access issues, flooding, sewage, watertable, the valley walk offers considerable health benefits to all ages of this community. If we loose it, it is lost forever. Some planning decisions in this town appear bizarre. Desborough Town Council requests locals to support the town centre shops, however, there is little choice, limited parking and the High Street has double yellow lines not a welcome sign for locals or shoppers from out of town. A library was constructed with five car parking spaces clearly not thought through. A doctors surgery was also constructed with no proper car parking for visitors to surgery parking is on a shared access road. Ise valley should stay as a place of tranquillity for the community to enjoy. If we loose it this would be extremely distressing for locals.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The impact on wildlife has been considered in the assessment of the site. Development of the site would need to provide mitigation for any harm to wildlife and would be required to provide a net increase in biodiversity. The access to the site has not yet been finalised. The provision of a safe and suitable access would be considered in detail at the planning application stage in consultation with NCC Highways Authority. The site does not fall within a flood zone. It is adjacent to a flood zone and this has been recognised in the assessment of the site. Any planning application for a site located within a flood zone would need to consider flood risk in accordance with Policy 10 of the National Planning Framework and would be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment. 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 was redeveloped alongside any residential development.</p>
---	-----	---------	--	--

4	141	Mr John Kemp	Secretary Desborough Civic Society	<p>Response to KBC consultation Dear Sirs Desborough Civic Society welcomes the opportunity of commenting on Housing Allocations Assessment of Additional Sites and Update. There is a widespread view among the people of Desborough that expansion of the town has already reached the point where its services are inadequate and that no further housing should be accepted. Existing permissions (DE/078, DE/062 and DE/073) already total 934 dwellings and most residents consider these to be more than the town can cope with. To propose to build a 491 further houses on top of this, is contrary to the wishes of the people of Desborough, who see it as further adding to the problems of Desborough as a community. The Civic Society welcomes the decision that the ridge and furrow field at the junction of Braybrooke Road and Arthingworth Road (DA/142) will not be considered for building. The Civic Society, however, strongly disagrees with proposed development on sites DE/067, DE/188, DE/063 and DE/210, as they represent further erosion of Desborough green infrastructure. The proposal to allow the building of 304 houses along the Ise Valley is one that we strongly oppose because it represents vital green infrastructure which is greatly valued by the people of Desborough; its value as such has been acknowledged in previous KBC consultations; local residents value the Ise Valley for its wildlife; building will reduce opportunities for wildlife to flourish and for biodiversity to increase; it is on a flood plain, and climate change may increase the prospect of flooding; there are significant access</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. 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. Impact on wildlife has been considered in the assessment of site DE/210 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 and would also need to provide a net increase in biodiversity. The site is adjacent to but not within a flood zone. Any planning application for a site located in a flood zone would need to consider flood risk in accordance with Policy 10 of the NPPF and would be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment. The access to the site has not yet been finalised. The provision of a safe and suitable access would be considered in detail at the planning application stage in consultation with NCC Highways Authority. Provision of schools and adequate medical</p>
---	-----	--------------	--	--	--

				<p>problems; local services, schools, doctors etc. will be unable to cope with the increase, particularly with the extra houses already planned; In our view, proposals to build on the Ise Valley and other green sites in Desborough disregard the thinking behind the National Planning Policy Framework. Specifically, para 17 of the Core Planning Principles planning should empower local people to shape their surroundings, finding ways to enhance and improve the places in which they live their lives. the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside should be recognised . planning should contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment. full account should be taken of flood risk.€ Para 73 of the section entitled Promoting Healthy Communities access to high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and recreation can make an important contribution to the health and well-being of the community . Para 74 of the same section existing open space. should not be built on unless the land is surplus to requirements Para 76 of the same section Local communities should be able to identify for special protection green areas of particular importance to them. The Civic Society believes that Kettering Borough Council should take these national guidelines into account and discount the remaining green infrastructure of Desborough as sites for residential development.</p>	<p>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.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

4	143	Mr David Cooper	<p>Proposed Developments DE/173, DE/189, DE/210 Dear Sirs These comments on the proposals for the Lower Steeping on Hawthorns area in Desborough are made primarily from the perspective of a physical hydrologist. The valley of the River Ise has not been closely monitored for its liability to flood, although sites have been identified in the recent Northamptonshire Flood Risk Management Strategy . As a County Council paper on which there is on-going work it should provide some guidance for you on how far any housing should be allowed into the Lower valley sites of the flood-plain channel of the Ise. Although the catchment area above the proposed sites is limited and the sites are unlikely to be subjected to prolonged natural inundation unless work downstream of any site temporarily or permanently impedes flow there are other risks. These may come from three sources: Firstly rapid run-off from the built-up areas of Desborough following, for example, a slow moving thunderstorm or rapid snow melt. This may be followed by run-off from the farmland above the Rothwell-Desborough road bridge. This would depend a little on the state of the fields both in timing and in volume. The slower the better for flood mitigation. Secondly from the amount of seasonal waters being discharged. The County Council team are looking into the flood risk problem given the character of the catchment. The description which the Centre for Ecology and Hydrology given in the Hydrometric Register and Statistics 1996-2000 in for the Slade Brook at Kettering is 48% clay 48% sandstone (p.78). It may well be that the Lias Clay and the Boulder Clay above</p>	Thank you for your comments which will be used to inform the next iteration of the plan.
---	-----	-----------------	---	--

			<p>Desborough is greater than the amount of sandstone. Given the character of the topography the Northants Sands are not likely to be very rapidly infiltrated nor indeed have a great retention capacity and that winter flooding surface water sitting in a shallow layer on the valley floor would be a problem, especially if gardens on which money has been spent are regularly inundated or favoured plants or shrubs do not flourish. This water tends to be slow to drain and will stand on the surface until it evaporates in the spring or even early summer. The catchment itself is flashy the term used by hydrologists to describe the time lag between rainfall and the river or stream rising otherwise the response time . The shorter the more flashy it is, and it is likely to be similar to the flow falling off after the peak discharge. The Slade weir at Kettering shows that following the rains of Easter 1998 it has a discharge of 28 cubic metres per second. The local peak record which has a drastic impact on Northampton. The 2000 peak flows was only 4.2m³/sec-1 Caution needs to be taken not to assume that because the 1998 record is something of a freak or that it might not happen for years, the hydrogists return frequency of 10, 25, 30, 100 years is only a statistical chance based on limited records. Some would have us believe that in the lifetime of the proposed developments climate change will result in a different rainfall-pattern - more extreme events. Although recommending a browse of CEH B65 Met Office The 2010 2012 drought and subsequent extensive flooding would probably bring this all into a better perspective. Leaving a wide swath of green in</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

				<p>the Ise Valley even if limited development on the upper valley site facing southlands is recommended could be the best long term plan.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

4	145	Mr P Manning	<p>Combining the proposed developments of DE072/DE173 & DE189 as DE210 is nothing short of environmental suicide. National and local talk of being green, environmental friendly, recycling etc. does not fall into the working areas of KBC, that is unless an EU directive has been issued. Come on KBC respect your local residents and stand up to the national and European bureaucrats. We moved to this charming part of Northamptonshire 11 years ago much to the envy of our friends and relations as we found the Ise Valley. Surveys came back stating it was a designated area of natural beauty but a note warning us of the flood plain in the dip between Desborough and Rothwell and it was unsuitable for domestic dwellings. During our 11 years we hear of the decline of British Wildlife and birds. Along with our neighbours we often feel we are in a different country as we have seen an increase in various species of birds. I am sure with the building of 300 house we will be losing the joy they bring to our part of the Desborough community, along with the foraging in the hedgerows for blackberries, elderberries, sloes etc. Not sure that people growing fruit in their new homes will appreciate us scrumping in their gardens. We wonder if any of KBC planners have actually visited Desborough or just look at pieces of paper(maps) in the comfort of their office. So many areas of the town centre are a disgrace and must be an embarrassment to our own town councillors, how they or KBC expect investors, either business or house builders, to put money into our town makes one wonder. The number of empty/derelict properties that could be</p>	<p>Impact on wildlife was considered in the assessment. Development of the site will need to provide mitigation for any harm and will be required to provide a net increase in biodiversity. The site assessment also considered flood risk. DE/210 does not fall within a flood zone but it is adjacent to a flood zone. Any planning application for a site located within a flood zone would need to consider flood risk in accordance with Policy 10 of the National Planning Framework and would be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment. 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.</p>
---	-----	--------------	---	---

				<p>rebuilt/renovated to give the housing required plus the brown land available must be quite substantial. KBC please keep our little valley green, allow nature to have its bit of freedom for us all to enjoy.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

4	153	Mr David Baylis	<p>1) There cannot be any merit whatsoever in using these fields for housing. This is a narrow strip of green space between 2 towns. If this plan goes ahead this area will become a urban sprawl and lose its identity. It should be noted that The land here has a high water table and consequently building here will increase the likely hood of flooding. I walk this area regularly (with plenty of others) and the wildlife sustained in these fields is amazing. I've personally seen Cranes, Red Kites, Barn Owls, Bats, Roe Deer, Voles amongst other more common species. The tracks across the fields stay visible all year round show how many people walk the area. Government tell us to exercise more but where - in a leisure centre which has yet to fulfil its promises? 2) Wherever access to the site is gained, it's likely to be problematic with flooding at the lse river bridge and a road through this new development is likely to become a "rat" run to cross Desborough. More housing will generally increase traffic in / around Desborough and present an increased danger to children who walk along the road up to Montsaye school. 3) Desborough has little infrastructure to support even the existing population without adding more. i.e. Limited in Schools, Doctors, transport, shops, parking etc, etc. 4) Taking into account all the above KBC and DTC have an outstanding opportunity to keep these fields as green space for all the people of Desborough and surrounding districts by making a "Linear Park" from the church through the fields and onto the Millenium bridge which can be used by all.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which have been noted. If the site is developed sufficient distance would be retained between Desborough and Rothwell to prevent coalescence. The site does not fall within a flood zone. It is adjacent to a flood zone and this has been recognised in the assessment of the sites. Any planning application for a site located within a flood zone would need to consider flood risk in accordance with Policy 10 of the National Planning Framework and would be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment. Impact on wildlife was also considered in the assessment. Development of the site will need to provide mitigation for any harm and will be required to provide a net increase in biodiversity. School provision and 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. 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 was redeveloped alongside any residential development.</p>
---	-----	-----------------	--	---

4	156	Mr P Manning		Site ref DE210 - Consolidation. Reference BBC Countryside magazine December 2013:- Quote - THE FIRST THING WE SHOULD DO TO PROTECT OUR LANDSCAPE IS TEACH OUR CHILDREN TO IDENTIFY, LOVE AND CHERISH THE SPECIES THAT SHOULD BE FOUND THERE. THEN WE CAN KEEP THEM THERE.	Thank you for your comments which have been noted.
4	157	Mr Richard May	Managing Director Go4 Results Limited	As a local resident and business owner I totally support the controlled expansion of Desborough. Local objections are being organised by a political charity, DCDT, to further their NIMBY principles. Meanwhile local people need homes and the town needs to grow to support the infrastructure, including shops, that it currently lacks.	Thank you for your comments which have been noted.

4	160	Ms Heather Webb	<p>I am extremely disappointed that Kettering Borough Council continues to ignore the advice of its paid ecological advisor and local residents by not only continuing to consider site DE/072 for allocation, but by increasing the allocation and creating the 'meta-allocation' that is site DE/210. The Wildlife Trust has repeatedly urged the council to reconsider allocating this area due to the projected visitor impact on Tailby Meadow LWS. Despite this expert advice the council has continued to put the site forward for allocation. Allocating this site would in my opinion contravene the mitigation hierarchy outlined in paragraph 118 of the NPPF. I believe it would also violate section 1.15 of the North Northamptonshire Biodiversity Supplementary Planning Document, which states that 'where avoidance of all impacts is not possible, the local planning authority will need to first be satisfied that the development cannot reasonably be located on any alternative sites that would result in less or no harm'. The combined (separate) yield of sites DE/072, DE/189 and DE/173 is 262 dwellings. The combined yield of sites DE/188/DE/067, DE/063 and DE/173 (the least unacceptable of the three DE/210 sites) is 273 dwellings. Therefore the could 'reasonably be located on alternative sites that would result in less or no harm'. Much of the objection to this site has focused on the impacts of visitor pressure on Tailby Meadow. To this end I have undertaken a site sensitivity analysis using a model developed and used in Bedfordshire and published in 'In Practice', the journal of the Institute for Ecology and Environmental Management (issue 74 December 2011, p.11-</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which will inform the preparation of the next iteration of the plan. Further ecological assessment of the impact of development of site DE/210 will be required before progression of the site as an allocation.</p>
---	-----	-----------------	--	---

15). The model evaluates a site's vegetation, avian and abiotic features to identify inherent sensitivity to visitor pressure. Results of the model have been appended below. It indicates that the southern half of Tailby Meadow is extremely sensitive because of its wet loamy soils. Trampling through normal footfall compacts the soil, which is not able to recover as drier soils would. The compaction inhibits root growth, leading in time to changes in the floristic community in favour of aggressive weedy species. Tailby Meadow is a rare form of lowland meadow habitat which itself is extremely rare: the UK Biodiversity Action Plan estimates that only 7200ha remain in England. The remaining fragments - which include Tailby Meadow - need to be protected from not only loss but degradation. Increasing development around Tailby Meadow would result in more visitors and more trampling, which risks overall site degradation and loss of plant biodiversity. I therefore urge Kettering Borough Council to remove site DE/210 (and in particular site DE/072 and DE/189) from its list of potential allocation sites. Tailby Meadow: site sensitivity analysis (per Webb H. 2011. A model to predict wildlife site sensitivity to visitor pressure. In Practice (74): 11-15) Size: 4.93ha (49300m²) Vegetation type(s): lowland meadow (GL) Bird community: Farmland and Woodland Vegetation: Uniqueness of plant community type: Score: 5/5 Nationally it is estimated that 7282ha of lowland meadow exist in England, representing 0.4% of the country BAP habitat. As it comprises <1% of the national BAP habitat area, lowland meadow has been classed as rare at a national scale.

			<p>Last estimates indicate that there are approximately 340.5ha of lowland meadow in the county. This represents 6.1% of county BAP habitat, and 4.7% of the national lowland meadow total. The habitat can therefore be considered locally as uncommon. In fact Northamptonshire has more than twice the expected amount of lowland meadow for its size. This disproportionate presence in the county plus its restriction to soils of neutral pH yields a score of 5. Representativity: Score: 2/5 As a Local Wildlife Site, Tailby Meadow scores a 2 on this scale. Succession-disturbance degree: Score: 2/5 Lowland meadow scores 2 habitat points for its restoration time (1 point), number of associated rare species (0.5 point) and facultative need for grazing (0.5 point). There are no known sensitive species at Tailby Meadow, nor is the site believed to have ancient soils. Rarity: Score: 0/5 No UK BAP vascular plant species have been recorded at Tailby Meadow. Richness: Score: 5/5 139 vascular plant species have been recorded at Tailby Meadow. Values of c (6.1) and z (0.019) calculated for Bedfordshire and which in the absence of more refined figures have been used for Northamptonshire were used in the species-area calculation, which yields a theoretical species richness of 7 vascular plant species for the site, a figure which reflects the degraded state of most of Northamptonshire's meadows. Therefore more than the maximum theoretical number of species has been recorded at Tailby Meadow, resulting in a score of 5. Avifauna: Uniqueness of wildlife habitat: Score: 3.1/5 The 2km radius around Tailby Meadow is a mix of</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>approximately 25% urban (the towns of Desborough and Rothwell) and 75% agricultural, in particular cultivated crops. In this case a weighted average has been taken of the two landscape cost values (urban: 20 and cultivated crops: 10). The result has been converted to a score out of 5. Representativity: Score: 0.2/5 Records for the site include 1 of the 30 woodland indicator species used in reporting for the East Midlands, and 0 of the 19 farmland indicator species. Converted to scores out of 5 (where 80% of the indicator species results in a full 5 points), these woodland and farmland scores would be 0.2 and 0 respectively. These two figures have been added together to yield a score of 0.2/5. The paucity of avian records for this site reflects a possible under-recording and consequently a misleadingly low score. Rarity: Score: 0.5/5 One UK BAP bird species has been recorded at Tailby Meadow. Importance for wildlife: Score: 0/5 No critical life cycle areas are known to exist at Tailby Meadow. Abiotic sensitivity: Drainage: Score: 0/6 According to Soilscales Viewer, Tailby Meadow lies on slightly acid loamy and clayey soils with impeded drainage, which are classed by the NSRI as having slightly impeded drainage. Submersibility: Score: 3/6 Tailby Meadow lies on the River Ise and approximately 40-50% of the site is within Environment Agency flood zones 2 and 3. The rest of the site is in zone 1. The site has therefore been assigned an intermediate score of 3. However the area closest to the river is classed as severely fragile which has implications for site management. Texture: Score: 3/6 Slightly acid loamy and clayey soils</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>with impeded drainage are classified by the NSRI as loamy some clay Slope: Score: 0/6 The steepest slope recorded at Tailby Meadow is 5%. Loamy soils with a slope <5% have been classified in the Farm Environment Plan manual as being at lower risk of erosion, yielding a score of 0.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

4	162	Mr & Mrs D Coe	<p>Dear Sirs, It is with great dismay that I have heard of a proposal to develop the Ise Valley area. As a local born person I have seen many green leisure areas built on and I feel Desborough has provided its fair share. Other issues come to mind such as Environmental Damage, possible flooding and the threat to the field known as Tailby Meadow. Do we not have already Planning Permission for over 900 houses? With infrastructure already under pressure. I think its high time further development was halted. Please leave this green area along the valley as it is.</p>	<p>Impact on wildlife was considered in the assessment. Development of the site will need to provide mitigation for any harm and will be required to provide a net increase in biodiversity. The site assessment also considered flood risk. DE/210 does not fall within a flood zone but it is adjacent to a flood zone. Any planning application for a site located within a flood zone would need to consider flood risk in accordance with Policy 10 of the National Planning Framework and would be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment. 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.</p>
---	-----	-------------------	---	---

4	163	Mr William Featherstone	<p>DE/072 Any designation here should recognise its status as an asset of community value and therefore not subject to inclusion in a comprehensive scheme. DE/173 Should remain as presently designated:- (a) Unwelcome infill of Ise Valley and creep towards Rothwell (b) Flood plain area (c) Green value (d) No requirement for development DE/189 No change, reasons as DE/173 DE/210 Should not link DE/072 with DE/172 and DE/189</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which will be used to inform the next iteration of the plan. If the site were to be developed sufficient distance would be retained between Desborough and Rothwell to prevent coalescence. DE/210 is not within a flood zone. It is adjacent to a flood zone and development of a site within a flood zone would be required to consider flood risk in accordance with Policy 10 of the NPPF and would be required to submit a flood risk assessment. 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.</p>
---	-----	-------------------------	---	--

4	164	Sheila Coe		DE/072 Having lived in Desborough all my life and often played in those fields I know the flood risk is likely. Also please dont spoil the green fields and access road leading to it.	Thank you for your comments which have been noted and which will be used to inform the next iteration of the plan.
---	-----	------------	--	--	--

4	165	Dr Robin Field	Nene Valley Nature Improvement Area Land Advisor River Nene Regional Park Community Interest Company	<p>Desborough Housing allocation DE/072, DE/173, DE/189, DE/210 I would like to object strongly to the allocation of land in the Ise Valley at Desborough for potential housing. I have written, given several presentations and had meetings regarding the importance of protecting Tailby Meadows from increase pressure. In fact we actually need to reduce pressure on Tailby Meadows by providing additional local green space. The allocation of further areas of local green space for housing can only make the situation worse and even though KBC keep saying they understand the issue this is not borne out by its actions. Tailby Meadows will practically be the only accessible green space on that side of the river, surrounded by housing and the first place the new residents will go for recreational purposes. This is the last thing we need at Tailby. The fact that the whole development is in the Nature Improvement Area seems to have been completely ignored and Planning Policy suggests sports pitches etc should not be built on unless it has been replaced by at least an equivalent amount. With only the first phase of the new Leisure Centre completed and no actual planned date for the second phase that also breaks Planning Policy.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which have been duly noted. Further ecological assessment of the impact of development of site DE/210 will be required before progression of the site as an allocation.</p>
---	-----	----------------	--	---	--

4	166	Mr Richard Tate	<p>1. Which part do you wish to comment on? DE072, DE173, DE189, DE210 2. Comments on the merits of the sites identified? No merits 3. Comments on detail for development? Access to the site would be dangerous. The B576 is very busy. School children have to walk along that road to school in Rothwell. The access frequently floods. 4. What infrastructure will be necessary to support development? The doctors and schools are full. Children have to go to surrounding towns. The doctors you have to go to Rothwell for many appointments so means the B576 is even busier. There is not enough employment in Desborough and transport is expensive for people to get to work. 5. Any other comments? This site is a lovely area for all to enjoy. Most council would be proud to have natural beauty on their door step. It should be cherish and preserved, to lose the wildlife will be disastrous for many generation to come.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments in relation to DE/072, DE/173, De/189 and DE/210. The access to the site has not yet been finalised. The provision of a safe and suitable access would be considered in detail at the planning application stage in consultation with NCC Highways Authority. The identified sites do not fall within a flood zone. They are adjacent to a flood zone and this has been recognised in the assessment of the sites. Any planning application for a site located within a flood zone would need to consider flood risk in accordance with Policy 10 of the National Planning Framework and would 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.</p>
---	-----	-----------------	---	--

4	167	Ms Elizabeth Tate	<p>1. Which part do you wish to comment on? Section 4.9, Appendix 3, DE072, DE173, DE189, DE210</p> <p>2. Comments on the merits of the sites identified? There are no merits, as the impact on wildlife will be disastrous. I am dismayed that the KBC has even considered building on green belt.</p> <p>3. Comments on detail for development? The site frequently floods and is impassable. Where the access is planned on the B576 it would be dangerous, the road is very busy with children walking to school.</p> <p>4. What infrastructure will be necessary to support development? The schools and doctors are over subscribed at the moment. There is talk about expanding the schools by building on their playing fields. So no playing fields and no green places. So where are children to go.</p> <p>5. Any other comments? This site is very beautiful area it would be criminal to build on it. There are many brown sites that could be transformed into pleasant housing sites e.g. Kettering Town FC, Charlie Perkins site. The impact on wildlife would be disastrous many rare species would lose their habitat. I went to the Town Council meeting on 21st Nov it would appear that the Town Council do not agree with this site. but do not have any say in the matter.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Impact on wildlife was considered in the assessment. Development of the site will need to provide mitigation for any harm and will be required to provide a net increase in biodiversity. The site assessment also considered flood risk. DE/210 does not fall within a flood zone but it is adjacent to a flood zone. Any planning application for a site located within a flood zone would need to consider flood risk in accordance with Policy 10 of the National Planning Framework and would be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment. The access to the site has not yet been finalised. The provision of a safe and suitable access would be considered in detail at the planning application stage in consultation with NCC Highways Authority. Provision of schools and medical facilities are an important consideration when planning for future growth. Kettering Borough Council works closely with NCC Education and health care providers to ensure adequate provision is available for residents of new 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.</p>
---	-----	-------------------------	---	---

4	168	Mrs Valerie Moore	<p>Dear Sirs Re: Ise Valley from Hawthorns to Old A6 I wish to protest against the proposal to allocate the Ise Valley for building development. On the grounds that: 1. green space is a valuable asset to the community 2. The increased risk of flooding in the area Valuable Asset to the Community I am sure many people, like me, chose to live in Desborough because of its rural location. Much of the surrounding countryside has now been built on changing the nature of the town. Desborough is now a busy place and this make our remaining green space even more precious. The Ise Valley is enjoyed by many walkers on a daily basis come rain or shine, and I believe strongly that this beautiful, green and tranquil setting enhances the lives of the whole community just by being there. A value that cannot be measured. Risk of Flooding I have witnessed that the Ise River floods into the fields proposed for development and I worry that building on this land could increase the risk of flooding. I wish to say NO to allocating the Ise Valley for building development.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which will be used to inform the next iteration of the plan. The identified site does not fall within a flood zone. It is adjacent to a flood zone and this has been recognised in the assessment of the sites. Any planning application for a site located within a flood zone would need to consider flood risk in accordance with Policy 10 of the National Planning Framework and would be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment.</p>
---	-----	-------------------	---	---

4	169	Mr Alan Collins	<p>Housing Proposal Development 'Ise Vale Valley: - DE/210 Dear Sir/Madam I am writing to strongly object to this proposed development. The main reasons are 1) The environmental impact of building 304 houses on this whole site, having a devastating effect on the biodiversity of wildlife (flora, insect & birds) in this lovely area of Desborough. 2) This land is used regularly by all ages to safely enjoy both walking and play. This area is easily accessed by a large proportion of Desborough residence. Although you may point to Tailby Meadow as an area to walk, don't you think this small area will get overused and therefore potentially spoil this protected area. Also remember the area across the river from Tailby Meadow which is marked on your plans as a Green Space is not easily accessible or practical to walk as the area directly over the bridge is often flooded and the gates are locked. It is certainly not safe for children to play, so please don't use Tailby Meadow and the Green Space in answer to my concerns. 3) Flooding and pollution. We all know there are already problems with flooding, if the development proceeds how will you insure it will not get worse? 4) Access from small side roads is too small and potentially dangerous for the number of vehicles that building 304 houses would produce. My other concern is if a link is made from the A6 to enter this area it could produce a southern ring road / rat run from Rushton Rd through to the A6, again potentially dangerous. 5) Overlooking privacy issues. There are numerous houses that face directly on to the open land. Will you guarantee all potential plans keep within existing laws regarding overlooking?</p>	<p>The impact on wildlife has been considered in the assessment of the site. Development of the site would need to provide mitigation for any harm to wildlife and would be required to provide a net increase in biodiversity. The identified site does not fall within a flood zone. It is adjacent to a flood zone and this has been recognised in the assessment of the sites. Any planning application for a site located within a flood zone would need to consider flood risk in accordance with Policy 10 of the National Planning Framework and would be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment. The access to the site has not yet been finalised. The provision of a safe and suitable access would be considered in detail at the planning application stage in consultation with NCC Highways Authority. Issues in relation to overlooking and loss of privacy are material planning considerations which are considered at the detailed planning application stage. 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.</p>
---	-----	-----------------	--	---

				<p>6) The impact of the extra population from 304 new houses on Desborough town centre infrastructure including Doctors Surgery, Schools and Social Services capability. I look forward to receiving your response.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

4	175	Frances Bayliss	<p>Proposed development of land across the Ise Valley south of Desborough for 304 houses Kettering Borough Council ref DE/210 (comprising DE/072, DE/189 and DE/173) I attach a letter detailing my objections to the above proposal. A hard copy will be hand-delivered to the Council Offices. I would be grateful if you would please acknowledge receipt.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which will be used to inform the next iteration of the plan. The access to the site has not yet been finalised. The provision of a safe and suitable access would be considered in detail at the planning application stage in consultation with NCC Highways Authority. 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. 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 identified site is adjacent to but not within a flood zone and this has been recognised in the assessment of the site. Any planning application for a site located within a flood zone would need to consider flood risk in accordance with Policy 10 of the National</p>
---	-----	-----------------	---	---

						Planning Framework and would be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment.
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

4	176	Sarah-Jane Robinson	<p>I have lived in Desborough for 9 years now, Kettering before that. Both my husband and I are so pleased we moved here as it is a good combination of village and town life. We have the combination of the shops and other facilities and also the countryside surrounding Desborough. If the plans for the HUGE housing development is passed, there are many facilities that would be massively affected. Doctors surgery; We already have problems in seeing our own Dr.....mainly due to the amount of patients on their list! this will increase massively Schools; too many children and not enough spaces.... I know of parents that were unable to get their children into their local school. The housing estate will have a huge impact on our local schools and those in the surrounding villages. Traffic will be horrendous and the roads will have even more pot holes than they already have..... Flooding!!!!!! And MOST IMPORTANTLY....OUR ENVIRONMENT!!! Me and my family regularly walk our dog along the Ise valley.....which us Desborough folk are very lucky to have and we should cherish it so that future generations can enjoy it!!! I definitely do not want to raise my young children up thinking that we don't have any passion towards or environment and wildlife and that you can build a concrete ugly soulless estate where ever you like. The Ise Valley is a beautiful tranquil area where you can escape the noise pollution of cars and enjoy the wildlife.</p>	<p>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. The identified site is adjacent to but not within a flood zone and this has been recognised in the assessment of the site. Any planning application for a site located within a flood zone would need to consider flood risk in accordance with Policy 10 of the National Planning Framework and would be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment.</p>
---	-----	---------------------	--	--

4	177	Bill & Liz Adcock	<p>We write to express our disapproval of the proposed development of 304 house along the Ise Valley adjacent to the river in Desborough. Desborough expansion has been grossly overdone with no provision for any essential services. You refused the much requested Sainsbury planning application in preference to the Tesco option which will never happen!! This latest proposal eats into our green belt reducing our enjoyment of free space & access to the countryside. Planning has always been discouraged here due to the proximity of the river. If the application is approved the subsequent rise in population will overstretch our already inadequate roads, medical services, schools etc. We suggest you get off your back sides and improve the pathetic amenities in Desborough especially the chronic town centre.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which will inform the next iteration of the plan.</p>
---	-----	----------------------	--	--

4	179	Mr Edward Fisk	Impact on wildlife, especially bird and small mammals which are always badly affected by close proximity of housing. The proposal will deprive residents of an open and accessible amenity that is well used and appears to be the next stage in the creep towards Desborough and Rothwell joining. Desborough at present does not have the infrastructure for more housing, the local schools are full and the doctors surgery is struggling to deal with the growing population. If Desborough is to expand there must be more suitable sites, please leave the green and open Ise valley alone.	The impact on wildlife has been considered in the assessment of the site. Development of the site would need to provide mitigation for any harm to wildlife and would be required to provide a net increase in biodiversity. If the site was to be progressed sufficient distance would be retained between Desborough and Rothwell to prevent coalescence. 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.
---	-----	----------------	--	---

4	180	Mr Richard Hill	<p>The Hawthorns to Rothwell Road green land alongside the River Ise has been used as a pleasant walking and leisure area for many generations. In the Local Plan for Kettering Borough, published by Kettering Borough Council (KBC) in 1995, this area was specifically designated as an area where planning permission for building would not be granted. Policy 94 designated that the area be used as a Public Open Space or Environmentally Important Open Space (EIOS). Policies 97 and D10 also proposed footpath and cycle links that would link the Damms Fields with the Millenium Bridge. Policy 88 designated a portion of the area to be used for Outdoor Sports Facilities. The Plan specifically stated that, It is fundamental to the Plan that these spaces should be retained and enhanced ...â€. The Damms Fields were designated an EIOS following a recommendation by the Planning Inspectorate that,.. I am firmly of the view that the open character of this area should continue to receive the strongest possible protection. All of this was, including the recommendations in their own Plan, were ignored by KBC. Planning permission was granted by KBC for housing developments within the EIOS, the Public Open Space was fenced off for cattle grazing and the footpath and cycle links were never built. KBC now intends to ignore their own plan altogether by proposing a development of 304 dwellings on the area. In 1991, Tailby Meadow was donated to KBC by the Tailby family. As part of the sale agreement, a covenant was placed on the land that restricted KBC from using it other than for recreational and open space purposes . I see that even this legal</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which will be used to inform the next iteration of the plan. Further work will be required to address some of the issues raised through the consultation process before progression of the site for allocation.</p>
---	-----	-----------------	---	--

				<p>covenant is being ignored with the meadow now being used for cattle grazing. The resulting mud and damage to grass is making it very difficult for it to be used for recreation, as originally intended by the Tailby family. I see little point in formally objecting since it is well known that KBC will ignore public opinion, their own previous plans, the recommendation of the Planning Inspectorate and even legal covenants. However, I would request that when/if the development is built that the area between the new houses and the River Ise be landscaped as a green public open space/leisure area and that footpath and cycle links be provided.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

4	182	Mr. Gerard O'Callaghan	I am strongly against development of DE/173, DE/189 and DE/072 together what you call a 'comprehensive development' DE/210 (although you have a different code for it in paragraph 4.9 !) I won't waste my time detailing my objections as KBC have absolutely no interest in the people of Desborough or the environment in Desborough.	
---	-----	---------------------------	--	--

4	183	Mr Gerald Cowdock	<p>Proposal DE/067 - Off Harrington Road, Desborough Since the 2012 document, Site DE/073 has been granted planning permission subject to S106 (Plan Ref: 2012/0780) Proposal DE/067 would require the same section of Harrington Road, beyond the Meissen Avenue turn off, for access. Whereas currently that stretch of road serves for access to 16 properties in all, the addition of up to 75 under 2012/0780 will increase this to 91, with the potential for up to 60 more I believe if DE/067 were to be granted planning permission, taking it to more than 150. I quote from the road geometry assessment 'as is' taken for the 2012/0780 report."the road width varies in width between 4.9 metres, at the western end, through to 4.8 metres at the proposed site access position and ending at 4.6 metres as Harrington Road / Meissen Avenue". I have further estimated that the shared section of that road that would serve the potential 150+ properties, if all approved, is between 65 and 75 from the Meissen Road Junction to up to the access point for the 2012/078 development on the north side of Harrington Road. Given the above, I question whether the road infrastructure 'as is' would be sufficient to support the likely pattern of traffic usage. I have further concerns on the existing road infrastructure;- a) Overnight there are usually a line of parked vehicles for residents on the South Kerb line of Harrington Road beyond Meissen Avenue - I question the subjective comment about 'ample car parking for dog walkers' referred to in the 2012/0780 Plan. b) The view at the junction of Harrington Road / Meissen Avenue is partially restricted by a</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. 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.</p>
---	-----	-------------------	--	---

residential wall and vegetation, making access to Harrington Road beyond that point awkward. Although this does not present a huge problem now, the additional traffic volumes requiring to make that turn would compound it; c) I further question the estimates of the Predicted Trip Rates and Traffic Generated for the Proposed Residential Development supplied in support of KET/2012/0780 (see Table 7.1); If I read it correctly, it indicates only 27 departures during morning peak time for up to 75 dwellings that provide for 2 car spaces per household. To put this into context, In Orchard Close nearby, also served for access via Harrington Road, there are currently 10 dwellings, albeit some with 4 bedroom capacity, where the average number of cars per household is 1.9, less that the maximum proposed development allowance of 2 as above. During the same morning peak period times however, the normal departures in fact total 12 from my own routine observation. So 10 dwellings nearby to the proposed development currently produce nearly half of the estimated number of departures from 75 dwellings! I believe that KET/2012/0780 also allows for high levels of cycle usage, another assumption I take issue with in reality. I assume that DE/067 would have to be assessed again post the implementation of plan KET/2012/0780 as the access route is identical. I have confined my comments only to road infrastructure and likely traffic volumes for now as I have yet to see the DE/067 summary assessment sheet, despite having twice requested this from the planning department last week. I welcome your response.

4	184	Mr Cavan Sullivan	<p>I have a number of serious concerns regarding the proposed development of 304 Dwellings in the Ise Valley under reference DE/072, DE/173, DE/189 and collectively under reference DE/210.</p> <p>Environment - This is a natural wildlife habitat rich in numerous species of birds, insects, and wild animals. It is as such a valued and vital area for the residents of South Desborough, many taking advantage of the opportunities for exercise and recreation that the Ise Valley offers.</p> <p>Resources - Desborough is a town that has very limited resources at the present time. Medical and School facilities are stretched. The Retail offering is virtually non existent for a Town of this size. How can the existing resources cope with the influx of an estimated 1200 to 1500 new residents? These in addition to the existing proposed developments to the North and East of the Town that have Planning Permission, and all the extra population they will bring to the Town.</p> <p>Also for a Town with virtually no Public Car Parks, how will Desborough cope with another 500/600 vehicles? Access - Initially it seemed that access was to be through the "Hawthorns", but subsequently it has been revealed that access is also proposed from the Western edge of the proposed development. Access to the development on the Western side via the B576 would seem to be an act of madness. The B576 is a busy fast road. Presumably a T Junction off the B576 would be out of the question as too dangerous so the answer would be a roundabout? This is already a hazardous road to cross especially for the elderly, infirm or schoolchildren. An additional junction here would only add significantly to the hazards for local</p>	<p>The impact on wildlife has been considered in the assessment of the site. Development of the site would need to provide mitigation for any harm to wildlife and would be required to provide a net increase in biodiversity. 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. The access to the site has not yet been finalised. The provision of a safe and suitable access would be considered in detail at the planning application stage in consultation with NCC Highways Authority.</p>
---	-----	----------------------	--	---

				<p>residents. In addition such access across the southern edge of Desborough would lead to a "rat run" for vehicles to the Rushton Road.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

4	185	Mr Adrian Joss	<p>The only benefit is filling a housing allocation and no other. With a detrimental effect on the wildlife, environment and most importantly the community, this is clearly irresponsible building and falls way outside the current government guidelines. No one from KBC is willing to come forward and speak on behalf KBC because KBC clearly know that this proposal is outrageous and irresponsible. I currently live at the end of the sewage pipe and often get raw sewage backing up out of my toilets with my house filling with raw sewage, this already is unacceptable but to add further houses on to the sewage will only exacerbate the situation. Natural flooding also occurs regularly which is unacceptable, and KBC intends again to make things worse. KBC also have no intentions in making good on any promises it makes to Desborough, such as remove a perfectly good leisure centre, and replace it with half a leisure centre while still increasing the population. All facilities in Desborough are being reduced, only this week we had to take my father-in-law to Kettering General hospital as he could not be seen by our local GP, for something which could easily have been resolved by GP if one were available. This will of course add a greater strain on Kettering General Hospital. I ask KBC to stop and think about what they are doing and not just think of filling housing allocations. you are an elected body and should start to think about and listen to your voters. Desborough is not a dumping ground for KBC, to just continually add more houses and Incinerators while removing anything that is good. If KBC goes ahead with this proposal it can only be because you are willing</p>	<p>The impact on wildlife has been considered in the assessment of the site. Development of the site would need to provide mitigation for any harm to wildlife and would be required to provide a net increase in biodiversity. Flood risk was also considered as part of the assessment of the site. The identified site does not fall within a flood zone. It is adjacent to a flood zone and this has been recognised in the assessment of the sites. Any planning application for a site located within a flood zone would need to consider flood risk in accordance with Policy 10 of the National Planning Framework and would be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment. Medical facilities are an important consideration when planning for future growth. Kettering Borough Council will work closely with 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.</p>
---	-----	----------------	--	---

				<p>to take ownership and responsibility for any flooding of property or more importantly the lives of all the children that have to walk to school through the new road layout.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

4	186	mrs deborah moore	<p>As a long standing resident of Desborough I am appalled that KBC think that they can continue to railroad through the development of this town without any thought being given to the residents opinions. This town has had a huge estate (The Grange) added in the last 8 years or so, many of those houses now being up for sale with no buyers in sight. There is too much housing stock in Desborough currently, which is why the prices are falling, also falling due to the possible building of an incinerator on our doorstep. Whilst all this additional housing is being discussed I see a distinct lack of facilities being offered at the same time. We don't have enough retail here, although I don't want to see a Tesco in the middle of town. Station Road is an absolute disgrace and is in dire need of improvement. The schools are full to overflowing, trying to get an appointment at the surgery is nigh on impossible, we have no decent community hall, in essence no infrastructure to speak of at all. And to top it all KBC want to take away one of the nicest pieces of 'green space' we have left, we lost The Plens to the Grange estate. I walk down there regularly, as do many other residents, where will we be able to walk if it becomes full of houses. And what will happen when we get a lot of rain, oh I think it may well flood, or have the planners never walked along there in the winter, I suggest they do. I moved here about 30 years ago, it was quiet, had lots of green space and little traffic. That is disappearing fast, the traffic going through town in rush hour is a joke, despite having had a by pass built, what will happen when another 300+ houses appear, it will be gridlock. I am appalled</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Given the changes to potential sites identified since the Options Paper consultation this current consultation enables people to comment on the alternative options for potential housing sites in Desborough. All comments received are used to inform the preparation of the next iteration 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. 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. Provision of schools and adequate medical facilities are an important consideration when planning for future growth. Kettering Borough Council works with NCC</p>
---	-----	-------------------------	--	---

at this development even being discussed it is an absolute disgrace! One very disgruntled Desborough resident.

Education and health care providers to ensure adequate provision is available for residents of new development. Flood risk was also considered as part of the assessment of the site. The identified site does not fall within a flood zone. It is adjacent to a flood zone and this has been recognised in the assessment of the sites. Any planning application for a site located within a flood zone would need to consider flood risk in accordance with Policy 10 of the National Planning Framework and would be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment.

