

BOROUGH OF KETTERING

PLANNING POLICY COMMITTEE

Meeting held: 23rd November 2016

Present: Councillor Mike Tebbutt (Chair)
Councillors Linda Adams, Duncan Bain, Ash Davies,
Ruth Groome, Cliff Moreton, Mark Rowley and Jan Smith

16.PP.22 APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Ian Jelley and it was noted that Councillor Cliff Moreton would be acting as substitute.

16.PP.23 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Moreton declared a personal interest in item 5 as a Slade Ward Councillor and a resident of Mawsley.

Councillor Ruth Groome declared an interest in item 5 as County Councillor.

16.PP.24 MINUTES

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 1st November 2016 be approved and signed as a correct record by the Chair

It was noted that several issues arising from the minutes would be followed-up in future:-

- Accessible Open Space Maps
- Protection of the Ise Valley (Policy 20)
- Update on the Building Regulations
- Buildings for Life

16.PP.25 SITE SPECIFIC PART 2 LOCAL PLAN – HOUSING LAND SUPPLY ALLOCATIONS (VILLAGES)

A report was submitted to update Members on the assessment of sites for the allocation of housing land in the villages for

inclusion in the draft Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan (SSP2), and for Members to endorse the 'next steps' as outlined in section 5 and 6 of appendix 1 attached to the report.

It was reported that the SSP2 would form part of the statutory North Northamptonshire Development Plan. The Development Plan, as it related to Kettering Borough, would consist of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (Part 1 Local Plan) adopted July 2016; the Kettering Borough SSP2 Local Plan; the Kettering Town Centre Area Action Plan (July 2011); and any made Neighbourhood Plans.

The Joint Core Strategy (JCS) provided a set of strategic planning policies for Corby, Kettering and Wellingborough Borough Councils, and East Northamptonshire District Council. Whereas, the SSP2 would provide local planning policies to cover Kettering Borough, and include the identification of sites for housing, employment, gypsy and traveller accommodation, recreation and other land uses.

The JCS proposes a housing requirement for Kettering Borough for the period 2011-2031 of 10,400 dwellings, this equated to an annual average dwelling completion rate of 520 dwellings per annum.

The SSP2 would need to provide sufficient land to meet the housing requirements contained within the JCS. Through the earlier work on the Plan, a number of sites had advanced through this committee in September 2012 and January 2014 to be supported for allocation. There remained however a number of sites at various settlements within the Borough yet to be progressed towards allocation, and Officers had been undertaking further technical work to resolve their suitability. The results of the work for each of the four towns were considered at the Planning Policy Committee meeting on 1st November 2016.

The housing requirement for the rural area was set in the JCS as 480 dwellings for the plan period 2011-2031. It was noted that since 2011, the rural area has experienced a number of sites coming forward for development. Between the period 1st April 2011 and 31st March 2016 there had been 83 new dwellings completed. In terms of existing commitments, there were 104 dwellings. This therefore left a residual figure of 293 dwellings to meet the JCS requirement.

During the preparation of the JCS, officers undertook a detailed review of historic windfall delivery rates in the rural area for the previous 13 years. The work recognised the potential of reducing availability of windfall sites in the villages, the

conclusion being that 10 dwellings per annum would be a reasonable allowance. Therefore, 10 dwellings per annum for the remaining period of the JCS, provided a windfall allowance of 150 dwellings. The addition of this windfall allowance therefore reduced the residual JCS requirement further, to 143 dwellings.

The rural sites that remained for consideration for allocation had the potential to provide in excess of 200 dwellings in total. However, it was unlikely that all of these sites would be allocated, or would deliver to the maximum density currently estimated. It did though suggest that the allocation of sites could supply sufficient land to meet the JCS requirement.

Four villages had currently been designated a Neighbourhood Plan area. It was recognised that residents should be encouraged to prepare Neighbourhood Plans for their areas, in support of the Localism agenda, and allocate land for development through their Neighbourhood Plans. Equally, other villages in the Borough continued to show an interest in Neighbourhood Planning, and they too should be given their chance to shape the environment in which they live, including through the allocation of land for housing development. The number of additional dwellings likely to be allocated through Neighbourhood Plans was difficult to predict at this stage. However, some account could be made in meeting the rural housing requirement through Neighbourhood Plans, without a risk that they would be in sufficient numbers to affect the urban focussed growth strategy of the JCS.

