

Appendix 1 – Summary table of Key Issues and NCC MWLP Preferred Approach

3.0 The degree of accordance between Kettering Borough Council's response to the Issues and Options Consultation and the MWLP draft plan are indicated through a traffic light system.

Table 1.

Issues and Options Questions	KBC Summary Comment / MWLP Preferred Approach
<p>1: <u>Planning for Land banks</u> Should the Council seek to encourage the maintenance of a land bank for sand and gravel (seven years) and limestone (ten years) after the end date of the plan by identifying surplus or reserve sites? Yes / No.</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Preferred Approach The Draft Plan is proposing that allocations should provide for the full requirement of minerals provision for the whole of the plan period from the start of the current plan period in 2011 to 2031, along with a further period to ensure there is a land bank beyond this period (i.e. a further 7 years for sand and gravel sites and a further 10 years for crushed rock), both in line with national policy and Policy 1 of the adopted MWLP.</p> <p><u>Draft Local Plan reference</u> - Policy 1: Providing for an adequate supply of aggregates - Paragraph 4.11</p>
<p>2: <u>Progress on the adopted allocations</u> 2A) The above summary of the adopted allocations has identified a number of sites that are still considered to be good sites to remain as allocations (refer Table 2). Do you agree with these findings? Yes / No. 2B) The above summary of the adopted allocations has identified several sites that are not considered to be good sites to remain as allocations (refer Table 2). Do you agree with these findings? Yes / No.</p>	<p>Question 2A and 2B - No comment</p> <p>Preferred Approach The following current local plan allocations are to be retained due to evidence supporting deliverability and assessment of site characteristics/potential impacts: sand and gravel - Milton Malsor, Bozeat, Heyford and Earls Barton West Extension; crushed rock - Wakerley; and building and roofing stone - Collyweston Village. It is accepted that both Milton Malsor and Heyford allocations have been in adopted plans for a considerable number of years but it is considered that the circumstances are such that these would be implemented during the plan period. Work by the agent at Milton Malsor to address access difficulties (involving negotiations with Network Rail) is progressing. Whilst the access difficulties at Heyford which were expensive to address will be resolved by the construction of the A45 Daventry Development Link. The current allocation at Passenham South is to</p>

	<p>be amended to delete that part already permitted and the area to the southwest, where the prospective operator considers the resources are not viable. It is proposed to remove the following existing allocations from the Updated Plan due to reduced deliverability: sand and gravel - Dodford and Wollaston West; and crushed rock and building stone - Pury End (South).</p> <p><u>Draft Local Plan reference</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Policy 4: Site for the provision of sand and gravel - Policy 5: Sites for the provision of crushed rock - Policy 7: Sites for the provision of building and roofing stone
<p>3: <u>Potential allocations for the Local Plan Update</u></p> <p>The Call for Sites process identified nine sites for sand and gravel, four for limestone (crushed rock) of which three also support production of building and roofing stone. All of these sites, plus the adopted allocations, have been subject to an initial screening assessment (refer Table 3).</p> <p>3A) Do you agree with the brief summaries above, but in particular the findings of the assessments? Yes / No. If no, please provide details on why not.</p> <p>3B) Are there any particular sites that you consider to be more/less suitable than others? Please provide your reasoning.</p> <p>3C) If reserve sites were to be included in the Draft Plan do you consider any of the potential allocations more appropriate? Please provide your reasoning.</p>	<p>Question 3A, 3B, 3C, 3D, 3E - No comment</p>

<p>3D) As there is no specific provision to be met for building or roofing stone compared to sand and gravel and crushed rock is there any need to identify specific allocations for such extraction? Yes / No.</p> <p>3E) Are there any other matters that you wish to raise about the approach to allocating mineral sites and to the potential allocations put forward for consideration?</p>	<p>Preferred Approach</p> <p>New (proposed) allocations identified through the Draft Plan include: sand and gravel – Passenham South Extension, Passenham East Extension and Elton Extension; crushed rock and building stone – Pury End Quarry Extension and Harlestone Quarry Extension. Other new sites put forward at the call for sites stage and consulted on at the issues and options stage will not be taken forward as allocations as these sites, on balance with other sites and consideration of potential impacts, are not as appropriate for inclusion as the sites already allocated or those proposed through the Draft Plan; this includes Denford Meadows (south of Thrapston) and Ryehill Farm (Buckby Wharf). This also applies to proposals at Welford and north of Oundle put forward at the issues and options consultation stage. A site at Easton Lodge (east of Duddington) is not to be taken forward. This is an appropriate site to allocate however there is no requirement for another site if the Wakerley site is to come forward (it is assumed by the planning authority that it will).</p> <p><u>Draft Local Plan reference</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Policy 4: Sites for the provision of sand and gravel - Policy 5: Sites for the provision of crushed rock - Policy 7: Sites for the provision of building and roofing stone
<p><u>4. Approach to be taken to allocation of waste sites / locations</u></p> <p>4A) Given the permitted capacity and remaining capacity gaps is there a need to identify site-specific allocations to facilitate delivery of the remaining capacity requirement for inert recycling and advanced treatment or can the need for these</p>	<p>Question 4A - Yes Question 4B - No Question 4C - No Comment Question 4D - Yes Question 4E - Yes</p>