4	187	Mrs Sue Dunkley	<p>Please find below my concerns re the proposed housing development along the Ise Valley (Hawthorns to Rothwell Road) in the form of questions which I would dearly like answered..... 1) My first question is: How on earth could you consider this as a suitable site when, compared to other sites in the town, this is Desborough's last area of natural beauty? Surely you should be preserving the countryside as much as possible and protecting sites such as these when making planning decisions. Planting a few trees after destroying such an area to 'appease' the locals just won't do - this kind of environment cannot be replicated, once destroyed it is gone for ever and I don't think anyone, elected councillors especially, should have the right to make such a 'permanently detrimental' decision. The historical aspects of the town and all who have lived here should be respected and preserved. These fields have been used and appreciated for generations, so much so, that a document exists which states that the 'Ise Valley should be preserved for the use of Desborough people for ALL TIME!' Who then feels that they have the power to overturn that decision. We vote people onto our councils to represent us and hopefully to respect previous directives such as this, sadly and all too often, we see that this is not the case and the views of the electorate are conveniently ignored, please listen carefully to what the people are saying! 2) My second question is: How could you reject the area to the South of Pioneer Avenue as potential building land and yet still consider the Hawthorns to Rothwell Road site as viable? Apart from being split in two by the Rothwell Road itself,</p>	<p>The document identifies a number of sites both brownfield and greenfield throughout the Borough. All sites have been assessed against a set of criteria set out in the Housing Allocations Background Paper. The site scored well in the assessment and therefore has been identified as a potential housing allocation. The assessment of the site to the south of Pioneer Avenue (DE/065) and the site had some significant constraints to development. For instance the southern element of the site is within the flood zone whereas DE/210 is not within a flood zone.</p>
---	-----	-----------------	---	--

			<p>these areas are one and the same. Every single reason for not using the Pioneer site should be replicated for the rest of the Ise Valley along with the same conclusion - 'Discount as Housing Allocation' 3) My third and last question is: How on earth could this side of town be considered for so many new houses, when the Leisure Centre was re-sited to the Harborough Road end of town because there were no amenities there? This development would practically double the size of the residential area in this part of town BUT we have no amenities down here! Would you include leisure facilities, green space etc in your plans. Needs some serious thought eh! I would appreciate your response to my queries. In the meantime may I ask that you acknowledge your position of importance on this matter and think very seriously about the decision you make and why! The future of this area of natural beauty is very very important to many people for a variety of different reasons but I feel that on the whole we are all united in a love of the countryside and a desire to protect these natural habitats for generations to come. We have to have homes and so accept that expansion is essential, but we also need to strike a balance to ensure a pleasant living environment for all..... Thank you for your time Kindest regards</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

4	189	mr rob price	<p>Dear Sir/Madam, Firstly, I'd like to thank you and your colleagues for sharing your LDD plans for 2013 online and at the recent consultation event at Marlow House. I hope in the spirit of localism, NPPF, Neighbourhood Planning and through your application of the National Planning Policy Framework you will now integrate the many views expressed to you by Desborough residents and their representative organisations to deliver a sustainable planning solution acceptable to all. Secondly I strongly urge you to revert back to your 2012 and 2011 LDD plans in which you clearly assessed the existing Southern Green Belt between Desborough and the River Ise, as discounted for development as it is Historically and Visually Important Open Space (source: KBC LDD plan 2012; Map of Desborough Housing Options) . The settlement boundary was clearly defined by a thick blue line as not extending into this ecologically and recreationally important green space. In summary I propose the above sites are discounted on the basis of: Proposal contradicts the Strategic Development Area Plan (Issues Paper 2) that clearly demarks the Ise valley on page 6 as being protected green area; similarly, the Core Spatial Strategy, LDD Housing Allocation 2012 and 2011 all state that the existing settlement boundary should not be extended into the Ise Valley. The assessment has been made on an inappropriate spatial scale that isolates it from the overall functioning of the upper River Ise Catchment, the green infrastructure it provides and the overall benefit to the Rural Economy. The proposal is in contradiction to the 12 principles stated in</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. All comments received are used to inform the preparation of the next iteration of the plan. It is important to note that the site was identified as a proposed Historically and Visually Important Open Space in the Options Paper. The Options Paper also stated that draft settlement boundaries shown on the proposals maps do not currently include new allocations and that new allocations will be added into boundaries following consultation on the Options Paper. Thank you for your detailed views in response to the identification of DE/210 as a potential housing allocation. Further additional work is required to address the issues and concerns raised through the consultation process before the site can be considered for progression.</p>
---	-----	--------------	--	--

			<p>National Planning Policy Framework, its guidance on sustainable development (economic, social and environmental roles) and engagement of communities through Neighbourhood planning. Precedence has been set in the criteria used for discounting site DE/065 (upstream of the proposed settlement) especially around the assessment of protected species, ecological features, cultural heritage, settlement character and drainage suggesting inconsistency in site assessments and that potential additional external influences are being considered. Serious fragmentation of a Green Corridor, enriched with habitat and protected species, along the River Ise Catchment between Naseby (river source) and Rushton on a waterbody with Good Ecological Status (GES) in terms of Water Framework Directive (WFD). There has been no consideration or evaluation of the cost avoidance of not having WFD GES versus the financial benefit the proposed settlement would bring to the Town and Borough. No consideration to significant historic and committed public, private and 3rd sector investment to the Ise Green Infrastructure to deliver ecosystem services (including flood risk mitigation, carbon sink, pollinators, health benefits, game and conservation events, Angling and the rural economy). No comparison of the gap between the existing depleted services, infrastructure, connectivity of dwellings and what appear to be desktop assessments for this LDD study (i.e. actual monitored performance of infrastructure and services rather than sampled assessments). The planning authority does not seem to understand that provision of urban</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>green space (micro pocket parks, commercial football grounds, cemetery, paving scabbed seated areas) should not be an acceptable mitigation to the consumption of natural and semi-natural open countryside. Regeneration objectives of the SDA appear to have failed to deliver sufficient increases in local employment for local residents and reduction in car travel to access work. The proposed settlement will only fuel and increase traffic congestion problems, burdening business transport and will result in increased public costs at a time of economic austerity. Impact of proposed development on habitat and biodiversity: The combined area you propose to develop comprises natural and semi-natural open spaces that border the Southern Desborough settlement extent and River Ise. The River Ise is one of only two Nene Catchment waterbodies reaching Good Ecological Status (GES) under the Water Framework Directive Regulations (source: Environment Agency), which puts it in the top 30% of England's Rivers. The high quality water environment should be seen as a proud flagship for both KBC and Northants County Council (NCC). This is no coincidence but is the result of significant financial investment from the public purse, private and 3rd sector investments. The GES is extremely sensitive to anthropogenic pressures, particularly development in close proximity. The area that is proposed for development has, over many, many years evolved, to provide a strong foundation for a rich and diverse habitat. This includes protected species sensitive to anthropogenic activity and climate change, such as bullhead fish, water</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>voles, white clawed crayfish (indigenous) and Daubenton bat roosts and Amber-listed Kingfishers. The Upper Ise is the only river in the Nene catchment to support naturally abundant stocks of Grayling. The nearby trees and hedgerows play host to numerous Pipistrelle bat roosts, red listed cricket warblers, starlings and red polls. Unploughed adjacent meadows provide abundance of field rodents which feed re-introduced red-listed red kites and other raptors including amber listed barn owls, rarer little owls, kestrels and buzzards. The proposed development of 304 houses, yielding 1000 humans, 100 + pets (and associated annual tonnage of pet faeces), 450 cars, uncontrolled domestic use of pesticides, herbicides, garden fertilisers, detergents, light pollution, artificially induced shading and micro-climate, so close to the heart of this catchment would undoubtedly impact the habitat and biodiversity, fragment the catchments green corridor linking Rushton and Naseby and increase pressures on the water quality environment, undoing sizeable historic and targeted financial investment. Even more significantly, the development would impact our range of unique eco-system service benefits. Even if a reduced area of green space to form a linear corridor was reserved next to the proposed development, the ecological status of the Ise catchment would be negatively affected due to its sensitivity to anthropogenic pressures. A linear corridor would concentrate anthropogenic and pet activity into a smaller area increasing the impact of pressures on our good but fragile catchment. There is no guarantee that any proposed mitigation for this</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>proposed development can reduce the impact on this green infrastructure. I suggest that precedence has been set with your own evaluation of Site DE/065 which has been discounted. There appears to be an inconsistent approach or mistake in the summary matrix where DE/065 scores red box and cross for protected species, ecological features, cultural heritage, settlement character and drainage. These are equally if not more applicable to DE/189 and DE/210. On this basis the proposed development on DE/189 and DE/210 and adjacent sites should be discounted.</p> <p>Consideration of Historical and Committed Future Investment in the River Ise Ecosystem Services and Rural Economy: Significant Public money and resources have been invested in protecting the Ise Vale environment resulting in a significant return on this investment comprising ecosystem service providers, regulatory cost avoidance and contributions to the rural economy: - Natural Englands entry and higher level stewardship scheme, wetland restoration and permissive footpath network - Revitalise river restoration projects and River Nene Regional Parks promotion of circular walks - Environment Agency channel improvements, channel maintenance, flood storage reservoirs biodiversity investigation, regulation and legal enforcement of the Combined Sewer Overflow at Valley Rise and Everdens factory drain, River Basin Management Plan and Catchment Flood Risk Management Plans - Wildlife Trusts management of Tailby meadow - Anglian Waters Valley Rise pump station improvements (Periodic Review â€ˆ PR14) - Town Council</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>funded millennium bridge to provide a managed access for visitors to benefit from the countryside without degrading it - Construction and maintenance of Swales and attenuation ponds to manage contaminated run-off from the A6 bypass - Preparation of 2012 Local Development Document designating land to the South of Desborough as high conservation value and important open space - Borough and county council budgets in marketing and positioning Desborough as a small country market town to attract inorganic population growth - County councils emerging Green Infrastructure (GI) Planning document which will state the importance of open spaces and green corridors - County Councils rights of way improvement plan and rights of way review Similarly, private resources, money and contributions in kind have been invested in protecting the Ise Vale environment: - Anglian Water (through customer revenue and shareholder capital) Valley Rise pump station improvements - Landowners invest time, physical and financial resources to reduce field erosion, buffer nutrient rich fertilisers/pesticides (including toxic metaldehyde)/herbicides from entering the watercourse - Sympathetically farmed meadows to minimise disruption to wildlife essential for predatory raptors and omnivorous mammals as well as grass meadows not ploughed for decades (priority habitat under Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006) - Donations to charitable organisations and contributions in kind e.g. Badgers Trust, RSPB and BTO to undertake wildlife observations, census and protection - Conservation through</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>managed, legal and organised game events - Volunteer group led healthy walks from the Grange and the Church to and around the Ise Valley The good ecological status of the Ise waterbody provides a high quality water environment. Water is used by wildlife and people as a both a resource and a condition. This enables a host of multi-million pound ecosystem services vital to the sustainability of the rural economy. In the Ise Valley these services range from pollinators, natural carbon sinks, natural flood defences and irrigation, natural surface water buffering, self-cleansing/self-healing/self-maintaining river water, water temperature regulation and oxygenation. These form important natural assets as the predicted impact of climate change is already showing evidence of extreme rainfall events interspersed with long periods of drought. A thriving habitat also provides conservation opportunities, enabling organised and managed events to control avian and mammal populations whilst contributing to the essential rural economy, a key objective of the central governments coalition party. The sum of these investments has given a significant payback and profitability in terms of both cost avoidance and benefit. For example the Ise catchment between Rushton and Naseby (source of the River Ise) is one of only 2 sub-catchments in the Nene Catchment that passes water quality requirements of Water Framework Directive (WFD) 2003. This means our ecosystem to the South of Desborough and North of Rothwell are one of the best in England. The Jordan and Slade Brook sub-catchments on the other hand</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>are at poor WFD status. The estimated cost of long term remediation from poor to good runs into tens if not hundreds of millions of pounds. The River Ise is already at good status avoiding incurring these huge costs required for river remediation. However, the Ise Valley ecosystem is still fragile and sensitive to change such as over-development, especially co-located on its margins. The Jordan and Slade Brook would benefit from the finances generated by Section 106 payments from adjacent developments and suitable planning conditions securing remediation helping to achieve good WFD status (planning location Site 34 and DE/142 and adjacent land). Surface water issues at the North and North West of the town are also far less significant than the proposed development along the Ise valley. Access, Highways and other Infrastructure Issues for proposed development Considerable investment has been made in the A6 by-pass to alleviate congestion in the Desborough and Rothwell Towns and provide congestion free access to the A14 and job rich Market Harborough. The proposed development does not take advantage of this investment. In fact the addition of 304 houses on the Southern boundary of Desborough will considerably add to the local traffic of both towns and the rural Rushton road increasing the need for spend on maintenance and improvements and safety measures. The traffic flows from this end of the town will worsen the highways issues that have remain unaddressed for almost a decade now including: Illegal use of B576 by HGVs accessing Great Bear Distribution On street parking on Rushton Road restricting safe</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

passage of vehicles Up to 60 daily 30 tonne lorry movements via B576 to transfer station located at Springfield farm Systematic degradation of road surface due to over use Other discounted options on the North West of the town would surely represent a much better option with safer road access onto the A6. This is the same approach you have taken for the development to the West of Rothwell off the Harrington Road. Assessment issues around access to services can overcome be addressed in development conditions for the inclusion of local services e.g. small shops, other businesses, bus stops bringing real business investment into the area. These services, promised with the development of the Grange never materialised!! Increased traffic will also require the safe storage and settlement of decontaminated water before being discharged into the River Ise. This could provide both a capital and revenue cost burden to KBC and NCC. This increase in traffic will have a significant impact on altering the character of Desborough which for many years has not suffered from traffic congestion but has now reached a peak for a market town , placing a burden on commuters, residents and businesses alike. The proposed site cuts across critical structures including a gas main and pumping station that needs 24 x 7 access by large plant which can be as big as 30 T mobile tankers and in emergencies up to 60 T lifting gear. A residential settlement could restrict this access and hamper recovery. Whilst I appreciate the carbon benefits of switching off alternative street lamps and recognise this is an NCC infrastructure, I feel its impact on personal and

			<p>highways safety in this particular location as being unacceptable. Building 304 more houses with inadequate and unsafe lighting regimes could be a breach of health and safety. Conversley increasing light pollution in this area would negatively impact the habitat and biodiversity of protected species in abundance on the adjacent land. Public services are already under significant pressure e.g. schools, dentist, GP, the sub-standard and uncompleted leisure and recreational centre. The addition of this development will surely require advanced further expansion of these services if they are meet their required service levels. This should include investment in safe pedestrian access to the town centre from the Northern, Western and Eastern residential areas. The 2013 LDD references job availability at the South of the town as being favourable due to access to employment opportunities in Corby. The proximity of Corby to this development is dependant on overcoming the major constraint of a suitable access road to the North East. However if the proposed development was situated to the North and North West of the town, there would be more ready access to job opportunities in the Grange Business Parks, Market Harborough, Corby and commuting opportunities via East Midlands Mainline. This would reduce increasing traffic flows through the rural road network which forms part of the attractive character of Desborough. Fluvial and Surface Water Flooding Impacts resulting from the Development: I would like to draw your attention to your published report on Options for Flood Risk and Water Management in which your statutory consultees have made</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>strong recommendations regarding surface water, ground water, fluvial water and green infrastructure. These comments have been noted by your officer but appear not to have been taken into consideration of your proposal of 304 houses to the South of Desborough. The proposed development will lie at the base of the River Ise Catchment adjacent to the designated flood plain. Being at the bottom of the gradient, your own surface water maps show that surface water flooding is problematic in the proposed area for development but is not problematic at the North and North West of the town, part of which has been discounted for development. The existing surface water and sewage system comprise of a mix of combined surface water and sewage drains and separate foul and pluvial systems. Currently the Valley Rise pump station is unable to cope with storm conditions and discharges sewage and effluent directly into the River Ise. This occurs even though considerable expansion of the holding tanks took place in 2005. It appears that further holding tanks are being built but these do not guarantee that sewage will not be discharged into the River Ise if increasingly extreme weather patterns exist. Combined, this discharge with the increased run off from the proposed development may reduce the GES of the River Ise resulting in considerable investment from public funds to restore it. If the discounted sites to the North West were reconsidered, this cost could be avoided as the surface water could be managed via the Jordon and Slade Brook catchments which are currently at poor ecological status. Attenuation of surface water to green run-off</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>rates at the base of a catchment requires capital investment, maintenance revenue and cannot always guarantee green field run-off rates. Increasing the volume of fluvial water through displacement of surface water could increase fluvial flood risk. This in turn could impact the hydromorphology of the River Ise and cause erosion and artificially induced flooding of Tailby Meadow and agricultural land. This would reduce the overall quality of the water environment and reduce the previously mentioned benefit of the investment in the Ise Catchment.</p> <p>Appearance and Character of the Southern Settlement Boundary: The Southern side of Desborough comprises of well-spaced 2 and single storey dwellings built by local developer Springfir. New and old house styles blend together to provide a pleasant spacial distribution reducing visual and physical impacts on the neighbouring green belt. The type of housing for the proposed development has not been confirmed but based on the Grange style of housing, high density, three storey housing would have an adverse impact on both existing housing and the biodiversity and wildlife creating shade and impacting privacy. It would not complement the style of the existing housing. On approach into Desborough from the North and North West, modern, sustainable, high density housing would be compatible with the look and character of the Grange and its neighbouring industrial zone. The proposed development is also co-located with larger concrete holding tanks that regularly blow the access chamber lids resulting in sanitary towels and sewage being deposited on the concrete surface which</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

are left to decompose naturally, exposed to children, pets and wildlife. Other discounted sites are not co-located to these type of infrastructure or assets. Duty and Compliance with Planning Framework I appreciate that you are expert planners and are faced with challenging decisions around where best to locate housing to achieve growth targets, satisfy your public and other stakeholders as well as to achieve your Statutory Duties. I also am aware that policy can be open to interpretation and is often manipulated to suit one party or the other. However the National Planning Policy Framework is quite clear with no room for mis-interpretation and I would like to draw you specific attention to the following key points from the policy and request that you think about your proposal in context of these points: Ministerial forward: Sustainable development is about change for the better, and not only in our built environment. Our natural environment is essential to our wellbeing, and it can be better looked after than it has been. Habitats that have been degraded can be restored. Species that have been isolated can be reconnected. Green Belt land that has been depleted of diversity can be refilled by nature and opened to people to experience it, to the benefit of body and soul. This should be a collective enterprise. Yet, in recent years, planning has tended to exclude, rather than to include, people and communities. In part, this has been a result of targets being imposed, and decisions taken, by bodies remote from them. Dismantling the unaccountable regional apparatus and introducing neighbourhood planning addresses this. Page 2:

			<p>There are three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental. These dimensions give rise to the need for the planning system to perform a number of roles: — an economic role — contributing to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth and innovation; and by identifying and coordinating development requirements, including the provision of infrastructure; — a social role supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community's needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being; and — an environmental role — contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; and, as part of this, helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently, minimise waste and pollution, and mitigate and adapt to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy. Page 5 be genuinely plan-led, empowering local people to shape their surroundings, with succinct local and neighbourhood plans setting out a positive vision for the future of the area. Plans should be kept up-to-date, and be based on joint working and cooperation to address larger than local issues. They should provide a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made with a high degree of predictability and efficiency; take account of the different roles and</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>character of different areas, promoting the vitality of our main urban areas, protecting the Green Belts around them, recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and supporting thriving rural communities within it; Page 6 contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. Allocations of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value, where consistent with other policies in this Framework; promote mixed use developments, and encourage multiple benefits from the use of land in urban and rural areas, recognising that some open land can perform many functions (such as for wildlife, recreation, flood risk mitigation, carbon storage, or food production); take account of and support local strategies to improve health, social and cultural wellbeing for all, and deliver sufficient community and cultural facilities and services to meet local needs. Page 7 Planning policies should avoid the long term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose. Land allocations should be regularly reviewed. Where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for the allocated employment use, applications for alternative uses of land or buildings should be treated on their merits having regard to market signals and the relative need for different land uses to support sustainable local communities. Page 9 Encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion. In preparing Local Plans, local planning authorities should therefore support a</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>pattern of development which, where reasonable to do so, facilitates the use of sustainable modes of transport. Page 17 The planning system can play an important role in facilitating social interaction and creating healthy, inclusive communities. Local planning authorities should create a shared vision with communities of the residential environment and facilities they wish to see. To support this, local planning authorities should aim to involve all sections of the community in the development of Local Plans and in planning decisions, and should facilitate neighbourhood planning. Planning policies and decisions, in turn, should aim to achieve places which promote: The National Planning Policy Framework 2012 (NPPF) consistently stresses the importance of green space in planning modern developments and making decisions that benefit the natural environment. Page 19 Green Belt serves five purposes:— to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; — to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; — to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; — to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and — to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land. Page 25 The planning system should</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:— protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, geological conservation interests and soils; — recognising the wider benefits of ecosystem services; — minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible, contributing to the Governments commitment to halt the overall decline in biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures; Page 27 To minimise impacts on biodiversity and geodiversity, planning policies should: — plan for biodiversity at a landscape-scale across local authority boundaries; — identify and map components of the local ecological networks, including the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites of importance for biodiversity, wildlife corridors and stepping stones that connect them and areas identified by local partnerships for habitat restoration or creation; — promote the preservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species populations, linked to national and local targets, and identify suitable indicators for monitoring biodiversity in the plan; — aim to prevent harm to geological conservation interests; and— where Nature Improvement Areas are identified in Local Plans, consider specifying the types of development that may be appropriate in these Page 28 To prevent unacceptable risks from pollution and land instability, planning policies and decisions should ensure that new development is appropriate for its location. The effects (including</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>cumulative effects) of pollution on health, the natural environment or general amenity, and the potential sensitivity of the area or proposed development to adverse effects from pollution, should be taken into account. Where a site is affected by contamination or land stability issues, responsibility for securing a safe development rests with the developer and/or landowner. Page 38 Crucially, Local Plans should: — plan positively for the development and infrastructure required in the area to meet the objectives, principles and policies of this Framework; — be drawn up over an appropriate time scale, preferably a 15-year time horizon, take account of longer term requirements, and be kept up to date; — be based on co-operation with neighbouring authorities, public, voluntary and private sector organisations;— indicate broad locations for strategic development on a key diagram and land-use designations on a proposals map; — allocate sites to promote development and flexible use of land, bringing forward new land where necessary, and provide detail on form, scale, access and quantum of development where appropriate; — identify areas where it may be necessary to limit freedom to change the uses of buildings, and support such restrictions with a clear explanation; — identify land where development would be inappropriate, for instance because of its environmental or historic significance; and — contain a clear strategy for enhancing the natural, built and historic environment, and supporting Nature Improvement Areas where they have been identified. Page 46 In assessing and determining</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

				<p>development proposals, local planning authorities should apply the presumption in favour of sustainable development. I am sure that you will also be aware that Local Authorities have a Duty to have regard to the conservation of biodiversity in exercising their functions. This Duty was introduced by the National Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006. The NPPF also introduces a duty towards the Health and wellbeing of the community. The South of Desborough has a natural environment that would not benefit from further development of any kind. The North West and West of Desborough have natural environments that would gain from the investment that sustainable development can provide benefiting residents, wildlife, rural economy and ecosystems alike. I hope these comments are both taken as constructive, genuine concerns for the overall benefit of Desborough, Rothwell and the River Ise Upper Catchment and are used effectively to positively inform your Site Allocation Plan.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

4	191	Mrs Lana Brighton	<p>I wish to add my voice to those who have already stated their objections so eloquently. I have lived in the Leys Avenue/Broadlands area for almost 30 years and have enjoyed the beauty and wildlife of the Ise valley in that time. I always encounter fellow Desborians on my walks and cannot believe that yet again the views of Desborough people will be completely ignored by Kettering Borough Council. The practical objections are considerable but for me the loss of such a fantastic local amenity would be devastating. I hope those involved will realise that once lost this can never be regained. I once attended a slide show showing how beautiful 'old Desborough' was before the centre was ripped out and hope this error of judgement will not be repeated.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which have been noted and which will be used to inform the next iteration of the plan.</p>
---	-----	-------------------	--	---

4	193	Gil Holmes	<p>Proposed Development for housing in the Ise Valley. The previous assessments of potential housing development sites in Desborough which formed part of the LDD entitled "Site Specific Proposals Local Development Document - Options Paper" available on KBC website (consultation on which ended in May 2012 last year) identified the Ise Valley as a "Proposed Historically and Visually Important Open Space" so what has changed in one year to this historically important Open Space? Oh! I know KBC owns part of it and wants to cash in by selling it to a developer and gaining so called maximum value for it! And what about the poor people who might buy a house built here? This flood assessment document, also available from the KBC website Kettering_and_Wellingborough_Level_1_SFRA_update_Final_Report_080411_Figure_11.pdf has areas of this site as areas susceptible to surface water flooding at categories of "Intermediate" and "More" So along with the vast majority of the comments here I have to point out that it is an area of open green space that has been utilised by the residents of Desborough for CENTURIES, and it FLOODS What lunatics are going to sanction this site as suitable for housing development - do I need to answer that?</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Flood risk was considered in the assessment of the site. The identified sites do not fall within a flood zone. They are adjacent to a flood zone and this has been recognised in the assessment of the sites. Any planning application for a site located within a flood zone would need to consider flood risk in accordance with Part 10 of the National Planning Framework and would be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment.</p>
---	-----	------------	---	--

4	195	Mrs Karin Twigger	<p>I strongly disagree with the proposed housing development along the Ise Valley DE/210 (DE/072, DE/173, DE/189) for the following reasons: 1. Environmental problems The fields allocated to the proposed development are regularly flooded for sustained periods of time. In recent years here has been plenty of evidence across the country of severe flood damage to houses built on flood plains. 2. Preservation of green space The fields along the River Ise provide the only extended area for outdoor exercise in the southern part of Desborough. If this green area is effectively destroyed, citizens will have to drive to further parts of the county in order to enjoy the countryside, which is not an environmentally friendly solution. Furthermore, the ensuing deprivation of exercise opportunity is in direct opposition of the government's drive to improve the nations health! 3. Additional strain on already scant services in Desborough As a resident of the town for over 30 years, I must state my dissatisfaction regarding the lack of shops, restaurants and decent pubs and the strain on medical, educational and leisure facilities. The development of the Grange estate has considerably aggravated this situation which would become completely unsustainable by the addition of over 300 houses.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The identified site does not fall within a flood zone. It is adjacent to a flood zone and this has been recognised in the assessment of the sites. Any planning application for a site located within a flood zone would need to consider flood risk in accordance with Policy 10 of the National Planning Framework and would 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. The Site Specific Proposals LDD also allocates land for employment. 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. 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.</p>
---	-----	-------------------	--	---

4	197	mr rich giles	<p>Objections to sites DE072 DE189 and DE173 = DE210 Where to being ... 300 houses planned to be built that is 600 odd cars as now its the usual for 2 cars per house hold. Traffic within our little town can not cope now as we are over crowded the Grange still has houses unsold! Plus there are other sites that can be used not taking this beauty away. Desborough is a small town which we can not cope with doctors are full, schools are full dentist there is only one. Taking away the wildlife of Ise Valley is completely out of order. Families have been using these fields for 40 years plus young child running and playing within this fields learning every day how our rural landscape and wildlife is so wonderful and important. Dog Walkers and families for 40 years too. The River Ise is listed on the flood plain. There is a document that states if an area of land has flooded in the last 200 years it should not be built upon. There is so much wildlife that lives along the river ise and to have housing built on this beautiful land will be the biggest mistake KBC has ever made. Taking away such a natural part of our county will be one big mistake. Please take all of our views and thoughts into account for once - listen to the people at the heart of this who will have to live with this every day of their life's missing out on some much nature and relaxation of these natural fields and lifestyle. Exercise and fresh clean air. This a no way practical and it seems not really thought of: access very poor increased traffic - we can not cope now ... and adding 600 cars to this - Desborough will become like blimeing London hussle and bussell which is what I moved away from to settle down here in this beautiful</p>	<p>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. 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. 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. The assessment of the site considers impact on wildlife. Development of the site would need to provide mitigation for any harm and would be required to provide a</p>
---	-----	------------------	--	--

			<p>countryside. Schools, doctors, employment - nothing about now for the population and you want to add to this . STRONGLY OBJECT TO THIS IN EVERYWAY. Wildlife Our greenspace leave our green fields alone ! Take everything into count over 100 comments DISAGREEING and that's just one online. We maybe a small town but we are FULLY OBJECTING to this proposed Housing.</p>	<p>net increase in biodiversity. The identified sites do not fall within a flood zone. They are adjacent to a flood zone and this has been recognised in the assessment of the sites. Any planning application for a site located within a flood zone would need to consider flood risk in accordance with Policy 10 of the National Planning Framework and would be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment. The access to the site has not yet been finalised. The provision of a safe and suitable access would be considered in detail at the planning application stage in consultation with NCC Highways Authority.</p>
--	--	--	---	--

4	202	Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge	Planner English Heritage	We previously commented in our 23 April 2012 letter that site DE/071 contained a building of local importance and that it should be retained in employment use. We therefore welcome the discounting of this site as housing allocation and its retention as an employment site.	
---	-----	---------------------------	--------------------------	--	--

4	213	Mr Grahame Twigger	<p>My objections to this proposal (projected construction of 304 houses along the site of the Ise Valley in Desborough DE 210) involve the following inter-related concerns:- (1) The water levels in all of these fields appear to have risen significantly in the course of the last few years. During the last two years in particular the fields have been visibly under water, indeed flooded, after a single day of sustained rainfall. Notably, after last year's snowfall, the fields remained waterlogged until the water levels receded during the onset of the particularly dry Summer months. As a general observation, it would seem unwise to build such a large number of houses on land which is so prone to easy flooding. This is a central concern. (2) I have lived in Desborough since July 1982, therefore for some 31 years. In that time there has been a significant increase in the size and the population of the town. Sadly, this has not been accompanied by an appropriate expansion in the range of services one might justifiably expect. In my view, these remain woefully underdeveloped. The GPs' services are extremely stretched, whilst leisure facilities and leisure opportunities have remained limited to say the least. I do not think that one could cite the Recreation Ground, a centrally located Green Space, as a modern leisure area nor point to the new Leisure Centre on the Grange Estate as an extension of facilities, as this replaced the former Hawthornes Leisure Centre. The proposed increase of 304 dwellings and therefore, as an estimate, at least another 1,000 inhabitants will place further, unacceptable pressure upon the existing services / facilities. Furthermore, the potential removal of</p>	<p>The land identified as DE/210 is not within a flood zone. It is adjacent to a flood zone and the assessment of the site considers flood risk. Any planning application for a site located within a flood zone would need to consider flood risk in accordance with Policy 10 of the National Planning Framework and would be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment. Medical facilities are an important consideration when planning for future growth. Kettering Borough Council will work closely with 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.</p>
---	-----	--------------------------	--	---

			<p>the Ise Valley area will deprive the town of a significant and natural Green Area, where residents of Desborough are able to relax and exercise at no financial cost to themselves. Where are the other, alternative Green Areas in the town, where such free activity is available to all, irrespective of income, age or social background? (3) Finally, the Ise Valley in Desborough is quite simply an area of natural beauty and a source of well-being for the residents of the town. Its preservation should be a priority for us all.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

4	214	HBH Developments Ltd	<p>Representation was made to the Site Specific Proposals LDD Options consultation in April 2012, that land south of Buxton Drive Desborough should be identified as a "Preferred Option site in preference to other then identified sites; the land in question, which lies within the settlement boundary (as defined in the extant Local Plan for Kettering Borough), is physically well-defined by existing hedgerows to the west, south and immediately adjoins existing built development, with vehicular and pedestrian access available from Buxton Drive and Eyam Close. In this current consultation, the site is identified as Buxton Drive (site reference DE/188), with an approximate yield of 46 dwellings. It is concluded in the assessment table of Desborough sites on page 23 (after para 4.10) that the site which is described as a new site with few constraints" should be identified as a potential housing option. The inclusion of this site as a potential housing option, and its identification on the Desborough Housing Options Plan as a Site with potential for allocation is supported.</p>	Your support for DE/188 is noted.
---	-----	----------------------	--	-----------------------------------

4	217	Mrs Angela DeLiddiard		Please find attached letter of OBJECTION to proposal to include DE072, DE173, DE189 and consolidated land as DE210 in the plans as land for development.	<p>Thank you for your comments. The land identified as DE/210 is not within a flood zone. It is adjacent to a flood zone and the assessment of the site considers flood risk. Any planning application for a site located within a flood zone would need to consider flood risk in accordance with Policy 10 of the National Planning Framework and would 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. The Options Paper (March 2012) identified opportunities of redevelopment of the town centre to enhance the current retail offer. If this option is adopted this will ensure the town centre is redeveloped alongside any residential development. The access to the site has not yet been finalised. The provision of a safe and suitable access would be considered in detail at the planning application stage in consultation with NCC Highways Authority. Further additional work is required to address the issues and concerns raised through the consultation process before the site can be considered for progression.</p>
---	-----	-----------------------	--	--	--

4	218	Mr Andrew Bailey	<p>Dear Sirs, Please find attached my objection letter for consideration under the currently active consultation for Site Specific Proposals LDD: Housing Allocations - Assessment of Additional Sites and Update (October 2013) on/for land known as "Ise Valley" in the town of Desborough. Please acknowledge receipt and confirm this will be added to other documents with regard this consultation. Kettering Borough Council, Development Services, Municipal Offices, Bowling Green Road, Kettering, NN15 7QX. 6th December 2013 To Whom it May Concern, I write to give my objection towards the proposed development of land to the South of Desborough on the area known as the Ise Valley. It is with disbelief that this area is even being considered as potential development land let alone for over 300 dwellings. As a resident living local to this area of land it must be considered how this land is currently utilised, it not only provides an area of green belt adjacent to the Ise watercourse but is an area popular with wildlife both developing and returning on a yearly basis and furthermore is an area used by many not only for the walking of pets but as general walking given its tranquillity and views during all months of the year. A development of this nature would not only take away an area of green belt and interest but would have a serious impact on residents not only adjacent to but throughout the town of Desborough. Whilst it is noted on the areas of consideration of development that "small pockets" of wildlife area are being considered within the proposals this is far less than currently exists in this area and would probably result in many local residents</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The assessment of the site considers impact on wildlife. Development of the site would need to provide mitigation for any harm and would be required to provide a net increase in biodiversity. Further ecological assessment of the impact of development of site DE/210 will be required before progression of the site as an allocation. 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.</p>
---	-----	------------------	--	---

			<p>considering moving to return to an area that provides what they current live in Desborough for. The development of this land and particularly that on land parallel with Valley Rise would be of serious concern and in considering this application we understand that ecology must be considered - however to expand on the initial points above, this area of land has remained untouched for many years and is known to contain 4 natural springs, 1 of which feeds a pond in an adjacent field which contains frogs, newts and toads. The area is also known to contain a badger set and for many years has seen the return of a nesting Kestrel, however in carrying out construction work this will not only result in the culling of natural wildlife but furthermore inevitably stop yearly returning wildlife from doing so. Lastly with regard ecology concerns this land is a natural habitat for an abundance of wildlife not mentioned above and if disturbed this will never be replaced. To accept any further expansion in Desborough, further consideration needs to be given to daily amenities, such as educational and healthcare facilities as at present Desborough is already at capacity with this regard. It should also be noted that this amount of housing will also generate a significant amount of traffic generation to the entire town of Desborough and as a local resident again it is felt that the current road network leading to this part of the town cannot accommodate this. With the construction line of the new A6 trunk road this should give serious consideration to any further expansion which would need to contain residential, commercial and educational facilities to serve the town of</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>Desborough being considered more appropriately positioned to the Western side of the town as it has the infrastructure to accept further growth in this area. By developing the proposed land this is asking more local roads to accept a higher volume of traffic that they do and were originally proposed to do and also ask traffic to pass through the village like town centre road network that still exists based on what Desborough used to be. All residents of Desborough and other areas in the UK understand the need to expand to accommodate an ever increasing population, however it is felt that other far more appropriate areas exist in the area in and around Desborough for this mass of residential dwellings and considering these would maintain areas of natural beauty for current and future residents.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

4	219	Jeff Taylor	<p>Dear Sir/Madam, I am writing to object to the proposals to build 304 new houses across the Ise Valley in Desborough. The area affected by this proposal with its network of footpaths provides one of the few areas adjacent to the town where residents can walk in the countryside without having to first make a journey in their car. We discovered it when we moved to Desborough 18 months ago and I regularly take my grandchildren walking there to introduce them to nature, walking from our home. With the river and its surrounding vegetation it is a natural park and to destroy it by turning it into a building site would to my mind be criminal. I would ask the Borough Council not to proceed with these proposals.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which have been noted and which will be used to inform the next iteration of the plan.</p>
---	-----	-------------	--	---

4	221	Katy White	<p>Dear KBC I would like to register my objection to the above proposed development. It would be nice if, for once, KBC listened to the residents of Desborough. My reasons for the objection are as follows: 1. The area has been designated an area of natural beauty and is home to much flora and fauna. 2. With so few green spaces left in the town it is very well used by the community and should remain as such. 3. The GP, midwifery and health visiting service cannot cope with the current demand, I honestly do not know how they will manage with an increased population. The Desborough surgery is literally bursting at the seams-queues out the door, no seats in the waiting room etc. Often there is not even any telephone consultations available. This is not a criticism of the service-they do a fantastic job-but they are under a lot of pressure. 4. Desborough has already got its fair share of new housing-enough is enough! 5. And planning permission for 900 more-how will the town cope with this?? 6. The town centre cannot cope with any more traffic in its present configuration, it is very dangerous for car drivers and pedestrians. Also the other main roads (e.g. Braybrooke, Rushton Rd, Dunkirk Ave) are very busy and clogged up and wouldn't cope with a further increase in traffic. 7. What will the access to the new development be? It is not safe to add an access road off the A6 and the rest of the area for access is residential. 8. As its name suggests it is the floodplain for a river-total madness to build on it-not only will those houses be at considerable risk of flooding but the rest of the nearby houses will be at a much increased risk due to increased surface water. 9. Finally there</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which have been noted and which will be used to inform the next iteration of the plan. Provision of medical facilities is an important consideration when planning for future growth. Kettering Borough Council will work with health care providers to ensure adequate provision is available for residents of new development. 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. The access to the site has not yet been finalised. The provision of a safe and suitable access would be considered in detail at the planning application stage in consultation with NCC Highways Authority. The land identified as DE/210 is not within a flood zone. It is adjacent to a flood zone and the assessment of the site recognises this. Any planning application for a site located within a flood zone would need to consider flood risk in accordance with Policy 10 of the</p>
---	-----	------------	---	---

are other brownfield sites you could consider that would actually benefit from redevelopment. Please listen to us, the residents who have to live here, and shelve this proposal. I look forward to your response.

National Planning Framework and would be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment. 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.

4	222	Elizabeth Armstrong	<p>I would like to object to the further development of 304 houses proposed for the Hawthorns Leisure site and beyond. This development would ruin what is currently a beautiful area of the Ise Valley, used by many residents of Desborough and which should remain for future generations to appreciate. Soon there will be so much development that Desborough and Rothwell will merge as one and we will have lost the lovely green spaces in between. I am writing this in support of the Desborough community development trust and am urging you to reconsider your plans to develop on this beautiful , green and pleasant land.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which have been noted and which will be used to inform the next iteration of the plan.</p>
---	-----	------------------------	---	---

4	223	Mrs Suzanne Edwards	<p>Ref: Planned Housing Allocations for Desborough KBC Reference DE/210 (consisting of DE/072, DE/189, DE/173) With reference to the recent proposals of Kettering Borough Council to allocate the afore mentioned areas for housing, I must raise the following concerns and objections. My concerns and objections centre around key issues of safety, adverse environmental impacts, and the strain on the existing infrastructure of Desborough. Specifically I raise the following points: Issues of Safety My first concern over this proposal is the potential lack of safe and practical access to the proposed development. Considering such proposals could lead to some additional 600 vehicles utilising the local area I feel this is a material point. My concern would be how this additional volume of traffic could access such a development. I fear any utilisation of existing roads and residential areas could lead to safety concerns, particularly to the young and elderly residents, congestion issues, and noise pollution to existing residents. I also have concern over the location of any new access points, firstly for the reasons given above but also more specifically concerning the main road through Desborough, the B576. Should access be sought from this particular road I have serious concerns over the following points: Â· Firstly, from a safety point of view, access from this road would be in the vicinity of the crest of the hill into Desborough. Such a scenario could effectively lead to a blind spot a very short distance from an access point. Â· The pathway on this road is a pathway is frequently used by school children in attendance of the Montsaye Community College</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The access to the site has not yet been finalised. The provision of a safe and suitable access would be considered in detail at the planning application stage in consultation with NCC Highways Authority. Development of a site of this size will be required to contribute towards improvements to the highway network via a s.106 agreement. Flood risk has been considered in the assessment of the site. The site is adjacent to, but not within, a flood zone. Development of a site in a flood zone will be required to consider flood risk in accordance with Policy 10 of the NPPF and will be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment. Impact on wildlife has been considered in the assessment of the site. Development of the site would need to provide mitigation for any harm and would be required to provide a net increase in biodiversity. Provision of schools and adequate medical facilities are an important consideration when planning for future growth. Kettering Borough Council will work with NCC Education and health care providers to ensure adequate provision is available for residents of new development.</p>
---	-----	---------------------------	---	---

in Desborough. Clearly the position of such access would be the region of the bottom of a very steep valley. I am concerned over the practicalities and safety of having an access point in this area. In the winter periods it is conceivable that effectively bringing traffic to a halt in this area could lead to vehicles not being able to make it out of the valley and thus leading to a major congestion point. This could not only affect commuters but the ability of emergency services to navigate this route. Furthermore, I have concern over the general issue of congestion in this area when some potential 600 additional vehicles would need to be managed. Environmental Concerns I, like other residents of the local community, have concerns over the risk of flooding on the proposed sight. Clearly this is in close proximity to the River Ise, a major water channel through the county. I have already witnessed this river to flood. My concern as a local resident is toward the further risk of flooding, particularly given the additional pressure to the water table such significant development may have. The area in question, which I believe is known as the Ise Valley, is one of natural beauty. It is a site that is currently enjoyed by many residents of the community for healthy recreation. I feel such green spaces should be preserved not only for the utilisation and enjoyment of our community but to preserve the beautiful environment in which we are privileged to live. Around the area in question are significant banks of hedges and greenery. Such areas could home protected species of wildlife, specifically certain species of birds such as sparrows. I have concerns that any

				<p>development of this site could have significant consequence to these creatures. Existing Infrastructure and Services My final point is centred on this impact such development may have on the already stretched resources of the town of Desborough, specifically the provision of schooling and doctors. In my opinion the town has seen limited improvements to infrastructure since the significant development of the Grange Estate. I fear further development of this scale would lead to further exasperation of the situation. Given these points I object to the proposals for planned housing allocations for the site referred to as DE/210.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

4	224	Philip Williams	<p>Ref: Plans to build 304 houses - Ise Valley, Desborough Dear sir/madam, I strongly object to the proposals to build houses on the above area. My family and I moved to Desborough about 9 years ago, because of the open spaces and countryside. We are able to walk through the fields and along the river with our dog and see kites, kingfishers, badgers, buzzards, hares, herons, lapwings, yellow and grey wagtails, and even an otter - none of which will stay if this building takes place. I am also surprised that there appears to be a desire to build additional housing on Ise Valley given the following factors: Many of the properties on the Grange (a fairly recently development) remain empty/owned on a buy to let basis (with no-one renting them) I am sure there are easily 300+ empty homes available already in Desborough There are brown field sites in Desborough that could be better used for this construction - it might cost a little more but fulfil the 'need' if the true aim is to purely provide additional housing There is not enough infrastructure to support the current population: o can't get in to see the doctor quickly o school and pre-school waiting lists o leisure facilities are inadequate and/or inappropriate (and the kids skate park was demolished instead of being upgraded) current proposals to build a shelter and exercise equipment on the recreation ground for young people is an embarrassing disgrace! o roads in total disrepair There are very few areas left that people can enjoy that are healthy and without cost. We already know that life expectancy for our children is likely to be less than our own - partially because of lack of exercise - it seems</p>	<p>Impact on wildlife has been considered in the assessment of the site. Development of the site would need to provide mitigation for any harm to wildlife and would be required to provide a net increase in biodiversity. 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 also 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. 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. Provision of schools and adequate medical facilities are an important consideration when planning for future growth. Kettering Borough Council will work closely</p>
---	-----	-----------------	---	---

insane to me to take away one of the few things that can be handed on to the next generation as a gift of our beautiful countryside - a breath of fresh air! If the council truly listen to their constituents then you will not proceed with this proposal. I look forward to hearing from you.

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.

4	225	Mark Wilson	<p>I am writing to express my concerns over the planned New developments for the old Desborough leisure centre site and Ise valley in general. What Desborough doesn't need is more houses, the town does not have the facility's or structure to cope. Getting a doctor's appointment is already a joke, the replacement leisure centre is not a like for like as promised there are no squash courts. Another question is what compensation will be offered to current residents the roads are already filthy from the Rushton road development not to mention the noise nuisance of a new development combined with the loss of field views which was why we purchased our property it will have an effect on values and salability and seeing houses on the France are still not selling why build more.....</p> <p>Yours dissatisfied and disappointed.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Medical facilities are an important consideration when planning for future growth. Kettering Borough Council will work closely with 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. Loss of view and impact on property value are not a material planning consideration. 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.</p>
---	-----	-------------	--	---

					<p>It is also 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.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

4	226	Kate Williams	<p>Dear Sir/Madam, I am raising an objection to the plans to build houses on Ise Valley, Desborough. My family has lived here for 9 years and we all enjoy walking on the fields together with our dog. The main reason for us moving to Desborough was access to the fields, and we all appreciate the beauty of the fields, the wildlife and being able to get out and enjoy the fresh air with our dog. My work takes me to London frequently and this makes me appreciate the open space at home, even more. It has also been disappointing to see the lack of additional infrastructure as more houses have been built in Desborough over the years - the proposal to build extra houses will just make the situation worse and provide even less space for the young people of Desborough to enjoy the countryside. I am sure there are enough 'empty' houses already in Desborough that can be used to fulfil this need. I trust that the council will listen to the views of those who live in Desborough and, therefore, will not proceed with this proposal. I look forward to hearing from you.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. 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 also 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.</p>
---	-----	---------------	--	---

4	228	John Turnbull	<p>With reference to the building of 304 new houses on the green area in Desborough, I have the following concerns: Wild Life - This development will have great impact on the local wildlife in the area including foxes and bats (which I believe are a protected species). Greater traffic Pollution - This development will produce a greater traffic noise and pollution problem in the area. Amenities - With the new housing which has already been built in Desborough currently having a great impact, a new estate will enhance this problem unless new schools, doctors, dentists and shops are put in place first. I am NOT in favour of these new houses being build in this greenbelt area.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Impact on wildlife has been considered in the assessment of the site. Development of the site would need to provide mitigation for any harm to wildlife and would be required to provide a net increase in biodiversity. 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.</p>
---	-----	------------------	---	--

4	229	Daphne Beasley	<p>Re Development along the Ise Valley at Desborough The planning permission being sort for houses along the Ise Valley needs very thoughtful consideration. The land has been boggy and often flooded in the past Are conditions being put in the planning permission to deepen and widen the brook? Access for construction lorries etc. bearing in mind that our lives have been made a misery by the lorries going to and from the Carp lake development on Rushton Road, taking full loads in and full loads out, sometimes 23 in an hour, over the past three years. Could this not be soil Laundering? The infrastructure in Desborough needs improving facilities, retail outlets, schools and the doctors etc. It is not possible to increase the population of Desborough without improvements to the town centre. What provisions are being made for these for the future? With the extra headcount in Northamptonshire are the council fighting for increased funding from the government for police etc. with a fair percentage coming into Desborough Town. I look forward with interest to see the planning decision.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. This document allows people to comments on the alternative options for potential housing sites in Desborough that emerged through the consultation on the Options Paper. The site is being considered as an allocation for future development and a planning application has not been submitted to the Local Authority. The site has been assessed against criteria set out in the Housing Allocations Background Paper. Flood risk was considered as part of this assessment. The site is adjacent to, but not within, a flood zone. Any planning application for a site located within a flood zone would need to consider flood risk in accordance with Policy 10 of the National Planning Framework and would 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 with NCC Education and health care providers to ensure adequate provision is available for residents of new development. The Options Paper (March 2012) identified opportunities of redevelopment of the town centre to enhance the current retail offer. If this option is adopted this will ensure the town centre is redeveloped alongside any residential development.</p>
---	-----	----------------	--	--

4	230	Councillor Belinda Humfrey	Councillor Northamptonshire County Council	<p>I am writing to oppose the four sites proposed for Desborough. Relative to the Ise Valley proposal, I shall forward the pre-application letter of March 2012 sent to KBC by Alan Smith of the three counties Wildlife Trust as he is their planning expert of 20 years on such matters and can speak better for the Desborough Wildlife Trust branch, a committee from which I can speak. On DE/210 you will be aware of the massive local opposition to any housing here. It is in response to local pleasure in & need of these fields as County Councillor over the past 3 years I was able to invest NCC money into improving access to and quality of them with resulting large match funding from the Environment Agency, Wild Life Trust & Revitalise. You will know that in 2012 the area was awarded the NIA. It has been designated a protected area for a long time, one example being in the 2002 Strategic Area Plan. To plan to put any further housing along the town side of the valley is just not acceptable for people or wildlife. The breadth of green between the present housing and the river is necessary not just to prevent pollution run-off from further housing but because walking human animals should keep a good distance from the water and its contents such as the otters, freshwater crayfish, the trout hatched in our Havelock Junior School -- to mention a few of its precious and rare wildlife. Or houses are already so close to the water that kingfishers & herons are seen in our gardens. In National Planning Policy Terms/Framework, this proposal goes against Paragraph 17 (communities protecting their green environment), Paragraph 73 (provisions for health with spaces for recreation & exercise)</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments and the information provided. Further ecological assessment of the impacts of the sites will be required before the site is progressed as an allocation.</p>
---	-----	----------------------------------	--	---	---

and Paragraph 76 (communities empowered to protect green areas of importance to them). Look at the map of Desborough & note how much our community needs green space: we have few other attractive facilities in our lives! My comments on other proposed housing areas follow separately.

