

APPENDIX 2 – Proposed Response to Northamptonshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan Update Consultation.

Issue 1: Planning for Land banks

Proposed comment to the Draft Plan

- Para 4.11 - *Kettering Borough Council supports insertion of additional text which seeks to secure additional mineral land banks.*
- Para 4.41 relating to Policy 4 - *Kettering Borough Council endorse the inclusion of text to support the maintenance of land banks, together with maintaining a watching brief of allocated sites in accordance question 4E of the Issues and Options Consultation.*

*Policy 1 – There have been no changes to this policy, so it is not possible to comment.

Issue 2: Progress on the adopted allocations

Proposed comment to the Draft Plan

- Changes to Policy 4, 5 and 7 - *No comment.*
- Striking out of paragraphs/part paragraphs 4.46 – 4.47, 4.53, or insertion of paragraphs (or text to paragraphs) 4.45 – 4.47, 4.57 relating to Policies 4, 5, and 7 – *No comment.*

Issue 3: Potential allocations for the Local Plan Update

Proposed comment to the Draft Plan

- Policy 4, 5 and 7 - *No comment in line with previous comments from Kettering Borough.*
- Striking out of paragraphs/part paragraphs 4.46 – 4.47, 4.53, or insertion of paragraphs (or text to paragraphs) 4.45 – 4.47, 4.57 relating to Policies 4, 5, and 7 – *no comment*

Issue 4: Approach to be taken to allocation of waste sites / locations

Proposed comment to the Draft Plan

- Policy 13 – *Kettering Borough Council endorses the allocation of Northampton East and Corby South East for future waste sites, together with inclusion of specified industrial area allocations for waste uses compatible within urban area. This includes two sites located within the Borough of Kettering; namely WL13: Telford Way, and WL14: Kettering: Pytchley Lodge. The Council acknowledges that only designated industrial areas are considered acceptable in principle for waste uses, and that similar proposals for non-designated industrial areas will be subject to full assessment in accordance with criteria set out within Policy 18 of the Draft Plan. Enlargement of industrial sites within Corby (WL16 – WL18) will provide some additional potential capacity for waste uses compatible within an urban area, but a greater use of site specific allocations is*

preferred, so that more certainty can be given to the location of new waste sites and new industrial sites identified within the emerging Joint Core Strategy which emphasises a focus on renewable, green and high performance technologies are safeguarded. The identified and designated sites are unlikely to provide additional capacity for windrow composting due to the nature of this technology.

- *4.45 – 4.47 (inserted) relating to Policy 5 – Kettering Borough Council supports maintaining a watching brief of allocated sites in accordance question 4E of the Issues and Options Consultation.*
- *Para 5.61 (removed) relating to Policy 13 - This paragraph is removed, and relates to the provision of rural allocations for composting and anaerobic digestion. None of the new site allocations and industrial site designations makes provision for new open windrow composting facilities which are in particular shortage. Appendix 4 of the draft plan indicates the limited number of existing commitments for open window row composting facilities in the area. This was an issue highlighted in the Council's comments to the Issues and Options Consultation in June 2015. As a result, the Council would re-iterate a need for the draft plan to include provision for suitable sites for advanced treatment of waste (i.e. open air windrow composting).*
- *Para 5.57 (inserted) relating to Policy 13 - This paragraph highlights a reliance on proposals coming forward through the planning process. As set out in comment to para 5.61, it is considered that some allocations should be considered for advanced treatments in rural area to provide low cost solutions for the processing of non-inert waste.*
- *Para 5.61 (inserted) relating to Policy 13 – This paragraph highlights that other un-identified general industrial areas may be suitable for waste uses but are not given 'in-principle' support. The Council accept this basic premise, subject to stringent assessment criteria being applied to safeguard against inappropriate development particularly at sites of strategic importance such as at new strategic industrial site allocations set out in the emerging Joint Core Strategy which emphasises a focus on renewable, green and high performance technologies.*
- *Para 5.62 – 5.70 (amended) relating to Policy 13 – para 5.70 states that additional facilities for integrated waste management uses, which lead to an over provision would not be supported. This supporting policy text does not appear to be incorporated elsewhere within the plan. As a result, where there is an over-provision of facilities which does not result in cumulative impacts, under the current policy provision, there may well be oversupply and continued early closure of sites as demand fluctuates. This will have a detrimental impact on employment and the environmental quality of the area. It is suggested that this text is incorporated into Policy 18, so that emerging sites which come forward through the planning process are fully justified through a demonstrable need to avoid this adverse impact.*

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

For the purposes of clarity, the preferred approach refers to a statement being added to Policy 13 instead of Policy 12, which is where the statement has been inserted into. Comment therefore refers to Policy 12.