be taken up through industrial area designations, development criteria and other relevant policies? Yes – There is still a need for site-specific allocations for inert recycling and advanced treatment (please provide justification). No - industrial area designations, development criteria and other relevant policies will be able to provide adequate opportunities for development of inert recycling and advanced treatment facilities.

4B) Is there a need to identify more industrial location designations, add new ones or adjust the boundaries of the existing ones? Yes / No. Are there any in particular that should be included or excluded from the plan or require an amendment to their boundaries? If so, please provide details.

4C) If the Plan is still to identify site-specific allocations would you agree that there is no need to allocate sites for inert recovery / landfill as the required capacity can be met through committed sites and future mineral extraction (allocated sites)? Yes / No.

4D) If the Plan is still to identify site-specific allocations would you agree with the approach outlined for hazardous disposal, i.e. not allocating specific sites and fully relying on local development criteria? Yes / No.

4E) If the Plan is still to identify site-specific allocations would you agree with the approach outlined for non-inert disposal, i.e. maintaining a watching brief and closely monitoring the situation to determine if, and when, additional capacity may be required? Yes / No.

Preferred Approach

The Plan is now proposed to largely not include allocations, with only the existing allocations at Northampton East and Corby South East being carried forward.

The boundaries of several industrial area designations *[which are all located within Corby Borough]* have been adjusted as follows:

WL16 and WL18 expanded to incorporate adjacent / related existing industrial areas; and WL17 reduced to exclude land off Stanion Lane that was granted planning permission for residential development.

Draft Local Plan reference

- Policy 13: Locations for waste management facilities
- Paragraph 5.57 and 5.60 – 5.64

5: The distribution of waste management facilities in the Central Spine

Should the MWLP seek to manage the distribution of waste

Question 5 – Yes (All proposals)

Preferred Approach

It is proposed that the following statement is added to Policy 13* (Development criteria for waste management facilities): Proposals

<p>development within the county in order to reinforce communities taking more responsibility for their own waste and address perceived over-concentration of waste management facilities in certain areas?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes – For all proposals for waste related development. If so what threshold or basis for apportionment should be used as the trigger for when an area is seen as having over-provided? Please provide justification.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes – But only for proposals relating to those management methods where there is already sufficient capacity. If so what threshold or basis for apportionment should be used as the trigger for when an area is seen as having over-provided? Please provide justification.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No. Please provide justification</p>	<p>within the central spine should also demonstrate how the development affects the overall distribution of Northamptonshire’s waste management network and that it would not result in unacceptable cumulative impacts (resulting from in-combination effects of existing and proposed development) adversely affecting the local area</p> <p>In order to balance out the removal of the majority of site-specific allocations and ensure compliance with government guidance it is proposed to retain all of the industrial area designations.</p> <p><i>*(draft plan incorrectly refers to Policy 13).</i></p> <p><u>Draft Local Plan reference</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Policy 11: Spatial strategy for waste management - Policy 12: Development criteria for waste management facilities (non-inert and hazardous) - Paragraph 5.51
<p>6: <u>Managing the risk of fires on waste sites</u></p> <p>6A) Should Policy 27: Layout and Design Quality be amended through either an amendment to the existing criterion on building in safety and security or by including an additional criterion in order to address managing the risk of fires? Yes / No.</p> <p>6B) Should appropriate detailed guidance also be set out in a revision to the Development and Implementation SPD. Yes / No.</p>	<p>Question 6A - Yes</p> <p>Question 6B - Yes</p> <p>Preferred Approach</p> <p>It is proposed to make an amendment to Policy 23 (Layout and design quality) to include reference to managing fire risk both in the policy and explanatory text.</p> <p><u>Draft Local Plan policy reference</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Policy 23: Layout and design quality - Paragraph 6.36
<p>7. <u>Other matters for consideration</u></p> <p>Are there any other matters that you consider the Local Plan Update should consider? Yes / No. If yes, please provide details.</p>	<p>No issues raised</p> <p>Preferred Approach</p> <p>No key changes.</p>