4	231	Councillor Belinda Humfrey	Councillor Northamptonshire County Council	<p>Comments against Three Smaller Portions of Land for Housing on the edges of Desborough. DE/188: land top the rear of the Peak District roads. This land was submitted to KBC & DTC by the developers, Wm Davies as a recreation area to include a junior football pitch and further lightly tended play & walking areas as developer compensation for the house-building. However, it was discovered too late that the proposed recreation land had not been fixed by a S106 Agreement & was not owned by Wm Davies -- the KBC Enforcement Officers failing to achieve anything therefore. This incompetence should not be followed by house building on the green land which is currently enjoyed by residents to the very northwest of the town. Please note that youth & adults in Desborough's Loatland Ward have no green recreational land, the football field on Braybrooke Rd being privately owned. DE/067: land on Harrington Rd beside the green road enjoyed by walkers which was cut off by the A6 bypass. Orchard Rd was built outside the parish boundary despite local protest and the Local Plan. This would further aggravate our green & recreational losses. Furthermore it would add to the dangers for adults & children attending the Loatland School, now being doubled in size. It is appalling that permission has been given for 70 houses on the green land to the other side of the road (DE/073). The current 20mph signs on Harrington Rd do not alleviate problems & dangers on Harrington road at present. DE/063: to dismiss this for housing because it is "arable land" shows little knowledge of wildlife. This field was suggested for a station at the CJC proposals for the Grange</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Site DE/188 scores well in the assessment with relatively few constraints and has been progressed on this basis. Further work is required in relation to DE/067 before conclusions about progression of this site as an allocation can be made. DE/063 was previously discounted due to capacity of the bridge. It was demonstrated through the Options Paper consultation process that this constraint can be overcome through the development and the site has been progressed on this basis.</p>
---	-----	----------------------------------	--	---	---

				<p>though dismissed as deception at the NCC Structure Plan Enquiry in 2001 (& supported to me by the Rail Research Director who said that even if Desborough were trebled in size there would be no business case for it to have a railway station) . It should remain as a field giving a little breathing space. The Pipewell Bridge is extremely dangerous for pedestrians and more housing would worsen this. The Desborough map shows how appalling short of public or any green space are our residents. These proposals are against the National Planning Policy Framework Pars. 73 &76.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

4	234	Mrs Leigh Parkin	Clerk to Desborough Town Council	<p>Please find attached Desborough Town Council's comments on the Site Specific Proposals LDD Housing Allocations 2013 - Desborough. The document outlines the Town Council's views on each of the sites identified in the document.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Sites that have been discounted are discounted for the period of the plan, i.e. to 2031, or until there is a review of the plan. It is noted that you support discounting of the following sites: DE/013a, DE/064, DE/065, DE/066, DE/068, DE/069, DE/070, DE/071, DE/079, DE/141 and DE/142. With regard to your additional comments on DE/065, work is ongoing in relation to Historically and Visually Important Open Spaces and the site will be considered against the assessment criteria set out in the Background Paper. Your support for allocation of DE/063 and DE/188 has been noted. With regard to a lower density for these sites, proposed yields will be reviewed while preparing design principles for the allocated sites and your comments will inform this process. Further work is required in relation to DE/067 prior to progression of the site as an allocation. No conclusions about the site have been reached at this time. Your objection to the allocation of DE/072, DE/173, DE/189 (comprehensive site DE/210) has been noted. At this stage further additional work is required to address the issues and concerns raised through the consultation process and the impacts of the development and mitigation measures will need to be assessed before conclusions about progression of the site as an allocation can be made.</p>
---	-----	------------------	----------------------------------	--	---

4	238	Mr J S Hall	<p>Dear Sir/Madam, Re: Comments on the Comprehensive development of DE/072, DE/172 and DE/189 I am writing in to express my absolute astonishment and disbelief regarding the proposal by Kettering Borough Council to develop one of the most beautiful areas of land in Desborough and that being the Ise Valley which in my years in living in the town I have seen many people of all generations and continue to do so, using this area of outstanding beauty for enjoying leisurely walks as families, cyclists, runners and dog walkers alike all year round. If this area goes then where will all these people go and therefore with this in mind I cannot comprehend how Kettering Borough Council can make this decision as this is clearly an act of wanton vandalism on a beautiful environment that we are all passionate about and would be a blot on the landscape and is this a legacy that the people within the Council would like to leave for future generations of our town with no green space and one that you would like to be remembered for in years to come when clearly this is yet again another poor decision of an already maligned Council? Coupled with the above does the Council realise the flooding issues that we have encountered over the years when the River Ise cannot deal with the volume of water during heavy rainfall or not forgetting to mention when we have had large volumes of snow and when this melts this causes extra volumes of water and also saturates the ground and we have encountered boggy conditions in our very own back garden and this would surely only increase the surface flooding risk and from my understanding other development areas</p>	<p>The assessment of the site considers flood risk. The sites identified are located adjacent to but not within a flood zone. Any planning application for a site located within a flood zone would need to consider flood risk in accordance with Policy 10 of the National Planning Framework and would be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment. Impact on wildlife has been considered in the assessment of the site. Development of the site would need to provide mitigation for any harm to wildlife and would be required to provide a net increase in biodiversity. 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 also 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. The Options Paper (March 2012) identified</p>
---	-----	-------------	--	---

			<p>within the town have been discounted due to the aforementioned? I am a keen countryman and hold the countryside close to my heart and enjoy working my dogs on my country pursuits and use the natural landscape that the Ise Valley provides to train my dogs all year round to an exceptional standard in preparation for the requirements they are required to work to and have met and become friends with many a person due to this and have seen other people using this open space that is available to them as well, to train their dogs to a requirement that suites them. As part of working my dogs and the various areas around the county and others counties I am fortunate to visit I can only say how lucky and proud we all are to have the Ise Valley within the town to enjoy as is this is a most scenic and beautiful area that can also be compared to other areas of natural outstanding beauty around the county as well as the country that has been afforded to us all to enjoy as well as the ecology that this brings within the Ise Valley that you are seeking to destroy. This also contradicts the statement of our very own government that is on their own website regarding protecting the natural environment for future generations and putting the countryside at the heart of there agenda and one final thing in 2002 did Kettering Borough Council not send out a newsletter stating that the ~Ise Valley is to be protected and also a significant amount of public money and resources have been invested in protecting the Ise Valley environment? So I ask you again why do we need these extra homes building when houses currently stand empty around the town and not to mention the</p>	<p>opportunities of redevelopment of the town centre to enhance the current retail offer. If this option is adopted this will ensure the town centre is redeveloped alongside any residential development.</p>
--	--	--	---	--

				<p>extra vehicles this will bring adding to the pollution of our atmosphere and wear and tear to our already poorly maintained roads, lighting will be installed and not fully used due to the current cost saving measures that the Council have put in place on existing street lighting and the potential H&S issues this will also bring. And with this surely there isnt the infrastructure in place as did we not have a bypass built to take traffic away from not only Desborough but also Rothwell and therefore the North and North West of the town would surely present better options due to the proximity of this road network and money could be better invested in our own high street?</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

4	243	mrs Ann Window	<p>Not one person I have met can support your plans for the Ise Valley housing proposal for Desborough, and I therefore speak for myself and many others. This area is a regular leisure space for many local people, dog walkers, clubs and children and gives great pleasure to those who use it and those who view it on a daily basis. Losing it would direct the general public, and dog walkers especially, to the Recreation Ground in Dunkirk Avenue and that impact would be detrimental to the Health and Safety of the children from Havelock School who use the Recreation Ground as their green play space, also football clubs, uniformed organisations and indeed the Desborough Carnival who all use the facility. The natural habitat of the Ise Valley supports a huge variety of wildlife and is a roaming area for the domestic animals from the many houses that border the land. We are the custodians of their future too! Removing their playground and life support system will impact on the bio-diversity of the area. This year, the fields were flooded in March, and the whole area acts like a sponge, retaining water for the majority of the year. Building houses here could be a monetary gain for you at this point but a complete loss to the breathing space of this town and the prospective future inhabitants of risk laden houses. This area is essential to the community of Desborough in many more ways that I leave who are more eloquent than I to expand on.</p>	
---	-----	----------------	--	--

4	244	Mr Paul Murray	<p>DE/210 would have a serious environmental impact on the Lse valley (as would DE/065 - already discounted), one of the few remaining natural areas in Desborough following the extensive Grange development. The Lse Valley provides a natural wildlife corridor to the south of Desborough and further encroachment on the river by additional housing can only be detrimental to the birds and animals that use the Lse Valley. As a bird watcher I have seen a wide variety of birds along the river valley, including the Water Rail, an extremely shy and reclusive bird. I have not in the past actively objected to housing expansion in Desborough but I fell the point has come where enough is enough following the Grange development that is still expanding. One could widen the discussion to question whether we really NEED all these extra houses rather than reviewing more carefully the use or non of the existing housing stock.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which have been noted. Impact on wildlife has been considered in the assessment of the site. Development of the site would need to provide mitigation for any harm to wildlife and would be required to provide a net increase in biodiversity. 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 the document identifies growth to 2031 and growth will be staggered over the plan period rather than there being an immediate growth in the number of households in Desborough.</p>
---	-----	----------------	---	--

4	252	Mrs Paula Holmes	<p>You talk about serious objections to DE/072 in the past and none of these have changed, so what happens next, KBC officers add DE/173 (Lower Steeping) stating that Desborough Town Council supports this - which is not exactly what the TC put forward but the TC did originally consider that fewer houses on this site may be acceptable - a point KBC has ignored. However, I understand that the TC's view has changed in light of public opposition and the whole extent of the potential site which is their right and so there are strong objections from the whole of Desborough to this site and DE/189 which together form DE/210. The access to Rothwell Road would be dangerous for vehicles and pedestrians alike. Many Desborough children use the footpath to get to Montsaye school, so any access would put a serious obstacle in their way and as for vehicles, many people drive far too fast down the hill and no amount of traffic calming will stop this. The other access at Redwood Close would just create a 'rat-run' which all manner of vehicles would use to cut out the town centre and this type of development is not in line with Core Spatial Strategy policies. Then there is the lack of infrastructure for the town as it is, without the 900+ houses which have current planning permission. The building of a school on the Grange for Phase 2 would just about cope with those houses but no more and Desborough has kept up with its expansion requirements as described in the CSS. Indeed with the downgraded figures there is no need for these sites as KBC has a five year supply at least and possibly even a ten year supply. This point was recently made by the Planning</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which have been noted. The access to the site has not yet been finalised. The provision of a safe and suitable access would be considered in detail at the planning application stage in consultation with NCC Highways Authority. The Site Specific Proposals LDD is required to allocate site to meet housing requirement to 2031 not just for a 5 year period. While the land adjacent to the site is in a flood zone the identified land is not. Further ecological assessment of the impacts of the sites will be required before the site is progressed as an allocation. Any development on a site within a flood zone would be required to consider flood risk in line with Policy 10 of the NPPF and would be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment.</p>
---	-----	------------------	---	---

Department in a planning application in Broughton (KET/2013/0284). The loss of a fragile and rare eco-system including a hedgerow of great worth is not something anyone wants to contemplate - in twenty years time any such loss will be looked on as wanton destruction and vandalism. To talk of mitigating measures to protect Tailby Meadow (MG4 wet grassland) which makes up the 3% of such grasslands in the country compared to a hundred years ago is one thing but no specifics have been given. I understand that there has been an idea floated by KBC to 'recreate' this environment (or something similar) across the river - if this is the case, it is ludicrous and even if this could be done (very unlikely) we are talking of hundreds of years. The meadow was left to the town and subsequently the borough to be protected and enjoyed as an open space. Building 102 houses on DE/027 would destroy it because of the increased footfall so another 304 houses would just bring about its destruction more quickly. As for the otters - I'm sure a sign telling them 'not to worry' will help keep them in the river until the building work is complete! Last year's LDD options paper dismissed DE/173 and DE/189 as potential housing sites as these formed part of a 'Historically and Visually Important Open Space' and in many documents over the years KBC has promised to protect the Ise Valley. In the same LLD document the proposed settlement boundary runs inside these two sites which means they should be excluded from development consideration in line with the CSS and NPPF. So what has changed I wonder? Finally, the flood line shown on the map

			<p>which is Appendix 1 for this week's Executive meeting (11th. December) can only be a 'mean average' as the flooding in the last two winters (2011/12 and 2012/13) has been far more severe and covered land which the borough now wants to build on. The land along the Lse is on a flood plain and in a report for Kettering and Wellingborough Councils in February 2011 it is pointed out that even with flood defences this area is at danger of surface water flooding - before another 304 houses are built. This before the flooding of the last two winters has been taken into consideration so I suggest the flood line map is out of date. The environmental destruction added to the high possibility of flooding irrespective of any reasonable defence being in place (and cost constraints would exclude exceptional measures) make this a totally unacceptable suggestion. I hear the need for maximum value but would stress that value from assets (and the Hawthorns is a listed asset of community value) can be viewed in terms of community and environmental well-being. This is what is needed, an acceptance that Desborough as a community (and look at all of the comments) does not need this.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

4	254	Mr Alan Smith	Planning & Biodiversity Officer The Wildlife Trust for Northamptonshire	<p>From The Wildlife Trust : For proposed Site Ref. No. DE/072; the Former Hawthorns Leisure Centre : In-line with our many previous comments made to KBC about the rarity of the grassland habitat on the adjacent Tailby Meadow Nature Reserve area, and its consequent importance and significance at a local, county, and national level, The Wildlife Trust would wish to repeat its view that we would not be in favour of any form / quantum of build development being constructed on this particular site area. From The Wildlife Trust : For proposed Site Ref. No. DE/210; the combined comprehensive development of Site Ref. Nos. DE/072 (as above), DE/173 (Lower Steeping) and DE/189 (land adjacent to the Former Hawthorns Leisure Centre) : In a similar vein to the comments given immediately here above, and as a continuation of that same reasoning, given both the strength and frequency of our consistent feedback, given to various Officers at KBC, in a series of relevant meetings and correspondences in the recent past, The Wildlife Trust is extremely disappointed to see that now KBC is proposing to allocate even more land - across the contiguous DE/189 and DE/173 site areas - for further housing development areas in close proximity to the Tailby Meadow Nature Reserve site area. Please note that The Wildlife Trust objects, in the strongest possible terms, to any proposals to extend the residential envelope of the town of Desborough on its southern edge in the valley of the Rive Ise corridor and in proximity to Tailby Meadow. From The Wildlife Trust : For proposed Site Ref. No. DE/063; Desborough Site 3 : We are not in favour of</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which have been duly noted. Further ecological assessment of the impact of development of site DE/210 will be required before progression of the site as an allocation. In terms of DE/063 the site is separated from The Plens by existing development. The impact on The Plens will be considered in detail at the planning application stage.</p>
---	-----	---------------	--	--	---

				<p>building a scheme of additional houses - and certainly not at the proposed yield of 81 dwellings - on this particular area of land. In our view, a further scheme of houses on this proposed site will simply add to the pressure impacted upon the nearby "The Plens" Nature Reserve area and will also thereby serve to hasten its complete decline as a valuable wildlife area.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

4	255	Mrs Jane Coe	DE/072 It would be sad to lose our green fields, as we in Desborough have so few left. We, the people love to walk there. DE/173 Its damp and very near to the brook, unsafe for young children and it will be mainly young family's that will live there! DE/189 Where will all these children school? I know we all need a home but there is sense + reason. DE/210 As above.	Thank you for your comments which have been noted.
---	-----	-----------------	--	---

4	256	Mrs Veronica Price	<p>Housing Allocations - Assessment of Additional Sites and Update Consultation OBJECTION to proposal to include DE072, DE173, DE189, and consolidated land as DE210 in the consultation plan as land for development To the south of the town the Tailby Meadow and Ise Valley provide an attractive and significant edge, important to protect to the south of the town Kettering Borough Council, Site Specific Proposals Local Development Document ‘ Options Paper, March 2012. I am writing with regard to the consultation plans regarding additional sites for housing allocations (updated) in Desborough and strongly object to your proposal to include any and all of this land in your plan. In the interests of sustainability, adaptation to climate change, health and wellbeing of the community I urge you to discount the proposal and revert back to your 2012 plan that defines this area as an important green space. I apologise for the length of the letter, but there are a substantial amount of issues that need your consideration in regards to this proposal. Your Core Spatial Strategy, Joint Core Strategy, Strategic Framework documents, Local Plans, Urban Development Frameworks, Rothwell and Desborough Urban Extension plans, Rights of Way Improvement Plan, Green Space Allocations plans, Local Plan for KBC produced prior to this consultation in December 2013 ‘ basically all the Strategic and Local documents prior to 2013, including the first version of this particular plan produced in 2012, have referenced these fields as being protected / designated green space, so this 2013 revised document is not in compliance with any of your</p>	<p>Thank you for your views in relation to identification of DE/210 as a site with potential for allocation for housing. Your views, along with those expressed by other Consultees, will inform the preparation of the next iteration of the plan. Further additional work is now required to address the issues and concerns raised through the consultation process before the site can be considered for progression.</p>
---	-----	--------------------------	--	---

			<p>local and national policies. Should your scoring methodology be applied consistently, without any internal influences, these sites either on their own or altogether do not perform well for proposals for development. Your plans up to and including the 2012 and 2013 revised version, including your first draft of this consultation document recognise this and make several recommendations and statements regarding Desborough, in particular enhancement and protection of the Ise Valley and the green area to the south of Desborough. Your statements include: site designated as Natural and Semi-natural open space, need to maintain for town boundary visually important open space providing the setting for Desborough and views and access to the Ise Valley The Ise Valley must be protected as an attractive break between the two towns Proposed historically and visually important Open Space , Source: Kettering Borough council and Northants County Council local and strategic plans Your 2013 plan refers to the land to the south of Desborough being designated as Natural and Semi-natural open space. According to your own recent green space survey, Desborough has a lack of green space. Your proposal will remove the only accessible countryside in the southern part of the town. Is the site still designated and if not, when was this designation removed, who was consulted on this change, and what has driven this change in status? NPPF states all your decisions should be evidence based. Where is your evidence to show this land no longer qualifies for the status it is currently assigned in all your and the Counties plans? According to</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>the NPPF, work undertaken prior to the commencement of the Act can be counted with regard to the preparation of a Local Development Document provided the appropriate community involvement, sustainability appraisal and other requirements as set out in the Act, secondary legislation and guidance is undertaken. Therefore all the past, present and existing plans should be considered unless there is strong evidence to demonstrate why these plans are no longer relevant. I am sure that you are fully aware of the Core principles of the National Planning Policy Framework in your role, but would like to take this opportunity to highlight key information from the document, like the core principle that states that planning should recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. This includes designated landscapes but also the wider countryside. Its clear that pursuing sustainable development includes moving from a net loss of biodiversity to achieving net gains for nature, and that a core principle for planning is that it should contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment. There is a statutory basis for planning to seek to minimise impacts on biodiversity and provide net gains in biodiversity where possible. This aim is underpinned by section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 (NERC), which places a duty on all public authorities in England and Wales to have regard, in the exercise of their functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity. A key purpose of this duty is to embed consideration of biodiversity as an integral part of policy and decision making</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>throughout the public sector, which should be seeking to make a significant contribution to the achievement of the commitments made by Government in its Biodiversity 2020 strategy. There will be a significant and unacceptable and irreversible Impact on the amenity, natural environment, biodiversity and landscape of Desborough, Rothwell and the Ise Valley if this grassland is built upon. As you say in your Site Specific Proposals LDD Options published on 9 March 2012, Kettering borough is characterised by market towns, attractive villages and countryside. The Ise Valley forms part of this attractive landscape, visually and environmentally. I moved here 20 years ago for that reason! I'm sure many others have too! 93% of People surveyed by Natural England value local greenspace very highly as a contributing factor to their quality of life. The highest level of agreement was with the statement having green spaces close to where I live is important, Your plan published in 2012 states that the River Ise Valley is one of the two sub-regional corridors in the borough that must be protected and enhanced for its benefits to the Green Infrastructure corridors and assets. Working with partners you will focus on delivery of GI recommendations of the Local Green Infrastructure study for the Ise Valley. I've no doubt you will have received objections to the proposal from the partners you say you will work with to achieve this, eg. RNRP, Wildlife Trust, Revital-Ise, the Community. These sites would benefit from designation as District Green Infrastructure assets, if indeed they are not already designated as such. Your past plans</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>refer to the area as being designated as historically and environmentally important. Keeping an already productive and popular amenity for the community is an opportunity gained. Trying to devastate the valley for the sake of 304 houses that really are not needed in Desborough is not just a missed opportunity it is a travesty. Nature, health and the environment will be hit with a double double impact. More homes and associated impacts concentrated into a smaller wild area = double impact on habitats and species existing and moved into those areas following displacement. Whilst I acknowledge that housing needs need to be met, there are better opportunities in Kettering Borough Council where this can take place. There are many brownfield sites in the borough that could be considered. Desborough does not have the facilities and infrastructure to support the existing community and until such issues are addressed, further housing should not even be considered in the town. If your plans come to fruition for further development in Desborough, the town will be one big housing estate with a few shops, half finished leisure centre, no open countryside, no green boundary to define the extent of the town. Is this your aspiration for our town? Kettering Borough Councils advertised Development Principles suggest a footpath along the Lse Valley to Triangular Lodge and through to Desborough. If you develop the Lse Valley in Desborough, you remove the open access countryside footpath and replace it with a footpath through housing estates. This is against the development principle. Your revised housing allocation plans are clearly not in compliance</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>with the government guidance on Green Infrastructure, Natural Environment White Paper aims, Accessible Natural Green Space Standards (Natural England), Green Infrastructure Strategy (Natural England), recommendations from the Lawton Review, PPS9, NPPF, draft Neighbourhood Plan, draft Core Spatial Strategy, National and Local government, Natural England and NPPF guidance to name but a few of the plans, strategies and policies it is not in compliance with. Can you explain why there has been this change of mind regarding the status of these fields? What is influencing this change? Natural England report Green Belt ‘A Greener Future’ shows how Green Belt land is contributing to a range of benefits to the environment and to society and states As areas that are particularly attractive for economic growth often tend to be those with Green Belt designations, the relationship between green infrastructure initiatives and Green Belt policy is significant. The document has several examples evidencing their findings. Defras independent review Making Space for nature carried out by Professor Sir John Lawton was set up to look at our wildlife sites and whether they are capable of responding and adapting to the growing challenges of climate change and other demands on our land. Launching the report, Professor Sir John Lawton said: There is compelling evidence that England’s collection of wildlife sites are generally too small and too isolated, leading to declines in many of England’s characteristic species. With climate change, the situation is likely to get worse. This</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>is bad news for wildlife but also bad news for us, because the damage to nature also means our natural environment is less able to provide the many services upon which we depend. We need more space for nature. Our 24 recommendations in this report call for action which will benefit wildlife and people. They provide a repair manual to help re-build nature Your plans to build in these fields go against the recommendations in this report and resultant Natural White Paper. These fields provide an effective ecological network that contributes towards meeting targets in the Natural White Paper. According to Natural Englands research, there were over 2.8 billion visits to the natural environment in England in year 2012/13. 66% of these visits were taken by people within 2 miles of their home illustrating the importance of accessible local greenspace. People spent money on a quarter of the visits to the natural countryside - but on these visits the average spend of Â£27 means an aggregated total of Â£21 billion expenditure. There will therefore be a negative impact on the local economy. There is growing evidence showing the health and economic benefits of open spaces and the contribution that access to open countryside has to health, savings to the economy and contribution to National Indicators for Health, Wellbeing, Social cohesion, the Environment and Climate change. The latest research from Macmillan and Ramblers states that inactivity is costing the economy Â£10billion per year. Removing the ability for the community to be active will contribute to an inactive community, resulting in an unhealthy community and</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>subsequent costs to the health service. The five top illnesses are all reduced by activity and access to open spaces and countryside. Walking helps to prevent and contributes to curing the UKs 5 top killers. How will you meet your National Indicators for Health and Wellbeing if you remove this valuable space that is a big contributor to the NI? I fear the removal of a free source of exercise and socialisation will have a detrimental effect on mine and the communitys health. Mental ill health currently costs Britain Â£77billion per year for care provision, lost outputs and costs to individuals. WHO report that by 2020 depression and depression related illness will become the greatest source of ill health across the globe. There is now substantial evidence that links natural environment with psychological wellbeing. With pressure on the environment for development and with 80% of the population of the UK living in urban areas, access to useable greenspace is becoming increasingly important. The number of dogs per household is around 33%. This means that your proposal will introduce around 100 more dogs to the south of Desborough with no facilities for walking them in open countryside and little green space for walking dogs in the town. The pressure this will put on Tailby meadow will be enormous and would only result in deterioration of this protected area that cannot be mitigated. Homes will bring with them noise pollution, air pollution, vehicle and traffic noise and pollution and also light pollution. Wildlife will be displaced from the surrounding area because of this. The recent minutes of the Desborough Town Council show that dog mess is already an issue for the</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>town. If you remove the area that people walk their dogs in, this will become more of a health issue for the town. The fields in the Ise Valley are habitat and resource to rare and protected species and also priority species under NERC such as kingfishers, otters, water voles, skylark, redpoll, linnet, cuckoo, lesser spotted woodpecker, grasshopper warbler, yellow wagtail, sparrows, dunnock, bullfinch to name a few! These fields have not been ploughed for at least 50 years according to my evidence. Given the luxury of time, I have no doubt a longer period of time could be established. As the Ise Valley is in the Northamptonshire Lowlands, the land includes Hedgerows, rivers, lowland hay meadows, Aquifer-fed naturally fluctuating water bodies which are Priority Habitats under NERC. Coupled with the fact that the grazing and hay cutting has reduced significantly in the last 20 years, the habitat has been farmed organically and is less disturbed and therefore more attractive to wildlife. You have a statutory Duty to conserve this habitat and not displace its inhabitants. There are also several trees and hedgerows that support protected bird and bat populations that will be removed from the fields resulting in loss of important habitat. Even if they were to remain, the introduction of a human population and associated impacts will displace them. The Ise Valley provides green spaces for recreation and opportunities for sustainable movement from urban areas to the countryside and open spaces. For wildlife it provides important habitats and movement routes. Maintaining this habitat can help with climate change adaptation. Please do not fragment the</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>Ise Valley habitat. Your plan says you want to encourage multifunctional use of green space! I couldn't think of any space in the Desborough or Rothwell that fulfills this aim and that serves as many people! I know of people who come from Corby, Market Harborough and as far as Bedfordshire who enjoy walking in our Ise Valley. Users of the fields include: Farmers, walkers, dog walkers, cross country runners, childrens (and adults) education, community engagement, kite flying, informal football and rounders games, picnics, model aircraft flyers, orienteering and tracking for the Scouts and Brownies, bird and mammal watching, fishing, informal golf practice, sledging, scenery watching, artists, photography, habitat, climate change mitigation, flood storage, walking to/from school. The number of visits paid to these free fields far outnumbers visits to any other managed (at a cost) green space in the town. In considering the definition of a viable site, your proposal is an unlikely candidate as DE210 is in Multiple ownership and has several constraints that have yet to be addressed like access (which you say you can overcome), loss of priority habitat and species under NERC, loss of a site designated as Natural and Semi-natural open space, overlooking, traffic congestion being created in Desborough and Rothwell Towns, inadequate infrastructure for sewage (non of which you say you can overcome). So, unless all these constraints have already been addressed and mitigation measures put in place, agreed, landowner agreements, land sales agreed, and agreement from landowners for the change of use of the fields, your proposal does not support</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>a viable option. The plan states only viable sites should be considered. Having searched the internet for houses for sale and for rent in Desborough, there are hundreds of homes for sale or to rent, including shared ownership and executive homes. There is also planning permission for several thousand homes yet to be built. Where is your evidence that another 304 homes are needed? Where is your evidence of this local need in a town with a lack of facilities, under developed town centre, lack of green space, lack of school spaces? As stated in your development plans there is little opportunity for employment in Desborough and Rothwell, so links to the A6, A14, Corby, Kettering and Market Harborough are key. There will be no more new education facilities, no new jobs and most residents who do work commute to do so. When compared to the North of the town, DE210 doesnt offer clear access to any of the main routes to these towns, is far from the leisure and sporting facilities, is on the opposite end of the town to the new school that is promised on the Grange, has limited access to employment. This proposal for development of DE210 does not contribute to your ten stated outcomes! It does not benefit or enhance our community, does not contribute to regeneration of our town, does not enhance our quality of life and takes away productive countryside. What it does do is take away our places to exercise and relax, increases the traffic by over 300-600plus additional car movements going through Desborough and Rothwell towns per day rather than making use of the new A6. The A6 was constructed at great expense to relieve Desborough and Rothwell</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>towns of congestion. There will be no direct access to it from the proposed development land. If the Grange and the development next to Cheaneys is anything to go by, there will be problems with car parking. These new homes have inadequate car parking as your statistics are well out of date regarding the number of cars per household. Cars will end up parking on the road, reducing the size of the road, visibility and increasing the road hazards. It will make the roads unsafe. When you were considering the sites for the Strategic Development Area you turned down all sites in the south of Desborough because you did not want any development taking place in the Ise Valley. You wanted development to take place in the North of Desborough because of the links to infrastructure, new leisure centre facilities, jobs, impact of flood risk being on the River Jordan rather than the Ise. This logic and criteria is even more applicable now that the town has already almost doubled in size. As I live at the bottom of the valley, my home suffers from surface water flooding during sustained and flash storms. The drains cannot cope with the surface water from the top of town to the valley. The combined sewers therefore discharge sewage and street waste from the streets and drains into our garden and garage, whilst at the same time the Anglian Water Combined Sewer overflows raw sewage into the River Ise. We have so far managed to protect the remainder of the property from flooding. Once the river level rises above the outfalls, the water can no longer discharge into the river, hence the surface water flooding as described. The location of this</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>development at the bottom of the Ise Valley means the elderly, less firm, disabled, mums with prams will find it difficult to access any facilities in the town. There is a steep uphill walk or wheelchair ride to get to the church, green space, town centre, shops, doctors, library. Have you paid due regard to the Disability Discrimination Act and if so, how do you plan to ensure that those who need to get to the top of the hill, ie. Those in the centre of Desborough are able to do so without the extra burden of cost, and without restriction. They can get there as and when and how they want to. This plan provides a lack of equal access to buildings, sites and services. All the sites I refer to in my reference do not contribute towards the achievement of sustainable development. This site is not only taking up green field space, it is taking up the only accessible green space and open countryside to the South of the town, removing NERC priority habitats and an important amenity which is used by the whole town and residents from Rothwell to the detriment of the health, wellbeing and cohesion of the community by removing the amenity, the visual attractiveness of the Ise Valley and creating a traffic issue and creation of air and light pollution from homes, vehicles, street lighting, putting pressure on the only protected site in the vicinity for all the above pollutions, including noise pollution from vehicles and homes and concentration of visitors to this meadow which is to be protected. More visitors = more deterioration of the site. Government guidance makes it clear that the Value of a site is not just the amount of money that enters</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>Kettering Borough Councils bank account. Ecosystems Services, Health savings, Environmental, Biodiversity support system, Social and Community Benefits, visual and recreation amenity are all of financial value to the economy either directly or indirectly and should be considered in planning. The Ise Valley pumping station is another poorly considered feature of your plan. It is constantly polluting the River Ise because it cannot cope with the existing development in the town. This pollution kills the fish, invertebrates and all life in the river for miles. This watercourse is currently at Good Status under the Water Framework Directive. Any further impacts would only serve to deteriorate the rivers status. Pollution from surface water containing surfactants, toxins and sewage will ensure the UK does not comply with this EU Directive and your plans will have contributed towards this failure. The current improvements to the pumping station are to accommodate the development that has planning permission in Desborough, any further development is not included in that provision. Development in these fields will have an overbearing presence on the properties that are at the edge of the fields and will have a detrimental effect on those existing homeowners. There will also be loss of privacy for those homeowners. If the homes are not designed correctly or in keeping with the existing homes there will be a loss of light. Three storey, densely clustered homes is not in keeping with this part of the town. At the November Desborough Town Council meeting, the Police presented to the Council and statistics show that</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>there is a rising level of crime in Desborough. More homes will inevitably bring more crime into the town. Only 2 weeks ago a shopkeeper was attacked on the Broadlands with a hammer. Will you be increasing the police resource in the town to deal with the increased levels of crime? The Ise Valley is a distinctive environment that gives local character to the town and enhances biodiversity. Your plans would remove our landscape and townscape character with no net gain in Green infrastructure, devastating the links between the countryside and the towns rather than enhancing it as your outcomes state it should. The town centre revitalisation and infrastructure and environmental improvements have still not taken place and until this is resolved and the town centre deemed to service the community better, no further development of housing in Desborough should be considered over and above the already existing plans. The local plan is for the next 5 years, so unless these issues have been addressed, no further plans for housing should be made and the actual benefits to the community stated in the proposals. With regards to this Consultation, I am not aware of any members of the community who were aware of the consultation. When we challenged the Town Councillors who attended the consultation, they said they weren't aware of it either. The reason people attended the event was that one tenacious member of the community found out about the consultation and started to spread the word a few days before your event at Marlow House. If you are able to show that you are fulfilling the consultation requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework, please</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>provide me with evidence as to how you have met this requirement. The event was carried out midway through the consultation period, meaning we have had little time to consider the plans. Where did you advertise the consultation and when? How did you inform the community of the consultation? I challenge your presumption that the consultation was successfully advertised and attended by the community and request that you extend the deadline for the consultation and alter subsequent dates for the submission of the report to carry out a full, transparent and open consultation that the whole community has the opportunity to be part of as opposed to those who found out by chance. It seems that this consultation would have been carried out without any community involvement if we had not found out by chance. What assurances can you provide that this is not a box ticking exercise and that a decision has not already been made? Will you review and alter the dates for consultation and submission? Having reviewed your documents, the site references are also different on your plans when compared with your documents, the colours in the keys change from plan to plan and are inconsistent, the consolidated land is referred to as HVI055, DE210, DE220 and DE240. This is very confusing and not transparent! I object to all the differently referenced lands being proposed for development. Please clarify which are the correct references for the land that was designated as Natural and Semi-natural open space to the south of Desborough that is now being proposed for development. Your proposals are inconsistent with the planning history of</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>these fields. Having attended the event at Marlow House, the recently formed residents group made the community aware of the plans. Those who attended the Desborough Town Council meeting on the 21st November and spoke strongly about their objections to the plans to allocate DE072, DE173, DE189 and DE210 for development. The Town Council response was extremely disappointing to put it mildly. We were told that there was nothing the Town Council could do and we were to write in to you. The least we expected was our representatives to support our objections or present this information to you. They also refuted the statement in your consultation document that they put this land forward as an option to be considered and stated that they did not support the plans. Can you advise on whether the statement in your document is correct or if you will be withdrawing this statement? If the statement remains in the document, please provide me with evidence to show that the Town Council indeed made this statement. Some clarification would be welcome. At this same meeting on the 21st Nov, the Housing Allocation Sites was on the Town Council agenda. However, following our representations, the Councillors decided not to discuss this agenda item at the town council meeting and arranged to meet at the home of two of the Councillors the following Monday. No members of the public were invited to attend this meeting or indeed informed that they could attend this meeting. No minutes have yet to be issued for this meeting either. Is it legal that they hold closed meetings? It's extremely concerning that this matter is</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>not being discussed in a transparent, consultative and open manner with community involvement as required by the NPPF. I have presented you with evidence to show that the plans are not in compliance with local and national policy and guidance. The NPPF requires your decisions to be based on accurate and up to date evidence. If you choose to pursue these plans, I will be making a Freedom of Information request to see all the evidence that you have collated to support your proposal. I expect your proposal would have been well informed with evidence to support it so this information would not be difficult to supply. I understand there is a meeting regarding this matter with your Executive Committee on the 11th December. As the consultation closes on the 9th and you appear to have had a substantial amount of correspondence from the community regarding this proposal, you are unlikely to have had an opportunity to consider the responses to your consultation or have had the opportunity to respond to the concerns of the community. I sincerely hope the Officers at this meeting will not be making recommendations or decisions to push on with your proposal as this would mean that your consultation was simply a box ticking exercise and did not involve the community at all. On a positive note, I would like to thank your Officers for their time and information provided at the consultation event. I hope they will be given the opportunity to make their recommendations for the benefit of our community based on the facts, up to date evidence and the community response to a open, transparent and democratic review. I look forward to receiving confirmation of</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>your receipt of this letter which I have uploaded to the portal, emailed and hand delivered. I look forward to receiving your comments on the points I have raised. My qualifications: BSc Hons Environmental Studies, Dip Environmental Policy, amateur Naturalist, Resident :)</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

4	257	mr peter giles	<p>Strongly objecting to site DE210 (72/189 and 173) Main reasons as why this is completely wrong Access:- 2 points of access for 300+ dwellings to one of which was turned done in previously. Population Coming into 300+ houses means 600+ cars our roads can not cope now! Flood Plain The river lse is on the flood plain and there is government documents stating if an area has flooded in the last 200 years then it should not be built upon. With 300+ houses comes families .. which need to live how are they going to pay for the homes earn a living pay their way?? with no employment within our small town. Building works the affect this will have on current local residents. The infrastructure ie doctors schools dentist etc - cant cope now In conclusion all the points above have been said and said again within this consultation page to the fact of over 100+ people have taken the time to complete their comments - so we all OBJECT to this housing proposal please think before ruining Isle Valley.</p>	<p>The access to the site has not yet been finalised. The provision of a safe and suitable access would be considered in detail at the planning application stage in consultation with NCC Highways Authority. The assessment of site DE/210 also considers flood risk. The site is adjacent to but not within a flood zone. Any planning application for a site located within a flood zone would need to consider flood risk in accordance with Part 10 of the National Planning Framework and would 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 with NCC Education and health care providers to ensure adequate provision is available for residents of new development.</p>
---	-----	----------------	---	---

4	258	Mrs B Crick	<p>DE/072 This is a most beautiful part of the Valley and used by walkers of all ages, it is also used by children and young for sport e.g. football, cricket, golf, model aeroplane flying. To build here along side Tailby meadow would destroy the birds and nature and wildlife of the river.</p> <p>DE/210 This natural and beautiful valley is used daily all year round by the public. To build here would deprive us of taking our children and grandchildren for walks along the valley teaching them about nature, birds and wild flowers and plants which my mum and dad for me and their parents did for them. Please do not take this beautiful valley for building when there are better areas of land with better access.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. 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 will also need to provide a net increase in biodiversity.</p>
---	-----	-------------	--	--

4	259	Miss Katharyn Window	<p>The area that has been suggested, is an area that isn't just inadvisable for one reason but many. The Ise Valley is a rare and valuable commodity, being one of only a handful that have a good ecological status, which if changed would cost this council money it doesn't have to rectify. This area is used by the community as a whole, dog walkers, ramblers, runners, the list could go on, how will you meet there needs? The only other area that is 'close' by is the Recreation Ground on Dunkirk Avenue, and this isn't an area that you really want to be over populated by dog walkers, due to the other events and ways that it is used. The ramifications of the increased through flow of dogs would have serious Health and Safety implications for the Schools that use it. Dogs are not the only wildlife that would be affected by this proposed work, the varied and abundant bird population would be affected, the aquatic life would also not just be affected, but due to its delicate nature be decimated. The delicate environment that has taken years to develop supports the ecosystem, that provides a stability to the Water Table. The fields that are the proposed development site are constantly saturated and flood annually, can you tell me how these houses will effect the water dynamics? By building here you are by definition are changing the dynamics of the water paths and channels, in an area that has troubles with drainage and flooding is it wise to remove a water sink? The Geology of the area doesn't support this kind of mass development, there will be problems with the builds on this site, unless expensive and time consuming techniques and technologies are</p>	<p>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. The assessment of site DE/210 also considers flood risk. The site is adjacent to but not within a flood zone. Any planning application for a site located within a flood zone would need to consider flood risk in accordance with Part 10 of the National Planning Framework and would be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment.</p>
---	-----	----------------------------	--	---

				<p>used. This development has not met a warm reception by this community, and with the Grange and the promises made, coupled with the under performance of those plans, how can you support the development of the Ise Valley?</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

4	260	Mrs Paula Holmes	Secretary Desborough Community Development Trust	<p>As you are aware Desborough Community Development Trust (DCDT) supported by Desborough Town Council successfully applied to have the Hawthorns site listed as an 'asset of community value' in August of this year. At the same time the town council requested that the borough through the Executive, defer any decisions on this site until the Neighbourhood Plan is developed as there is no need to allocate any further sites because Kettering Borough is in the enviable position of having at least a five year supply for housing sites and possibly a ten year supply, even accounting for the buffer requirements. It is very odd that the Executive Committee is meeting to discuss this request on 11th. December, two days after this consultation ends and before any analysis of the responses can be collated we would think. Considering the number of comments made it would be very helpful if the Executive could be made aware of the strength of feeling and the plans the Trust is beginning to develop for this site, having received a feasibility grant to enable us to work on a plan and involve the town in this. The points the Trust feels need stating again (on top of all of the comments so far) focus on the loss of a fragile and un-reproducible eco-system, the proposed access points, t lack of supporting infrastructure and the flood risk. Tailby Meadow would be destroyed there is no doubt and this has been repeated by the Wildlife trust and Revital-ISE on many occasions. There is no mitigating measures which would compensate for the increased footfall of 102 houses, let alone 304. We would very much like to hear what the borough considers could be done as the details</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The 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. Flood risk was also considered in the assessment of the site. The site is adjacent to but not within a flood zone. Any planning application for a site located within a flood zone would need to consider flood risk in accordance with Part 10 of the National Planning Framework and would be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment. At this stage 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 considered and addressed in further detail before conclusions about progression of the site as an allocation can be made.</p>
---	-----	------------------	---	---	---

are thin on the ground. We know that nothing can be done. There is inadequate infrastructure in the town now and with an additional 900 plus houses having received planning permission and only one extra school planned, this situation won't improve. The doctors' surgery is overloaded and we have one dental practise - need we go on? The traffic system will not work but will provide a vehicle route from Rushton/Corby etc. across to the Rothwell Road without going through the town and the schoolchildren will have a major obstacle to overcome on their way to and from school. Finally the flood risk has not been analysed correctly and the Executive map does not reflect the current extent of flooding. Add another 304 houses to this and the surface water flood risk will not be worth contemplating. The Trust urges KBC to work with the town to protect the Ise Valley and bring forward something the town wants and deserves. It has an opportunity to do so as 'value' can be considered in more human terms under Localism and Asset Transfer and the asset of community value presents the borough with a wonderful chance to take this view.