Proposed comment to the Draft Plan

- Policy 12 – *The Council endorse the inserted statement which seeks to focus waste development within the Central Spine and does not result in unacceptable cumulative impacts or adversely affect the local area. This will go some way to protecting residential amenity against inappropriately located waste treatment development. However, it is recommended to include wording within Policy 12 which makes reference to Policy 18, which sets out specific criteria for assessing proposals located within the Central Spine. As a separate observation, the exact extent of the Central Spine cannot be identified from Plan 5 (page 49), and a clearer Ordnance Survey map would be recommended.*

- Para 5.51 (amended) relating to Policy 12 – *no comment*

- Para 6.4 (inserted) relating to Policy 18 - *This supporting text highlights the need to address potential impacts of waste development. Ideally, the newly inserted paragraph to Policy 12 would signpost to criteria set out within Policy 18 which itself, remains unchanged. Subject to this, it is considered that new development proposed outside of industrial site designations and site allocations should be adequately assessed.*

Notwithstanding this endorsement, the Council would object to waste treatment facilities in areas of significant residential development, where sensitive receptors may be affected by the negative consequences of co-located waste treatment facilities. Para 5.60 to 5.61 of the proposed supporting text to policy 13 of the draft plan states:

5.60 *‘Within the central spine and sub-regional centre the spatial strategy for waste management states that the preferred locations for urban-located waste management uses will be general industrial areas or areas of significant residential and commercial development. General industrial areas within which waste management uses would be acceptable in principle are identified in Policy 13.’*

5.61 *‘Industrial areas, or parts thereof, not identified (as well as other industrial areas in the central spine, sub-regional centre and rural service centre locations) are not ruled out through this policy but do not have the same ‘in principle’ support. This is because they are not predominantly general industrial areas (i.e. they also comprise such uses as B1 offices, retail or large*

distribution warehouses), or the extent of the industrial area is small in comparison with other industrial areas in the urban area.'

The Council's comments to the Issues and Options Consultation stated in comment to issue 4 that waste sites should be located away from existing and planned housing. Whilst the Council advocates the application of the proximity principle with respect of waste treatment and disposal, sufficient separation distance needs to be applied between residential areas and waste treatment/disposal sites in order to protect amenity. As a result, it is recommended that the wording of para 5.60 is amended to make this clear so that it more closely accords with Policy 12 and 18 of the draft plan.

*Policy 11 – There have been no changes to this policy, so it is not possible to comment.

Issue 6: Managing the risk of fires on waste sites

Proposed comment to the Draft Plan

- Policy 23: Layout and Design Quality – The final bullet point makes reference to 'regard to relevant guidance' in terms of reducing fire risk on waste management and disposal sites. The relevant guidance is referred to by inserted para 6.36 and footnote 18. It is recommended that the policy or footnote to current best practice guidance includes a reference also to 'any subsequent versions which replace it' so that the policy can remain relevant even when current 'relevant guidance' is superseded.

Issue 7: Other Matters for Consideration

Proposed comment to the Draft Plan

Kettering Borough Council endorses this preferred option.

Other changes included in the draft plan.

Proposed comment to the Draft Plan

- striking out of paragraphs/part paragraphs or insert of text to the following paragraphs:
 - 4.14 – 4.32 relating to Policy 2 – *no comment.*
 - 4.38 relating to Policy 3 - *Kettering Borough Council endorse the inclusion of text to support the maintenance of land banks.*
 - 4.46 – 4.47 (deleted) relating to Policy 5 – *no comment*
 - 4.45 – 4.47 (inserted) relating to Policy 5 – *no comment*
 - 4.57 (amended) relating to Policy 7 – *no comment*
 - 4.53 (struck out) relating to Policy 7 – *no comment*

- 4.60 (amended) relating to Policy 9 - *no comment*
- Policy 9 (deleted) – *no comment*
- 5.35 (amended) relating to Policy 10 – *Kettering Borough Council acknowledge the flexibility being sought through a reduction in site specific allocations, retention of industrial area designations, and market led supply within the central spine in accordance with the proximity principle. Whilst the Council supported site specific allocations, it is considered that this approach should maintain an adequate supply of waste sites.*
- 5.36 (struck out) relating to Policy 10 – *no comment.*
- 5.50 (inserted) relating to Policy 12 – *Kettering Borough Council supports the inclusion of wording which seeks to locate development within the Central Spine and reinforce the proximity principle to the location of waste sites. It is concerned however, that the associated map (plan 5: The spatial strategy for waste management, page 49) has not been shown in relation to a detailed Ordnance Survey map. As a result, the yellow area depicting the central spine is ambiguous, and makes it difficult to properly assess applications which assert to being within the central spine. The Council recommend that this be addressed through an updated central spine map.*
- 5.57 – 5.61 (struck out) relating to Policy 13 – *no comment.*
- 5.71 – 5.72 and associated Policy 15 (struck out) – *no comment.*
- 5.73 – 5.74 and Policy 16 (struck out) – *no comment*
- 5.75 – 5.76 and Policy 17 (struck out) – *no comment*
- 5.67 – 5.68 relating to Policy 14 (amended) – *no comment.*
- 6.4 relating to Policy 18 (inserted) – *The insertion of this paragraph to protect residential amenity is endorsed. However, it is also recommended that the wording is clarified further, to also protect sensitive industrial area neighbours, such as those which may be attracted to new strategic industrial areas set out within the Joint Core Strategy (e.g. offices, renewable, green and high performance technologies.*
- 6.9 relating to Policy 20 (amended) – *the reference to the Nene Valley Nature Improvement Area is endorsed.*
- Table 8 MWLP Monitoring Framework (page 89 – 94) – *Policy 13 refers to Policy 134 and should be corrected to read 'Policy 13'. It may also*

be appropriate to include a trigger to monitor sites which are subsequently closed (indicating excess supply). No other comments.

- Appendix 1 (page 95 – 113) – *no comment*
- Appendix 2 (page 114 – 115) – *no comment*
- Appendix 3 (page 116 – 142) – *no comment*
- Appendix 4 (page 143 – 153) – *no comment*

- END -