4	261	Marie and Michael Lacey	<p>DE/072 The green fields adjoining the Hawthorns is a wonderful open space and should stay that way. This land was a wonderful place for wildlife and birds and we should encourage everyone to keep it so. DE/173 The land shown here is a flood plain. It is bound to cause severe problems. This valley is a beautiful place full of wildlife. Do not destroy this living, breathing space. DE/189 The area bordering the north of the river Lse is a natural flood plain and is regularly water logged after rainfall. KBC have already caused great harm to the folk of Desborough when it demolished the Leisure Centre, skate board park and other. DE/210 The natural beauty of the Lse Valley would be spoilt forever. We have already encroached too far into our green land. Desborough needs to be protected, it already is beginning to seem like a huge housing estate. Our infrastructure has not changed. Our schools are full. Our doctors surgery is already struggling to cope with the present population of Desborough</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Impact on wildlife 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 and will also need to provide a net increase in biodiversity. The assessment of sites considers flood risk. DE/173 and DE/189 are adjacent to but not within a flood zone. Any planning application for a site located within a flood zone would need to consider flood risk in accordance with Part 10 of the National Planning Framework and would 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 with NCC Education and health care providers to ensure adequate provision is available for residents of new development.</p>
---	-----	-------------------------	---	--

4	263	Ian Holmes	<p>DE/072 Concerned about effects on Tailby Meadow – surface run off, the need to drain and re profile the cricket pitch. DE/173 This area contains Desboroughs original sewers. Is the land contaminated? Was this land recorded as a Visual Impact Area for the approach to Desborough? DE/189 This area is adjacent to the old sewer beds and to the present pumping station. How popular will this be? Part of the Visual Impact Area? DE/210 Development of the Ise Valley seems to be closer to a possible flood risk than ought to be the case. House insurance will obviously come at a premium. What extra facilities/employment will the town gain?</p>	<p>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 will also need to provide a net increase in biodiversity. Contamination will be considered at detail planning stage in consultation with the Councils Environmental Health Department. Investigation/remediation works can be satisfactorily secured by condition. The assessment of sites considers flood risk. DE/210 is adjacent to but not within a flood zone. Any planning application for a site located within a flood zone would need to consider flood risk in accordance with Part 10 of the National Planning Framework and would be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment.</p>
---	-----	------------	---	--

4	264	A Brice	<p>DE/072 It should be used for local children/people to enjoy this area which is also close to a nature area and open countryside. Roads, doctors and schools will suffer. Its not needed! DE/173 Poor roads access and safety, doctors, schools, and shops. Its not wanted or needed! DE/189 House building in these areas will on existing domestic roads will cause safety hazards! Poor town parking. Over subscribing of doctors surgery, schools will all be acute. All are close Nature Agreed Areas and flood land, these sites can only be described as poor opportunistic choices! DE/210 As above!</p>	<p>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. Development of a site of this size will be required to contribute towards improvements to the highway network via a s.106 agreement. The Options Paper (March 2012) identified opportunities of redevelopment of the town centre to enhance the current retail offer. If this option is adopted this will ensure the town centre is redeveloped alongside any residential development. The sites which make up DE/210 are adjacent to but not within a flood zone. Any planning application for sites located within a flood zone would need to consider flood risk in accordance with Part 10 of the National Planning Framework and would be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment.</p>
---	-----	---------	--	---

4	265	Mr & Mrs Brown		Dear Sir/Madam, We strongly object to the building of 304 houses on the green and tranquil Ise Valley. There is no consideration for the people of Desborough and for what they will be losing, never to get back. The only ones who will benefit are the greedy developers.	Thank you for your comments which have been noted.
---	-----	-------------------	--	--	--

4	266	Mary Hill	<p>DE/210 I am against the build of houses along the Ise valley for 2 reasons. 1) the reduction of remaining green space adjacent to the brook. 2) the increase of traffic i.e. potentially 608 extra cars which neither Desborough nor Rothwell Road will be able to cope with. The residents on the south side of Desborough have lost the Leisure Centre, the Skate Park and the sports fields. An extension of the existing green area towards the Rothwell Road would create a delightful and natural area for old and young alike. Flat designated pathways would enable residents of all ages, wheelchair users and dog walkers to appreciate the natural habitat away from traffic. Teachers could take groups of children there. A small playground could be created for young children. The approach to Desborough on the southern side would be an attractive one as opposed to the ugliness of limitless housing.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which have been noted.</p>
---	-----	-----------	---	---

4	267	Mr Chris Jones		<p>I wish to object to the above proposal as I think it is unbelievable that you intend to destroy such a lovely area that is enjoyed by both adults and children. Soon there will be no areas that have not been ruined by development. I feel that this affects both Desborough and Rothwell.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which have been noted.</p>
4	268	Mrs Jacqui Jones		<p>I am writing to object to the proposal to build houses across the Ise Valley at Desborough. I find it awful that yet again an area of beauty is going to be destroyed to build more houses. This is an area I use to walk my dogs, as do many others. It is also used by children. I think it is wrong for us to lose this area. I believe it affects both the people of Desborough and the people of Rothwell.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which have been noted.</p>

4	270	Mr & Mrs Fondham		<p>DE/072 Our understanding is that the houses on this site have already been agreed hence the closure of the Hawthorns and the building of the new Leisure Centre. Without the houses on this site we have been led to believe that the 2nd phase of the new Leisure Centre will not happen. It is need as the new centre is not big enough to hold all classes offered. DE/173 This is a potential risk to the flood plain and therefore a fool hardy decision DE/189 Again this is a potential risk to the flood plain and therefore another fool hardy decision DE/210 See previous comments</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The purpose of this document and consultation process is to allow people to comment on the options for potential housing sites in Desborough given the level of change in sites identified since the Options Paper consultation. Sites are identified as potential allocations only and further work will be required to address the issues and concerns raised in relation to comprehensive site DE/210 before it can be considered for progression. The sites which make up DE/210 are located adjacent to but not within a flood zone. Any planning application for sites located within a flood zone would need to consider flood risk in accordance with Part 10 of the National Planning Framework and would be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment.</p>
---	-----	---------------------	--	--	---

4	271	Mr Richard A King	<p>DE/072 This site next to Tailby Meadow is not suitable for such a large yield. Also the old cricket field is a community asset no to used for housing but for the benefit of residents. DE/173 Going out onto the old main road is ill thought out and a recipe for disaster this road is still used a lot. Also a large part of this site has outstanding natural beauty. DE/189 This field has been subjected to threat of development before in the 90s and was decided then that enough land is available without this and also you need a field between wildlife areas and habitation. DE/210 Looking at this comprehensively is ridiculous for many reasons. 304 houses in a natural valley, loss of social amenities, natural environment for wildlife. I suggest this is being proposed for monetary gain and has not been thought through.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. 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. The access to the site has not yet been finalised. The provision of a safe and suitable access would be considered in detail at the planning application stage in consultation with NCC Highways Authority.</p>
---	-----	----------------------	--	---

4	272	Mr I Murkett		<p>DE/072 Do not need Flood risk Loss of green space DE/173 Loss of land Too many people Not enough facilities DE/189 As above DE/210 As above</p>	<p>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 growth will be staggered across the plan period rather than there being an immediate increase in the number of households.</p>
4	273	Linda Burnham		<p>DE/072 This town can take no more housing. This will spoil a green and beautiful area and the town can not facilitate more people. DE/173 As above DE/189 As above DE/210 As above</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which have been noted.</p>

4	274	Neil Chambers	<p>DE/072 Lower part of site liable to flooding, access inadequate and likely to cause problems to existing roads. Valuable green area of the town. Lack of facilities. DE/173 Liable to flood Access problems Sewage overload Lack of facilities DE/189 Liable to flood Access problems Sewage overload Lack of facilities DE/210 All of above plus access to Rothwell Road being accidents waiting to happen. Sufficient over development of town already has planning granted to the north of Desborough. No need for this development.</p>	<p>The sites which make up DE/210 are located adjacent to but not within a flood zone. Any planning application for sites located within a flood zone would need to consider flood risk in accordance with Part 10 of the National Planning Framework and would be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment. The access to the site has not yet been finalised. The provision of a safe and suitable access would be considered in detail at the planning application stage in consultation with NCC Highways Authority. 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 growth will be staggered across the plan period rather than there being an immediate increase in the number of households.</p>
---	-----	---------------	--	--

4	275	Mr & Mrs Broadbent	<p>DE/072 Our property is a bungalow backing onto one of the playing fields linked to the former Hawthorns leisure centre. On a personal level we are extremely concerned by the enormous detrimental impact of having residential development totally swamping and overwhelming our property and obliterating the rear view outlook. This will also be the case for neighbouring and other properties backing onto the playing fields, be it bungalow or house. The hawthorn hedge bordering the rear boundary of the existing properties is home to many and varied wildlife and birds. Over the short time we have lived here, from our windows we have regularly seen a variety of birds ‘ red kite, buzzard, blackbird, robin, goldfinch, sparrow, blue tit, magpie, gulls, wood pigeon, dove, heron, redwing and fieldfare to name but a few. This area has a vast array of visiting birds, not mentioning all the other species of wildlife that inhabit this environment and call it home. This will be severely disrupted, possibly even destroyed, through development on an already existing habitat. DE/173, DE/189, DE/210 On a wider level, as with many other residents, we are extremely concerned on the overall impact of developing the whole of the Ise Valley. Not only will this have a disastrous effect on the established many and varied species of wildlife, birds and their habitat, but also will dramatically increase risk of flooding (the playing fields to the side of the former Hawthorns Leisure Centre often has standing water and pooling in wet weather and long afterwards). KBC now have planning permission requirement for hardstanding on property frontage due to</p>	<p>While loss of view is not a material planning consideration impact on existing development in terms of overbearing, loss of light or loss of privacy will be considered at the planning application stage. Impact on wildlife has been considered in the assessment of the site. Development of the site would need to provide mitigation for any harm to wildlife and would be required to provide a net increase in biodiversity. 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. The Options Paper (March 2012) identified opportunities of redevelopment of the town centre to enhance the current retail offer. If this option is adopted this will ensure the town centre is redeveloped alongside any residential development.</p>
---	-----	--------------------	--	--

			<p>concerns of possible flooding from rainfall water run off, therefore where do the Council anticipate all the rainfall water to run off to, from the new housing development, presumable each property will have frontage with road leading up to? Desborough residents are already concerned about existing local services but with more housing this will have an adverse affect on an already overloaded doctors surgery, schools and the wider NHS services of local hospitals and clinics, plus heavier traffic on local road and an already congested A14. Notwithstanding the fact that Desborough does not even have a petrol station or major supermarket a small town the size of Desborough does not have the structure/services to cope with more development, more people, more traffic. Should current housing development sites, already under construction on The Grange and Pipewell Road, be taken into consideration before committing other areas in Desborough to further development? It seems KBC is putting housing development before infrastructure? Following on from 2012 Olympics everyone was encouraged to be more active and make use of green space how can Desborough residents make use of green space when KBC want to use it for housing development? What will happen to everyone who currently enjoys using the Ise Valley green space for picnics, rambling, dog walking, bird watching, exploring the countryside, playing football and cricket on the playing fields? What green space will be available for them to use that will encompass all this activity? We are all encouraged to give nature a chance and protect the environment</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

				<p>does this not apply to KBC? Perhaps the Councillors and Planners might like to wander along the Ise Valley and explore the beauty of this environment for themselves and then have a think about the impact of annihilating it for good! Once its gone, its gone forever! It isnt a case of not in my back yard , it should be not at the cost of the environment“ everyone deserves the right to a home, not just humans!</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

4	276	Jennifer Williams	<p>Dear Sir/Madam, I am writing to you because I strongly disagree with the 304 houses that you want to build on Ise Valley. I first moved to Desborough with my family and then had a child of my own and now I rent a house in Desborough. Over all I've been living here just over 9 years now. I actually live on Valley Rise, right next to where you want to build and it would be such a shame as the amount of wildlife in that area is precious! Most mornings I can see the kite (bird of prey) out of my window. But since there has been disruption in the fields such as crane and lorries etc, I haven't seen them. If you build houses there will be NO wildlife. Ise Valley fields, I take my son for walks to get as much fresh air as possible and show him the wildlife. The reason why we moved to Desborough in the first place was because of all the fields around. There has been houses build on the Grange, we can no longer go for walks there. The only place to walk is in Ise Valley fields. At the moment, there is a year/two year waiting list to put my son on for schools and nurseries. So if you build on this land it will mean even longer waiting list and some children may not be able to have a place in a Desborough nursery or school. Children surestart centre is attached on to the Library and it is very small and its hard to book your child in for a group as it is and if more houses are build, more people, more children and even harder for surestart to allow booking for activities that take place at surestart. I also walk my dog on Ise Valley as that is the only place where he can run freely on his walks. The Grange houses couldn't be sold so the Council put them as Council houses so what makes you think that building</p>	<p>Impact on wildlife has been considered in the assessment of the site. Development of the site would need to provide mitigation for any harm to wildlife and would be required to provide a net increase in biodiversity. Provision of schools is an important consideration when planning for future growth. Kettering Borough Council works closely with NCC Education 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.</p>
---	-----	-------------------	---	--

houses on Ise Valley will be any different. The Leisure Centre was also rebuilt up the grange but no bigger, just the same size as what it was down Broadlands. It will not be able to accommodate more people than what it does now. Please do not build houses on Ise Valley.

4	277	Thomas Williams		Dear Man or Lady, I got my mummy to help me write this. Please do not build on Ise Valley because I love to walk and play there with my mum and our dog. Thank you.	Thank you for your comments which have been noted.
4	278	Mrs Linda Cordazzo		Desborough 'Ise Valley Development I oppose this potential development for reasons set out below: The infrastructure of Desborough town totally inadequate to support the addition of 304 extra houses: schools, doctors surgery, shopping facilities would require careful scrutiny. The eradication of so much green field area, a conservation/wildlife hotspot, is unacceptable in these days of save the environment philosophy. Increased traffic on Broadlands a hazard this road already becomes a rat run at peak times and road traffic humps would need to be installed to slow traffic down plus erection of speed limit signs. Surface water flooding would be inevitable within the valley and new houses would be subjected to flooding risk on a larger scale.	Thank you for your comments. 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. The Options Paper (March 2012) identified opportunities of redevelopment of the town centre to enhance the current retail offer. If this option is adopted this will ensure the town centre is redeveloped alongside any residential development.

4	285	Jill Ransom	<p>Dear Sirs Site Specific Proposals Local Development Document Housing Allocation Assessment of Additional Sites and Update DE/072 Former Hawthorns Site, DE/173 Lower Steeping, DE/189 Land Adjacent to the Hawthorns, DE/210 Comprehensive Development of DE/072, DE/173 and DE/189 I wish to make the following comments in respect of the above proposals: 1. The current access road to the former Hawthorns site is completely unsuitable for the number of houses proposed given that at the very least there will be 102 vehicles passing through but as most families have at least 2 cars that is 404 vehicles at best. 2. The same can be said for the land adjacent to the Hawthorns if you add the amount of vehicles to the number of houses that is another 74 (double it to 148) vehicles passing along Broadlands up towards and along Dunkirk Avenue, or Rushton Road. 3. There is currently no access at Lower Steeping but again if there were the number of vehicles using this would be 86 (double it to 172) In total 724 additional vehicles. Any access onto a new development from Rothwell Road would turn the roads in this area into rat runs with people using it as a short cut, thus making it very dangerous. The junctions onto the main road (Rothwell Road/Harborough Road) are not capable of taking the extra traffic. It is already noticeably busy due to the extra traffic from The Grange. It is well known due to the gradient of Lower Steeping, Kenmore Drive and in fact all the roads leading up to Dunkirk Avenue that these roads become very icy in the winter making it very difficult/impossible to drive along. There</p>	<p>The access to site DE/210 has not yet been finalised. The provision of a safe and suitable access would be considered in detail at the planning application stage in consultation with NCC Highways Authority. It is also likely that development of a site of this size will be required to contribute towards improvements to the highway network via a s.106 agreement. The sites which make up DE/210 are adjacent to but not within a flood zone. Any planning application for sites located within a flood zone would need to consider flood risk in accordance with Part 10 of the National Planning Framework and would 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. 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.</p>
---	-----	-------------	---	---

			<p>have been occasions when many residents in Kenmore Drive have not able to get to work when it snows due to the road becoming too slippery. Increased traffic will make this situation worse and the prospect of an accident inevitable.</p> <p>4. The land beyond Lower Steeping is prone to flooding. The River Ise frequently bursts its banks leading to severe flooding in the dip on the Rothwell Road making it impossible for some vehicles. An example of what can happen when land near a river is developed can be found in Market Harborough. The car park next to the development on the old Harborough Rubber site on St Marys Road has flooded on more than one occasion with vehicles left standing in deep water.</p> <p>5. There is the matter of the water pumping station on the land adjacent to the Hawthorns. Again the ground is very wet along here near the river.</p> <p>6. Apart from the hundreds of extra vehicles using the roads there is the extra load on public amenities doctor surgery, schools etc. Since the development on The Grange (with more houses to be built in the future) it is already difficult to get an appointment at the doctors and the schools are full to capacity with Loatlands being the only school with land to expand. There is not the capability to cope with anymore people.</p> <p>7. The entire area of land which has been allocated for comprehensive development is of ecological and historic interest together with valuable much needed green space, much of which has already been lost. It is asked that the points above be taken into account when decisions are made on the future of Desborough.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

4	287	Mr Leslie Green	<p>To whom it may concern: I have only lived in Desborough for just over a year now but what attracted me here was the view from the back of the house. It was perfect for my two dogs and safe for my kids which we plan to have in the future. As a keen photographer this was perfect to. My worry now is when you start building on this land the abundance of snakes, kingfishers, herons, bats, badgers, red kites and the vast amount of other birds we get in this area may disappear for good which would be a shame for everyone who enjoys walking in and around these area!!! My main concern is the future of our Children. Over 300 houses in this small area, if each house has at least two kids this means an extra 600 children fighting for School places. Is building more Schools in your plans to? If so can we know where and when you will be building them so we can plan for our Childrens future, weather we stay in Desborough or move to somewhere were we know our kids are going to have the attention they need instead of just being part of a money making project. Another worry is the amount of traffic 300 house will cause to what was once a very safe environment for children. Look forward to reading your reply. A very concerned Resident & Parent</p>	<p>Impact on wildlife 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 and would also need to provide a net increase in biodiversity. Provision of schools is an important consideration when planning for future growth. Kettering Borough Council works closely with NCC Education to ensure adequate provision is available for residents of new development.</p>
---	-----	-----------------	---	---

4	288	John & Rita Eden	<p>Dear Sir, We would like to register our objection to planning applications DE/072, DE/073, DE/189 & DE/210 in the LDD Housing Applications 2013 for the following reasons: 1) There will be considerable increased traffic along the various roads linking the development to Dunkirk Avenue, both during construction by heavy building plant/lorries & once built. Additionally, Dunkirk Avenue itself is already a very busy road which will be made more congested & dangerous by the additional traffic. 2) The developments will result in loss of land that is regularly used for both social & pleasure purposes as well as a valuable & longstanding wildlife habitat. 3) Damage will be caused to the River Ise through pollution, vandalism & general lack of care & maintenance by the close proximity of the development. 4) The building of the properties is on land that has already been designated as a potential flood area. For these reasons, I do not believe that any parts of the proposals ' & particularly the part DE/210 comprising the whole site - are suitable for the building of dwellings or of any other forms of building or structure.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which have been noted. The sites which make up DE/210 are adjacent to but not within a flood zone. Any planning application for sites located within a flood zone would need to consider flood risk in accordance with Part 10 of the National Planning Framework and would be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment. Impact on wildlife 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 and would also need to provide a net increase in biodiversity.</p>
---	-----	---------------------	--	---

4	289	Christina Kingsnorth	<p>Dear Sir/Madam PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF LAND ACROSS THE ISE VALLEY SOUTH OF DESBOROUGH FOR 304 HOUSES KETTERING BOROUGH COUNCIL REF DE/210 (COMPRISING DE/072, DE/189 AND DE/173) I wish to inform Kettering Borough Council that I strongly object to the proposed development of the land above, due to serious and genuine concerns which are outlined below. ENVIRONMENT: The 2012 National Planning Policy Framework clearly lays out the importance of sustainable development stating planning systems need to perform an environmental role contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; and as part of this helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently, minimise waste and pollution, mitigate and adapt to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy. The Ise Valley is comprised of arable, modern meadow, historic meadow, natural scrub and natural wetland. Semi-natural grasslands, along with other habitats, are now so fragmented that wildlife cannot move from one area to another this isolation threatens it with extinction. Pollution from transport, etc changes grasslands and damages wildlife nitrogen gases from vehicle emissions eventually land on the soil. A proposed development of 300+ houses generating an average of 1.5 to 2 cars per household, associated pet waste, uncontrolled domestic use of pesticides, herbicides, garden fertilisers and detergents, would have a devastating impact on the environment and biodiversity not just on the protected land of the</p>	<p>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. The access to site DE/210 has not yet been finalised. The provision of a safe and suitable access would be considered in detail at the planning application stage in consultation with NCC Highways Authority. 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 sites which make up DE/210 are adjacent to but not within a flood zone. Any planning application for sites located within a flood zone would need to consider flood risk in accordance with Part 10 of the National Planning Framework and would be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment.</p>
---	-----	----------------------	---	---

adjacent Tailby Meadow, but the entire River Ise catchment, and would waste significant amounts of public money invested to protect the valleys complex Ecosystems. Even if a reduced area of green space to form a linear corridor was reserved next to the proposed development, the ecological status of the Ise catchment would be negatively affected. Millions of pounds from public resources have been invested to benefit the valley, together with a number of costly yet sustainable river restoration projects. As a result of this investment, the River Ise is one of only two rivers in the whole of Northamptonshires Nene Catchment that has Good Ecological Status as required by EU and British law through the Water Framework Directive. Consequently, this has established a strong foundation for a rich and diverse habitat to evolve, much of which resides in the Ise Valley on the southern margins of Desborough. Many of the trees and hedges across the whole area of DE/210 are ancient and provide habitat for birds such as green woodpeckers, greater spotted woodpeckers, sparrows, robins, wrens, bullfinches, chaffinches, greenfinches, kingfishers, and many varieties of butterflies. There are known badger sets to the east and there have been sightings of otters and Muntjac deer. Newts, frogs, toads, mice, and grass snakes inhabit the wetland areas from east to west. This habitat includes protected species such as bullhead fish, water voles, white clawed crayfish and Daubenton bat roosts. The Ise is the only river in the Nene catchment to naturally support stocks of Grayling. Numerous pipestrelle bat roosts, red listed cricket warblers, starlings and red polls in

			<p>the hedgerows. Unploughed adjacent meadows provide an abundance of field rodents which feed re-introduced red-listed red kites and amber-listed barn owls, rarer little owls, kestrels and buzzards. Developers may offer artificial mitigation measures that offer some relief in dense urban areas where wildlife is at a minimum surely this could not be approved in such a habitat rich area as this? Local Authorities have a Duty to have regard to the conservation of biodiversity in exercising their functions. This Duty was introduced by the National Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 again at a cost to the tax payer. Similarly the National Planning Policy Framework also places a Duty on the Local Authority to have regard to health matters when planning. Over the last 50 years, this private and public investment combined runs into millions of pounds for the Ise Valley. VEHICULAR ACCESS TO DE/210: Access issues have frequently been raised in the past and have been regarded as constraints against development of the area. Vehicular access points are still limited - possible areas such as Rothwell Road (former A6) to the west, Redwood Close, Sycamore Drive and despite the demolition of Desboroughs former Leisure Centre in the Hawthorns to the east, are all unsuitable for such a large development. There are several issues relating to access points at the east of the town via Redwood Close a narrow road with on-street parking. Accessed via Broadlands which is already a congested area (particularly with its proximity to the shop virtually opposite the junction). This area of Broadlands has restricted off-street parking and</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>is also a bus route. Access via the Hawthorns would also be unsuitable for such volumes of traffic due to the size of the road and its exit onto Broadlands, as detailed above, is already a congested area with cars parked along the street. Despite the obvious reduction due to the by-pass, the volume of traffic on the B576 (previously the A6) is still heavy as it is still used extensively. It is often quicker to leave the A14 and drive through Rothwell and Desborough using the B576, as opposed to using the by-pass and trying to manoeuvre past parked cars on Braybrooke Road and negotiating the chaotic junction at the end to join the B576. The proposed access point from Rothwell Road (B576) is a potential accident zone. It lies at the lowest point in the valley and traffic travels at speed down/up the hill. The volume of vehicles generated from a development of this size accessing at this point, would compromise the safety of pedestrians and school children travelling daily to/from Montsaye Academy either walking/or cycling. As this land is the lowest point in the valley, it frequently floods and the River Ise sometimes bursts its banks</p> <p>PROTECTED OPEN SPACE AND HEALTH BENEFITS: Thousands of residents regularly exercise and mentally and physically benefit from open, natural space and habitat provided by the Ise Valley. We are often reminded about the increased burden an increasing population living a longer lifespan, is having on the National Health Service. There is abundant evidence associating poor mental and physical health with poor access to open countryside. An active population will reduce chances of obesity and</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>related conditions e.g. diabetes and heart disease. On a national scale inactivity places an estimated cost burden on the NHS of over £10 bn pa. The National Planning Policy Framework 2012 (NPPF) stresses the importance of green space in planning modern developments and making decisions that benefit the natural environment. The South of Desborough has a natural environment that would not benefit from further development of any kind. The North West and West of Desborough have natural environments that would gain from the investment that sustainable development can provide benefiting residents, wildlife, rural economy and ecosystems alike. The Revital-Ise leaflet promotes circular walks; The fields on the Desborough side of the River Ise between the Millennium Green and Tailby Meadow are regularly walked by local people and have been for hundreds of years. Kissing gates and a stile have been put in at the end of the walk for ease of site access. The Desborough Local Plan 1995-2006 (adopted 1995) identified the whole area under ref 94, 97 D10, 88, 18 and 19 as areas protected and/or proposed as 1. Public open space or environmentally important open space and 2. Outdoor sports facilities. The paper Strategic Development area at Desborough produced by Kettering Borough Council in 2002 states There are areas that clearly should not be developed - the most obvious being the River Ise Valley, which provides an attractive break between the two towns . The reasoning is questionable for the reclassification of this land since 2006, especially since the reason for discounting the parcel of land under KBC ref</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>DE/065 (to the south of Pioneer Avenue and west of Rothwell Road) has been discounted for reasons that development of this site would have a negative impact on the Lse green corridor and has a potential flood risk and noise issue. It is questionable that Desborough needs, or can cope with the addition of a further 304 houses. There are currently approximately 150-200 properties within a varying price range for sale in Desborough and additional properties available for rent. In fact at the Desborough Town Council meeting on 21 November 2013, which was attended by more than 60 concerned residents, the Committee stated that KBC already has its housing allocation for the next 10 years. The reasons the Borough Council have given for discounting development of site DE/065 apply equally to DE/210, so there may be scope for pursuing a judicial review on the grounds of irrationality or procedural impropriety.</p> <p>INFRASTRUCTURE: It is apparent that Desborough has inadequate infrastructure to support this proposed development. It would generate additional use of vehicles and traffic congestion in the centre of the town in order to access medical, educational and leisure facilities and at access points. Education Schools are already full to capacity with some children residing in Desborough having to attend schools in neighbouring villages. Medical Facilities The Desborough surgery already is over-stretched and it is difficult for residents to actually see a doctor, often having to travel to Rothwell, which isnt acceptable whilst ill, especially if someone has no transport. The surgery has a limited parking facility and there are inadequate public</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>car parks in Desborough. The proposed development is a distance from the town centre and approached by a steep, uphill climb 'not conducive to walking or cycling by the elderly, disabled or people with small children, whilst ill.</p> <p>Recreation The location of the proposed dwellings south of Desborough is not conducive to use of the leisure centre on the north as it would not be practical to have to walk this distance, and would certainly be unsafe for children to travel on foot. The current facilities provided by the new leisure centre at the Grange are less than those provided by the old leisure centre at the Hawthorns. It is widely agreed by Desborough residents that the facilities provided by the new leisure centre are inadequate to support an additional 304 houses.</p> <p>FLOODING: The majority of the area of the proposed development land and access areas is subject to frequent and severe flooding and there is evidence of this at times of consistent rain, melting snow and increasing frequency of flash floods, not only along the proximity to the river but elsewhere to the east and the west because of the variations in land levels. Surface water issues at the North and North West of the town are also far less significant than the proposed development along the Ise valley.</p> <p>SUMMARY: To summarise - this part of the Ise Valley has been habitually used by generations, and is a hugely important amenity currently enjoyed by the community of Desborough. Everybody should have the opportunity to access, use, and enjoy England natural environment and outdoor spaces. The natural environment is not a luxury for society it critically underpins and delivers a</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

wide range of goods and services from food and water, to flood defence and carbon storage. (Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs policy). The CPRE (Campaign to Protect Rural England) in its campaign for the protection of rural England states: Local people are being disregarded, open countryside is being developed... evidence from across England that the effects of current policies on the countryside are devastating, with the Green Belt, protected areas and, above all, our "ordinary" but hugely valued countryside, destroyed or threatened with destruction. www.cpre.org.uk/how-you-can-help/
I hope these comments are received as constructive, genuine concerns for the overall benefit of Desborough, Rothwell and the River Ise Upper Catchment, and would be grateful if you could acknowledge receipt of this letter.
Yours faithfully

4	290	Thomas Kingsnorth	<p>To whom it may concern PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF LAND ACROSS THE ISE VALLEY SOUTH OF DESBOROUGH FOR 304 HOUSES KETTERING BOROUGH COUNCIL REF DE/210 (COMPRISING DE/072, DE/189 AND DE/173) I wish to inform Kettering Borough Council that I strongly object to the proposed development of the land above, due to serious and genuine concerns as follows: Access issues have frequently been raised in the past and have been regarded as constraints against development of the area. Many of the trees and hedges across the whole area of DE/210 are ancient and provide habitat for several protected species of wildlife. Also, birds such as green woodpeckers, greater spotted woodpeckers, sparrows, robins, wrens, bullfinches, chaffinches, greenfinches, kingfishers, and many varieties of butterflies. We know there are badger sets to the east and neighbours have seen otters and also Muntjac deer. Other wildlife along the Valley include newts, frogs, toads, mice, and grass snakes. There are fish, water voles, white clawed crayfish and bat roosts. There are field rodents which feed re-introduced red-listed red kites, also owls, kestrels and buzzards. Thousands of residents of all ages regularly exercise and walk their dogs 'whatever the weather or time of year. Everyone benefits mentally and physically from the countryside and the open, natural space provided by the Ise Valley. My Dad, my twin brother and myself benefit from cross-country running and have enjoyed the recreational benefits of being in the countryside since we were born in 1994. The Government is actively</p>	<p>The access to site DE/210 has not yet been finalised. The provision of a safe and suitable access would be considered in detail at the planning application stage in consultation with NCC Highways Authority. Impact on wildlife 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 and would also need to provide a net increase in biodiversity. 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. The sites which make up DE/210 are adjacent to but not within a flood zone. Any planning application for sites located within a flood zone would need to consider flood risk in accordance with Part 10 of the National Planning Framework and would be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment.</p>
---	-----	-------------------	--	---

			<p>encouraging the public to exercise which obviously reduces obesity and related illnesses such as diabetes and heart disease. On a national scale inactivity places an estimated cost burden on the NHS of over Â£10 billion pa. Desborough is already struggling to cope with traffic congestion, insufficient car parking facilities, schools within the town are full, doctors surgery cannot often accommodate patients and are asked to travel to Rothwell, and also the new Leisure Centre at the Grange doesnt offer equivalent facilities as the previous Hawthorns Leisure Centre did, and its quite a distance for people who live in the South of Desborough to go all the way up to the Grange. We often see the River Ise burst its banks and I've taken some photos of the extent of the flooding. If there were over 300 houses and tarmac roads built along this proposed development in the valley, all the surface water, household detergents and chemicals, together with climate change and flash floods, would make the flooding situation worse and severely affect the water quality of the River Ise.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

4	291	Keith Kingsnorth	<p>Dear Sir/Madam PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF LAND ACROSS THE ISE VALLEY SOUTH OF DESBOROUGH FOR 304 HOUSES KETTERING BOROUGH COUNCIL REF DE/210 (COMPRISING DE/072, DE/189 AND DE/173) I wish to inform Kettering Borough Council that I strongly object to the proposed development of the land above, due to the following serious and genuine concerns :</p> <p>ENVIRONMENT: Pollution from transport, etc changes grasslands and damages wildlife ‘ nitrogen gases from vehicle emissions eventually land on the soil. A proposed development of 300+ houses generating an average of 1.5 to 2 cars per household, associated pet waste, uncontrolled domestic use of pesticides, herbicides, garden fertilisers and detergents, would have a devastating impact on the environment and biodiversity ‘ not just on the protected land of the adjacent Tailby Meadow, managed by The Wildlife Trust, but the entire River Ise catchment, and would waste significant amounts of public money invested to protect the valleys complex Ecosystems. Even if a reduced area of green space was created next to the proposed development, still giving access for the public to the countryside, this would impact on the ecological status of the Ise catchment. Millions of pounds from public resources have been invested to benefit the valley, together with a number of costly yet sustainable river restoration projects. As a result of this investment, the River Ise is one of only two rivers in the whole of Northamptonshire’s Nene Catchment that has Good Ecological Status as required by EU and British law through</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Impact on wildlife 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 and would also need to provide a net increase in biodiversity. The access to the site has not yet been finalised. The provision of a safe and suitable access would be considered in detail at the planning application stage in consultation with NCC Highways Authority. 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. The Options Paper (March 2012) identified opportunities of redevelopment of the town centre to enhance the current retail offer. If this option is adopted this will ensure the town centre is redeveloped alongside any residential 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 identified sites do not fall within a flood zone. They are adjacent to a flood zone and this has been recognised in</p>
---	-----	------------------	--	---

			<p>the Water Framework Directive. Consequently, this has established a strong foundation for a rich and diverse habitat to evolve, much of which resides in the Ise Valley on the southern margins of Desborough. Many of the trees and hedges across the whole area of DE/210 are ancient and provide habitat for birds such as green woodpeckers, greater spotted woodpeckers, sparrows, robins, wrens, bullfinches, chaffinches, greenfinches, kingfishers, and many varieties of butterflies. There are known badger sets to the east and there have been sightings of otters and Muntjac deer. Newts, frogs, toads, mice, and grass snakes inhabit the wetland areas from east to west. This habitat includes protected species such as bullhead fish, water voles, white clawed crayfish and Daubenton bat roosts. The Ise is the only river in the Nene catchment to naturally support stocks of Grayling. Numerous pipestrelle bat roosts, red listed cricket warblers, starlings and red polls in the hedgerows. Unploughed adjacent meadows provide an abundance of field rodents which feed re-introduced red-listed red kites and amber-listed barn owls, rarer little owls, kestrels and buzzards. Even with the assurance that developers may offer artificial mitigation measures with regard to the wildlife, with such an abundant variety of species, some red-listed, this cannot be acceptable. Over the last 50 years, this private and public investment combined runs into millions of pounds for the Ise Valley. VEHICULAR ACCESS TO DE/210: Access issues have frequently been raised in the past and have been regarded as constraints against development of the area. Vehicular</p>	<p>the assessment of the sites. Any planning application for a site located within a flood zone would need to consider flood risk in accordance with Part 10 of the National Planning Framework and would be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment.</p>
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>access points are still limited - possible areas such as Rothwell Road (former A6) to the west, Redwood Close, Sycamore Drive and despite the demolition of Desboroughs former Leisure Centre in the Hawthorns to the east, are all unsuitable for such a large development. The proposed access point from Rothwell Road (B576) is a potential accident zone. It lies at the lowest point in the valley and traffic travels at speed down/up the hill. The volume of vehicles generated from a development of this size accessing at this point, would compromise the safety of pedestrians and school children travelling daily to/from Montsaye Academy either walking/or cycling. As this land is the lowest point in the valley, it frequently floods and the River Ise sometimes bursts its banks</p> <p>PROTECTED OPEN SPACE AND HEALTH BENEFITS: Thousands of residents regularly exercise and mentally and physically benefit from open, natural space and habitat provided by the Ise Valley, myself included and have done for 23 years since moving here. I enjoy regular cross country running in the Valley, together with my sons, and is of a huge health benefit. We are often reminded about the increased burden an increasing population living a longer lifespan, is having on the National Health Service. There is abundant evidence associating poor mental and physical health with poor access to open countryside. An active population will reduce chances of obesity and related conditions e.g. diabetes and heart disease. On a national scale inactivity places an estimated cost burden on the NHS of over £10 bn pa. The National Planning Policy Framework 2012 (NPPF) stresses the</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>importance of green space in planning modern developments and making decisions that benefit the natural environment. The South of Desborough has a natural environment that would not benefit from further development of any kind. The Revital-Ise leaflet promotes circular walks; The fields on the Desborough side of the River Ise between the Millennium Green and Tailby Meadow are regularly walked by local people and have been for hundreds of years. Kissing gates and a stile have been put in at the end of the walk for ease of site access. The Desborough Local Plan 1995-2006 (adopted 1995) identified the whole area under ref 94, 97 D10, 88, 18 and 19 as areas protected and/or proposed as 1. Public open space or environmentally important open space and 2. Outdoor sports facilities. The paper Strategic Development area at Desborough produced by Kettering Borough Council in 2002 states There are areas that clearly should not be developed - the most obvious being the River Ise Valley, which provides an attractive break between the two towns. The reasoning is questionable for the reclassification of this land since 2006, especially since the reason for discounting the parcel of land under KBC ref DE/065 (to the south of Pioneer Avenue and west of Rothwell Road) has been discounted for reasons that development of this site would have a negative impact on the Ise green corridor and has a potential flood risk and noise issue. It is questionable that Desborough needs, or can cope with the addition of a further 304 houses. There are currently approximately 150-200 properties within a varying price range for sale in</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>Desborough and additional properties available for rent. In fact at the Desborough Town Council meeting on 21 November 2013, which was attended by more than 60 concerned residents who signed an ongoing petition, the Committee stated that KBC already has its housing allocation for the next 10 years. The reasons the Borough Council have given for discounting development of site DE/065 apply equally to DE/210, so why would KBC assess the land comprised in DE/210 as any different, which suggests inconsistencies with the assessment?</p> <p>INFRASTRUCTURE: It is apparent that Desborough has inadequate infrastructure to support this proposed development. It would generate additional use of vehicles and traffic congestion in the centre of the town in order to access already over-stretched medical, educational and leisure facilities and at congested access points, and clearly the car parking facilities are inadequate.</p> <p>FLOODING: Surface water issues at the North and North West of the town are also far less significant than the proposed development along the Ise valley. The majority of the area of the proposed development land and access areas is subject to frequent and severe flooding and there is evidence of this at times of consistent rain, melting snow and increasing frequency of flash floods, not only along the proximity to the river but elsewhere to the east and the west because of the variations in land levels. To conclude, I would like to highlight that this part of the Ise Valley has been habitually used by generations, and is a hugely important amenity currently enjoyed by the community of Desborough. I</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

hope these comments are received as constructive, genuine concerns for the overall benefit of Desborough, Rothwell and the River Ise Upper Catchment, and would be grateful if you could acknowledge receipt of this letter.

4	292	Mr & Mrs D S Rayson	<p>Dear Sir/Madam, Re: Comprehensive Development of DE/072/DE173/DE189 I have lived in Desborough for over 50 years to take away the green space and area of natural beauty would be a disgrace, before we look at building more houses we need to invest in the town centre it is insufficient to support our current population. We lost the Hawthorns Leisure Ctr to be replaced by one that is insufficient with not enough car parking facilities. Residents of Desborough wanted a Sainsburys 89% with a Petrol Filling Station, but it appears Tescos are going to build if the Co-op which I understand has taken place lift the covenant off the site for Tescos to sell food. The Co-op are in talks with I wonder who to sell the land adjacent to the Hawthorns for a substantial amount of money to build 74 houses on land that you quoted on your website in 2012 was a Historically Visually Important Open Space, and in 2002 K.B.C also quoted that the Ise Valley is to be protected. K.B.C if you let this development go ahead you are a disgrace to take away a Green Open Space that is enjoyed by Families, Dog Walkerâ€™s, Disabled, Cyclists and Runners. It would be a disaster if this area of Desborough became a housing estate. At the end of the day who in their right mind would like to live on top of a sewage plant which just recently turns your stomach with raw sewage going into the river Ise which is another point. This land should be protected like the Tailby Meadow to enable wildlife to flourish. Last year the River Ise burst its banks which is the field below the proposed development. If more houses are built it will increase surface water</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The Options Paper (March 2012) identified opportunities of redevelopment of the town centre to enhance the current retail offer. If this option is adopted this will ensure the town centre is redeveloped alongside any residential 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 identified sites do not fall within a flood zone. They are adjacent to a flood zone and this has been recognised in the assessment of the sites. Any planning application for a site located within a flood zone would need to consider flood risk in accordance with Part 10 of the National Planning Framework and would be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment. The access to site DE/210 has not yet been finalised. The provision of a safe and suitable access would be considered in detail at the planning application stage in consultation with NCC Highways Authority. 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.</p>
---	-----	------------------------	--	--

flooding and more raw sewage!!! Proposed access to the site is insufficient, what plans are in place to deal with the increase in traffic, when building the Desborough/Rothwell by-pass I understood that the idea was to keep a corridor between the towns and both towns be Market Towns, it seems for Rothwell that this is the case with pleasant shops and restaurants, schools and doctors, but Desborough just keeps increasing without extra schools, Doctors and as for the town centre it is a disgrace. We need to protect the Ise Valley and not build another 304 houses let it be protected as Green Open Space. Please do not destroy this area of natural beauty

4	293	Lewis Kingsnorth	<p>Dear Sirs PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF LAND ACROSS THE ISE VALLEY SOUTH OF DESBOROUGH FOR 304 HOUSES KETTERING BOROUGH COUNCIL REF DE/210 (COMPRISING DE/072, DE/189 AND DE/173) I wish to inform Kettering Borough Council that I strongly object to the proposed development of the land above for housing. I am studying BSc Environmental Science and have a passionate interest in the environment and its conservation. Many of the trees and hedges across the whole area of DE/210 are ancient and provide habitat for several protected species of wildlife. Also, birds such as green woodpeckers, greater spotted woodpeckers, sparrows, robins, wrens, bullfinches, chaffinches, greenfinches, kingfishers, and many varieties of butterflies. We know there are badger sets to the east and neighbours have seen otters and also Muntjac deer. Other wildlife along the Valley include newts, frogs, toads, mice, and grass snakes. There are fish, water voles, white clawed crayfish and bat roosts. Re-introduced red-listed red kites, owls, kestrels and buzzards feed on field rodents in the fields within this area. The River Ise is prone to flooding; if there were over 300 houses and tarmac roads constructed along this proposed development in the valley, all the additional surface water and pollutants, combined with climate change, would exacerbate the flooding situation and uncontrolled use of household detergents and chemicals would severely affect the water quality of the River Ise. Millions of pounds from public resources have been invested to benefit the valley, together with a number of costly yet</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Impact on wildlife 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 and would also need to provide a net increase in biodiversity. The identified sites do not fall within a flood zone. They are adjacent to a flood zone and this has been recognised in the assessment of the sites. Any planning application for a site located within a flood zone would need to consider flood risk in accordance with Policy 10 of the National Planning Framework and would be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment. The access to site DE/210 has not yet been finalised. The provision of a safe and suitable access would be considered in detail at the planning application stage in consultation with NCC Highways Authority. 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. Further work will be required to address the issues raised</p>
---	-----	---------------------	---	---

			<p>sustainable river restoration projects. As a result of this investment, the River Ise is one of only two rivers in the whole of Northamptonshire's Nene Catchment that has Good Ecological Status as required by EU and British law through the Water Framework Directive. The Government is actively encouraging the public to exercise which obviously reduces obesity and related illnesses such as diabetes and heart disease. On a national scale inactivity places an estimated cost burden on the NHS of over £10 billion pa. My family all enjoy walking and exercising in the fields; My Dad, my twin brother and myself benefit from cross-country running and have enjoyed the recreational benefits of being in the countryside since we were born in 1994. Thousands of residents of all ages, and also people from Rothwell, regularly exercise and walk their dogs 'whatever the weather or time of year. Everyone benefits mentally and physically from the countryside and the open, natural space provided by the Ise Valley. Access issues have frequently been raised in the past and have been regarded as constraints against development of the area. Desborough is already struggling to cope with traffic congestion, insufficient car parking facilities, schools within the town are full, doctors surgery cannot often accommodate patients and are asked to travel to Rothwell, and also the new Leisure Centre at the Grange doesn't offer equivalent facilities as the previous Hawthorns Leisure Centre. The infrastructure of the town has not really been improved since the introduction of the Grange development and its numerous inhabitants. Taking into account my concerns, together with</p>	<p>through the consultation process before progression of the site.</p>
--	--	--	---	---

				<p>a large percentage of Desborough residents who are opposing this proposed development, it surely has to be questioned whether it is really necessary to develop along this part of the Ise Valley. Our natural environment is priceless.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

4	294	Sheila Baylis	<p>DE/173 This area is prone to flooding as it has a high water table. After rain it becomes soggy. However wildlife abounds bats, red kites, barn owls, red deer, foxes, voles etc etc. All this amenity will be lost - make it a linear park for all to enjoy aster the loss of the plens. DE/189 This area is fundamental to the joining up of a walk from the church to the millennium bridge and onwards to Rothwell via Shotwell Mill. DE/210 The amenities, doctors, schools, traffic are appalling and this area must be kept free from housing as it allows Desborough people to breathe. The tracks made by people who use this area are visible all year round proving it is used by many people and groups for dog walking, guide/scout excursions, wildlife studying including all birds and animals.</p>	<p>The site is adjacent to but not within a flood zone. Any planning application for sites located within a flood zone would need to consider flood risk in accordance with Part 10 of the National Planning Framework and would be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment. Impact on wildlife 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 and will also need to provide a net increase in biodiversity. Provision of schools and adequate medical facilities are an important consideration when planning for future growth. Kettering Borough Council will work with NCC Education and health care providers to ensure adequate provision is available for residents of new development.</p>
---	-----	---------------	--	--

4	295	Grahame Bayliss	<p>Dear Sir or Madam Proposed development of land across the Ise Valley south of Desborough for 304 houses Kettering Borough Council ref DE/210 (comprising DE/072, DE/189 and DE/173) I write to object most strongly to the proposed development of the land above. My main concern is the infrastructure and local amenities to support the residents of a further 304 homes in Desborough. We have already seen a significant increase in the population as a result of the significant housing development to the north of the town at The Grange and there have also been smaller pockets of residential growth elsewhere. I believe the town centre just cannot even support the current number of residents. A further development of 304 houses will have a major impact on medical facilities, schools, traffic and town centre congestion and recreational facilities. I have personally queued in the street at the Desborough doctors surgery amidst elderly people and people with children it is simply not an answer to say that there is a surgery in Rothwell because contact has to be made with the Desborough surgery first with possible referral to Rothwell and people have to get there. Many of the elderly struggle even to get to Desborough surgery and certainly would not be able to walk to Rothwell. Increased car usage is also contrary to government policy. The doctors surgery was allowed planning permission without a car park and patients are warned (by notice) that they park on private land at their own risk. The library is inadequate to support a population of this size and with an increasing demand for new technology and there is no car parking facility. The Desborough</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. 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. The Options Paper (March 2012) identified opportunities of redevelopment of the town centre to enhance the current retail offer. If this option is adopted this will ensure the town centre is redeveloped alongside any residential 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. Impact on wildlife 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 and would also need to provide a net increase in biodiversity. The identified sites do not fall within a flood zone. They are adjacent to a flood zone and this has been recognised in the assessment of the sites. Any planning application for a site located within a flood zone would need to consider flood risk in accordance with Policy 10 of the National Planning Framework and would be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment. The access</p>
---	-----	-----------------	--	--

			<p>schools are full and children travel to neighbouring villages such as Wilbarston and Rushton, again increasing car usage. Our recreational facilities are poor and the new leisure centre is located well away from the proposed development sites, potentially increasing the use of the car. I believe money was left in the Maud Elkington Trust for the town to have a swimming pool but this has not materialised and the only swimming pool again, is at Rothwell, but is part of Montsaye school so its times of use are restricted and many of the elderly do not want to go out in the evenings. Desborough town centre is a disgrace. The brilliant Heritage Centre, signposted on the B576 as a place of interest is lost amidst a mis-match of take-away food outlets and boarded up buildings and very little car parking facility. How can we take pride in our town and attract visitors to the area's heritage and history when it will be almost adjacent to a major supermarket and run-down buildings! Before the Council considers more housing development at Desborough I believe it needs to concentrate on renovating the town centre. In contrast, Rothwell is a joy to visit. There are interesting shops, quality restaurants, a good library and plenty of parking. My second point concerns the conservation of the Lse Valley. Until recently the area south of Desborough (and included in the latest local Plan (to 2006) as protected open space. Numerous people walk across these fields, alone or with their families along footpaths which have been used for over twenty years and possibly for hundreds of years (as can be evidenced from the aerial view of Google Earth)</p>	<p>to site DE/210 has not yet been finalised. The provision of a safe and suitable access would be considered in detail at the planning application stage in consultation with NCC Highways Authority.</p>
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>and enjoy the wildlife. The trees and ancient hedgerows which are habitat to a huge variety of animals and birds, many of whom are native to wetland areas. There have been sightings of Munjak deer and otters, and there are badgers, grass snakes, newts, frogs, toads, mice, voles, moles and other small creatures. Bats are commonplace. Buzzards, red kites and seagulls visit the valley and there are kingfishers along the river and streams, barn owls, little owls, tawny owls, green woodpeckers, greater spotted woodpeckers, pheasants, starlings, sparrows, robins, wrens, bullfinches, chaffinches, greenfinches and a wide variety of butterflies. The preservation of Tailby Meadow has been supported by Kettering Borough Council, the County Council and the Wildlife Trust through numerous projects and in many publications as ancient meadow which should be protected. Building work and people living nearby will mean that the wildlife will be frightened away and may never return. The Environment Agency map shows an area of extreme flooding of varying widths along the River Ise but this is not indicative of the surface water which covers these fields after periods of heavy rain or melting snow. The field owned by Mr Main on which crops are grown and on which the proposed access from the B576 frequently floods and even to the north. This is because this field is bordered by land sloping into it from the east to the west, from the west to the east and from the north to the south. Even the field at the back of the church floods in wet weather and the stream between these two fields rises dramatically when there are flash floods. The proposed access</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

point off the B576 I believe is not suitable for this purpose. The B576 actually floods at this point as it is the lowest point in the valley and when it is icy and after heavy snowfalls cars are often abandoned around this point as they are unable to get up the hill to Rothwell or up the hill to Desborough in the opposite direction. This is also an area which schoolchildren use on foot or by cycle to travel home to Desborough from Montsaye School and I believe there is potential for accidents at this point. The roads in the south east of Desborough are too narrow and too congested to accommodate the potential number of vehicles that a development of this size would have if access is to be from the Hawthorns. Redwood Close and Broadlands, in particular, have vehicles parked on-street at all times as the houses do not have garages. I can only draw the conclusion that this proposal is to satisfy financial gain on behalf of the Council and the Midlands Co-op without any genuine care or consideration being given through real engagement with the community by the Council. This is very sad as there are many examples throughout the country where Councils are working together with the public to ensure the best possible outcome for all parties. In reality, KBC merely inherited the land as, I believe, it was previously owned by Desborough Urban District Council and therefore the people of Desborough. I very much doubt whether any of the money received from the sale will be used to benefit Desborough residents because, so far, I havent seen much evidence of this judging by the abysmal state of Desborough town centre and its bad reputation elsewhere because of it.

Please acknowledge receipt of this letter.

4	296	Midlands Co- operative Society		Dear Sirs please find attached representation on the above in relation to Desborough from the Midlands Co-operative Society.	Thank you for your comments which will be used to inform the next iteration of the plan. Once housing targets have been finalised in the Joint Core Strategy allocations will be reviewed to ensure sufficient land is allocated to meet housing requirements. The site identified for development will be assessed against the criteria set out in the Housing Allocations Background Paper prior to the next iteration of the plan.
---	-----	---	--	--	---

4	297	Tata Steel	<p>I write from Harris Lamb Planning Consultancy on behalf TATA Steel UK Limited in relation to the above consultation for the Site Specific Proposals LDD Housing Allocations 2013. In particular, I write in relation to sites DE/063 and DE/064 in Desborough. We are pleased to see that site DE/063 has been reassessed and has now been included as a potential housing allocation in the updated housing allocations. We fully support the allocation of this sustainably located site. I can re-confirm that the site is available to deliver housing and look forward to working with the Local Planning Authority in due course. TATA Steel UK also owns land to the north east of DE/063, which includes your site ref. DE/064. I consider this land to also be a sustainable and appropriate location for housing. It is available for development and we would welcome the opportunity to discuss the site further if the Local Planning Authority find that they require further land to meet the need for housing.</p>	<p>Your support for allocation of DE/063 has been noted. There are 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.</p>
---	-----	------------	---	--

4	304	Mr Steve Beard	Sport England	<p>DE072 ' Hawthorns Leisure centre sport England has on a number of occasions raised the issue of replacement pitches for those to be lost we have not received a response to this issue. We would object to the inclusion of this site without replacement or the area being identified as surplus in an up to date playing pitch strategy. Sport England considers proposals affecting playing fields in the light of its Playing Fields Policy: A Sporting Future for the Playing Fields of England. This is available online at: http://www.sportengland.org/facilities__planning/putting_policy_into_practice/playing_fields.aspx This policy statement defines in planning terms what is considered a Playing Pitch, which is; the whole of a site that encompasses at least one playing pitch. A playing pitch is a delineated area, which together with any run off is of 0.2 hectares or more. The aim of this policy is to ensure that there is an adequate supply of quality pitches to satisfy the current and estimated future demands of the pitch sports. The policy identifies five exceptions to our normal position of opposing development, which would result in the loss of playing fields. These may be summarised as follows: The exceptions relate to the following:- E1 - A proven excess of provision. E2 - The use is ancillary to the playing field. E3 - The site is incapable of forming part of a pitch. E4 - Equivalent or better replacement will be provided elsewhere. E5 - An alternative sports use is proposed, outweighing loss The proposal would involve the redevelopment of Desborough Leisure centre and the associated playing pitches. Clearly Sport England would</p>	Thank you for your comments which will be used to inform the production of the next iteration of the plan.
---	-----	----------------	---------------	---	--

			<p>object to the loss of facilities and pitches unless one of the exceptions listed above is met. However, we are aware of the new Desborough Leisure Centre (Phase 1 and 2) with associated pitches and facilities. We are unsure of the precise relationship of the new facility as a like for like replacement, particularly with relation to the pitches at each site and the timetable for replacement given the phasing. We also understand that there is some local opposition to the closure of the old facility and the suitability of the new facility as a replacement. In addition the built facilities have a much wider catchment than the playing pitches, the existing pitches may still be required in the local area to meet local demand It is considered therefore that there is insufficient information to make valid comments without the background and supporting information referred to above. The Kettering Leisure Facilities Strategy is currently being circulated for consultation; the strategy includes reference to the new Desborough Leisure centre. It would appear prudent to wait for this strategy to be finalised and adopted before bringing forward proposals for development on the existing site.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

4	305	Darin and Sharon Smith	<p>Dear Sir or Madam, May I already point out I already have a less than healthy opinion of development in Desborough following a large area of land in Desborough that my father in law used to own and could not get planning permission to develop despite trying prior to sale. In fact he was told planning would never be available and having subsequently sold it to a local developer it was miraculously granted planning. That road is now Water Mill Close! I now read with interest that our beautiful Ise valley is about to be decimated with yet more housing. Not content with steadily ruining Desborough town centre over the years one of the most beautiful areas it seems is again to be developed in the interest of money. This area not only suffers from terrible drainage but it is an area of great natural beauty, a natural habitat for animals and is used daily by dog walkers and happy householders living nearby. My objection will doubtless make little or no difference as this will be sneaked through before most people are aware whats going on but the additional council tax gained from the houses will hardly deal with the extra load on schools and other public services. I note work has already started in order to improve the old sewer works so it would seem a waste of time to object to this if this is the beginning which I suspect it is, which is why my short letter is to the point and concise as there is no point wasting too much time. In short I object as does almost every resident in Desborough and if the council gave a hoot about its ratepayers they would ask for a mandate prior to getting the bulldozers in!</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. All comments received are used to inform the preparation of the next iteration of the plan. Impact on wildlife was considered in the assessment. Development of the site will need to provide mitigation for any harm and will be required to provide a net increase in biodiversity.</p>
---	-----	------------------------	---	---

5	18	Mr Philip Houghton	All of the Avalon Allotments should be included with RO/086 as proposed under RO/202, this would create a more viable development and remove any potential access issues with regard to the remaining plots.	Thank you for your comments which have been noted.
---	----	--------------------	--	--

5	120	Mrs Alice Kirkham	Graduate Planner Persimmon Homes Midlands	<p>Re: Consultation Response: KBC Site Specific Proposals Local Development Document 'Housing Allocations Assessment of Additional Sites and Update This letter outlines the Persimmon Homes Midlands (Persimmon) response to Kettering Borough Councils consultation on the Housing Allocations Assessment of Additional Sites and Update paper October 2013. The response focuses on the updates to the sites in the town of Rothwell, where Persimmon have a number of land interests and where an outline planning application for the sustainable urban extension known as Rothwell North is currently being progressed. Persimmon supports the continued allocation of an additional 300 dwellings within the current application boundary at Rothwell North (site reference RO/088). Based on the anticipated trajectory of completions at Rothwell North, it is considered that the total of 1,000 dwellings can comfortably be delivered within the plan period proposed within the emerging Joint Core Strategy to 2031. Persimmon are actively working alongside the Council to progress the planning application and a revised masterplan is being drawn up in consultation with officer from the Council and the Joint Planning Unit to reflect the current planning objective and market conditions. Additionally, Persimmon consider that the site described as Land to the West of Rothwell (ref RO/085) should also be considered as an allocation for additional dwellings. This site represents a logical rounding off of the settlement when considered in the context of the Rothwell North scheme and the planning approval for dwellings on the opposite side of</p>	<p>Your comments in relation to RO/088 have been noted. Further work will be required in relation to RO/085 to determine whether it is suitable for allocation.</p>
---	-----	-------------------	---	---	---

				<p>Harrington Road to the South. It is well contained by the strategic highway infrastructure and existing/proposed development. This site is wholly owned by Persimmon and therefore there are no land contract issues that would delay the delivery of development. It is therefore considered available, suitable and achievable in line with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

5	155	Mrs Carol Marriott	Secretary (Planning & Development) Bletsoes	Please see attached Representation	Thank you for your comments which have been noted. Prior to any allocation the site will need to be assessed according to the criteria set out in the Housing Allocations Background Paper. The site will be assessed prior to the preparation of the next iteration of the Site Specific Proposals Local Development Document.
---	-----	--------------------	--	------------------------------------	---

5	250	Mr F Graves	Head of Planning Andrew Granger & Co	<p>The Borough Council is to be commended for taking a robust position with regard to the level of new housing provision. 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. In view of the above, and objections to other sites, notably Mawsley and Desborough, the inclusion of additional land at the Rothwell SUE should be considered as a further site allocation.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which have been noted. The site will need to be assessed according to the assessment criteria set out in the Housing Allocations Background Paper.</p>
---	-----	----------------	---	--	---

5	298	Mrs Carolyn Mackay	Clerk Rothwell Town Council	<p>RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION ON HOUSING ALLOCATIONS The following statements by Rothwell Town Council are in response to the Site Specific Proposals Local Development Document - Housing Allocations Assessment of Additional Sites and Update, and also to the E-mail from Julia Baish dated 15th November 2013 relating to the proposed development at Rothwell North. (1) Additional 300 homes: Rothwell Town Council already stated at an earlier Consultation that we would prefer to defer the additional 300 homes until after the first section of the development has taken place, so that we can monitor the effect that large development would have on the town generally, but especially on the town centre and the schools. The additional traffic generated by Rothwell North, a lot of which would go through our already congested town, will make the situation worse unless steps are taken to reduce the effect. However we note that the extension will be subject to a separate Planning Application. 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</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which will be used to inform the next iteration of the plan. 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</p>
---	-----	--------------------------	--------------------------------	---	--

			<p>education element to be paid by the developer. (2) Employment Land: Rothwell Town Council already stated at an earlier Consultation that the original 11 hectares of employment land must be retained at Rothwell North as Rothwell has very few jobs in the town for people to work locally so this allocation must be reinstated. This would have the additional benefit of being environmentally friendly as there would be fewer journeys to work. (3) Green Space: The area of 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. (4) Corinthians Football Ground: Rothwell Town Council already stated at an earlier Consultation that provision must be made for a suitable vehicular access to the Corinthians Football Ground with an adjoining car park. The situation is already untenable with people having to park on the verge in Desborough Road when a match is being played. If necessary, the pitch could be moved to an acceptable alternative site to provide an adequate access and a parking area. The 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 and it is also hoped that with the increased number of young people in the town the Corinthians Football Club, already thriving, will grow and this will mean additional use of the ground. (5) Conclusion: Rothwell Town Council is very concerned that</p>	<p>the existing Brachers Allotments and to the east of the new development by Morris Homes off Harrington Road have been noted.</p>
--	--	--	---	---

				<p>Kettering Borough Council did not respond positively to our original comments but instead ignored the result of the earlier consultation and we hope that this negative attitude will now be corrected. 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.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

5	300	The Governors of Jesus Hospital Rothwell	The Governors of Jesus Hospital Rothwell	Dear Sirs Housing Allocations Assessment of additional sites and update which each of the first I write in respect of your proposals set out on page 26-28 of the above document with particular reference to site RO/083 and would ask that this site would be considered further in line with the representations previously submitted on 23 April 2012, copy enclosed, for your consideration. Similarly in relation to RO/203 we would ask you to reconsider that this could be brought forward as a part of the sustainable urban extension currently being considered as a current planning application by your council and it would seem illogical to exclude this area of land from that development. We look forward to hearing from you further and would be grateful to receive an acknowledgement in writing by return.	RO/083 has been assessed according to the criteria set out in the Housing Allocations Background Paper. While the site scores highly in terms of its central location development would have a harmful impact upon the setting of various heritage assets in the vicinity of the site. The site has therefore been discounted on this basis. RO/203 has not been included in the planning application boundary for this site and consequently it has not been included as part of RO/088. The site 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.
6	5	Mrs Jackie Matthews		We strongly agree with the recommendations, both sites are inappropriate for development for a number of reasons.	Noted.
6	64	Mr David Quayle	Ashley Parish Council	Ashley Parish Council notes and accepts the content regarding Ashley.	Noted.

6	118	Mr Martin Whatton		Site Specific Proposals Local Development Document Housing Allocations 2013 Assessment of Additional Sites and Update Consultation Further to the above consultation, please find enclosed representations on behalf of our client.	Thank you for your comments which have been duly 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. Notwithstanding the Inspectors 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. The site is a greenfield site which contributes to the rural character and setting of this part of the village and on this basis remains a discounted option.
---	-----	----------------------	--	---	--

8	1	Mr George Normand	<p>Add a new site: the school, which is now closed and eminently suitable for redevelopment. The conclusions on the other sites seem illogical. If there is no established need for housing now, either all sites should be discounted without further comment or, more rationally, the sites should assigned according to other criteria against the time when there is a need. Para 8.5 says RA/185 "has relatively few constraints", so in what sense is it unsustainable? I am not aware of it having been considered before. I suggest RA/185 should be allocated now as a suitable site for development unless there is a much stronger argument against than is made here. I further suggest the issue of "established need for housing" should be qualified by reference to a widespread need for affordable housing.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. RA/185 was suggested as a site for development following the Options Paper consultation. The school site will now need to be assessed according to the same criteria set out in the Housing Allocations Background Paper prior to any conclusions on an appropriate option for Braybrooke.</p>
---	---	-------------------	---	--

8	2	Mr James Hakewill	<p>We STRONGLY AGREE that the Paddock to the South of the Old Rectory should be included within the "Village Boundary" of Braybrooke. We also believe that the Local Plan Inspector's and Local Planning Authority's acceptance of development potential to the west and of the Old Rectory and South of 29 Newland Street should also be included within the Village Boundary (see report extract below). - We therefore STRONGLY DISAGREE with the shading red of part of RA/128. - The following extract from the Inspectors Report on the Kettering Borough Local Plan June 1993. The three sites identified A,B and C relate to the paddock to the south of the Old Rectory (A), the derelict buildings to the west of the Rectory (B) and the former grain store barn immediately to the south of 29 Newland Street (C). - The inspector considered all the issues including that of the setting of the listed Building The Old Rectory. Nothing has changed and we would expect a similar outcome today, but feel that we have waited long enough for the injustice in the way that our aspirations were rejected in the absence of material planning reasons. We therefore request that the paddock to the south of the Old Rectory RA/128 be included within the village boundary, and in line with the previous Inspector's recommendations that should include the remaining area or RA/128 shaded red. - Page 80/81/82 of the Local Plan Inspector's Report to Kettering Borough Council May 1993."Case For Objector 128 (Hakewill - Braybrooke) - 4.224 This objection is seeking the inclusion of three separate but adjoining sites around the old Rectory, a listed building, within the village</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which have been noted. A number of representations received through the consultation process have identified the school site as being suitable for development. It is therefore necessary to assess this site against the criteria set out in the Housing Allocations Background Paper before any conclusions can be made on the preferred option for Braybrooke in the next iteration of the plan.</p>
---	---	-------------------	--	--

			<p>boundary of Braybrooke. All three sites are within the historic boundary of the village and the acceptance of that would mean that they could contribute to the shortfall in housing allocations within the LP by accommodating up to 10 dwellings. The sites can be considered separately as each would be served by its own access and service arrangements. 4.225 Site A consists of the Paddock to the south of the Rectory and adjoins development to the east and south. Within the site is a large Beech tree, the subject of a preservation order, but there is sufficient space to the south of that tree to permit some development. The Rectory has received permission to be sub-divided into three units plus the conversion of the garage block to a single unit. Development has also taken place next to the Rectory and fronting Griffin Road. These developments have not caused any harm to the setting of the Rectory, neither would careful development of Site A. 4.226 Site B consists of a range of partially derelict former agricultural buildings close to the Garage block granted consent for conversion. Access is available off Griffin Road and the re-use and/or conversion of these buildings would be entirely consistent with Government advice. 4.227 Site C has a frontage to Newland Street and is occupied by a modern farm building which is now redundant. Lying beyond the Conservation Area boundary this site would be suitable for residential development. Response by KBC 4.228 Between 1988 and 1991 some 23 dwellings have been committed within the village and this level of growth is considered appropriate to the village and its needs. Acceptance of the suggested village</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>boundary would even should any proposal be restricted to only 10 dwellings, significantly increase the potential housing development within the village with subsequent adverse implications for its size form and function. 4.229 It is agreed that the building within site C could be considered for some alternative use. Similarly the conversion of other buildings can be considered under policy 13 regardless of them lying outside the village boundary. Any decision to change the village boundary should be made in the context of the 1997 review. Inspectors conclusions 4.230 I have dealt with the wider issues of housing allocation elsewhere. The village boundary defined in the LP is complex within this area. While that is no reason on its own for change, I feel that there are grounds for re-considering this part of the boundary now rather than awaiting the review in 1997. I agree that the development potential of any land enclosed, even by modest adjustments to the village boundaries, requires careful attention if the overall Rural Strategy is to be maintained. For that reason my comments on this objection are somewhat detailed. 4.231 Site A is an attractive and well defined paddock which is clearly within the confines of the village, and the Copper Beech tree is a quite outstanding example. The contribution that the site makes to the setting of the Rectory is in my judgement restricted to the northern part and the inclusion of the site within the village boundary would enable that part of the paddock to be designated environmentally important open space should that be considered appropriate. the remainder is partially screened by the tree and visually</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>dominated by the adjoining development. Because of these conditions I am satisfied that with great care and attention to the protection of , and the relationship with the tree, two, of at the most three dwellings within this area, served by a sensitively designed access off Griffin Road, would have no adverse impact on the character of the village and would ensure the preservation of the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. 4.232 Within site B is a mixture of dereliction arising from demolished buildings, various structures and storage. These conditions and the relationship of the site with the Rectory means that it detracts from that building. From the information before me and my visit it is not clear what, if any, potential the existing structures afford for conversion or re-use. However this site is clearly related to the fabric of the village and the conversion of the buildings to , or their replacement with a single dwelling, would seem to offer an opportunity to enhance this area with subsequent benefits to the wider appearance and character of the Listed Building and the Conservation Area. 4.233 With regard to site C the Local Planning Authority accept that there is some scope for re-use or development on this site because of the existing building. I agree with that view, but I see no advantage , given the limited size of the site, to delay a decision on an adjustment to the village boundary until the review. Greater clarity and certainty would be achieved recognising the potential of this land and the other sites as part of the present LP proposals. The actual number of dwellings which may be provided is a matter for the LPA but, having regard to my conclusions</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>above I would not regard the likely number as causing any significant change to the role or function of the village. Recommendation 4.234 I recommend that the village boundary for Braybrooke be amended to include the land the subject of representation 128 and that consideration be given to the designation of the Northern part of site A, including the whole spread of the protected tree, as an environmentally important open space under policy 94". - The Kettering Borough Council planning team had decided that the Inspector's recommendations should be accepted in full unless there were changes in circumstances from the point of publication or the Inspector's recommendations, which there were not. This was not unusual as the Inspector is seen as Independent and in possession of all the facts, and in all other circumstances their decision is final. In the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 the following change was made to the significance of the Local Plan Inspector's Recommendations ... -"Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (c. 5) SCHEDULE 8 Section 119 TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS: PARTS 1 AND 2 Development plan Page 151 - Section 10 (5) If such an inquiry or other hearing is held the authority must adopt the proposals in accordance with the recommendations of the person appointed to hold the inquiry or other hearing". - Had this one-line of legislation been in place in 1993 our land would have been included within the Village Boundary of Braybrooke. We believe that this change in legislation was brought about by a number of cases where political or other non-</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>material considerations had been taken into consideration when the Local Plan Inspector's Recommendations had been considered by Local Planning Authorities. - We question the conclusion that Braybrooke is not a sustainable village and reserve the option to furnish more information to compliment the material and sustainable reasons for RA/128 to be included including suitable protection to the setting of the Old Rectory, beech tree and other significant enhancements to the Conservation Area. - It should be noted that the appendix (6.2) still shows 66 houses on this land. The anticipated yield is more likely to be the 6-8 on the total area shown in section 8. - It should further be noted that RA/128 was fully tested during the run-up to the 1995 Local Plan against RA/185 the conclusion being clearly in favour of RA/128. RA/185 is set high above Newland Street, with clearly defined earthworks from the historic village and with no historical boundaries to contain or define the limits of development. RA/128 has a clearly defined boundary with the field to the West which includes areas of the village already running up to this hedge-line. - The numbers of dwellings likely to be developed on the developable areas of RA/128 have been suggested to be from between 23 and 66 homes as opposed to the 6-8 we would anticipate. This we feel been used to generate opposition, as we have no intention of that level of development as not least there is clearly insufficient space! - The recent appeal decision on RA/187 (KET/2012/0685 Appeal APP/L2820/A/13/2192189/NWF) represents a very similar form and style of development. Our</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>site A has already got an appropriate access and a similar small scale development can easily be accommodated respecting the significance of the Old Rectory and Beech Tree. - The Old Rectory was sold in 1982 with full permission to convert the main building and stable block to four separate homes. The current owners applied to build a fifth dwelling (KE/89/0549) closer to the Rectory than any proposal that we have put forward. The only reason for refusing that application (on appeal) was the likely need for the tree in the courtyard of the Rectory to be felled, not because of its proximity to the Rectory itself. There were no petitions against that development or indeed any of the other applications relating to the Rectory or Stables. We respect that we have a clear self-interest in developing this land and we respect that others have a self-interest in not developing it. The Planning System should only interest itself in the Public Interest and that is why we were so devastated by the debate and Committee Decision delivered in 1993 and the subsequent references to opposition over the last 30 years. The guidance is in our opinion clear .. - Government Guidance: -"Keep it relevant Although local views are important, central government has made it quite clear through its planning legislation that local opposition to a proposal is not in itself a reason for refusing planning permission, unless this opposition is based on valid and substantiated planning grounds. Comments, which are not based on material planning matters, cannot be taken into account". - Government Document "The Planning System - General Principles" .. -"The</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

				<p>members of the local planning authority are elected to represent the interests of the whole community in planning matters. When determining planning applications they must take into account planning considerations only. This can include views expressed on relevant planning matters. However, local opposition or support for a proposal is not in itself a ground for refusing or granting planning permission, unless it is founded upon valid planning reasons". - Whilst we believe that the strengthening of Codes of Conduct and training for Councillors has improved the situation, we are convinced that in 1993 our legitimate right to have the Inspector's Recommendations agreed was thwarted in the most disappointing, upsetting and divisive departure from the responsibility to consider the issues in a quasi-judicial manner. - The author is available to compliment and expand on any of the above comments.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

8	21	Mrs Barbara Lynch	<p>There are a number of problems with the SSP for Braybrooke. 1 The map does not show all the existing planning permissions in the village. KET/2013/0257, KET/2013/0349, KE/89/0781 & 0782LB - these should have been identified in BLUE. 2. The text does not reflect the permissions granted on the site behind Scholars Row, School Lane. In the text this is described as unsuitable for development, and had been identified as land that would be removed from the village envelope. Now that permission has been granted for two houses this needs to be amended. Bringing this land into the equation and adding in the above permissions reduces the need to develop the land at RA128 (GREEN on map) between the pub and the Old Rectory. 3. The issue of the land at the school needs to be addressed - the school is being decommissioned and the CC will be looking to maximise its return from the site. Has KBC been in contact with the CC to discuss this site and how it is to be developed. If it is to be considered for housing this changes the whole SSP for the village completely as a site this size would probably meet the needs of the village for at least 50 years.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. It was not intended for the maps to show all existing planning permissions in the village but rather to show the sites which sites had been granted planning permission in the time since their consideration as allocations in the Options Paper. As such only RA/187 has been identified in blue. The text in relation to RA/187 will be amended in future versions of the document. Your comments in relation to the need for development in Braybrooke have been noted and will be used to inform the next iteration of the document. The school site will be assessed according to the criteria set out in the Housing Allocations Background Paper prior to any conclusions on an appropriate option for Braybrooke.</p>
---	----	-------------------------	--	--

8	43	Mr Malcolm Watkins		<p>Any housing proposals in Braybrooke have been overtaken by the closure of the primary school. This is a brownfield site which should be priority for any housing development needed in the village. Development of RA185 or RA128 would extend the village envelope and detract from the attractiveness of the village. Similar comments apply to RA186 however it is an anomaly to include this plot within the conservation area.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments in relation to RA/128, RA/185 and RA/186 which have been noted. The school site will be assessed according to the criteria set out in the Housing Allocations Background Paper prior to any conclusions on an appropriate option for Braybrooke.</p>
8	59	Mrs Dinah Berry		<p>Braybrooke primary school has now closed. This site should be considered the priority site for any building within the village, should a housing need be established. Then no other sites would need to be considered within Braybrooke for the foreseeable future. Any sites outside the village envelope should be discounted. Extending the envelope at all would detract from the rural character of the village. RA128 is totally unsuitable. Both green and red areas would impact negatively on listed buildings and the character of the village. There is no established need for housing in Braybrooke at the present time.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments in relation to housing need in Braybrooke and site RA/128. The school site will be assessed according to the criteria set out in the Housing Allocations Background Paper prior to any conclusions on an appropriate option for Braybrooke.</p>

8	140	Mr James Thompson	<p>The proposed reduction in scale of housing development on RA128 is not relevant. The housing that has been built in the village since the Local Plan was adopted ,combined with existing consents such as the School Lane site is more than sufficient for any perceived Local Plan needs. Less detrimental sites within the village boundary have also been identified .These include Church Close and the now redundant school. In addition, the Officers' report to the Planning Policy Committee of 30th September confirms that there is currently no identified need for additional housing in Braybrooke. The proposed reduction in scale of development is therefore not a material consideration for reconsidering RA128 as a site for future housing. Many planning applications for permission to develop similar volumes (6-8 houses)on this site have been made since the Local Plan was adopted. They have always been opposed by a large majority of the villagers and the Parish Council. They have then been consistently rejected by the Borough Council and the Planning Inspectorate. Nothing has changed , the current consultation document reconfirms that : 1 Housing on this site will still have a detrimental impact on the listed building and conservation area. 2 Housing on this site will still constitute backland development and have a detrimental impact on the village's pattern of development. 3 Housing on this site will still be detrimental to the link between village and open countryside. Kettering Borough Council endorsed these facts when the Local Plan was adopted . The reasons for discounting this site are as relevant now as they were then. The</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments in relation to housing need in Braybrooke and site RA/128. The school site will be assessed according to the criteria set out in the Housing Allocations Background Paper prior to any conclusions on an appropriate option for Braybrooke.</p>
---	-----	-------------------	--	--

				<p>proposed reduction in numbers of housing for this site is not a new consideration and the reasons for removing this site from further consideration are as valid as ever. It should be discounted from any future housing allocation reviews.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

8	158	mr jack hartley	<p>The land - RA 128 should not be developed at all. There has been no established housing need in the village and to develop this site would break the established definition of the village as an in-fill only village. It would also change the village boundary. In a recent survey of the whole village, 97% of the replies indicated that they wanted a clearly defined village boundary, 70% of the replies indicated that they wanted no change to the boundary and only 16% wanted any change. 88% of the replies also indicated that no development should be allowed outside of the existing boundary. In short if you allow development on any part of RA128 you will be ignoring the views of the vast majority of the village. Now the school has closed, many people identified that as the area that should be developed if there is an established need for more houses in the village. It is true to say that 45% want it retained for community use and 44% want it developed with a further 8 comments in favour of developing the site. It is also true to say that only 27% want the council to raise a precept to pay for its' retention. My own view is that the village is split on the "need" for any more housing with a very large majority in favour of no more development at all. I also believe that the vast majority believe that the only place any more development should take place is on the school site but with a play/park area included as part of the development and that would be my view as well. I would totally support the view that no development at all should take place on the red part of RA 128, RA186, RA185 and RA143. I would encourage the council to wait until after the County council</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments in relation to housing need and site RA/128. Your support for discounting sites RA/185, RA/186 and RA/143 has also been noted. The school site will be assessed according to the criteria set out in the Housing Allocations Background Paper prior to any conclusions on an appropriate option for Braybrooke.</p>
---	-----	-----------------	--	--

				<p>have decided the fate of the school site as if that is sold to a developer then there will be absolutely no need for any further houses in this village.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

8	181	mr hesford	<p>We STRONGLY DISAGREE that the RA/128 should be reconsidered as a potential housing option. This land has had a historic number of applications, all strongly objected to by the majority of the village and rejected by the Village Council, Borough Council and The Planning Inspectorate. We would strongly suggest that RA/128 be permanently removed as a potential housing option as there has been no material change since the last review. We also cite the Officers comments to the Planning Policy Committee of 30th September, that there is no identified need for additional housing in Braybrooke. We strongly agree with the conclusion on RA/185 & RA/186, that they be discounted as potential housing allocation. With regard to future allocations, we would urge the Council to peruse the County for the old school site, as a potential future option.</p>	<p>Your comments in relation to RA/128, RA/185 and RA/186 have been noted. The school site will be assessed according to the criteria set out in the Housing Allocations Background Paper prior to any conclusions on an appropriate option for Braybrooke.</p>
---	-----	------------	---	---

8	196	Mr Michael Lynch	<p>RA128 is outwith the village boundary and the village has consistently indicated that such development is not desired, justified and would be detrimental to connection between the village and the open countryside. 77% are against such a development according to the recent survey. The plan shows major deficiencies in so far as it fails to reflect the fait accompli in relationship to the permission granted to the two houses at the rear of Scholars Row (a development within the village boundary until the council recent attempts to unilaterally change to it), the omission of those sites with established planning permission, and the now redundant brown filed site that used to be the school. There is therefore no imperative to develop this site other than to serve the ambitions of the member of the council. This smacks of favouritism and undue influence.</p>	<p>Your comments in relation to RA/128 have been noted. The school site will be assessed according to the criteria set out in the Housing Allocations Background Paper prior to any conclusions on an appropriate option for Braybrooke.</p>
---	-----	------------------	--	--

8	203	Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge	Planner English Heritage	<p>We are unable to agree or disagree with the current proposals for Braybrooke, but neither do we have "no opinion". However, we have ticked that box as it is the least controversial option. We have previously highlighted the sensitivity of Site RA/128 adjoining a Grade II listed building and partly lying within the conservation area. We note that part of RA/128 is shown as a discounted housing option (to the west of the listed building), whereas the remainder to the south of the listed building is shown as a potential housing option. It is not clear from the supporting text 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. We have also commented on new sites RA/185, RA/186 and RA/187 in our letter dated 15 January 2013, in which we highlighted the conservation area issues. We note that RA/185 and RA/186 have been discounted as potential allocations, while RA/187 now has planning permission.</p>	Thank you for your comments which will be used to inform the next iteration of the Plan.
---	-----	---------------------------	--------------------------	---	--

8	215	Mr Lindsay Holliman	<p>Your view Strongly disagree Reason for comment We strongly disagree that RA/128 should be considered for potential development. Over the years this site has been put forward for development on a number of occasions and on each occasion the proposal has been strongly opposed by villagers. Development has been declined by Kettering on each occasion and the reasons for opposition and refusal remain as valid today and they were before. The proposed reduction in the number of houses on RA/128 is totally irrelevant. RA/128 should remain outside the village boundary. We strongly agree that RA/185 and RA/186 be discounted as potential housing potential. We are very surprised that the site of the now closed village school has not been included in the considerations. This is a brownfield site which would be the sensible solution for further housing when needed and could also provide a small play area for children.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments in relation to RA/128, RA/185 and RA/186 which have been duly noted. The school site will be assessed according to the criteria set out in the Housing Allocations Background Paper prior to any conclusions on an appropriate option for Braybrooke.</p>
---	-----	---------------------	--	--

8	286	Mr A Jessop	<p>1. Re: Section 8, Paragraph 13.4.5, Site RA/128</p> <p>2. Comments on the merits of the sites identified? Site RA/128 southern part - is outside village boundary recent village survey shows majority against development outside village boundary. Site also affects listed buildings and detrimental to setting of same. It is also a further example of back building to existing properties in a traditionally linear development village and limited infill village. The Councils recent stance in School Lane on this was correct the earlier misjudgement of allowing that site in the previous plan resulted in successful appeal, should not be repeated with this site.</p> <p>3. Comments on detail for development Access to the site problematic due to parking by pub users. This area full of parked cars. Backbuilding and effect on listed building already stated minimal development is proposed on this site if growth is needed for the future no present growth need is proven 3 small sites and the 2 on School Lane already have permissions no proven need even for these there are always houses for sale in the village.</p> <p>4. What infrastructure will be necessary to support development? There has been ongoing problems with sewage capacity in Braybrooke for years and has worsened with additional housing. The sustainable ethic is modern development policy, the need for local facilities without need to use private motor vehicles, should prevent development in such villages with no facilities, unless there is a proven need not in this case.</p> <p>5. Any other comments? If there is any need for future growth in Braybrooke, there is now the school site coming available, already within the village</p>	<p>Your comments in relation to RA/128 and the need for growth in Braybrooke have been noted. The school site will be assessed according to the criteria set out in the Housing Allocations Background Paper prior to any conclusions on an appropriate option for Braybrooke.</p>
---	-----	----------------	--	--

				<p>boundary in a suitable position for modern housing with less effect on listed buildings and conservation area. The recent village survey showed support for development here for future if needed.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

9	4	Mr Robert Hardcastle	<p>Whilst I am pleased to see that RA/101 has been commented on by NCC Highways Agency and recommended that it be limited to no more than 12 dwellings, I am still very concerned about any potential development on this site as it will add to traffic flow at an already dangerous junction. The junction of Bentham Close sits less than ten metres from a road calming (narrowing of the road) measure and this is also a point of crossing for pedestrians. The junction affords poor visibility, especially to the right as traffic tends to park on the roadside in front of the properties to the right of the junction. Having more vehicles coming in and out of this junction will lead to a much higher possibility of accidents. I am also concerned about the drainage on the potential site. Has then been assessed by KBC? Currently there are no drainage facilities in the field and the existing housing stock on Bentham Close suffers with excess water run off from the field towards the properties. This will only be exacerbated by further housing unless very careful consideration is given to this problem. Experience of many developments in Broughton tells me this is usually not thought about at all. I am also concerned about the potential developer applying for more than the 12 dwellings that NCC Highways recommend as safe. If this occurs I would like to know how closely KBC planning will enforce the recommendations provided for them.</p>	<p>Your comments in relation to RA/101 are noted. Any future planning application for the site will need to demonstrate that the access is suitable to accommodate the number of dwellings proposed. It is unlikely that this will exceed 12 dwellings given the access information submitted which NCC Highways recommends is suitable for a maximum of 12 only. Adequate drainage will also be a requirement for any new development.</p>
---	---	----------------------	---	---

9	6	Mrs Pat Scouse	<p>At the time of this consultation the site RA207 which is described as being discounted has a planning appeal pending which, if successful will exceed the combined yield of the remaining proposed sites. Until this matter is resolved it would be incorrect to formulate a plan for Broughton on the basis of this report without making reference to the potential development of RA207.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Given the outstanding appeals at RA/095 and RA/095 and given that Broughton is in the process of preparing a Neighbourhood Plan additional work is required to determine which potential housing allocations will be progressed in Broughton.</p>
---	---	----------------	--	---

9	147	Bucleuch Property The Broughton Estate	<p>BROUGHTON 3.1 A village the size of Broughton contributes a wide range of services for its residents including job opportunities, a primary school, retail, community and recreation uses. A settlement of this size should accommodate a significant level of growth over the plan period in order for the diverse range of uses to be supported, and maintained, within the village. As referred to in responses relating to Geddington (see below), the adopted Local Plan acknowledges that Broughton is a key settlement which has long fulfilled the role within the Boroughs rural area as the main locations for development (paragraph 15.56 of the Local Plan refers). 3.2 In view of Broughtons role outlined above, limiting development in the village to small scale growth is considered to be overly restrictive and a more flexible approach should be adopted. This should plan for a range of development throughout the village which could provide for a mix of uses over the plan period. Broughton Allotments (RA/099) 3.3 Bucleuch Property has been promoting land at Broughton Allotments (RA/099) throughout the development plan process. The site extends to approximately 5.4ha and includes a number of existing allotments. Previously, the site has been promoted for a range of uses including residential and employment, however, it has been made clear at all stages that the allotments will remain, or be relocated on adjacent land as part of any development scheme. As set out above, the full site assessment matrix has not been made available for this site. On this basis, it has not been possible to compare the scoring of the site to others within the same settlement,</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which have been noted. The site assessment of RA/099 will be reviewed to take account of the smaller site now being promoted for development. 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 (http://consult.kettering.gov.uk/portal/development_services/sspldd/sspldd?tab=files). Given the outstanding appeals at RA/095 and RA/207 and give that Broughton is in the process of preparing a Neighbourhood Plan additional work is required to determine which potential housing allocations will be progressed in Broughton.</p>
---	-----	---	--	--

			<p>which have had their scoring matrix published.</p> <p>3.4 Notwithstanding the above, Buccleuch Property is of the opinion that the size of the site gives a false impression in respect of the level of development that will actually be provided. In view of this, a smaller site is now being promoted as part of the Site Specific Housing Allocations DPD. The location of the site is identified on the accompanying plan. It is therefore requested that this new site is assessed against the site assessment matrix as part of the development plan process going forward.</p> <p>3.5 The revised site extends to approximately 1.4ha and could provide for a small number of high quality residential dwellings (approximately 15-25 dwellings) and/or small scale employment units. This type of development is supported in the Rural Masterplanning Report (2012) which states there is the need for realistic encouragement of small industrial units outside of the present village envelope. In view of this, Buccleuch Property consider that the revised site RA/099 should be allocated within the Site Specific Housing Allocations DPD. Any development on the site would ensure that the existing allotment provision is maintained or relocated on land adjoining the site, which is also in the same ownership. Any relocation of the allotments would provide an excellent opportunity to improve the existing facilities and the overall quality of the allotments.</p> <p>3.6 Site RA/099 is considered to be in close proximity to the services and facilities available in Broughton; located a similar distance from these facilities as site RA/094b which is proposed for allocation. It</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

				<p>should be noted that, in reference to site RA/094, the Rural Masterplanning Report states that the site scores poorly in terms of accessibility and would not bring any benefits to the village. It is considered the same considerations apply to site RA/094b as the sites are adjacent to one another. 3.7 Land at Broughton Allotments (RA/099) is currently available for development and can be brought forward in the short term. This is not the case with site RA/094b, as demonstrated by the site assessment which states the sites availability and the market interest in developing the site is questionable. In view of the uncertainty regarding the delivery of site RA/094b, it is considered site RA/099 should be allocated in its place to ensure available and deliverable sites are included within the development plan that have a realistic prospect of coming forward.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

9	171	Pytchley Estate Settlement 1996	Pytchley Estate Settlement 1996	<p>Dear Sirs Housing Allocations ' Assessment of Additional Sites and Update I act on behalf of Pytchley Estate Settlement 1996 who wish to make further representations to the Housing Allocations document, having previously made comments to the Site Specific Proposals Local Development Document Options Paper. This representation relates to land in my clients ownership at Broughton and I attach a site plan for reference. Within the recently published update paper the land (ref: RA/207) has been discounted as a potential housing allocation due to it being in a rural area. The land had originally been put forward as a Historically and Visually Important Open Space in the Site Specific Proposals Local Development Document Options Paper, however, it is pleasing to note that Kettering Borough Council have taken on board previous comments made and that the land offers no value either historically or visually. Nevertheless, the Housing Allocations Update now identifies the site as a discounted housing allocation, based purely on the fact that the site lies in a rural area. No definition is provided as to what constitutes a rural area but, on face value, this seems to be based purely on the site lying outside of the current limits to development for Broughton. However, all sites put forward as part of the Housing Allocations Update lie outside of the limits to development and as such, in a rural area. An appropriate assessment would to be consider the harm that developing a site would cause and in respect of my clients land there would be no harm. This is clearly shown in the recent planning application on the land that was reduced and is now the subject of a Public</p>	<p>Your comments in relation to RA/207 have been noted. Given the outstanding appeal at this site and at RA/095 and give that Broughton is in the process of preparing a Neighbourhood Plan additional work is required to determine which potential housing allocations will be progressed in Broughton.</p>
---	-----	---------------------------------	---------------------------------	---	---

			<p>Inquiry. Whilst the application was refused on two grounds; being outside of the village boundary and the site layout. There were no reasons for refusal that related to the harm in developing the site would have on the overall character of the area or specific matters, such as access or ecology. The Housing Allocations Update paper outlines three sites that are considered as being potential housing sites and I would regard two of these having a greater harm than my clients land. RA/101a is identified for 12 dwellings but has been artificially limited to this number of dwellings due to fundamental highway issues. It would seem to be a contrived way of allocating housing and does not make best use of the land available. RA/094b is a thin strip of land fronting Northampton Road and not only extends the village further into open countryside but also represents inappropriate ribbon development along the road. My clients land, accessed via Glebe Avenue, offers an ideal site to develop 67 dwellings, including over 20 affordable homes. The land has clearly been considered by Kettering Borough Council to not be historically or visually important, a matter reinforced by the recent planning decision, and there are no other constraints as a potential housing development.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

9	204	Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge	Planner English Heritage	<p>We are unable to agree or disagree with the current proposals for Broughton, but neither do we have "no opinion". However, we have ticked that box as it is the least controversial option. The proposed designation of a conservation area for Broughton should result in a reassessment of relevant sites within the village. Sites RA/101 and RA/127 would adjoin the proposed boundary of the conservation area. We have previously commented on site RA/207 in terms of its potential impact on listed buildings (see letter of 6 February 2013). However, we note the site has been discounted as a housing option.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which have been noted. The assessments of RA/101 and RA/127 will be updated to reflect proximity to the proposed conservation area boundary. However, it is considered that any impact on the proposed conservation area could be overcome.</p>
---	-----	---------------------------	--------------------------	--	--

9	279	Keith Oliver	Strategic Developments Regional Director (Eastern) Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd	<p>We are in the process of acquiring a contractual interest in sites RA/094 and RA/096 at Broughton, both of which are owned by the Animal Welfare Foundation charity and are available for development. In the Site Specific Proposals Options Paper (March 2012), sites RA/094 (part only) and RA/096 were put forward as two of three sites preferred for allocation under the dispersed growth option. In the latest consultation document, site RA/094 (part only) is retained as a potential allocation and site RA/096 is discounted from further consideration due to potential access constraints. In response, we wish to object to allocation of part only of site RA/094 and the omission of site RA/096 as an allocation. We believe that the whole of site RA/094 should be allocated for development rather than just the frontage. It is a discrete site with no internal boundary sub-division, which occupies an edge of village position without impacting upon the setting of the Conservation Area. It has easy access to the strategic road network and is within just over 800 metres walking distance of the local primary school. Its development will allow the creation of a softer edge to the village with suitable boundary reinforcement. It has capacity for about 50 homes. Site RA/096 has been discounted as no information was submitted at the earlier consultation stage to demonstrate how access can be achieved. This is unfortunate as we are in the process of getting both this site and site RA/094 under option and will be commissioning technical work shortly, especially in relation to access. We believe that the development of site RA/096 offers a real opportunity to sort out</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which have been noted. Given the outstanding appeals at RA/095 and RA/207 and give that Broughton is in the process of preparing a Neighbourhood Plan additional work is required to determine which potential housing allocations will be progressed in Broughton. RA/094 and RA/096 will be considered as part of this process.</p>
---	-----	--------------	---	---	--

			<p>existing traffic problems at the school. The existing school entrance is very narrow currently but can be widened to estate road standard by incorporating the strip of land running in parallel to it. The estate road can then have the dual purpose of serving the school and the rest of site RA/096 for housing development. Development of the site also offers the opportunity to provide more parking for the school on site in order to relieve traffic congestion in Cransley Hill at school drop off and pick up times. This will be of real benefit to the village. We hope that consideration will be given to our representations and are more than willing to discuss both sites further. We hope to submit further information shortly on the school access issue. Both sites are available and deliverable.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

9	306	Keith Oliver	<p>Strategic Developments Regional Director (Eastern) Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd</p>	<p>Site Specific Proposals LDD Housing Allocations 2013 Assessment of Additional Sites and Update We have made representations on the above document in respect of sites RA/094 and RA/096 in Broughton which have been registered and given reference 279. When making our representations, we noted that site RA/096 had been discounted from further consideration as no information had been submitted as to how a suitable means of access can be achieved to serve both it and the school. Our highway consultants, Waterman, have now looked at the feasibility of providing a suitable means of access and believe that there is scope to design a road to appropriate standards as illustrated by the attached drawing. Their brief was to design a road capable of serving both the school and site RA/096. The access has been designed in line with the standards for a Major Access Collector road as set out in the Northamptonshire Transportation Design Guide for Residential Developments and is suitable to serve up to 200 homes or equivalent. The access has been designed to a standard of 5.5 metres in width with 1.8 metre wide footways on either side. Visibility splays of 4.5 metres x 43 metres can be accommodated within the highway boundary and comply with standards laid down in Manual for Streets 2. As mentioned in our representations, we believe that the allocation of site RA/096 for housing development provides a real opportunity to improve access to the primary school, as well as potential to remove congestion in Cransley Hill at peak times by providing a pick up/set down off-street. I would be grateful if you could attach this letter to our representations in the</p>	<p>Thank you for the additional information relating to access to site RA/096. NCC Highways will be consulted with the additional information. Given the outstanding appeals at RA/095 and RA/207 and give that Broughton is in the process of preparing a Neighbourhood Plan additional work is required to determine which potential housing allocations will be progressed in Broughton. RA/096 will be considered as part of this process.</p>
---	-----	--------------	--	--	--

				<p>hope that it satisfies your concerns over the feasibility of securing a suitable means of access to the site.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

9	307	Mr Gary Duthie	Clerk Broughton Parish Council	<p>In response to the consultation regarding the Site Specific Proposal, and with apologies for the slightly delayed response, with regard to Broughton the Parish Council would like to comment as follows: Site 50 falls within Broughton Parish and is not included in this consultation for Broughton. To-date, the Parish Council has not been consulted on this site at all although it sits squarely within Broughton Parish boundary and appears in the Shortlist of potential sites for development. The Parish Council object to this site being progressed any further as it would have a wholly dominating factor on the village of Broughton. 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 the sites being proposed for consideration and yields that sit within the immediate vicinity of the village itself, these are: RA94 and RA104a combined: 12 RA94b: 15 RA98: 65 RA101a: 12 RA127: 10 RA27 is discounted however an application for 67 houses with the demolition of 2 existing and sound properties, has been progressed and although permission has been refused, an appeal is lodged so the application remains a possibility. The Council agree completely with the draft conservation area plan that this site is of significant importance for the village and should not be considered for development. Equally, for RA95, an application for 4 properties has been progressed and although permission has been refused, an</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which have been noted. Site 50 is a strategic site which has been considered through the Joint Core Strategy. The site has been discounted and is not being considered as a potential allocation. In relation to RA/101 NCC Highway Authority has been consulted on the site and has advised that the access is suitable subject to the number of dwellings not exceeding 12. The Highway Authority have also commented on RA/127 and have advised that it is possible that the access could be widened to comply with Highway standards. As such it is considered that the access constraint can be overcome. It is noted that RA/207 and RA/095 have appeals pending. As a result it is considered that additional work is required to determine which potential housing allocations will be progressed in Broughton.</p>
---	-----	----------------	--------------------------------	---	--

			<p>appeal is lodged so the application remains a possibility. In regard to this particular site, 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 Council again agrees completely with the draft conservation area plan that this site is of significant importance for the village and should not be considered for development. With regards to sites RA98 and RA127, the Site Specific Options consultation document states that there is scope to overcome the constraint of the lack of capacity in Coxs Lane and no further detail is given. Before being able to comment on this, councillors would need to understand what is the scope that is being considered? RA127 is of great concern as should this become developed, the bund area would become completely inaccessible and will be left to become an unsightly area of ground which would detract from the current attractiveness of the village. RA101 is equally of concern as access to this site is being given as from Bentham Close. This will only serve to compound an already chronic High Street traffic situation. All village traffic intending to travel toward Kettering passes through this hazardous area to exit the village at the Kettering Road A43 junction because of the additional households emerging at this point in the High Street where there is a pinchpoint, a priority traffic stop line, parked vehicles, a bus stop, a crossing, shops and several other road entrances, is particularly worrisome. In addition</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>to this, although not noted in the site specific document, there exist two further applications; KET/2005/1120 which was for the existing bungalow in front of site RA101 to be demolished and 8 properties to be built and KET/2011/0062 for 1 property to be built so site RA101 should not be considered in isolation and the cumulation comprises RA101 considerably. 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</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

				<p>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. In conclusion, councillors support the sites that the parish council has previously proposed for development within the village boundary which could be designed to respond to local requirements but do not support site 101 or 127. Comments at this stage regarding site 98 are withheld.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

10	205	Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge	Planner English Heritage	<p>We are unable to agree or disagree with the current proposals for Cranford, but neither do we have "no opinion". However, we have ticked that box as it is the least controversial option. Site RA/170 lies within the conservation area, while site RA/173 adjoins the boundary. We are aware that both sites are only potentially suitable for affordable housing, but the impact on heritage assets will need the same level of consideration. If these sites are 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. We note the discounting of sites RA/171 and RA/205, both of which lie within the conservation area. We advised on RA/205 in our letter dated 6 February 2013 and raised concerns about the loss of significant open space and views within the conservation area (as identified by the conservation area appraisal). The sites discounting would therefore preserve the significance of heritage assets.</p>	Thank you for your comments which have been noted.
----	-----	---------------------------	--------------------------	---	--

11	282	Mrs Helen James	<p>Site REF:- RA/204 Land at Braybrooke Road, Dingley Having read the disappointing result on the above site I am writing to query the constraints you seem to think are there. First the issue of landscape, this paddock of two acres sits between two sets of development so has no impact on landscape owing to the open countryside to the rear and front of the paddock. I am most intrigued to know what ecological features you found or is it a case of plucking reasons from thin air. The settlement character was somewhat amusing on the basis of the ghastly development that I have had to look at for some four decades namely Home Close. Where over the years plastic gnome domes (conservatories) extensions and solar panels have sprouted up making a complete mockery of village architecture. In fact all the odd houses that have been built in gardens and odd corners of the village have made this settlement a real hotch potch of horror. The number of units that you would deem suitable for this site, 9, is in my view too many anyway and I would be looking for somewhere between 4-6 maximum. I own a farm in Dingley, along with my husband, that has been in the family for four generations and a property portfolio in Kettering Borough and I am passionate about keeping village life afloat having been part of it for so long. It is my belief as a country person, having lived in predominantly Northamptonshire for the best part of six decades, that to keep village life sustainable you need people and a village hall. Any village that has a community hall has the ability to be sustainable. No matter what age, culture or religion, this is the place that crosses</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The site was assessed according to the criteria set out in the Housing Allocations Background Paper. The assessment identified that the site has medium to high sensitivity to development. The western edge of the site is TPO woodland. As this provides access to the site it is unlikely that these features can be retained. Furthermore, Dingley does not have a settlement boundary and is considered scattered development in the open countryside. It is national policy to strictly control development in the open countryside and as such allocation of the site as a potential housing allocation would be contrary to national policy.</p>
----	-----	-----------------	---	--

				<p>all divides and ages and is often the heart of the community. I know that my time over the years trying to obtain some building on this site has been wasted but as a council you seriously need to widen your horizons on the future of our villages within the borough.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

12	149	Buccleuch Property The Boughton Estate	<p>GEDDINGTON 4.1 A village the size of Geddington contributes a range of services for its residents including job opportunities, a primary school, retail, community and recreation uses. As such, it is one of the largest rural communities in the Borough and has been identified as a primary village settlement. 4.2 A settlement of this size should accommodate a significant level of growth in order for the diverse range of uses to be supported and maintained within the village over the plan period. The settlement is considered to be a sustainable location for new development in the context of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), in part due to the level of services it provides, as set out above. 4.3 It is, therefore, inappropriate for development at Geddington to be restricted to small scale growth. This approach threatens the vitality of local services and facilities and the ability of these to remain operational in the future. Reference should be given to paragraph 55 of the Framework, which states that: To promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. 4.4 Given Geddington recognition as a principal rural settlement, and taking account of the range of services and facilities it offers, the Framework encourages housing in this type of settlement. In view of this, it is considered that future development at Geddington should not be restricted to small scale growth and that additional development should be planned to meet its needs. 4.5 It should be noted that in various local planning authorities nearby (South Northamptonshire and</p>	<p>Your support for allocation of RA/107 and RA/109 has been noted. The adopted CSS and emerging JCS require allocations to be made based on local need. A Housing Needs Assessment, undertaken for Geddington, Newton and Little Oakley in February 2011, identified a need for small scale growth to be located primarily in Geddington. RA/107, RA/109 and RA/110 have been identified as suitable sites to accommodate this identified local need. RA/102 is a large site for the size of the village. Development of this site would exceed the identified needs of the settlement and would not be consistent with the growth strategy. As such it is considered RA/102 should remain a discounted option. 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 Councils Consultation Portal under supporting documents associated with the Site Specific Proposals LDD Options Paper (http://consult.kettering.gov.uk/portal/development_services/sspldd/sspldd?tab=files).</p>
----	-----	--	---	--

			<p>West Northamptonshire) a more proactive approach has been taken. Settlements, similar in size to Geddington, have been allowed to grow by 10-12% of their existing dwelling stock over the plan period. This is deemed an appropriate percentage to allow the village to expand and caters for local housing requirements. This approach recognises the need for development in rural areas and accords with the principles set out in paragraph 55 of the Framework.</p> <p>Buccleuch Property advocates this approach and considers this to be suitable for the Borough of Kettering, which has numerous villages of varying sizes. Geddington Saw Mill (RA/07) and Geddington South East (RA/109) 4.6 Buccleuch Property fully supports the allocation of Geddington South East (RA/109) for residential development and Geddington Saw Mill (RA/107) for mixed use development comprising of residential and employment uses. Both sites provide opportunities for sustainable development, which has been recognised by way of their proposed allocations. 4.7</p> <p>Geddington South East provides the opportunity to create a high quality gateway to the village which reflects the attractive historical nature of the settlement. The development of the Saw Mill also provides an excellent opportunity to enhance the setting and character of the conservation area, whilst providing housing and employment for the residents of Geddington. Stamford Road (RA/102) 4.8 The site at Stamford Road is located to the north of Geddington and is currently within the existing settlement boundary, as set out on the Proposals Map which accompanies the adopted</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>Local Plan (1996). There are two issues in respect of this site. The first relates to the sites potential allocation for residential development, and the second is in respect of maintaining the site within the existing settlement boundary. This representation deals solely with the first of these issues. Representations in respect of the settlement boundary were made during the previous round of consultation. 4.9 Buccleuch Property objects to land at Stamford Road (RA/102) being discounted as a potential allocation on the basis that it does not accord with the growth strategy set out in the Core Spatial Strategy. It is considered inappropriate to dismiss the site for this reason. As set out above, the Framework requires that Local Planning Authorities promote sustainable development in rural areas (paragraph 55 refers). 4.10 The adopted Local Plan identifies Geddington, and Broughton, as being settlements which have long fulfilled the role within the Boroughs rural area as the main locations for development (paragraph 15.56 of the Local Plan refers). In this context, and taking account of the Framework, both settlements are considered to be sustainable and can accommodate development over the plan period. 4.11 The emerging Site Specific Housing Allocations DPD has previously proposed to allocated land at Cransley Hill, Broughton for residential development. Subsequent to this, a planning application for 64 dwellings has been approved by the Council. 4.12 The site at Cransley Hill is similar in size to the site at Stamford Road. An initial site assessment of the Stamford Road site indicates that approximately</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>55-65 dwellings could be provided after taking account of robust landscaping, open space and infrastructure provision. 4.13 Given that the sites at Cransley Hill and Stamford Road are broadly similar in terms of their size and potential dwelling yield; and the settlements are broadly similar in terms of the range of services and facilities they provide, it is completely unjustified to allocate sites in Broughton, only for similar sized sites in Geddington to be dismissed on the basis that they would be contrary to the growth strategy set out in the Core Strategy . 4.14 As set out above, site RA/102 is located within the settlement boundary of Geddington as defined by the adopted Local Plan Proposals Map (1996). The existing settlement boundary was clearly drawn to enable sustainable development within Geddington to come forward to meet local needs. 4.15 The site can be accessed in a number of locations and any development of the site would respect and enhance the character of the conservation area. As such, there are considered to be no constraints that would preclude development on the site. The site is also being actively promoted by The Estate for development. Development of the site has the potential to provide a high quality gateway to the northern part of the settlement, which could signal peoples arrival into the historic village. As such, the site is also a logical parcel of land for development that would neatly round off the village, and in doing so, does not extend into open countryside due to it being surrounded by residential development on three sides. 4.16 In view of this, Buccleuch Property considers that site RA/102 should be allocated for residential</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

				<p>development within the Site Specific Housing Allocations DPD. 4.17 Notwithstanding the comments made above in respect of site RA/102, as referred to in previous areas of these representations the complete site assessment matrix has not been made available for this site, unlike other sites in Geddington. Therefore, it is not possible for the site to have been given appropriate consideration in the development plan process and its consideration as a reasonable alternative, as required by the Framework, cannot be demonstrated. 4.18 In view of this, it is requested that the full site assessment matrix is made available for consideration and appropriate opportunity is given for responses to be made to it.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

12	206	Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge	Planner English Heritage	<p>We are unable to agree or disagree with the current proposals for Geddington, but neither do we have "no opinion". However, we have ticked that box as it is the least controversial option. We have previously commented on sites RA/107, 109 and 110 in our 16 May 2011 and 23 April 2012 letters. We note that there have been some changes to the scoring of each site, but they remain potential housing allocations. If these sites are 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.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which have been noted.</p>
----	-----	---------------------------	--------------------------	---	---

14	150	Buccleuch Property The Boughton Estate	<p>5. GRAFTON UNDERWOOD 5.1 Buccleuch Property is keen to ensure that the emerging planning policy framework enables some small scale growth beyond the village boundary of Grafton Underwood in order to enable further organic growth that maintains the vitality of rural communities, an approach advocated by the Framework. This should include opportunities for a mix of small scale employment and residential development through the conversion and replacement of barns and agricultural buildings on appropriate sites. 5.2 The Framework makes clear the need for local planning authorities to promote sustainable development in rural areas to ensure that the vitality of rural communities is maintained (paragraph 55 refers). In addition, where there are small groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby. This situation is considered to be applicable to Grafton Underwood, where services and facilities located in settlements, such as Geddington, can be sustained by small scale growth located in the village. 5.3 The approach proposed by the Council to provide no growth at all is contrary to this and threatens the long term vibrancy and vitality of Grafton Underwood. For this reason, Buccleuch Property objects to this approach and to the removal of Dukes Mill Farm (RA/113) and Slipton Lane Barns (RA/114) as allocations in the Plan. Dukes Mill Farm (RA/113) and Slipton Lane Barns (RA/114) 5.4 The review of the Grafton Underwood Conservation Area in 2007 identified a number of redundant sites containing agricultural buildings, which are at risk due to changes in</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which have been noted. Concern 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 and given its importance in historical, at this time the sites remain discounted options.</p>
----	-----	---	--	---

			<p>farming practices. It recognises that: Appropriately designed development of Manor House Farm, Grafton Park Farm and Dukes Arms Farm could have benefit for the special character of the conservation area. Proposals for the change of use of these sites would be regarded favourably if problems of access and car parking were overcome, buildings at risk brought back into use, and/or unsympathetic land uses concluded. Whilst the preference would be for conversion to business use, residential housing might be the most appropriate form if business use is demonstrated to be uneconomic. 5.5 The development of these sites would lead to an improvement in the character and appearance of the conservation area, as demonstrated by the Council's own evidence base. It should be noted that paragraph 55 of the Framework encourages the re-use and conversion of redundant and disused buildings which would lead to an enhancement of the immediate surrounding. 5.6 No justifiable reasons have been provided to warrant the removal of these sites as allocations. As set out above, they offer an excellent opportunity to provide a small level of growth to meet the needs of the settlement over the plan period and to sustainable rural services and facilities located in the village and in nearby settlements. For these reasons, Buccleuch Property consider that site RA/113 and RA/114 should be re-allocated for potential development.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

14	207	Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge	Planner English Heritage	Our letter of 16 May 2011 raised concerns about the impact of sites RA/113 and RA/114 on the conservation area and listed buildings, but we note that they have been discounted.	Thank you for your comments which have been noted.
18	70	Mr Stacey		Strongly agree with the 'no growth' of 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 (as previous Local Plan) as they contribute to the setting of the Church (paddock specifically) and both retain openness on entering and exiting the village. Both sit within the existing Conservation Area emphasising their contribution to the village.	Thank you for your comments which have been noted. This document relates to housing allocations only. The open spaces to which you refer were identified as potential Historically and Visually Important Open Spaces in the Site Specific Proposals Local Development Document Options Paper, which are being considered as a separate ongoing piece of work.

19	17	Mr Nicholas Chalmers		<p>Although the new proposed site is an improvement on the original proposal, it still represents a further and continued development of Mawsley which from a services and infrastructure perspective, is already unable to cope. The village has already expanded well beyond the original size it was planned to be and further expansion at this point in time is ill-advised and unwanted. The school, medical centre and dental practice are not designed for a larger village.</p>	<p>Your objection to further development in Mawsley is noted. However, 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. However, at this stage further work will be required to address some of the issues raised through the consultation process any conclusions can be made on the preferred option for Mawsley in the next iteration of the plan. 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. It is also important to note that the document identifies growth to 2031 and growth will be staggered over the plan period rather than there being an immediate growth in the number of households in Mawsley.</p>
----	----	----------------------	--	--	--

19	25	Mr Russell Walters-Morgan	<p>I fully support the previous posters comments and would add the following: In particular the village school has already been expanded several times, each occasion at the expense of both playground and playing field. This means that the children at the school are losing valuable play space at a time when we should be promoting outdoor activities. Having now lived in the village for over 11 years we have yet to have had a period without ongoing construction and it's associated heavy traffic. Moreover, although not fully completed, some of the village roads have only recently been finished. It would be nice to have a period of time where we are not being subjected to the inevitable upheaval and damage that always accompanies such building activities; cracked kerbstones, huge wheel ruts in grassed areas etc. Indeed, it would be nice if the council were finally able to adopt the roads and maintain the communal areas within the village.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which have been noted. Provision of schools is an important consideration when planning for future growth. Kettering Borough Council will work with NCC to ensure adequate provision is available for residents of new development. It is important to note, however, that the document identifies growth to 2031 and growth will be staggered over the plan period rather than there being an immediate growth in the number of households in Mawsley. 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. However, at this stage further work will be required to address some of the issues raised through the consultation process before any conclusions can be made on the preferred option for Mawsley in the next iteration of the plan.</p>
----	----	---------------------------	---	--

19	48	Adrienne Nixon	<p>Have lived here for a year in Mawsley and it's lovely. It is modern but it has a nice village feel and a community spirit, sadly that Northampton seems to have lost. I moved out of Northampton because of the over development of the town and constant building of new houses which has ruined it. My big question is why? Why do we need more houses ? This county seems to be constantly a target from the Government but has already taken, in my opinion ,enough. In regards to Mawsley: They had just finished the 'final' development of houses in the village which was apparently 'no more' building when I moved here. To me there seems enough houses here and any more will ruin the 'village ' that surely this place was meant to be. Any more will start turning into an urban sprawl which is not the reason I moved here for. Also, the land around the village is great for the children ,this after all is meant to be a village, I think there is enough houses now and the council look elsewhere or perhaps turn to the government and ask why they need all these new developments, I do not believe that it is the reason they give. I do not want to see any changes to the village .the buildings have just been finished and Wimpey are still completing the roads. Leave it alone to live and establish itself for now as it was designed to be 'A VILLAGE'</p>	<p>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. 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.</p>
----	----	----------------	--	---

19	49	Mr Graham Marsden	<p>The recent site specific proposal RA174 to give planning consent to build more houses in the field encompassed by Cransley Rise, Malaslea and Birch Spinney in the village of Mawsley, seriously lacks credibility. One of the unique features of the village is the design layout, The proposal will totally undermine this particular characteristic and represents a piecemeal development which will only lead to further over expansion of the village into an urban sprawl in years to come. The North Northamptonshire Development Company and the Daily Telegraph "Best New Village Award" cited the design layout as part of the unique creation of Mawsley as a village rather than a housing estate. The design layout should be safeguarded. To build houses in this particular location takes away an amenity that all villagers share, with views over open country. Taking away this amenity is no different to taking away the park or playing field. This area of land should remain for agricultural purposes growing crops, in the way the farmer has used the field since the village was created and for the benefit of the existing community. Access to the field is extremely limited and very dangerous in Cransley Rise where the gate to the field is located. The development would raise serious road safety concerns, there are already traffic and parking issues on Cransley Rise and Birch Spinney, a further 200 or more traffic movements a day would be dangerous, onerous and a real concern to all residents. During winter months and periods of heavy rain, large ponds develop in the field, likely due to the topography of the field that drains towards Malaslea and Cransley Rise. These ponds naturally drain</p>	<p>Your objection to further development in Mawsley is noted. However, 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. However, at this stage further work will be required to address some of the issues raised through the consultation process any conclusions can be made on the preferred option for Mawsley in the next iteration of the plan. 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. It is also important to note that the document identifies growth to 2031 and growth will be staggered over the plan period rather than there being an immediate growth in the number of households in Mawsley.</p>
----	----	-------------------	--	--

				<p>away but should houses be built here, in this field, the risk of flooding homes in Cransley Rise and Malaslea will be a major concern. Further development would also raise serious issues regarding adequacy of existing infrastructure in the village. Mawsley Village School in itself has attracted potential residents to the village and we have many young families in the village. The school is full again after further extension, The doctors and dentist surgery no longer offer the same level of prompt service. Further housing in Mawsley would therefore be counter-productive. The village has already been extended beyond the original scope of the number of houses built. New house owners in the proposed area would discover over crowding of facilities, poor and dangerous access and road safety issues. The cumulative impact of this or any further development in Mawsley would be meritless and ill-advised.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

19	61	Dr Shane Duncan	<p>I am sure that most villagers originally moved to Mawsley to be part of a nice discrete Northamptonshire village and it was categorically stated from the beginning on the maximum number of houses to be built. Due to the blatant greed of builders and developers this number has increased significantly and will continue to increase unless we put a stop to it now! For me this whole issue is based on a simple question: Where will it stop Enough is enough!</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which have been noted. 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. 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. It is important to note that this document identifies growth to 2031 and growth will be staggered over the plan period rather than there being an immediate growth in the number of households in Mawsley.</p>
----	----	--------------------	---	---

19	78	Mr Kevin White	<p>This plot of land is unsatisfactory and not appropriate for residential development for the following reasons:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Access to the site via Cransley Rise is very limited with , it is suggested, insufficient room for vision splays. The " Access point" is on a sharp bend on a narrow estate road and will be dangerous. 2. Cransley Rise is/about to be adopted and construction traffic would not only damage the road (we have waited over 10 years for the road to be finished with a top coat and adopted) but would also cause major traffic congestion given the current road layout. 3. Mawsley School has already been extended 3 times and there is no possibility for further expansion. Already we are aware of Mawsley children who cannot get a place in the School. So adding potentially 55 houses could add maybe 40-50 young children requiring a School place. 4. The current village facilities are already stretched and the medical centre appointment times are becoming longer. 5. The infill expansion on this site goes against the original ethos of Mawsley village and extends the village boundary unnecessarily. 6. Mawsley was supposed to emulate the development of a typical Northamptonshire village with nooks and crannies. As such constraints on building design, replacement windows and doors, car parking provision generally off road and hidden, support this. If RA/174 development is allowed then Mawsley becomes just a " big estate". 6. From a personal point of view the proposed site currently offers an excellent countryside view which is why the houses that look onto it were laid out in such a manner. The removal of this view would almost 	<p>Thank you for your comments in relation to proposed development in Mawsley. 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. However, at this stage further work will be required to address some of the issues raised through the consultation process before any conclusions can be made on the preferred option for Mawsley in the next iteration of the plan.</p>
----	----	----------------	---	--

				<p>certainly reduce the value/saleability of those houses and reduce the habitat of the local birds such as yellow hammers, fieldfares and increasingly Red Kites.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

19	80	Mr Nicholas Lenton	<p>I am writing to express my views with regards to the proposed development of the village of Mawsley. I have lived in Mawsley for four years and STRONGLY OBJECT to this proposed development for the following reasons: a) My property backs onto the field subject to this proposed development. One of the reasons for purchasing this house was its location on the edge of the village and the associated countryside views; b) My house and back garden will become overlooked thus affecting my privacy; c) I will experience increased levels of noise during and after the development; d) My property will be subject to increased light pollution during and after the development; e) The proposal ignores the previous wishes of myself and other villagers when objecting to the development of a different site; f) Mawsley first became inhabited approximately 11 years ago and to date works have never ceased, either housing development or road adoption. It must surely be time for stability within the village; g) The land is currently farmed and any development will have an irreversible loss of this agricultural land; h) Mawsley has a beautiful diversity of wildlife with frequent sightings of foxes, bats, badgers, and deer. There is also a wonderful range of birds, including migrant species such as the Waxwing, and our garden alone attracts over 30 different species including woodpeckers, yellowhammers, owls, bullfinches, linnets and reed buntings. Further development can only have a negative impact on these populations; i) The infrastructure of the village was designed to support 700 homes, as per the original plan. There are now approximately 1,000</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which have been noted. Loss of view and impact on property values are not a material planning consideration. Overlooking, loss of light, noise and or other pollution is considered in detail at planning application stage. The site is not in a flood zone. 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. It is also important to note that the document identifies growth to 2031 and growth will be staggered over the plan period rather than there being an immediate growth in the number of households in Mawsley. 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. However, at this stage further work will be required to address some of the issues raised through the consultation process any conclusions can be made on the preferred option for Mawsley in the next iteration of the plan.</p>
----	----	--------------------	--	--

			<p>homes. The infrastructure is struggling to cope with present demand and further development can only exacerbate this situation; j) The loss of countryside views will have an adverse effect on the value of my property; k) Being overlooked will have an adverse effect on the value of my property; l) The school has been subject to numerous extensions to accommodate the influx of children within the village. This has had a detrimental effect on the outdoor space in which the children have to play. An increased population can only add to the pressures faced by the school; m) The spirit throughout the village is fantastic and events at the community centre are well supported and very well attended. For example the recent children's Halloween party sold out quickly leaving a number of children very disappointed. I believe the forthcoming Christmas party has also sold out, no doubt presenting the same issues. Obviously an increase in the number of families is going to create more of these problems; n) The field subject to the proposal has a tendency to become flooded during the winter months and I fear any development may increase these problems and cause issues for those living Cransley Rise; o) An increase in the number of homes will inevitably increase the traffic within the village which will have an adverse effect on road safety and no doubt further the issues of nuisance parking; p) The current access point to the field is fairly restricted and those living in its immediate vicinity will experience problems with large vehicles negotiating tight and twisty roads. There are already parking issues in this area I envisage this will create further road safety</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>problems; and q) Central Government has indicated there is the need for a substantial increase in the number of homes in Northamptonshire. Whether this is true is quite subjective but the negatives this local proposal will bring will far out-way the alleged benefits. Mawsley is a fantastic place to live and has a wonderful community spirit. It is ideally situated and well designed. It isn't a thoroughfare for anywhere and consequently cannot be used as a rat-run for commuters. If more housing is required in Northamptonshire then surely it would make eminent sense to replicate the Mawsley concept at different sites within Northamptonshire?</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

19	81	Miss Rebecca Straker		I agree with the other comment. If more development is agreed the village will become oversubscribed therefore putting more pressure on the school and medical facilities. The village has a strong community which we would like to stay this way. The developers have only just finished the roads after years with loads of disruption! Let us enjoy the village now please.	Thank you for your comments which have been noted.
----	----	----------------------------	--	---	--

19	82	Miss Michele Allison	<p>I was one of the first to move to Mawsley and the main reason for moving was to a village community. It was to be 750 homes but then it went to 850, currently around 1000 and now even more houses are to be built. If I had wanted to move to a small town I would have done so. The village should be kept as it is, a village. Increasing the number of houses has already put pressure on Mawsley and my reasons include: 1. Doctor - it has become more difficult to gain an appointment due to the increase in the number of people wishing to use a local doctor and becoming patients 2. Dentist - there have been additional dentists added to the surgery to cope with the people which has created its own problems and still you have to wait for an appointment. How many more patients will be added to an already full surgery? 3. The above two problems have meant that you cannot get a parking place at the doctor/dentist surgery. A lot of cars park on the road making it dangerous to drive around the area, particularly for children going to the nearby school. Has anyone gone to the doctors and tried to get a parking place? How can it cope with more patients? 4. The roads have just gone through resurfacing and finally been adopted after living here for over 12 years. Does this mean we have to go through this all over again? 5. Parking in the village has become difficult. More and more cars park on the road and particularly some roads are narrow and it is difficult to manoeuvre around the roads. It is an obstacle course down Cransley Rise already and that is without any extra houses down in that area. The past 2 Ambulance crews attending my father in Cransley Rise apologised</p>	<p>Your objection to further development in Mawsley is noted. However, 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. However, at this stage further work will be required to address some of the issues raised through the consultation process any conclusions can be made on the preferred option for Mawsley in the next iteration of the plan. 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. It is also important to note that the document identifies growth to 2031 and growth will be staggered over the plan period rather than there being an immediate growth in the number of households in Mawsley.</p>
----	----	----------------------------	---	--

			<p>as they found it difficult steering safely around the cars and said it has delayed them, even with the blue lights. 6. The entrance/ exit from Cransley Rise is dangerous. Have anyone tried to get out of the road in the morning or in the evening? Directly opposite the junction cars are parked and turning right to get out of Cransley Rise is really dangerous, particularly since the change in the junction at the end of School Road/Loddington Road. With cars parked on School Road, there is only one side of the road free, so when you turn right you are on the wrong side of the road and when cars from School Road approach turning right they do not even see when a car is coming out and end up head to head with each other. Another car behind both, causes a major bottleneck and this is even now, let alone more cars in the village. 7. Following point 6, how will construction vehicles access this proposed new development? This is an established part of the village who have been through years and years of construction traffic and having to put up with the noise, road closures, congestion, dirt, pathways closed, fenced off areas, traffic lights. WE HAVE HAD ENOUGH. What will it take? An accident? More houses up for sale? 8. Homes for sale in the village have been slow to sell. Part of this is due to the increase in additional homes coming up for sale. New homes offer deals and under the market rates for new homes so a current owner struggles to sell. Over the past few years I have seen so many homes up for sale for a long time and cannot compete with the new homes. 9. The shop in the village is at capacity for the number of residents. The number of times I have gone</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>in, seen the queue (I don't just mean 4 or 6 people) and walked out. The resources in the village is at capacity already. It cannot take any more residents. I end instead of walking and saying hello to my neighbours and enjoying a stroll to the shop, the shop is so busy I end up driving out of the village to Kettering, with yet another car on the road, using fuel and losing the carbon neutral village I so wanted to achieve.</p> <p>10. The school has already been extended several times and cannot extend any more. Already people in the village complain they cannot get a place for their children, so how will it cope with yet more families? Is it fair to get more residents to our village and then they cannot gain access due to doctor/dentist/school/road as they are already full.</p> <p>11. Road access in and out of Mawsley is already at breaking point. Have you ever tried to get out of village, turning left with everyone as we queue out. Then to get on to the A43 takes another 10 minutes, particularly when turning right towards Northampton. More recently the A43 towards Kettering is also really busy. How can this already congested A43 cope with more traffic from additional residents? The road in the evening is even worse. Has anyone come from Northampton to Kettering after work? It is enough to question why you would want to live in Mawsley.</p> <p>12. The wildlife around the village is fantastic. The birds in particular remind you that you are in a village and why you came to live outside of the town. With construction it will drive these away, when it has taken so long for these animals and birds to come freely and nest in the village.</p> <p>13. We want to remain a village. Please</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

do not build any more houses in Mawsley. Please do not destroy our village. We are just coping since the original concept and the additional houses have stretched our facilities. More houses will push us over the edge and end up with people not wanting to live here and current residents leaving. When the last new houses were built there was an influx of residents leaving, please do not allow that to happen. We want to remain a village. Please let me know if you would like me to explain any of my points in more detail.

19	83	Mr james Lawson	<p>As stated in the housing charter there is not enough facilities to support another 250 houses the school is full currently has a waiting list which is supported by the current village !! You SIMPLY WANT TO RUIN WHAT IS HERE families have paid thousands to live here and to have this village community for there families not only do they all work hard to maintain this lifestyle but the fact that having this to come home makes it worth while !!! If there is a need for social housing or any other use the land down the A43 near the roundabout which has been unused for 12 years and leave what is already established alone this is a joke and a total disregard for the common tax payer i.e. every Mawsley resident</p>	<p>Your objection to further development in Mawsley is noted. However, 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. However, at this stage further work will be required to address some of the issues raised through the consultation process any conclusions can be made on the preferred option for Mawsley in the next iteration of the plan.</p>
----	----	--------------------	--	---

19	85	Mr Matthew Berrill	<p>Having first moved to the village some 10 years ago and seen the village grow past its original design size by approx 35%, it is clear to me that the village infrastructure cannot cope with any additional expansion. The roads are at times very dangerous with the amount of cars leaving or arriving at the same time. As Mawsley offers only limited employment opportunities, everyone is commuting in and out of the village at the same time, causing very busy roads. The junction at the end of school road, where most of the new vehicles will travel, is one of the most poorly designed junctions I have used. There is no other possible access to the proposed plot to help relieve this bottle neck. The village still has an undersized pumping station that does not cope with the number of houses we have at the moment. After numerous calls to the EA and Anglian Water, no improvements have been made. This problem results in raw effluent overflowing onto public footpaths and into open watercourses. The School has no capacity to accept the additional children that would come as a result of this expansion. You cannot use nationally accepted assumptions on the number of children per household, as Mawsley bucks this trend and would result in Mawsley children having leave the village to attend a primary school. This is completely unacceptable. Now that building has finished the amount of wildlife on that side of the village has increase exponentially. Mawsley is now a fantastic habitat for the local birds such as yellow hammers, fieldfares, Red Kites, Woodpeckers and Monk jack deer's are seen regularly in this area. The broadband connection for the village is one of</p>	<p>Your objection to further development in Mawsley is noted. However, 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. At this stage further work will be required to address some of the issues raised through the consultation process any conclusions can be made on the preferred option for Mawsley in the next iteration of the plan.</p>
----	----	--------------------	--	--

			<p>the slowest connections I've experienced. Adding to this connection will only slow up the network further. This service makes it impossible for me, or any business, to work from within the village. Any expansion to Mawsley, which is already creaking at the seams, would be very detrimental to the existing residents as mentioned above, but also cause the local environment and wildlife to suffer. Come on KBC, you are better than this! The number of brown field sites in and around the Kettering area must surely be looked at ahead of this scheme. Mawsley was a long time coming, it took over a decade to complete the roads after houses were completed and was like living on a building site during that time. Having already done its bit by increasing in size by over 35%, this constant attack on land around Mawsley is an insult to the local residents who just want to finally get on and enjoy living in the village.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

19	88	Mr Frank Quinn	<p>I have lived in Mawsley village for 11 years and I must say I have been amazed that the developers have managed to get away with what they have, continually breaching Health and Safety regulations also that the District and Parish Council have allowed this to happen and its still on going. It will only be a matter of time before a child is seriously injured by a vehicle, there has been no common sense applied to the crossing and road lay out along with the problem of people parking on corners, crossings and general bad practices. With the plans to increase the houses it is madness and will only compound the problems. There must be around 57 houses for sale in the village due to many people moving because there is a waiting list of years to get in the school. The computer network is very slow as it is, without addition usage. The water supplies system and drainage still have not been resolve and continually smell. When we have heavy rain fall it always ends up running down the roads to the proposed new site as its the lowest point in the village. We were told by the parish council that the strip of land running along the side of the proposed field, was a SSSI site but in fact it is not, I have also heard that the land owner of this strip of land wants to sell it, so how can houses be built on it if its privately owned. And finally how on earth will the developer get plant and materials to the site as the only access is round two 90% very small corners in constant use by villages and children going to and from school. The only other option for access is of the narrow main road and down a field owned by a different land owner. Yes we are totally opposed to any development on this</p>	<p>Your objection to further development in Mawsley is noted. However, 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. At this stage further work will be required to address some of the issues raised through the consultation process any conclusions can be made on the preferred option for Mawsley in the next iteration of the plan.</p>
----	----	----------------	--	--

				site or any where else in the village as we are already past the number of properties agreed it the Core Policy.	
--	--	--	--	--	--

19	91	Mr Stephen Farthing	<p>I strongly disagree for the following reasons 1) Mawsley has already increased in size from 700 to 1000 houses 42 % increase, it has taken it's share of increased development for KBC. 2) The school is already over subscribed and has had to be extended three times with considerable disruption to the children 3) Dentist/ Doctors over subscribed. 4) KBC should not be considering any further development until the existing development has been completed and the roads have been adopted. I have lived in Mawsley for 10 years with poorly maintained unadopted roads, street light inoperable and having to cut communal grass in front of our property myself. 5) Cransley rise is a small road with existing parking and traffic issues. 6) To the best of my knowledge the sewage system on Cransley Rise has blocked twice and can not cope with the existing houses.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. 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. However, at this stage further work will be required to address some of the issues raised through the consultation process any conclusions can be made on the preferred option for Mawsley in the next iteration of the plan. 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. It is also important to note that the document identifies growth to 2031 and growth will be staggered over the plan period rather than there being an immediate growth in the number of households in Mawsley.</p>
----	----	---------------------	---	---

19	97	Mrs Clare Farthing	<p>Dear Sirs I would like to strongly object to the planning application regarding a new housing development being built in Mawsley. Firstly we have had to endure over ten years of no road adoption, of terrible drains and sewage problems, of terrible traffic flow and bad road maintenance, a school that has had to be re-built four times over the last 6 years, there is no possible way that Mawsley can accommodate anymore houses or cars or people. The village was meant to represent all that was good about living in a traditional Northamptonshire environment, with lovely buildings built in a harmonious way, using Northamptonshire stone and heritage building ethics. Over the last 5 years developers have squeezed in over 100 houses that are not keeping with village ethos. The chaos that this new development would create can not be underestimated. The drains around Cransley Rise cannot cope with the amount of houses that are currently there at the moment, so how they'd cope with an extra 250 people (estimated) people is beyond comprehension. I strongly object also to the destruction of yet another lovely green space, isn't this going to effect the surrounding flora and fauna and the fact that the village deserves a few key "open spaces". The roads around Cransley will not be able to cope with the extra amount of traffic either. These houses would block out the current views of the villagers living around Cransley and the development would have a devastating impact on an attractive rural landscape. I will also be speaking to our local MP, local Media and Press about our objections to this planned development.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The site is being considered as an allocation for future development and a planning application has not been submitted to the Local Authority. Mawsley is identified as a Principle Village in the Joint Core, making it 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. However, at this stage further work will be required to address some of the issues raised through the consultation process any conclusions can be made on the preferred option for Mawsley in the next iteration of the plan. It is also important to note that the document identifies growth to 2031 and growth will be staggered over the plan period rather than there being an immediate growth in the number of households in Mawsley.</p>
----	----	--------------------	--	--

19	98	Mrs Elizabeth Shapcott	Strongly disagree with the potential to develop 57 houses at field near Cransley Rise, Malaslea, Birch Spinney. I've written a letter outlining our objections and posted it to your offices. We object because we feel it would be further congestion of traffic around that area on a road that is already narrow, too many houses, over developed and crammed in, detrimental to the surrounding agricultural land and wildlife and also impact on local services such as school, Doctors, Dentist and shop etc. I've also sent a copy of our letter outlining our full objections to our Councillor and MP. We've lived here 12 years and fed up with development and just want to see an end to it.	Your objection to identification of site RA/174 has been noted. However, 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. However, at this stage further work will be required to address some of the issues raised through the consultation process any conclusions can be made on the preferred option for Mawsley in the next iteration of the plan.
----	----	------------------------------	--	---

19	99	Mr. Andrew Lewis		<p>I suggest that the Red Land RA115 is given serious consideration for inclusion within the current development plans. The site is adjacent to the village centre and could assist in servicing the playing field and nursery and can provide its own access point through retained land with minimal disruption to the current highways situation.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments in relation to development in Mawsley. You may be aware that the site was previously discounted on the grounds of access. Information has been provided through the consultation which indicates that access constraints can be overcome. Further work will therefore be required in conjunction with Northamptonshire Highways Authority to determine whether the constraints can be overcome and this will need to be carried out before any conclusions can be made on the preferred option for Mawsley in the next iteration of the plan.</p>
----	----	------------------	--	--	--

19	102	Mrs Louise Boyle	<p>We wish to register our very strong objection to the proposal RA174 to build 57 new houses on the field bordering Birch Spinney, Malaslea and Cransley Rise. The plot of land is unsatisfactory and not appropriate for residential development for the following reasons : The developments take no account of the wishes of villagers as expressed through our previous successful objection to previous proposals to develop the land by the playing fields RA/115. (Localism Act 2011) Our house backs onto the field which is the reason we bought it 10 years ago Our house and back garden will be subject to light pollution during and after the development Our house and back garden will be subject to noise pollution both during and after the development We will experience loss of privacy due to the house and garden being overlooked We chose to live in a village, if we wanted to live in town we would have bought a house in Kettering, we work hard to maintain this lifestyle for our families It will make existing homes for sale more difficult to sell with the added competition from more new homes Access to the site along Cransley Rise is very limited with insufficient room for vision splays. The access point is on a narrow bend on a sharp estate road and will be dangerous. Cransley Rise is about to be adopted and construction traffic will damage the road it has taken 10 years for the road to be top coated and we have put up with the disruption of construction for over 11 years. The current road layout will cause major traffic congestion Adverse effect on roads or highway safety, local traffic generation, working on the assumption that there is a minimum of 1 car/house, & in</p>	<p>Your objection to further development in Mawsley, and in particular to the identification 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. At this stage further work will be required to address some of the issues raised through the consultation process any conclusions can be made on the preferred option for Mawsley in the next iteration of the plan.</p>
----	-----	------------------	---	---

			<p>many cases 2, judging by the existing volume of traffic in the village and already nuisance parking on roads we could see with 57 houses possibly 57-114 more cars, plus the impact on pedestrians, cyclists, road capacity. The junctions at the end of School Road where most of the traffic will be is very poorly designed and clogged with parked cars Road access in and out of the village is already very congested at rush hour due to limited employment opportunities in Mawsley most people commute to work The roundabout onto the A43 is already busy without additional traffic trying to negotiate the junction of what is a very busy carriage way as it is the main road between Kettering and Northampton Adverse impact on the size, form, character & setting of the village, especially if taken in combination with other developments The pumping station is undersized and raw sewerage runs across the footpaths and into water courses The broadband connection is very slow, the Government is going to make it a Human Right that everyone has access to the internet more residents will have a detrimental impact on existing residents making it impossible for residents and businesses to work from the village . Mawsley school has already been expanded 3 times with the loss of valuable playing fields and playgrounds. There is no possibility of further expansion and there are already children living in the village who cannot get a place at the school. The additional houses would lead to a possible 57-114 children who would require a school place. In addition the crèche is oversubscribed and other groups like the Scouts are also at maximum capacity. The</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>Childrens Halloween and Christmas parties are also sold out so that some children cannot attend. At the consultation meeting I attended the council representative tried to fob me off on this point about the end of a baby boom and falling birth rates, you cannot make this assumption that Mawsley conforms to the national trend it doesnt. it is unacceptable for Mawsley children to leave the village to obtain a school education The current village facilities are already stretched and it is noticeable that making a doctors or dentists appointment is taking longer. Prompt service is no longer achievable or available. It is not feasible to build more homes and encourage people to live in a village where they cannot access the school, dentist & doctors, where the local shop is overstretched and the roads choked with parked cars Irreversible loss of valuable agricultural land. This area should remain for agricultural use in the way the farmer has always used the field, growing crops, for the benefit of the existing community Loss of countryside view around which the layout of the village was designed, to build in this location takes away an amenity that all villagers share with view over open country. Taking away this amenity is no different to taking away the laying fields or pond Irrevocable loss of wildlife habitat and negative impact on the populations of local birds and animals eg yellow hammer, red kites, field fayres, Waxwings, owls, woodpeckers, reed buntings, linnets and reed buntings, foxes, badgers, deer, bats, monk jack deers Detriment to residential amenity Revision to the Core Spatial Strategy, due to be adopted shortly by Kettering Council will show they have a 5 year</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>land bank Policy 15 of North Northants Core Spatial Policy states that to meet local housing needs 30-40% more houses are needed to Kettering. Mawsley was originally 700 homes, this has been increased already by 300 homes to 1000 an increase of 42%. This proposal would mean a total of 1357 homes which is a total increase of 51% - far in excess of the Core Spatial Policy. It was categorically stated from the beginning of the building of the village that the village would consist of 700 homes. We have taken our fair share of increased development for Kettering Borough Council The need to avoid town cramming and over development The infill expansion on the site undermines the characteristic layout of Mawsley and goes against the original ethos of the village and extends the village beyond the boundary lines unnecessarily One of the unique design features of Mawsley is the design layout and this should be safeguarded. Mawsley was supposed to emulate the development of a typical Northamptonshire village with nooks and crannies, as such constraints on building design, replacement windows and doors, car parking provision to keep cars hidden and off the street support this. If this proposal goes ahead Mawsley will become another suburb of Kettering and become a housing estate rather than a village There is a possibility of developmental creep and urban crawl, the hatched area of the plan was also originally part of the new housing proposal, whilst this has been dropped for now it is not hard to see how a precedent will be set for future infilling New houses increase the strain on police, hospitals,</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>fire and ambulance services Increased flood risk to Malaslea and Birch Spinney, water pools in these fields in the winter and after heavy rain and once this is tarmacked over risk of flooding will be a major concern Little regard appears to have been paid to either the letter or the spirit of the Governments National Planning Policy Framework, and we would like to draw the Councils attention to the aims behind those paragraphs most relevant to Mawsley. Core Planning Principles. Paragraph 17 - planning should empower local people to shape their surroundings, finding ways to enhance and improve the places in which they live their lives. Comments already registered suggest that building on this site would be entirely at odds with the wishes of local residents. - the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside should be recognised. To allow further housing to be built on the site would degrade it both visually and as a wildlife corridor. Does the Council not recognise this? - planning should contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment, planning to build 57 houses on this site would be contrary to this Promoting Healthy Communities Paragraph 74 existing open space should not be built on, unless the land is surplus to requirements. With an already increasing population, the land is agricultural and cannot be considered to be surplus to requirements Paragraph 76 - Local communities should be able to identify for special protection green areas of particular importance to them. The objections have made it abundantly clear that this site is treasured. In conclusion, we believe the area under consideration must be rejected on the</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>grounds that it does not accord with the way in which the National Planning Policy Framework is expected to be applied. If additional housing is required in Northamptonshire it would be far preferable to build another new village designed like Mawsley or consider the brown field sites around Kettering. For all the above reasons we wish to register and you to acknowledge our very strong objection to RA/174. Mawsley was designed to be a village not an urban sprawl. The village has already been extended beyond the original scope and further houses would be counter-productive. The North Northamptonshire Development Company and the Daily Telegraph Best Village Aware cite the design layout of Mawsley as part of its unique creation as a Village rather than a housing estate. It is a village and has not become a rat run for commuters. There is no merit to the proposal and the existing facilities are over stretched. It is a wonderful village with a fabulous community spirit and we feel very strongly it must remain a village and not destroyed with more unwanted housing. Please do not build more houses in Mawsley Village.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

19	104	Mrs Helen Ellis	<p>We moved to the village because of the village community, school and local amenities. Since then, there has been constant building work, which we were expecting, but with assurances from the council that "these will be the final developments". The roads have started to be finished and villagers were starting to breathe a sigh of relief that we could finally have the village complete. Apparently we were wrong. First there was a proposal to build houses near the playing field, to which the village objected and it was overturned. Again we thought that was it, but no. Another proposal. So once again, villagers are objecting to try and save their already over expanded community (originally 700 houses, now proposed to be double that). A major concern is health and safety, not only due to the additional construction traffic that will have to negotiate around 90 degree bends and narrow roads, but the additional traffic that will be created by additional properties down this small link road, that is already difficult to negotiate due to the positioning of the surrounding houses and road layout. The junction is already causing problems and with an increased traffic throughput of around 100 cars, this has to increase the potential of accidents. It will only be a matter of time before a child is seriously injured by a vehicle. There will be additional pressure on the traffic in and around the village, in addition to the problems of access into Cransley Rise. There will be more traffic on the C31 into the village, which has already seen accidents. Also, getting onto the A43 is getting increasingly difficult and more cars would increase congestion. It is getting more and more</p>	<p>Your objection to further development in Mawsley. 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. At this stage further work is required to address some of the issues raised through the consultation process any conclusions can be made on the preferred option for Mawsley in the next iteration of the plan.</p>
----	-----	-----------------	---	---

			<p>difficult to sell houses in the village due to the inability to access the local amenities. The school has expanded beyond all expectations with children no longer having the room in the playground they once had, as it has now been built on. The surgery list size has increased far beyond the original expectation with additional doctors, resulting in patients not being able to see their preferred doctor and increasing waiting times. The dentist now has a huge waiting list. The nursery had to expand to accommodate additional children in the village. The shop is constantly busy, which is great, but makes a "quick trip to the shop" a thing of the past! Broadband is extremely slow, making it difficult for anyone trying to work from home, so additional users will make this worse. This cannot be good for local businesses either! Properties in Cransley Rise already have problems with the drainage and sewers, which would be under greater pressure from additional housing. There is concern from neighbouring properties about flooding, as this field often has lakes of water in the winter. Where will the soakaway be for this part of the village? There is confusion about the ransom strip behind the houses in Birch Spinney. There was talk of it being privately owned? Also that the hedge was protected and could not be tampered with? How can this strip be incorporated into the plans? The village was supposed to be different, with nooks and crannies, unusual road layouts, , constraints on building design, replacement windows and doors, car parking provision to keep cars hidden and views across the fields. This planning proposal contravenes paragraphs 17, 74 and 76</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>of the Mawsley Planning Principles document. And lastly, but certainly not least, this is supposed to be a village, surrounded by fields and wildlife. Children able to see the combine harvester clacking round the field every year, picking up the stalks of wheat and wondering how it gets into their Weetabix. If we wanted to live in a town, we would have moved to a town, but we didnt. We wanted to live in Mawsley Village. A Village. Surrounded by fields.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

19	105	Mr Russell Allison	<p>As one of the older residents of Mawsley I strongly disagree with any further development. I moved here to a village community, being able to walk around and knowing who my neighbours are. This has changed since moving here with the increase in the number of homes than originally told to me. I struggled to walk around (I am not as quick moving around as I used to be) and when the construction traffic hurtle around the village, it stops me from getting around. They have no consideration to us elderly and complaints to the builders made no difference. It is already difficult to walk around in between all the parked cars. Why do the council not understand that realistically houses have 2 cars in general. One garage means 2nd cars block the roads and walking between the cars it difficult. I bought my house for the views of the open fields as I have few pastimes in later years. The proposed new homes would stop this and mean the views of the wonderful rolling countryside of Northamptonshire would be spoilt along with the enjoyment of watching birds and wildlife in the fields and their natural habitat. All this would be stopped for ever. The birds and animals would not come back. Since moving to Mawsley village, it has been really good to benefit from having a village doctor who knows me and the wonderful support of the surgery. However since the increase in homes, it has been difficult to get an appointment with my own doctor and have to wait. Sometimes that has meant me being poorly and having to call and ambulance and a stay in hospital. I can only see this getting worse. My home is my pension. With new homes comes a show home and sales team</p>	<p>Your objection to further development in Mawsley. 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. At this stage further work is required to address some of the issues raised through the consultation process any conclusions can be made on the preferred option for Mawsley in the next iteration of the plan.</p>
----	-----	-----------------------	---	---

				<p>who offer all kinds of incentives. I know it will not be too long before I have to sell and lose my independence. On top of this, my property due to the close proximity of the proposed houses and the show home incentive mean it is highly unlikely my home will retain its current value. Who will help me through difficult times? Will the builders or the council help as they made the decision to decrease my home price? I despair when I see brown field sites in Kettering in or near the town, shops, office and house boarded up. Why spoil our village when the council need to make use of the almost derelict town with just charity shops in it. Money should be invested in the already established areas. Keep Mawsley as it is - a village. Stop forcing extra homes on us.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

19	106	Mr Stuart Ellis	<p>I am completely opposed to this and any other plans to expand Mawsley. The current construction in the village is finally drawing to a close and I am pleased that no one has been hurt by the plant vehicle traffic and the way it has been driven around the village. With the road layout as it is, more traffic will reverse this and may result in injury or death. The broadband connection in the village is already slow. Contention of this will only make a bad situation worse. Drainage and water system issues already exist, especially in the Cransley Rise area (the lowest part of the village, I believe) and this will amplify these fundamental problems. The field in question usually floods during very heavy rainfall. The parish council have stated that the Ransom strip of land running along the side of the proposed field, was subject to a tree preservation order, but since the meeting held at the school, it seems that that it is not. Access to the site is extremely limited and I do not see how construction traffic is going to be able to negotiate the pair of 90 degree turns and parked traffic.</p>	<p>Your objection to further development in Mawsley. 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. At this stage further work is required to address some of the issues raised through the consultation process any conclusions can be made on the preferred option for Mawsley in the next iteration of the plan.</p>
----	-----	--------------------	---	---

19	121	Philip and Elizabeth Shapcott	<p>Please find attached a copy of the letter outlining our objections to the proposal to potentially build a further 57 houses in Mawsley, a hard copy is in the post and I've also summarised our objections on the KBC planning portal. I've also sent copies to Mr Jim Hakewell and Mr Philip Hollobone, as well, as we feel so strongly about further developing our Village more and more. We've lived here 12 years and think enough is enough.</p>	<p>Your objection to further development in Mawsley 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. Unfortunately loss of view is not a material planning consideration. 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. It is also important to note that the document identifies growth to 2031 and growth will be staggered over the plan period rather than there being an immediate growth in the number of households in Mawsley. At this stage further work will be required to address some of the issues raised through the consultation process any conclusions can be made on the preferred option for Mawsley in the next iteration of the plan. 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. It is also important to note that the document identifies growth to 2031 and growth will be staggered over the plan period rather than</p>
----	-----	-------------------------------	---	--

					there being an immediate growth in the number of households in Mawsley.
--	--	--	--	--	---

19	125	<p>Laura Stratford Shane Connolly</p>	<p>We are writing to express our many concerns regarding the proposed development of 57 houses on the greenfield site to the west of Mawsley. Mawsley was built as a rural settlement, which has already grown well beyond the extent originally intended. In fact, policy 15 of the North Northants Core Spatial Policy states that between 30-40% more homes are required in the Borough to meet local housing needs. The original plan was for Mawsley to consist of 700 homes, which has already increased by 42% and now totals a thousand houses. This new proposal would then take the increase rate up to a huge 51%, which is far greater than the required 30-40%. We therefore feel that Mawsley has already met and far exceeded the criteria for meeting the housing needs of the Borough. On a personal level, many residents including ourselves moved here for the village lifestyle offered by access to the countryside, attractive views from footpaths even within the village itself, and the community feel. The community is already very large for a village, and we believe that any more development would have a significant impact on all of the aforementioned factors, turning Mawsley into more of a suburb than a village. We are not alone in this view and are aware of many others who are also voicing their objections. We would therefore encourage you to consider the Localism Act (2011) which includes the duty to consider the views of local people in matters such as this, and gives the community a right to challenge the issues they are unhappy with. The Localism Act (2011) also refers to sustainable development, which we feel</p>	<p>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. 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. 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. It is also important to note that the document identifies growth to 2031 and growth will be staggered over the plan period rather than there being an immediate growth in the number of households in Mawsley.</p>
----	-----	---	---	--

			<p>that the proposed development is not. Our school, doctors surgery, dentist and shopping area were designed to meet the needs of the current population, and would become over subscribed and are unlikely to meet the needs of such a large increase. Another issue is road safety, which is already a problem with dangerously parked cars and heavy traffic along the C31, which is essentially a country road. In an area so popular with walkers and cyclists it seems very insensible to make these issues worse, by adding potentially more than a hundred extra cars to the problem. Owning a car is a necessity here, as the public transport system to and from the village is simply not reliable enough. We moved to Mawsley with the intention of sharing one car for the two of us, but after being late for work on several occasions due to buses not arriving or coming late we were forced to buy a second car. I am sure we are not alone in this experience. Finally, we are very worried about the effects that this development may have on local wildlife, particularly since the proposed site is so close to a Site of Special Scientific Interest at Birch Spinney & Mawsley Marsh. A great deal of wildlife habitat was lost with the original building of Mawsley, making it all the more important that the surrounding area is as well protected as possible. Thank you for taking the time to read our comments, and we hope that you will consider them carefully before allowing further development in Mawsley.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

19	126	Mrs Leigh Cacchioli	<p>It would be unfair to the current Mawsley residents to put up with yet more years of living in a building site, with loud noise, and builders that have no consideration for the villagers. The village school, dentist and doctors are all over subscribed, which concerns me greatly as my two year old may not be able to attend the school when it becomes time. The village is already much larger than originally intended and the sewage and broadband facilities are struggling to cope. Please do not ignore these messages.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. 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. 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. 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. It is also important to note that the document identifies growth to 2031 and growth will be staggered over the plan period rather than there being an immediate growth in the number of households in Mawsley.</p>
----	-----	------------------------	--	---

19	129	Mrs Morag Byrne	<p>We write to strongly object to any development off Cransley Rise and indeed anywhere in Mawsley. The village has already grown far bigger than was originally planned and any further expansion will destroy the community atmosphere that we currently enjoy. The school has been expanded several times and families are being forced to send their children to other primary schools due to the large class sizes in Mawsley. The situation will only get worse, as children grow into teenagers and attend senior school. The number of students attending senior school in Kettering and Rothwell is growing rapidly each year and this will have a big impact on car journeys in and out of the village. The proposed site off Cransley Rise is not practical due to its situation off a narrow side road, with an extremely sharp bend. We live close to this bend and have seen several near misses with vehicles cutting the corner. Unfortunately this road is an accident waiting to happen and introducing more vehicles is just not feasible. We can't imagine the problems that will ensue if large construction vehicles have to use the road. We live alongside the proposed site and have enjoyed the beautiful countryside and wildlife that inhabits it. We see many residents walking along Cransley Rise stopping and taking in the views. This is an amenity for all villagers and the loss of this view will have a significant impact on a lot of people. I remember not long after moving to Mawsley seeing an article in a national newspaper quoting Mawsley as a great example of a new village. Don't spoil what you've achieved here, Kettering Borough Council. I think Mawsley is a village to be proud of and the</p>	<p>Your objection to further growth is Mawsley has been noted. 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. 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. At this stage further work will be required to address some of the issues raised through the consultation process any conclusions can be made on the preferred option for Mawsley in the next iteration of the plan.</p>
----	-----	-----------------	---	--

				<p>Planners should be proud of it too. Continual expansion of the village will destroy everything that has been achieved, by way of community spirit, and is totally unfair and detrimental to the residents. We should have the opportunity to experience village life as we were all promised.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

19	134	Miss Pat Downing	Chair of Governors Governors of Mawsley Community Primary School	<p>The Governors of Mawsley Community Primary School wish to register the following points in regard to KBC 'Housing Allocations - Assessment of Additional Sites and Update' document: In September 2014 our primary school will celebrate its tenth birthday and since it opened has gone from one to two-form entry. Currently there are 362 pupils on roll. We have room for 420. The Local Authority will need to accurately assess and predict pupil numbers at a time in the future when the need to provide additional housing is determined. We have been informed by the LA that the school cannot expand further on its present site. There have already been significant additions and extensions to the school buildings, the last of which was completed in December 2012. Community cohesion is crucial in our village and the school and wider village community have played an important part in ensuring that the village grows confidently and establishes and develops community organisations which seek to be inclusive and actively promote this vision. Developing a school/village community takes time, energy and commitment. We ask that you take account of this when looking at any proposal to increase the village population. Our village is still not finished. We have lived with builders/developers on site and they are still with us. KBC must appreciate and take on board that we would all benefit here from a period of peace and calm when we do not see evidence of builders at work and roads being brought up to standard for adoption. What additional strain would the proposed development put on our existing infrastructure? The area around the</p>	Thank you for your comment which have been noted. Your comments will be used to inform the next iteration of the plan.
----	-----	------------------	---	--	--

				<p>school is already congested at times when children are being dropped off and collected. The Medical Centre, which is close to the school, is also a very busy location in terms of traffic, both from our village and from villages in the surrounding area. There is also the issue of flooding which sometimes occurs near the proposed site. Should additional housing be provided on the site indicated it is very important to ensure completion of the cycle path in that area. It existed on the original plan for this village, was designed to circumnavigate our village and would provide, as was always intended, an amenity we would enjoy. Families from our school and the village set off for their ride or walk and then have to come to an abrupt stop because our valued cycle path is still incomplete.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

19	137	Mrs Claire Lenton	<p>Dear Sir or Madam, Housing Allocations Assessment of Additional Sites & Update Land to the West of Mawsley ' Site Reference RA/174 I am writing to express my views with regards to the proposed development of the village of Mawsley. I have lived in Mawsley for four years and strongly object to this proposed development for the following reasons: a) The proposal ignores the previous wishes of myself and other villagers when objecting to the development of a different site; b) Mawsley first became inhabited approximately 11 years ago and to date works have never ceased, either housing development or road adoption. It must surely be time for stability within the village; c) The infrastructure of the village was designed to support 700 homes, as per the original plan. There are now approximately 1,000 homes. The infrastructure is struggling to cope with present demand and further development can only exacerbate this situation; d) The land is currently farmed and any development will have an irreversible loss of this agricultural land; e) Mawsley has a beautiful diversity of wildlife with frequent sightings of foxes, bats, badgers, and deer. There is also a wonderful range of birds, including migrant species such as the Waxwing, and our garden alone attracts over 30 different species including woodpeckers, yellowhammers, owls, bullfinches, linnets and reed buntings. Further development can only have a negative impact on these populations; f) The ancient and protected hedgerow will become completely encased with housing thus causing irreversible effects on this green habitat. All the species mentioned above use the hedgerow for nesting,</p>	<p>Your objections to further development in Mawsley have been noted. 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. 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. The site is not located in a flood zone, and any impact on wildlife can be satisfactorily mitigated. While loss of view is not a material planning consideration, overlooking, loss of privacy, noise and other pollution are material considerations which will be assessed in detail at planning application stage. At this stage further work will be required to address some of the other issues raised through the consultation process any conclusions can be made on the preferred option for Mawsley in the next iteration of the</p>
----	-----	-------------------	--	---

			<p>shelter and some species such as fieldfares and reed buntings use it for roosting during winter months. g) The school has been subject to numerous extensions to accommodate the influx of children within the village. This has had a detrimental effect on the outdoor space in which the children have to play. An increased population can only add to the pressures faced by the school; h) The spirit throughout the village is fantastic and events at the community centre are well supported and very well attended. For example the recent children's Halloween party sold out quickly leaving a number of children very disappointed. I believe the forthcoming Christmas party has also sold out, no doubt presenting the same issues. Obviously an increase in the number of families is going to create more of these problems; i) The field subject to the proposal has a tendency to become flooded during the winter months and I fear any development may increase these problems and cause issues for those living Cransley Rise; j) An increase in the number of homes will inevitably increase the traffic within the village which will have an adverse effect on road safety and no doubt further the issues of nuisance parking; k) The current access point to the field is fairly restricted and those living in its immediate vicinity will experience problems with large vehicles negotiating tight and twisty roads. There are already parking issues in this area I envisage this will create further road safety problems; l) My property backs onto the field subject to this proposed development. One of the reasons for purchasing this house was its location on the edge of the village and the</p>	plan.
--	--	--	--	-------

			<p>associated countryside views. m) My house and back garden will become overlooked thus affecting my privacy; n) The loss of countryside views will have an adverse effect on the value of my property; o) Being overlooked will have an adverse effect on the value of my property; p) I will experience increased levels of noise during and after the development q) My property will be subject to increased light pollution during and after the development; and r) Central Government has indicted there is the need for a substantial increase in the number of homes in Northamptonshire. Whether this is true is quite subjective but the negatives this local proposal will bring will far out-way the alleged benefits. Mawsley is a fantastic place to live and has a wonderful community spirit. Villagers are proud of the community they have helped to create. It is ideally situated and well designed. It isnt a thoroughfare for anywhere and consequently cannot be used as a rat-run for commuters. Please give this friendly and inspiring village a chance to be a village without the constant worry of further development. If more housing is required in Northamptonshire then surely it would make eminent sense to replicate the Mawsley concept at different sites within Northamptonshire thus creating jobs? Once again I would like to repeat my strong objection to this development proposal.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

19	138	Paul and Wendy Slater	<p>Dear Sir With reference to the recent consultation at Mawsley School on 20th November I am writing to express my concerns and objection to the further development of land in Mawsley, in particular the land to the West of the village adjacent to Cransley Road (Site Reference RA/174). I object to any further development of the Village for a range of reasons a few of which are listed below:- I have safety concerns relating to the increased traffic flow, not only in the village as a whole but specifically in Cransley Rise at the corner adjacent to the proposed site where a number of traffic incidents have occurred. Any increase in the number of vehicles using this road could well result in a serious accident/s. Any development on this Green Field site will result in the loss of valuable agricultural land as well as the loss of natural habitat for wildlife which is regularly seen in the local area. The development of agricultural land is out of line with planning policy to prioritise development on Brown Fields previously developed land. The additional traffic flow will have an adverse effect on our property and additional housing will probably impact on our privacy. The development takes no account of the wishes of villagers as expressed through our previous successful objection to the proposals to develop the land adjacent to the playing fields (Site Reference RA/115). We moved to the Village over 10 years ago at which time the total number of residential properties was intended to be 700. Since then we have already had an additional 300 properties added which has not only changed the feel of the original village concept and master plan but has</p>	<p>Your objections to further development in Mawsley have been noted. Brownfield sites have been considered as potential allocations throughout the Borough and there are many instances where brownfield sites have been identified as potential allocations. However, the Joint Core Strategy requires Kettering Borough Council to allocate sites to accommodate 10,700 dwellings to the period 2031. Therefore, in order to meet this requirement the Council needs to consider greenfield sites in conjunction with brownfield sites. 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. At this stage further work will be required to address some of the other issues raised through the consultation process any conclusions can be made on the preferred option for Mawsley in the next iteration of the plan.</p>
----	-----	-----------------------------	--	--

			<p>been delivered in far greater density with a detrimental impact on the village as a whole. Any further increase in the number of properties and at the density proposed will only exacerbate this and increase the pressure on the local amenities. We have effectively been living on a building site for the last 10 years, with a number of roads still to be finished and many still to be adopted. The thought of many more years of construction, noise, dust, un-adopted roads, heavy construction vehicles travelling along unsuitable road etc. fills us with dread. I would be pleased to meet up and clarify any of the points listed as well as go through our further concerns should you wish any additional information.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

19	139	Miss Nikkita Hatfield	<p>I wish to object the proposed development of 57 houses in Mawsley. We brought a house here earlier this year, because we wanted the village lifestyle and really liked the fact that Mawsley is a new development that has been carefully thought out, with fields breaking up the estate. I feel if these houses were built it will take away a part of this, and Mawsley will start to feel like any other new housing estate. Our other main reason was because we wanted our children to attend a village school in the same village that we lived, so our children can become an integrated part of Mawsley village and love amongst their school friends. As the school has already been extended twice before and is oversubscribed, I would worry that more houses could potentially mean my children won't get a place when their time comes. Other amenities within the village are also stretched already and unless extra infrastructure is out in place then I do not think Mawsley can cope with more houses. I am very happy to live in a small village, which is already bigger than it was intended to be, and would like it to stay this way.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which have been duly noted.</p>
----	-----	-----------------------	--	--

19	154	Mr Richard Boyes	<p>HOUSING ALLOCATIONS ASSESSMENT OF ADDITIONAL SITES & UPDATE 19 MAWSLEY I live in Mawsley and wish to submit my comments and views on the proposed additional development RA/174 as outlined in the Housing Allocations Assessment of Additional Sites & Update 19-Mawsley which was also shown at Mawsley School on 20th November 2013. The proposal to build 57 new dwellings on agricultural land to the West of Mawsley Village in the area surrounded by Birch Spinney, Malaslea and Cransley Rise is contrary to the statement in Paragraph 19.3 which states there was a significant amount of opposition to any development in the village. The proposal further takes no account of the views of the villagers as expressed in previous objections to develop land by the playing fields as outlined in RA/115. This is totally counter to the intent of the Localism Act 2011. The building of 57 dwellings on the proposed site will be out of keeping with the character of the surrounding dwellings which were built in line with the original intent for Mawsley Village which was to build a traditional Northamptonshire Village not another modern housing estate. The surrounding dwellings are laid out on generous (by modern standard) plots, not crammed in on top of each other as the proposed dwellings would be. The village infrastructure was based on a village of 700 dwellings and is now struggling to cope with the current 1000 dwellings, an increase of 42%. Building a further 57 properties will increase the oversize nature of Mawsley which is contrary to the North Northants Core Spatial Policy which envisages an increase of between 30-40%.</p>	<p>Your objections to further development in Mawsley have been 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. At this stage further work will be required to address the issues raised through the consultation process any conclusions can be made on the preferred option for Mawsley in the next iteration of the plan.</p>
----	-----	------------------	---	---

Mawsley Village School has already been expanded three times since it opened and there is no scope for further expansion on the current site. Despite the expansion the School is at or near to capacity and Mawsley parents are already finding it increasingly difficult to find places for their children in their local school. The suggestion that surrounding schools can be expanded to cope with displaced Mawsley children is ridiculous and will increase traffic on local roads at an already busy time of the day. The roads in the immediate area of the proposed development are already unsuitable for the level of traffic at busy times of the day. Cransley Rise is a narrow link road with cars often parked at the side of the road, reducing the available width to single lane operation. The layout of the road with traffic islands and parked cars make it unsuitable for heavy traffic. Access to the proposed development is on a blind corner with poor sight lines and is unsuitable for any regular access and certainly unsuitable for up to 200 vehicles movements daily that would be generated by the between 57 and 114 vehicles associated with building 57 dwellings on the site. The proposed development is on land that is currently used for agricultural purposes and was until recently the subject of a 10 year Restricted Covenant on its development. I am unclear as to what has changed to allow removal of this Restricted Covenant. The site is also adjacent to a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) (Birch Spinney) and is the home to a significant and varied amount of wildlife and flora and fauna. Building on this site will further erode the natural habitat of the wildlife and surround Birch Spinney

			<p>with dwellings to the detriment of the SSSI. The site is also prone to flooding in winter with significant levels of water surface lying until it slowly soaks into the ground. Building on this site could increase the flooding risk to neighbouring dwellings and also to dwellings built on the site. Allowing development of this site, against the wishes of the Village will open up further sites around Mawsley for development in the future. If this site is approved the logical extension would see dwellings built further round Cransley Rise towards Stoneyfield and then on the Eco Field. If the same logic of infilling is followed then the field adjacent to Old Gorse Way would also be built upon as would the field adjacent to the First Entrance to Mawsley. Mawsley is an Award Winning Village for a reason, it was designed as a village and not just another modern housing estate. Additional development has already eroded some of the original character of the Village, further development should not be allowed to further erode the special nature and character of Mawsley. This proposal is unsuitable and should be discounted.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

19	161	Mr John Claypole	<p>I believe site ra 115 should be included in the draft allocation for the following reasons: 1/The exclusion of site RA115 would be a controversial ommitance from the National Policy Framework guidelines in that there is a "presumption in favour of sustainable development" in plan making and decision taking . siteRA115 is a high scoring site if assement criteria were be applied to it. National guidelines also ask local councils to "plan positively to support local development shaping and directing development in their area" Government guidelines also suggest that planning principles are "not simply about scrutiny, but instead be a creative exercise in finding ways to enhance and improve the places which people live their lives". Site RA115 can achieve this criteria because of its excellent siting to the village core and services. government guidelines also suggest "the supply of new homes can sometimes be best achieved through new settlements or extensions to existing villages", a criteria which site RA115 complies with. Also guidelines suggest "to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities". site RA115 achieves this criteria 2/The landform is excellent and further development enhances the intergration of the settlement with the open countryside and footpaths, a feature not applicable to other areas of the village. 3/ site RA115 offers close proximity to both schools, and could yield some of the area to the adjacent nursery school. It also offers the chance for further expansion to the playing field area ,an increased parking area for TCAM for the benefit</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments in relation to RA/115 and development in Mawsley. As you are aware the site was previously discounted on the grounds of access. It is noted that information has been provided which indicates that access constraints can be overcome. Further work will therefore be required in conjunction with Northamptonshire Highways Authority to determine whether the constraints can be overcome and this will need to be carried out before any conclusions can be made on the preferred option for Mawsley in the next iteration of the plan.</p>
----	-----	------------------	--	--

			<p>of the community as a whole. Site RA115 would also offer a solution to the allotment area currently located some 2 miles from Mawsley. Another site can provide the improvements to TCAM or the nursery. 4/site RA115 would also be able to accommodate a provision for the elderly, something not yet addressed in Mawsley. Indeed, Mawsley village is the lowest ranking village in this area in the Kettering borough in housing provision and bungalows. 5/A flagged concern with site RA115 is access and connecting to the existing settlement. Another concern is increased pressure on the existing highway system and facilities. One access point is required near TCAM to provide connectivity. This would provide excellent opportunities for parking at TCAM, nursery access, playing field access and Barnwell court. The site has provision for a new road across the owners existing land, easing current highway pressure and traffic flow on the current two access points. The creation of a third road also means no disruption to the current residents by heavy plant traffic and service vehicles. No disturbance would be created by the development of Site RA115. In topographical terms, less than 5% of the existing residents of Mawsley would be affected by the development of site RA115, whereas 100% could benefit from the improvements it offers. Other large villages have housing allocations to relieve minor, more historic villages of development pressure and Mawsley and its facilities can accommodate further growth.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

19	170	Mr N Lenton	<p>Dear Sir or Madam, Housing Allocations Assessment of Additional Sites & Update Land to the West of Mawsley Site Reference RA/174 I am writing to express my views with regards to the proposed development of the village of Mawsley. I have lived in Mawsley for four years and strongly object to this proposed development for the following reasons: a) My property backs onto the field subject to this proposed development. One of the reasons for purchasing this house was its location on the edge of the village and the associated countryside views; b) My house and back garden will become overlooked thus affecting my privacy; c) I will experience increased levels of noise during and after the development; d) My property will be subject to increased light pollution during and after the development; e) The proposal ignores the previous wishes of myself and other villagers when objecting to the development of a different site; f) Mawsley first became inhabited approximately 11 years ago and to date works have never ceased, either housing development or road adoption. It must surely be time for stability within the village; g) The land is currently farmed and any development will have an irreversible loss of this agricultural land; h) Mawsley has a beautiful diversity of wildlife with frequent sightings of foxes, bats, badgers, and deer. There is also a wonderful range of birds, including migrant species such as the Waxwing, and our garden alone attracts over 30 different species including woodpeckers, yellowhammers, owls, bullfinches, linnets and reed buntings. Further development can only have a negative impact on these</p>	<p>While loss of view and impact on property value is not a material planning consideration, overlooking, loss of privacy, noise and other pollution are material considerations which will be assessed in detail at planning application stage. The site is not located in a flood zone, and any impact on wildlife can be satisfactorily mitigated. 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. At this stage further work will be required to address some of the other issues raised through the consultation process any conclusions can be made on the preferred option for Mawsley in the next iteration of the plan.</p>
----	-----	-------------	--	---

			<p>populations. i) The infrastructure of the village was designed to support 700 homes, as per the original plan. There are now approximately 1,000 homes. The infrastructure is struggling to cope with present demand and further development can only exacerbate this situation; j) The loss of countryside views will have an adverse effect on the value of my property; k) Being overlooked will have an adverse effect on the value of my property l) The school has been subject to numerous extensions to accommodate the influx of children within the village. This has had a detrimental effect on the outdoor space in which the children have to play. An increased population can only add to the pressures faced by the school; m) The spirit throughout the village is fantastic and events at the community centre are well supported and very well attended. For example the recent children's Halloween party sold out quickly leaving a number of children very disappointed. I believe the forthcoming Christmas party has also sold out, no doubt presenting the same issues. Obviously an increase in the number of families is going to create more of these problems; n) The field subject to the proposal has a tendency to become flooded during the winter months and I fear any development may increase these problems and cause issues for those living Cransley Rise; o) An increase in the number of homes will inevitably increase the traffic within the village which will have an adverse effect on road safety and no doubt further the issues of nuisance parking; p) The current access point to the field is fairly restricted and those living in its immediate vicinity will experience problems with</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>large vehicles negotiating tight and twisty road. There are already parking issues in this area I envisage this will create further road safety problems; and q) Central Government has indicated there is the need for a substantial increase in the number of homes in Northamptonshire. Whether this is true is quite subjective but the negatives this local proposal will bring will far out-way the alleged benefits. Mawsley is a fantastic place to live and has a wonderful community spirit. It is ideally situated and well designed. It isn't a thoroughfare for anywhere and consequently cannot be used as a rat-run for commuters. If more housing is required in Northamptonshire then surely it would make eminent sense to replicate the Mawsley concept at different sites within Northamptonshire? Once again I would like to repeat my strong objection to this development proposal.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

19	174	Mrs Moutrie	<p>Dear Sir/Madam Development services Re: planning site Mawsley bordering Birch spinney, Malaslea and Cransley rise (RA/174) I write in connection with the above planning application. I wish to object strongly to the development of 57 houses in this location. Cransley rise has already issues with parking and traffic, it would be hazardous to add further to the already troublesome roads. The school is overflowing and has been extended several times. Mawsley has already expanded over its original proposal by over 40%. I moved to Mawsley to be away from over crowded housing estates which will be created if the proposal goes ahead. I will personally be disturbed by the noise, pollution and traffic from heavy machinery which will have to access on an already dangerous bend and thereafter will have the added noise of extra population and traffic (2 cars per house potentially an extra 114 cars) which will be very hazardous on the roads and for parking issues. The view WILL be spoilt and the character of the village. It will also be Detrimental for the wildlife.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. At this stage further work will be required to address some of the other issues raised through the consultation process any conclusions can be made on the preferred option for Mawsley in the next iteration of the plan.</p>
----	-----	-------------	---	--

19	178	Mr Nick Haley	<p>Dear Sir/Madam Development services Re: planning site Mawsley bordering Birch spinney, Malaslea and Cransley rise (RA/174) I write in connection with the above planning application. I wish to object strongly to the development of 57 houses in this location. This is due to the fact that the sewage system is already overload by having more houses built than originally planned and the extra housing will just cause more problems The road system into that area is not designed for an other 57 houses. The school is now full. After a long time the roads and pavements have just been finish, so all the extra building traffic will only damage the roads, therefore wasting money that has been spent to get them ready to be adopted.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. At this stage further work will be required to address some of the other issues raised through the consultation process any conclusions can be made on the preferred option for Mawsley in the next iteration of the plan.</p>
----	-----	------------------	--	--

19	188	Mr Paul Fountain	<p>We feel very strongly against any further or future development of any land in or around Mawsley and specifically the land off Cransley Rise. 1) We purchased our house 7 years ago and paid what we considered a premium to have a property on the end of the village with county views. 2) The field floods after heavy or persistent rainfall or snow-melt. Where would that water go should any building work happen? I have pictures of the area when it is in flood should you wish to see them. 3) Access to the site, is just off a dangerous bend in the road where there are frequent near-misses. 4) When we initially moved to the village just over 10 years ago, we were advised that the village would be a maximum of 660 houses. As you are aware this figures has already been significantly increased. The knock-on effect of this means we have limited services and infrastructure that is at capacity. The school has been built onto almost every year since it opened, reducing the playing space and sports space available to the children. 5) You currently can wait almost a week to see your own GP, if not longer. Further development could mean even longer delays. The same applies to the dentist. Would they have capacity for a further 57 houses worth of occupants? 6) With only 2 entry\exit points of the village, there would be significant increase in traffic, and the noise that is associated with that. Cransley Rise comes out onto School Road which is the main route taken by children to get to the school and increased traffic would be increased danger for young school children. 7) Public transport is unreliable and limited service, ie, no buses run at all on a Sunday. 8) We have designed our</p>	<p>Your objection to future development in Mawsley 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. At this stage further work will be required to address some of the issues raised through the consultation process any conclusions can be made on the preferred option for Mawsley in the next iteration of the plan.</p>
----	-----	------------------	--	--

				<p>gardens with the beautiful countryside views that we currently enjoy and this design work was at considerable expense. 9) Any development work that would take place, would very much overlook our property and due to the angle of our property any new houses would look into both our front and rear gardens, and the living spaces in our house and leave us with absolutely no privacy. 10) Loss of farming land.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

19	190	Mr Jonathan Perkins	<p>We moved to Mawsley in 2004 to take advantage of the "village lifestyle" and "countryside views" being offered by the development. Since moving to Mawsley we have had a family and have welcomed the growth and development within the community. We have been so happy here, that we decided to extend the property costing us many tens of thousands of pounds rather than moving, specifically because of our countryside views and wanting to remain in the village. As indicated above the words "Strongly disagree" are not strong enough to represent the objection put forward for the proposed development. The reasoning behind this is as follows:- 1) Access to the development is inadequate with the proposed road structure and is directly at the point of a blind bend. Additional traffic caused by building 57 properties will result in a minimum of 200 extra car journeys down a narrow road increasing the possibility of accidents or pedestrian injury. 2) The school is already at maximum capacity with all surrounding village schools also at capacity. Mawsley School had its third and final extension completed this year and no further expansion is possible on that site. Some village children were unsuccessful in application for Mawsley school and have been placed in surrounding schools. 3) The village has already been increased from the original proposal of circa 700 houses up to 1000. Any additional build will ruin the village concept and infrastructure. Do you want a to turn a village into a "housing estate"? 4) The proposed area for build is subject to regular flooding. Why build on a flood plain? Surely this will only increase the risk of flooding to surrounding areas</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which have been duly 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. The site is not located within a flood zone. The site is not a site of special scientific interest (SSSI) and any impact on wildlife can be satisfactorily mitigated. At this stage further work will be required to address some of the other issues raised through the consultation process any conclusions can be made on the preferred option for Mawsley in the next iteration of the plan.</p>
----	-----	---------------------------	--	--

			<p>of Cransley Rise. 5) I understood that part of the building site known as the "strip" was an area of scientific interest because of the rare foliage, wildlife and fossils contained within. Has this all of a sudden been dis-regarded to accommodate the proposed development? 6) In 2007 Mawsley won a prestigious New Village award as voted by the Daily Telegraph. Further development will destroy what the village is and KBC should safeguard the design and layout of the village, not propose further development. 7) The C31 road that runs parallel to the village is already too narrow and struggles to accommodate existing traffic levels. More traffic will only increase the accident potential of this road. 8) Access onto the A43 is already congested. 9) Public Transport would have to be improved. The current bus service to the village is poor and very expensive. 10) Mawsley Medical centre already struggles to accommodate existing residents requests and an expansion to the village will reduce resident appointment availability further. To summarise, we feel that it is an infringement of our human rights to remove the " countryside view's, "loss of privacy" and the "lack of green walking areas" which made us move to the village in the first place.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

19	192	Miss Janette Allison	<p>Having lived in Mawsley since the start of the village, we have never seen a time when there has been no building work. The proposed addition of 57 new houses is unbelievable when this village is already over stretched with - places in the school are limited and already there are not sufficient places for current children in the village - roads are full of parked cars as there are insufficient parking for current cars - Cransley Rise is already full and like an obstacle course to drive down - how will residents manage who currently live in Cransley/Malasea area with building traffic - the noise from construction traffic will be terrible and where will they park - house prices for current residents will drop, particularly while building work takes place - currently Cransley Road / School Road junction is designed badly and near misses between cars occur virtually daily - wildlife and birds area the current field areas will be badly effected with any building work - currently road repairs are taking place in the village and a make shift site is in Chambers Hill and every day the noise is terrible and can be heard inside houses not on even on Chambers Hill. This is also from 7/8am even on Saturdays - cars are parked on Chambers Hill from the builders and is difficult to get a space and the road is blocked off regularly - there are not facilities for the current homes please let the village remain a village</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which have been duly 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. At this stage further work will be required to address some of the issues raised through the consultation process any conclusions can be made on the preferred option for Mawsley in the next iteration of the plan.</p>
----	-----	----------------------------	---	--

19	198	Mr Mark Watts	<p>Reference: Planning site Mawsley bordering Birch spinney, Malaslea and Cransley Rise I would like to formally register my strong disagreement to the proposal for building a significant number of new houses on land bordering Birch spinney, Malaslea and Cransley Rise in Mawsley: 1. Having been a resident for nearly 10 years we are still waiting for the roads to be fully adopted - any further development will not only damage existing infrastructure but further delay the completion of the village. PLEASE allow our community to exist in peace! 2. The village has already seen a significant increase in size compared to the original plans upon which we were sold our property. As a direct result of this the fantastic local primary school (and its teachers and students) has been disrupted by 3 separate instances of redevelopment to cope with the increasing numbers - resulting in the loss of valuable playground space. There is no room left and I cannot practically see how children from 57 extra houses could possibly be accommodated. 3. Our property is highly likely to suffer from increased noise pollution 4. The children of this area of Mawsley lead active outdoor lives, and can be always found outside playing on their bikes and scooters, the significant increase in traffic during an extended build period, and the massive potential increase in traffic with a development of this size will increase the risk of accidents in a road that already has a tight, blind corner. 5. We are lucky enough to have a fantastic variety of flora and fauna, with owls, red kites, hares and deer often seen in this area. This will be hugely impacted by any further development. 6. Any</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which have been duly noted. At this stage further work will be required to address some of the issues raised through the consultation process any conclusions can be made on the preferred option for Mawsley in the next iteration of the plan.</p>
----	-----	---------------	--	---

				<p>further development will result in changing what had always been designed to be a 'traditional' rural village and community into an overly large housing estate. 7. We benefit from open space in this area, subsequent developments have proven to be 'crammed' in - please do not ruin this village any further by shoe-horning further properties in.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

19	199	Mrs Linda Perry	<p>As a resident of a property which directly adjoins the parcel of land in question, I strongly object to the building of approx 57 houses for the following reasons:- 1 I do not feel that the council, land owner or any potential developers have given due consideration or thought to the impact of the potential number of vehicles that will be obliged to use Cransley Rise as they enter and leave the village, particularly during rush hour times. Cransley Rise is a narrow road with a traffic calming island situated fairly close to the junction with School Road. There are currently issues in turning in and out of Cransley Rise due to vehicles being parked on School Road, opposite the junction and on Cransley Rise itself. I can only see the problem of access escalating if the proposed development were to go ahead. 2 Given the above, again I do not feel that enough thought has been give to the potential of accidents occurring at this junction, both vehicular and pedestrian. Considering the number of children that cross the road at the point of Cransley Rise/School Road on their way to and from school, I fear that there is a very real danger of an incident occurring. 3 Whilst I understand that planning committees do not take notice of any objections levelled at the disruption caused during building work, I feel that I must comment on the problems the site access will cause to current road users. The access to the site appears to be situated on a 45 degree bend in the road at the bottom of Cransley Rise, which again given the above points has the potential to be of a hazardous nature to those currently living in the vicinity and pedestrians. 4 I understand that current planning policy is to prioritise</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which have been noted. Brownfield sites have been considered as potential allocations throughout the Borough and there are many instances where brownfield sites have been identified as potential allocations. However, the Joint Core Strategy requires Kettering Borough Council to allocate sites to accommodate 10,700 dwellings to the period 2031. Therefore, in order to meet this requirement the Council needs to consider greenfield sites in conjunction with brownfield sites. While loss of view and impact on property value is not a material planning consideration, over looking and loss of privacy are material considerations which will be assessed in detail at planning application stage. The site is not located within a flood zone. The site is not a site of special scientific interest (SSSI) and any impact on wildlife can be satisfactorily mitigated. At this stage further work will be required to address some of the other issues raised through the consultation process any conclusions can be made on the preferred option for Mawsley in the next iteration of the plan.</p>
----	-----	-----------------	---	--

			<p>development on Brown Field sites; therefore the proposed development of this Green Field site is blatantly against current policy. 5 Whilst I understand that there is no right to a view, the loss of the views currently afforded to the properties surrounding the proposed site will be greatly affected by way of loss of privacy, being overlooked, along with additional noise and disturbance once the site is developed 6 Due to the proposed number of units being put forward, I feel that the visual impact on this area of the village will be out character in terms of its appearance with the existing properties as well as being out of scale and over-bearing. Having attended the meeting at the school on the 20/11/13, I was concerned about the attitude of one of the hosts. When questioned about the proposed number of units possibly being more than planned at the moment, there was no clear indication that this would not be increased further, which would result in a much greater number of units being built, as has been found to be the case with the later build phases in the village. 7 There have been many incidents in the past two/three years when the field has become water logged during period of heavy rain, resulting in a number of large puddles developing in the area which appear to come from water running out of the now called ransom strip into the field. Given the problems which have occurred around the village from various underground springs, this could cause major problems for any properties built on this site along with the current existing dwellings. 8 Prior to purchasing our property we contacted the planning office to enquire about the nature of the</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>ransom strip and its intended use. After much deliberation we were informed that this strip had been designated as a SSSI due to the flora and fauna it contained, therefore due to the lie of the land the field in question would not be built on as this would upset the water table and kill off the plants etc in that strip. What has changed within Kettering Borough Councils policy to overturn this decision? 9 The said strip provides a perfect natural corridor for all manner of creatures to move freely from the fields, to and in and around the village, any proposed development would surely mean that the village would lose many wild animals and birds from the surrounding area, thus resulting in a negative impact from the proposed development. 10 Whilst the over subscription of the village school does not directly affect me, I would agree with the other residence who have raised concerns over the school roll and lack of places available and the impact the constant building work has had on the children attending, some who I believe will go through their junior school years knowing nothing else than learning within a building site. 11 Again the problems with the GP surgery, dentist and shop do not directly affect me, however I would support the remarks already made by other residents within the village. Finally I would also add that it is time for the residents of Mawsley to be left in peace to enjoy our village, let the children grow up in a safe environment, and away from more building plant, trucks and lorries constantly coming and going, therefore it would be my intention to object strongly to any future detailed planning applications which may be made for this site.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

19	220	Sarah Marsden	<p>I write with strong objection regarding the proposal of additional housing in Mawsley village in the field boarding Birch Spinny, Malaslea and Cransley Rise. Any further additional homes to the village will have adverse impact on the character and setting of the village, which has already grown beyond it's intended size. The village is attractive to buyers because of just that "it's a village" and not just another housing estate. Already we can see Mawsley school has built several extensions over the years to accommodate the growing number of children attending. The school has already lost outdoor space for the children and further homes in the village may mean children of Mawsley will have to seek schooling outside the village, or Mawsley school will expand yet again, leaving the children very limited outdoor space. Furthermore, getting an appointment at Mawsley surgery is already problematic without further homes and additional residents using the service. Other amenities at Mawsley, such as play group would not cope with additional children and would lose its family feel. The amenities at Mawsley were simply not intended for such a large population. The village has many greens, where the children use to play, particularly on Cransley Rise. Increase traffic in this area would make these greens unsafe for the children to play. We had been trying to move to Mawsley village since 2005 and only last year became financially able and purchased a house on Cransley Rise. We very much enjoy country life and spend many hours watching the farmer in the field, walking the path along the field, watching the wildlife come and go each season. The new proposal for housing</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which have been noted. At this stage further work will be required to address some of the issues raised through the consultation process any conclusions can be made on the preferred option for Mawsley in the next iteration of the plan.</p>
----	-----	---------------	---	--

				<p>means an irreversible loss of valuable agricultural land and all the outdoor activities the government are trying so hard to promote with their Change4Life programme. Living on Cransley Rise, the increase in traffic noise is a concern to us, as well as the safety of Mawsley children with an increase in traffic the new homes would bring. The housing development would to mean a loss of privacy and light to us that border the field.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

19	227	Adam Mulligan	<p>To whom it may concern, I'd like to forward my deepest objection to the proposed planning application for the field adjacent to Cransley Rise Mawsley Village. Having been involved in the village for the past 10 years the opportunity arose to purchase 16 Cransley Rise. Now we were aware that the " view " may not be there forever but was part of the consideration when purchasing and you can't help but feel will impact on the resale. What is a greater concern is the need to grow the village even more, this in turn will impact on all the amenities currently within the village. Amenities that will no doubt struggle to cope with the added numbers previously never accounted for. I do feel it is unfair for current owners and their families who have bought in to the village life for their own reasons now face the risk that what they hold as something unique and special be watered down into something that is no more than just another housing estate. This would be a real shame and unfortunately would give me cause to think about our own future within Mawsley Village.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which have been noted. At this stage further work will be required to address some of the issues raised through the consultation process any conclusions can be made on the preferred option for Mawsley in the next iteration of the plan.</p>
----	-----	---------------	---	--

19	232	J Claypole Esq		We believe that site RA/115 offers some key benefits to the local community and we would welcome the opportunity to discuss the site with stakeholders further. Please see attachment for further details.	Thank you for the additional information provided in relation to RA/115. Further work will therefore be required to determine whether the access constraints can be overcome and this will need to be carried out before any conclusions can be made on the preferred option for Mawsley in the next iteration of the plan.
----	-----	-------------------	--	--	---

19	235	Miss Claire Crew	<p>I live facing the field site RA 115. I and my family moved to Mawsley 18 months ago. The access to the site is totally inadequate. The proposed addition of 57 new houses is unbelievable when this village is already over stretched. Places in the school are limited and already there are not sufficient places for current children in the village. Roads are full of parked cars as there are insufficient parking for current cars. Cransley Rise is already full and like an obstacle course to drive down. The work site traffic would create more traffic and congestion in Mawsley and where would they park. Noise from construction traffic will be terrible. The T junction Cransley Rise / School Road is designed badly and which near misses nearly daily. Facilities are already limited for the current homes. House prices for current residents will drop, particularly while building work takes place. Wildlife and birds in the current field areas will be badly effected with any building work and the loss of more farm land. It would be nice for Mawsley to have the work which is currently going on finished. We are still waiting for Mawsley to be adopted..... So please finish what has been started and leave Mawsley as a Village.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. RA/115 was discounted following the Options Paper consultation in 2012 due to access constraints. Additional information has been provided through this consultation period indicating the accesses constraints can be overcome. Further work will therefore be required in conjunction with Northamptonshire Highways Authority to determine whether the constraints can be overcome and this will need to be carried out before any conclusions can be made on the preferred option for Mawsley in the next iteration of the plan.</p>
----	-----	---------------------	---	--

19	236	Mr Steven Taylor	RA174 Please note that there is a dispute, which may require resolution in Court, regarding the 1st pumping station in Mawsley. Unless and until Anglian Water have resolved these issues to the satisfaction of the affected parties, there is no scope whatsoever for increasing pressure upon the existing infrastructure. We envisage no further comment in an open forum for legal reasons. Please contact Ms CT Russell, Company Secretary of Anglian Water if necessary for confirmation.	Noted.
----	-----	------------------	--	--------

19	239	Miss Hazel Lillies	<p>I am writing to strongly disagree to the proposed development on site RA/174 in Mawsley. We have lived in Mawsley for 11 years and during that time the village has already increased by 300 homes over the original proposal. After 10 years the road outside our house still hadn't been adopted and brought up to a suitable standard and construction traffic was still a regularity and only in the last year was our road finally finished. We recently choose to stay in Mawsley moved to Cransley Rise to bring up our family in a village setting where we could take advantage of the school, surgery and dentist, all of which are already incredibly busy and we face the possibility of our son not being able to attend Mawsley school in the future due to capacity issues which will only be made worse by the addition of another 57 homes. Part of the attraction of Cransley Rise was also the view across site RA/174 and the wildlife that area attracts. This for us is what makes Mawsley feel like village and why we deliberately chose to stay on that side of the village. This development will adversely impact the value of our property. It will increase traffic and noise on the road we live on. The entrance to the proposed site is already a dangerous blind corner on a narrow road which will become worse with the increased traffic. We will also spend years living across from a building site severely diminishing our quality of life. We already had to put up with 10 years of this before finally getting to a stage where we could enjoy the village we live in. Now we face it again but the outcome of this development will significantly alter the character of the village for the worse. Residents pay a</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which have been noted. At this stage further work will be required to address some of the issues raised through the consultation process any conclusions can be made on the preferred option for Mawsley in the next iteration of the plan.</p>
----	-----	--------------------	--	--

				<p>premium to live in Mawsley to not feel like they are on a housing estate and further housing development will continue to destroy this.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

19	240	Mrs Linda Perry	<p>As a resident of a property which directly adjoins the parcel of land in question, I strongly object to the building of approx 57 houses for the following reasons:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 I do not feel that the council, land owner or any potential developers have given due consideration or thought to the impact of the potential number of vehicles that will be obliged to use Cransley Rise as they enter and leave the village, particularly during rush hour times. Cransley Rise is a narrow road with a traffic calming island situated fairly close to the junction with School Road. There are currently issues in turning in and out of Cransley Rise due to vehicles being parked on School Road, opposite the junction and on Cransley Rise itself. I can only see the problem of access escalating if the proposed development were to go ahead. 2 Given the above, again I do not feel that enough thought has been given to the potential of accidents occurring at this junction, both vehicular and pedestrian. Considering the number of children that cross the road at the point of Cransley Rise/School Road on their way to and from school, I fear that there is a very real danger of an incident occurring. 3 Whilst I understand that planning committees do not take notice of any objections levelled at the disruption caused during building work, I feel that I must comment on the problems the site access will cause to current road users. The access to the site appears to be situated on a 45 degree bend in the road at the bottom of Cransley Rise, which again given the above points has the potential to be of a hazardous nature to those currently living in the vicinity and pedestrians. 4 I understand that current planning policy is to prioritise 	<p>Thank you for your comments which have been noted. Brownfield sites have been considered as potential allocations throughout the Borough and there are many instances where brownfield sites have been identified as potential allocations. However, the Joint Core Strategy requires Kettering Borough Council to allocate sites to accommodate 10,700 dwellings to the period 2031. Therefore, in order to meet this requirement the Council needs to consider greenfield sites in conjunction with brownfield sites. While loss of view and impact on property value is not a material planning consideration, overlooking and loss of privacy are material considerations which will be assessed in detail at planning application stage. The site is not located within a flood zone. The site is not a site of special scientific interest (SSSI) and any impact on wildlife can be satisfactorily mitigated. At this stage further work will be required to address some of the other issues raised through the consultation process any conclusions can be made on the preferred option for Mawsley in the next iteration of the plan.</p>
----	-----	-----------------	---	---

			<p>development on Brown Field sites; therefore the proposed development of this Green Field site is blatantly against current policy. 5 Whilst I understand that there is no right to a view, the loss of the views currently afforded to the properties surrounding the proposed site will be greatly affected by way of loss of privacy, being overlooked, along with additional noise and disturbance once the site is developed 6 Due to the proposed number of units being put forward, I feel that the visual impact on this area of the village will be out character in terms of its appearance with the existing properties as well as being out of scale and over-bearing. Having attended the meeting at the school on the 20/11/13, I was concerned about the attitude of one of the hosts. When questioned about the proposed number of units possibly being more than planned at the moment, there was no clear indication that this would not be increased further, which would result in a much greater number of units being built, as has been found to be the case with the later build phases in the village. 7 There have been many incidents in the past two/three years when the field has become water logged during period of heavy rain, resulting in a number of large puddles developing in the area which appear to come from water running out of the now called ransom strip into the field. Given the problems which have occurred around the village from various underground springs, this could cause major problems for any properties built on this site along with the current existing dwellings. 8 Prior to purchasing our property we contacted the planning office to enquire about the nature of the</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p>ransom strip and its intended use. After much deliberation we were informed that this strip had been designated as a SSSI due to the flora and fauna it contained, therefore due to the lie of the land the field in question would not be built on as this would upset the water table and kill off the plants etc in that strip. What has changed within Kettering Borough Councils policy to overturn this decision? 9 The said strip provides a perfect natural corridor for all manner of creatures to move freely from the fields, to and in and around the village, any proposed development would surely mean that the village would lose many wild animals and birds from the surrounding area, thus resulting in a negative impact from the proposed development. 10 Whilst the over subscription of the village school does not directly affect me, I would agree with the other residence who have raised concerns over the school roll and lack of places available and the impact the constant building work has had on the children attending, some who I believe will go through their junior school years knowing nothing else than learning within a building site. 11 Again the problems with the GP surgery, dentist and shop do not directly affect me, however I would support the remarks already made by other residents within the village. Finally I would also add that it is time for the residents of Mawsley to be left in peace to enjoy our village, let the children grow up in a safe environment, and away from more building plant, trucks and lorries constantly coming and going, therefore it would be my intention to object strongly to any future detailed planning applications which may be made for this site.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

19	242	Mr Danny Perry	<p>I thoroughly concur with all the statements posted regarding the proposed development of RA/174 within Mawsley Village. This proposal warrants further full discussion at a council meeting and should not move forward on a directed permissions basis, as the basic rights of many Mawsley villagers are not being taken into full consideration by this proposal. The density of housing proposed is not in keeping with that area of the village and will lead to over looking and loss of privacy for many residents, the visual impact of the development will affect the character of the neighbourhood. The traffic situation within the village and the impact of these additional houses needs a formal survey with particular regard to the junction of School Road, and Cransley Rise, which with the number of school children crossing the road and proximity of parked cars is already leading to safety issues, particularly during the winter months.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which have been noted. At this stage further work will be required to address some of the issues raised through the consultation process any conclusions can be made on the preferred option for Mawsley in the next iteration of the plan.</p>
----	-----	----------------	---	--

19	269	Mr M R Lane	<p>I am writing to object strongly to any further development of Mawsley village regarding housing. After serving nine years with HM British Forces my family and I chose Mawsley as our UK residence due to its rural location, size, character and accessible amenities. Over the last three years we have been fortunate to be part of a happy community that contributes to the Kettering area in many ways. I understand that the village has already exceeded its Core spatial capacity and that any further development would put the amenities under excessive pressure leading to a decrease in the quality services and schooling. Road traffic and crime would increase, the rare sense of village community spirit similar to that of British Forces would be diminished. At present, Mawsley is an example of how good Northamptonshire can be.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which have been noted. At this stage further work will be required to address some of the issues raised through the consultation process any conclusions can be made on the preferred option for Mawsley in the next iteration of the plan.</p>
----	-----	----------------	--	--

19	280	Colin Voysey	<p>Dear Sir/Madam, RE: RA/174 This letter is in response to the recent news of the possibility of building more property in the village of Mawsley, and specifically the proposal to build on the field bordering Birch Spinney, Malaslea and Cransley Rise. I would like to raise not only concerns but also objections to the project. My concerns would be to the impact it would have on the local environment, there would be a substantial increase in traffic which would also lead to more cars parking on the roads. The local primary school is also nearby this in itself raises concerns as to the impact that 57 more houses would have. The school has already been extended and the demand on places for the school outweighs the capabilities they currently hold. This same concern also applies to the local Doctors and Dentists. There will be an adverse effect on the roads which would mean an increase in traffic, which raises concerns especially as this is a village with a lot of young children which frequently play outside. It would also be assumed that the as the field would effectively be a building site, the effect that the heavy vehicles would have on the road would be detrimental as well, the roads have only just been surfaced and this would ruin them. It will affect our property by increasing the noise levels and our privacy would be affected also the loss of light. Mawsley was originally created for 700 homes and this has been exceeded already, more houses would have detrimental effects on our community and put extra strain on all of our local amenities.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which have been 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. At this stage further work will be required to address some of the issues raised through the consultation process any conclusions can be made on the preferred option for Mawsley in the next iteration of the plan.</p>
----	-----	-----------------	--	---

19	281	Rachel Voysey	<p>Dear Sir/Madam, RE: RA/174 This letter is in response to the recent news of the possibility of building more property in the village of Mawsley, and specifically the proposal to build on the field bordering Birch Spinney, Malaslea and Cransley Rise. I would like to raise not only concerns but also objections to the project. My concerns would be to the impact it would have on the local environment, there would be a substantial increase in traffic which would also lead to more cars parking on the roads. The local primary school is also nearby this in itself raises concerns as to the impact that 57 more houses would have. The school has already been extended and the demand on places for the school outweighs the capabilities they currently hold. This same concern also applies to the local Doctors and Dentists. There will be an adverse effect on the roads which would mean an increase in traffic, which raises concerns especially as this is a village with a lot of young children which frequently play outside. It would also be assumed that the as the field would effectively be a building site, the effect that the heavy vehicles would have on the road would be detrimental as well, the roads have only just been surfaced and this would ruin them. It will affect our property by increasing the noise levels and our privacy would be affected also the loss of light. Mawsley was originally created for 700 homes and this has been exceeded already, more houses would have detrimental effects on our community and put extra strain on all of our local amenities.</p>	<p>Your objection to future development in Mawsley 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. At this stage further work will be required to address some of the issues raised through the consultation process any conclusions can be made on the preferred option for Mawsley in the next iteration of the plan.</p>
----	-----	------------------	--	--

20	151	Buccleuch Property The Boughton Estate		<p>NEWTON 6.1 Buccleuch Property is keen to ensure that the emerging planning policy framework for Kettering Borough enables some small scale growth beyond the village boundary of Newton to enable organic growth over the plan period. 6.2 This should include opportunities for a mix of residential and live/work development through the conversion and replacement of barns and agricultural buildings on appropriate sites, with some relevant new build. This will help to maintain a strong, vibrant and sustainable community which enables local residents to meet many of their daily requirements. 6.3 In view of this, the preferred option for small scale growth in Newton is supported and it is considered this approach will allow for the necessary level of development to support the needs of the rural population over the plan period. Dovecote Farm (RA/130) 6.4 The proposed allocation of land south of Dovecote Farm (RA/130) for residential development is also support by Buccleuch Property. 6.5 The allocation of this site will provide for conversion and new build housing allowing for the replacement and conversion of existing agricultural buildings and improving the appearance of some of the buildings, described as unsightly in the Rural Masterplanning Report. The overall development of this site will provide a more environmentally attractive landscaped area which maintains the historic character of the village.</p>	Thank you for your comments which have been duly noted.
22	100	Mrs Leigh Parkin	Clerk Wilbarston Parish Council	Wilbarston Parish Council agrees with the Pipewell section of this document.	Noted.

23	172	Pytchley Estate Settlement 1996	Pytchley Estate Settlement 1996	<p>Dear Sirs Housing Allocations ' Assessment of Additional Sites and Update I act on behalf of Pytchley Estate Settlement 1996 who wish to make further representations to the Housing Allocations document, having previously made comments to the Site Specific Proposals Local Development Document Options Paper. This representation relates to land in my clients ownership at Butchers Lane, Pytchley and I attach a site plan for reference. Within the recently published update paper the land (ref: RA/176) has been discounted as a potential housing allocation due to apparent highway constraints. Firstly, it should be noted that part of the site has an existing planning permission for 9 dwellings that occupies approximately half of the site. This planning permission has not been reflected on the Housing Options Plan for Pytchley which indicates sites with planning permission should be coloured blue. This information provides an unfair representation of the site as part of the public consultation process. Should members of the public be aware that half of the site already has an existing planning permission they may look upon developing the remainder of the site more favourably. Secondly, the site has been discounted due to apparent access constraints but no details are provided as to what these constraints may be. Again, half of the site has an existing planning permission with 6 dwelling off a single access point onto Butchers Lane. Therefore, the site already benefits from an access point considered appropriate for residential development. Furthermore, the remainder of the site would still be used as a</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. It is noted that part of the site has planning permission. It was not intended for the maps to show all existing planning permissions in the village but rather to show the sites which sites had been granted planning permission in the time since their consideration as allocations in the Options Paper. NCC Highway Authority were consulted when the assessment of site RA/176 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.</p>
----	-----	---------------------------------	---------------------------------	--	---

				<p>farmyard, with the resultant traffic movements, including larger vehicles. The redevelopment of the remainder of the land would not only cause no harm to the surrounding road network but would also provide a visible improvement to the site that can be viewed from within and outside of the village. There are no other physical constraints to the site, such as flooding or ecology and the site is owned by Pytchley Estate Settlement 1996 who have an intention and desire to develop the site. Therefore, the site should be considered as a potential housing allocation.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

23	208	Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge	Planner English Heritage	We have previously commented on all the Pytchley sites and their impact on heritage assets. We note that site RA/117 has been much reduced and will probably have no impact on heritage assets. Sites RA/119, RA/175, RA/176 and RA/209 would all impact quite considerably on the conservation area and other heritage assets, but we note that they have been discounted.	Thank you for your comments which have been noted.
24	209	Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge	Planner English Heritage	We have previously commented on all the Rushton sites and their impact on heritage assets. They would all impact quite considerably on various heritage assets, including the conservation area and registered park and garden, so their discounting is welcomed.	Noted.
25	51	Mr James Palfreyman	Godfrey-Payton Chartered Surveyors	We attach a document promoting circa 1.4 hectares of land at Stoke Albany for mixed residential development. The land is ideally situated for the purpose within the village contributing to the sustainability of the settlement where there is a proven local need for housing.	Thank you for your comments. The proposed site will be assessed according to the criteria set out in the Housing Allocations Background Paper prior to the next iteration of the plan.
25	107	Mrs Leigh Parkin	Clerk Stoke Albany Parish Council	Stoke Albany Parish Council agrees with the section of the document on Stoke Albany.	Thank you for your comments which have been noted.

25	210	Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge	Planner English Heritage	We have previously comments on sites RA/120 and RA/160 in 16 May and 13 June 2011. Both would have impacts on the conservation area and other heritage assets, but we note they have been discounted.	Noted.
25	251	Mr F Graves	Head of Planning Andrew Granger & Co	In the light of the Government's National Planning Policy Framework it is unreasonable and unrealistic to continue to confine the creation and provision of new homes only to 'Affordable Homes' in our rural villages. Site RA 160 would provide for a small number of dwellings towards the 'small scale growth' being advocated by the proposed policy. We would recommend the inclusion of this site for appropriately designed small scale infill development.	Your comments in relation to RA/160 have been noted. The site has been assessed according to the assessment criteria set out in the Housing Allocations Background Paper. The site scores poorly in terms of accessibility, is sensitive to new development due to its elevated position and its potential impacts on the neighbouring Conservation Area and Listed Buildings. The site is also considered inappropriate for development due to the importance of the gap between the two elements of the village boundary to the village's unique character.

25	284	Alex Brodie	Ager Developments	<p>Site RA/120 Stoke Farm, Stoke Albany STRONGLY DISAGREE with the proposal to discount this site as a potential housing allocation. REVISED SITE AREA (Plan attached) ref: SFH -10A) Redevelopment of the revised site area for housing offers a viable opportunity to enhance the village character of Stoke Albany. Village Character Stoke Albany is located within an undulating landscape of enclosed fields, typifying the northern margins of Northamptonshire. A bland of attractive buildings and open pattern of development reflects the village character constructed over the last three centuries. The overall character of the village is rural, open and green. The built form to the north of the settlement is generally of lower density and marks a distinction with that of development to the south. Large buildings in large plots sit comfortably within the local landscape and are well related to the countryside and topography. Edges are almost exclusively soft with good transition to the open countryside. Open space throughout the village contributes to the village character. The street is enclosed by trees, hedges, and stone walls leading to the church which forms an end stop to views of the open countryside. Impact on Open Countryside Site RA/120 Stoke Farm is assessed in accordance with the criteria outlined in the Background Paper Housing Allocations and is summarised in the Rural Masterplanning report which has considered the site in the context of the village. It identifies the site as a good opportunity for small scale development in Stoke Albany. The site scores well in the assessment and it is considered that a high quality well designed</p>	<p>Site RA/120 was identified in the Options Paper as an opportunity for small scale development within Stoke Albany. Following consultation on the Options Paper the site was reassessed and concerns previously identified relating to impact on the character of the settlement remain. One new site has been promoted for development through this consultation process and this will need to be assessed against the criteria set out in the Housing Allocations Background Paper to determine whether it is suitable to accommodate small scale growth for affordable housing in Stoke Albany. Nevertheless it is considered RA/120 should remain a discounted option.</p>
----	-----	-------------	-------------------	---	--

			<p>scheme could make a positive contribution to the built environment through replacement of the large mass agricultural buildings with domestic scale dwellings in keeping with the historic character of the village. The document provides Draft Design Principles for the site and identifies potential opportunities for improvement/enhancement within the village which could result from development. A 400m isochrone confirms all of the dwellings are well within 400m of the historic centre of the village, indicating the settlement is compact and walkable. The Options Paper further recognises the opportunity for small scale growth in Stoke Albany with site RA/120 identifies as the preferred site. Land fronting the Ashley road (outlined blue) and which forms part of site RA/120, benefits from planning permission (KET/2012/0715) for 3 two storey and 2 single storey dwellings and approved landscape scheme. To extend the development and encompass the area of the second large agricultural building to the south (outlined red) will provide an opportunity for significant landscape improvement. A planting scheme of indigenous species will enhance the character of the village and the adjoining open countryside setting. The development creates a sustainable land use and relieves this delightful village environment of the significant detrimental impact associated with larger second agricultural building. The revised area should therefore be allocated. 5 Year Land Supply Local planning authorities are required to identify and update annually, a supply of specific deliverable sites in order to provide a five year supply of housing</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

				<p>against their housing requirements. Some LPAs are yet to achieve the required stock and we are advised the Kettering Borough Council falls short of this requirement. Deliverability The site is immediately available for redevelopment and we would welcome an invitation to submit a detailed layout and landscape design for your consideration.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

26	93	Mr Michael Sandell	<p>1. As a basic principle additional housing in the Borough should be restricted to areas where there is already large urban development, or in the larger villages, and NOT placed in small villages (such as Sutton Bassett), as it is the villages which provide the character of our Northamptonshire countryside and landscape. 2. We agree strongly that there is no requirement for growth or development beyond the existing village envelope or boundary in Sutton Bassett. The existing format with occasional open spaces, RA196/197/198/199, between existing development should be retained. 3. Definitely no development in RA195 (on a steep hill) and RA194 (opposite the Church). 4. Please could the final preferred plan include for the grassed areas within the village, ie. the wide grass verges and the area around the 12thC Church of All Saints which are both major features, be allocated as Green Space, as is illustrated on the other village plans within the Borough ?</p>	<p>Noted. Your comments in relation to green spaces will inform the next iteration of the plan.</p>
----	----	--------------------	---	---

26	241	Ian Dunckley		<p>Dear sirs, I am writing to make representations to put forward the attached site for residential development within the LDD. The land is located to the east side, fronting Main Street as you enter Sutton Bassett from Market Harborough and is approximately 0.4 acres. It lies within the built environment of the village as a natural infill site as there are houses to the north and south and abuts the village boundary on three side. I am happy to come in and discuss with you. Please confirm receipt of this email.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The site you have put forward has previously been assessed according to the criteria set out in the Housing Allocations Background Paper under site reference RA/197. The site has a significant number of constraints and has been discounted as it is likely to have a negative impact on landscape character, historic environment and built form of the settlement. Furthermore, there is no identified housing need in Sutton Bassett and as a result the preferred option is for no growth in Sutton Bassett in line with the growth strategy of the CSS and emerging JCS.</p>
----	-----	-----------------	--	---	--

26	283	Mrs Helen James	<p>Sutton Bassett RA/194 199 Inclusive I have been studying the responses to your consultation along with my site at Dingley. Your comments on the various sites put forward for this village and I quote:- There is no identified housing need in Sutton Bassett and even if a need was identified it would be more appropriate for its need to be met in nearby town or village which has a basic range of facilities . If one strolls a few hundred yards up and over the hill to Weston by Welland, lo and behold a total different strategy. Weston by Welland RA/136 The Options Paper identified the opportunity for some small growth in Weston by Welland to support village facilities and provide housing to meet local need including affordable housing . So if you want to live in Sutton Bassett hard luck go and live in a town but Weston by Welland, no problem. I am most intrigued to know WHAT facilities there are in Weston by Welland that need supporting and how two villages within yards of each other can be treated so blatantly different, or were you hoping that nobody was going to trawl through the consultation responses? Well I did, from Stoke Albany, Brampton Ash, Dingley, Sutton Bassett, Weston by Welland and Ashley just to get a flavour as to the plans for the other villages within the Welland Valley. I intent to pursue this complete travesty of policy with my M.P. as it seems to me that out of those villages WHY has Weston by Welland been treated so differently?</p>	<p>The site 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. The site has therefore been identified as a suitable option based on the benefits development will bring to improving the appearance of the surrounding area.</p>
----	-----	-----------------	---	---

27	299	Thorpe Malsor Estate	Thorpe Malsor Estate	<p>Dear Sirs Housing Allocations Assessment of additional sites and update which each of the first I write in relation to the above consultation on behalf of the Thorpe Malsor Estate in relation to the village of Thorpe Malsor. With reference to the above document and particularly page 93 which states that there is some support for small scale growth but no sites were identified to accommodate this. I would refer you to my previous representations on behalf of the Thorpe Malsor Estate submitted on 23 April 2012 and acknowledged by your offices in relation to Thorpe Malsor village. This clearly identifies a site off Church Way known as Dairy Buildings as outlined in pink on the attached plan. Under paragraph 27.2 of your document you propose Thorpe Malsor as a no growth village, as we would ask you to reconsider this as clearly a suitable site is available to accommodate small scale sustainable growth. We look forward to hearing from you and would be grateful to receive an acknowledgement by return.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. No growth 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.</p>
----	-----	----------------------	----------------------	---	---

30	152	Buccleuch Property The Boughton Estate	<p>WEEKLEY 7.1 Buccleuch Property objects to the preferred option for no growth to be provided in Weekley over the plan period. It is essential to ensure that the emerging planning policy framework enables some small scale growth beyond the existing village boundary of Weekley in order to enable further organic growth. This should include opportunities for a mix of small scale employment and residential development through the conversion and replacement of barns 8 and agricultural buildings on appropriate sites. Without allowing the settlement to organically grow over the plan period the needs of the rural area will remain unmet at the detriment to the services and facilities which the settlement provides. Weekley Builders Yard Barns (RA/121) and Weekley Builders Yard (RA/149) 7.2 Buccleuch Property objects to the exclusion of Weekley Builders Yard Barns (RA/121) and Weekley Builders Yard (RA/149) as allocations for residential development. 7.3 Although it is recognised the development of these two sites is supported by reference to the Design Principles which are to be prepared for each site, the lack of allocations does not give the landowner/developer certainty in respect of the principle of development, nor does it provide a robust planning framework for bringing the sites forward. The Framework states that Local Plans should plan positively and allocate sites to promote development allowing development to come forward (paragraph 157 refers). The approach taken by not allocating these sites, and assuming they will be considered acceptable in principle by Planning Officers and Members, does not accord with the approach set out in the</p>	<p>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>
----	-----	--	--	--

				<p>Framework or provide the level for certainty required for the landowner/developer to bring the sites forward. 7.4 Notwithstanding this, the approach adopted is not consistent with that adopted in other settlements. Sites located within the settlement boundary are proposed to be allocated in Kettering and Burton Latimer, however, this approach has not been followed through in Weekley. Although there is a clear distinction in terms of the size of the settlements, the approach to sites located within the settlement boundary should remain consistent. 7.5 In view of this, it is considered that sites RA/121 and RA/149 should be reallocated to provide the landowner/developer with certainty that they can come forward for development over the plan period.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

30	211	Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge	Planner English Heritage	<p>We are unable to agree or disagree with the current proposals for Weekley, but neither do we have "no opinion". However, we have ticked that box as it is the least controversial option. We note that none of the sites within Weekley are considered suitable for allocation because they already lie within the settlement boundary. However, they remain sensitive sites due to the conservation area, listed buildings and other heritage assets. We note that development principles will be developed for each site, which is welcomed, although it is not clear whether those principles will be displayed in this document or elsewhere. Paragraph 30.2 refers to on new site being promoted during the consultation process, but it is not clear which site this is. We note that it is also not considered suitable for allocation due to its location within the settlement boundary.</p>	Thank you for your comments which have been noted.
31	50	Mr. David Quayle	Clerk Weston by Welland Parish Council		Noted.

31	212	Mr Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge	Planner English Heritage	We are unable to agree or disagree with the current proposals for Weston-by-Welland, but neither do we have "no opinion". However, we have ticked that box as it is the least controversial option. Site RA136 is on the edge of the conservation area and could impact on this and other heritage assets. 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. Site RA/168 includes a large area of open space within the conservation area near to the church, but we note this has been discounted for allocation.	Thank you for your comments which have been noted.
31	247	C Parker		Please see attached Representation for your attention.	Thank you for your comments which 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.
32	101	Mrs Leigh Parkin	Clerk Wilbarston Parish Council	Wilbarston Parish Council agrees with the Wilbarston section of this document.	Noted.

32	119	Rockingham Castle Estate	<p>32. Wilbarston - RA/200 & RA/201 Our client, Rockingham Castle Estate ('The Estate') objects to the proposed exclusion of sites RA/200 and RA/201 as options for potential housing allocations. From consideration of the further assessment of the additional sites it would appear that there is an apparent inconsistency in the approach that has been adopted to the scoring of the assessment criteria on which the additional sites have been considered. In particular it is noted that there are a number of those sites which are now identified within the consultation document as a potential housing option:- Braybrooke (RA/128), Cranford (RA/170 & RA/173), Geddington (RA/109 & RA/110) and Mawsley (RA/174) which overall actually score less favourably than either of the Wilbarston sites RA/200 or RA/201 which are discounted as potential housing options. There is no explanation provided as to why this is the case and although the principal reason identified for discounting the Wilbarston sites from further consideration is their significant impacts on the landscape and settlement character it has to be acknowledged that any development proposed beyond the existing settlement boundary is likely to have an impact, although this can be mitigated. It has been acknowledged within the previous background papers prepared in support of the Site Specific Proposals DPD Options Paper that Wilbarston is a larger village with a good range of services and facilities and with good connection to Corby and Market Harborough as the larger towns. In this regard it is reasonable to conclude that the village of Wilbarston should be considered as a</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which have been duly noted. Both RA/200 and RA/201 have been discounted due to adverse impact on the landscape and settlement character.. As no evidence has been provided at this stage to demonstrate that these constraints can be overcome 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.</p>
----	-----	--------------------------	--	---

			<p>sustainable location to accommodate additional new residential development. If the settlement of Wilbarston is to continue to perform and retain its role as a sustainable rural service centre then it is considered that a modest scale of new residential development should be permitted within the village which would need to be accommodated outside the extent of the existing village framework boundary. In this regard development has already taken place in the area to the north of Carlton Road where the village hall is at present located in a relatively detached position from the built up framework of the village. Development of site RA/200 is in particular considered a logical potential development area located between the existing development of Weinahr Close and the Village Hall, providing the opportunity to link the developments and provide the potential for improved mitigation for the existing development in the area. The Estate considers that any potential impacts on landscape and settlement character are limited and although not able at this consultation stage to provide the further detailed landscape and visual impact assessment in support of this representation due to time constraints, would intend that this is submitted at the next stage in the consultation process to support the contention that the site is capable of being mitigated through further consideration at a detailed site layout stage and the incorporation of an appropriate landscaping scheme as part of any development proposal for the site.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

35	253	Mrs Paula Holmes	<p>The loss of a fragile and rare eco-system including a hedgerow of great worth is not something anyone wants to contemplate - in twenty years time any such loss will be looked on as wanton destruction and vandalism. To talk of mitigating measures to protect Tailby Meadow (MG4 wet grassland) which makes up the 3% of such grasslands in the country compared to a hundred years ago is one thing but no specifics have been given. I understand that there has been an idea floated by KBC to 'recreate' this environment (or something similar) across the river - if this is the case, it is ludicrous and even if this could be done (very unlikely) we are talking of hundreds of years. The meadow was left to the town and subsequently the borough to be protected and enjoyed as an open space. Building 102 houses on DE/027 would destroy it because of the increased footfall so another 304 houses would just bring about its destruction more quickly. As for the otters - I'm sure a sign telling them 'not to worry' will help keep them in the river until the building work is complete! There is no mitigation possible that would protect the meadow as has been said repeatedly by Wildlife experts.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which will be used to inform the next iteration of the plan. Further ecological assessment of the impacts of the sites will be required before the site is progressed as an allocation.</p>
----	-----	------------------	--	--

38	262	Mr James Hakewill	<p>We strongly disagree with the factual data and conclusions that site RA/128 is not suitable for sustainable modest growth in the village of Braybrooke. The data recorded in the form seeks to conclude that site RA/128 is not suitable and further that the village of Braybrooke is not a "sustainable" village. It has been almost impossible to drill down to the underlying data which has been used to draw those conclusions and the relevant symbols and colours used in the chart. My comments are specifically around the suitability of RA/128 and I make the following points: 1. Yield it has already been agreed that the likely yield of both the red and green shaded RA/128 is likely to be 8 not the 66 shown which is the result of a transposition error from our original request for inclusion of the land onto the primary Rural Housing Master Planning Document. This was not our error but has caused concern both to ourselves and the Planning Policy Committee. 2. Employment - The village school has now closed, but there is no definitive decision at the time of writing as to what may be on site in the future, including the possibility of a school which would deliver employment. The village pub the Swan Inn provides employment for up to 16 people. The Brookside Residential Home Provides Employment for 20 people. The village has an active Garage. These employment option would be available to new residents and reflect a vibrant village with employment opportunities. 3. Public Transport - The village benefits from a very regular (hourly) bus service which exists because of the service between Kettering and Market Harborough, making it one of the most</p>	<p>Thank you for your detailed comments in relation to RA/128 which have been noted. A number of representations received through the consultation process have identified the school site as being suitable for development. It is therefore necessary to assess this site against the criteria set out in the Housing Allocations Background Paper before any conclusions can be made on the preferred option for Braybrooke in the next iteration of the plan.</p>
----	-----	-------------------	---	---

			<p>sustainable village in the Borough in relation to public transport. 4. Settlement Hierarchy Not sure what this means or how it influences development decisions. 5. Health I have no idea how this shows as orange. 6. Skills ‘ I have no idea how skills can be different on our land from other options being considered in Braybrooke. 7 Community The village has a Church, Chapel, Morris Dancing Group, Annual Fete, Cricket Club, Village Hall, Tots Group. The Pub was saved from closure some years ago and now thrives under the ownership of Everards and the present Managers. The village is on three major (national) footpaths MacMillan, Midshires and Jurassic with a short connection to the Brampton Valley way (between Market Harborough and Northampton. Significant numbers of ramblers/walkers use these routes and the Pub as a stopping point along the route or a start point for walks (or the Church). 8. Liveability ‘ RA/128 is close to existing properties and further away from for example the permission to build next to the Pub (immediately to the North). Not sure what this means or why it is shaded orange. 9. Ecological Feature Not sure how this differs from other sites in the village. 10. Cultural Heritage Not sure what this means shaded orange. 11. Settlement Character ‘ As the area to the south of The Old Rectory would mirror Latymer close not sure what this means. The recent appeal decision permitting development to the south of School Lane is almost exactly the same positioning and scale. It was also considered sustainable by default as it gained permission. 12. Relationship to the area Not sure what this means and why it only record</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>one tick. See point 11. 13. Water conservation Not sure what this means. 14. The paddock was an integral part of Rectory Farm until 1979 when my Father died and the land was segregated from the main land-holding. It has no agricultural use no stock or crops growing or has there been for many years. Other sites are in agricultural use but are given the same designation. 15. Previously Developed Land The farm buildings to the west of the Rectory and south of Newland Street have lain empty and redundant since the larger agricultural holding was divided. (see point 14.) If it is a compromise orange because both previously and developed and not previously developed land is involved then the areas should perhaps be designated as RA/128 A, B and C. In which case some of the area is very much previously developed and should be presumably Green. 16. Minerals and Wealth Creation Not sure what this means. 17. Capacity of Infrastructure These sites and their access were testing in previous planning applications and infrastructure was not an issue. Cannot see how this site is in anyway different from the other sites which achieve two ticks and green? 18. Drainage The land has connection all the way through to the River Jordan and Sewage mains are available in Griffin Road and Newland Street for foul sewage. Cannot understand how this site differs from others. 19. Deliverability The land in question has been put forward in 1982, 1987, 1995, 1997, 2001, 2006 and 2010 how does it only get one tick? Our understanding is that land being available for the use is a material consideration. On a more general front relating to infrastructure: Flood Alleviation Scheme This</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>was carried out in 1985 and involved a restricted flow and flood retention reservoir. The new houses in Newland Street were not permitted to be built until that scheme was completed and which was designed to protect properties adjacent to the Jordan. This was a significant investment at the time and an investment which benefits Braybrooke and makes it a safer place for future development. Significant investment in infrastructure Sewage Treatment Works This had a major renovation and renewal in 200 in order to implement latest technology and create capacity. This makes the village more able than those without such improvements to accept modest growth. Significant investment in infrastructure. Pumping Main- The pumping main from the pumping station in the centre of the village was recently renewed from the old cast iron to plastic. Significant investment in infrastructure. Rothwell Desborough Bypass This road makes communications onto the National road and rail network much easier since being opened. Market Harborough Station is less than 3 miles. The bypass means that access to and from the village towards Kettering no longer needs to go through Rothwell and Desborough. Railway Horse and Foot Bridge. Rail track have recently invested a considerable amount of money in providing a foot and horse bridge over the Midland Mainline to the north east of the village. This is yet further local infrastructure both for the benefit of present and future villagers and this walking long-distance footpaths. Significant sums invested in infrastructure mean that the Village will not need additional infrastructure to accommodate modest</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

				<p>growth as indicated in RA/128. Indeed modest growth will create a return on the investment already carried out and limit the need to invest to accommodate new development elsewhere.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

Table 12.2	41	Mr Kevin White	<p>This plot of land is unsatisfactory and not appropriate for residential development for the following reasons:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Access to the site via Cransley Rise is very limited with, it is suggested, insufficient room for vision splays. The "Access point" is on a sharp bend on a narrow estate road and will be dangerous. 2. Cransley Rise is/about to be adopted and construction traffic would not only damage the road (we have waited over 10 years for the road to be finished with a top coat and adopted) but would also cause major traffic congestion given the current road layout. 3. Mawsley School has already been extended 3 times and there is no possibility for further expansion. Already we are aware of Mawsley children who cannot get a place in the School. So adding potentially 55 houses could add maybe 40-50 young children requiring a School place. 4. The current village facilities are already stretched and the medical centre appointment times are becoming longer. 5. The infill expansion on this site goes against the original ethos of Mawsley village and extends the village boundary unnecessarily. 6. Mawsley was supposed to emulate the development of a typical Northamptonshire village with nooks and crannies. As such constraints on building design, replacement windows and doors, car parking provision generally off road and hidden, support this. If RA/174 development is allowed then Mawsley becomes just a "big estate". 6. From a personal point of view the proposed site currently offers an excellent countryside view which is why the houses that look onto it were laid out in such a manner. The removal of this view would almost 	<p>Thank you for your comments in relation to proposed development in Mawsley. 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. However, at this stage further work will be required to address some of the issues raised through the consultation process before any conclusions can be made on the preferred option for Mawsley in the next iteration of the plan.</p>
---------------	----	-------------------	---	--

				<p>certainly reduce the value/saleability of those houses and reduce the habitat of the local birds such as yellow hammers, fieldfares and increasingly Red Kites.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

Table 12.2	148	Mr Richard Boyes		<p>The Table above does not reflect the reality on the ground. The proposed density of 55 DPH is totally out of keeping with surrounding area of Mawsley. The land proposed floods regularly in winter and will cause problems to any dwelling built on that land and also existing dwellings in the immediate area. Cransley Rise is a relatively narrow side road where access is regularly restricted by vehicles parked and has not been designed to handle the proposed increase of traffic. In addition, access to the proposed development will be located adjacent to a sharp blind corner and will be dangerous to all road users. A number of categories on the table which have been graded Green are incorrectly graded and should be correctly graded as Red or Amber.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which have been duly noted. At this stage further work will be required to address issues raised through the consultation process any conclusions can be made on the preferred option for Mawsley in the next iteration of the plan.</p>
Table 4.3	16	Mr Andrew Bryan		<p>Would like the area R0/086 changed to allow building of housing as this would be a perfect site due to its close proximity to town centre and amenities. Area above on former allotments has been developed with no adverse impact, would enhance look of town when approached from Rushton.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which have been noted. The site identified as RO/086 has been identified as a potential allocation. The site is being progressed along with land to the east of RO/086 under a new site reference RO/202. The approximate yield of RO/202 has been identified as 66 dwellings.</p>

Table 7.3	47	Mrs Pat Scouse	<p>Cox's Lane capacity - no realistic solution to the issue of traffic management in Cox's Lane has ever been detailed so it is unsatisfactory to brush this aside. The carriageway at the junction with Kettering Rd is only 4m wide and there is a very narrow footpath on one side only. The road is bounded by the walls of residential dwellings on both sides so unless one or other of these structures is to be demolished there is no scope for widening the carriageway. Creating some kind of one-way system will only serve to exacerbate the traffic volume on Silver Street and Cransley Hill. There was nothing in the planning application documentation to demonstrate how this 'constraint' would be overcome - perhaps you could publish the proposed solution. School capacity - the S106 contribution stated in the planning consent does not specify that it would be ear-marked for Broughton Primary. Have KBC analysed the current very limited capacity of the school against the under-five numbers already in the 'pipeline' and the projected demand from the proposed developments over the next 5 years using the standard formula and created a strategic plan to provide adequate primary education? Perhaps you could reassure us by publishing your strategy along with the associated costs.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments which will inform the next iteration of the plan. At this stage additional work is required in order to determine potential allocations will be progressed in Broughton.</p>
--------------	----	-------------------	--	---

	20	Mr marco Novaga	<p>BL/042 - Overdevelopment of this site 35 houses already too high given flooding constraints to site (see attached photographs). Increasing this number is not reasonable. Road infrastructure already under pressure on Findon Road. Development of available/ non floodplain will result in overdeveloped cramped site, not in keeping with existing dwellings - 3 bungalows resulting in overbearing nature.</p>	<p>Representations were made during the Options Paper consultation indicating that the site could accommodate 50 dwellings. However, a planning application, KET/2013/0597, has been submitted for development of this site proposing 35 dwellings. The site has, therefore, been identified as a potential housing option based on a yield of 35 dwellings. All sites identified as potential housing allocations have been assessed against criteria set out in the Housing Allocations Background Paper. This assessment took account of flood risk and capacity of the road network. The site layout plan submitted as part of KET/2013/0597 indicates that 35 dwellings can be accommodated on the site avoiding the flood zone area. A flood risk assessment and transport assessment have also been submitted as part of the application. Any impacts on local infrastructure could be mitigated by the development through obligations secured via S106. Comments in relation to the design of the development have been noted. This is being considered in detail through the planning application process.</p>
--	----	-----------------	---	--