At this committee's meeting on 30th January 2014, Members endorsed a series of next steps to enable Officers to proceed with the production of the plan document and entailed concluding on each of the sites and placing them into one of three broad categories. These were that sites were:

- 1) Recommended to be progressed as housing allocations; or
- 2) Required further identified work before concluding whether they should be progressed as housing allocations; or
- 3) New sites (submitted during the Options stage consultation process) which were to be assessed against criteria set out in the Housing Allocations Background Paper.

Members heard that officers had been undertaking recent work to provide a further shortlist of potential sites. Sites on the villages not included were largely discounted based upon the roles of those villages, local need for housing, and constraints and characteristics identified through the preparation of the

Kettering Borough Rural Masterplanning Report. In accordance with Government guidance in considering sites, the emphasis was about sites being available, suitable and achievable.

It was recognised that in some villages, a Neighbourhood Plan was being prepared. In some cases, housing sites being identified for allocation may be the same in both the SSP2 and the Neighbourhood Plan, equally, allocations may differ. At this stage in the preparation of the SSP2, and given that the neighbourhood plans were still working their way towards submission to the Council, it was considered prudent to retain those sites still being considered for allocation. This was until such time as there was a clearer understanding of the contents of the Neighbourhood Plans in those villages affected.

A summary for each village was set out in appendix 1 of the report, and set out a number of recommendations to proceed with making further progress to the allocation of housing sites in those locations.

Broughton

At the Planning Policy Committee meeting on 30th January 2014, Members resolved that all sites in Broughton under consideration, RA/094b, RA/99a, RA/101 and RA/127 required further work to be undertaken before concluding which sites should be progressed as housing allocations. Members heard that consideration needed to be given to other recent developments that had been taking place in the village, such as at Cransley Hill which was providing 60 new dwellings. Whilst comment was made in respect of the suitability of individual sites for residential allocation purposes, it was noted that officers would be in a position to make more informed decisions about the scale of growth appropriate in Broughton, once the draft neighbourhood plan had been published regarding the amount and location of any other housing development sites identified in the document.

Recent work on site RA/094b confirmed that the site was in three separate ownerships. The site promoter of the largest parcel of land indicated that they wished for the previously discounted larger site RA/094, to be considered for allocation, with an indicative yield of 55-65 dwellings being provided. However, this needed to be weighed up against previous findings of the site's assessment for allocation including the suitability of such a scale of development in the village as well as its distance away from the village centre relative to other sites. A smaller site RA/094b was considered as a potentially better alternative.

The delivery of this site was dependant on two factors, the first

being co-operation between landowners and the second being that there was a pumping station located in the middle of the site owned by Anglian Water. A buffer free of development of up to 15 metres would also be required and would therefore affect the net development area of the site.

It was considered that site RA/099a did not connect well to the rest of the village and would result in the loss of allotments, which would be mitigated through relocation to the north of the site. The site had been re-assessed and now indicated an increase of up to 28 dwellings. As a result, it was now apparent that one significant issue would be that of site access, where through consultation with NCC Highways, the site was given an amber RAG rating.

Further consultation with Anglian Water raised an issue regarding asset encroachment, particularly in relation to the risk of odour from the Broughton Water Recycling Centre, located approximately 130m to the north-east of the site. It had been recommended by Anglian Water that a more detailed assessment of the risk of odour and potential impact on residents was required prior to development of the site.

The relocation of the allotments was potentially disruptive to the users of this facility, despite the provision of a replacement facility this site had some constraints to overcome. On balance, other sites that were located closer to the village centre may be deemed to be preferable to this site.

The potential yield of site RA/101 was 12, however through further assessment of the site it was evident that the most significant constraint for the site was access. NCC Highways, who had given the site a 'red' RAG rating stated that further development to the rear of the site was not suitable as Bentham Close was currently too narrow and not capable of being improved to adoptable standards. Therefore, development to the rear of Bentham Close was not considered to be achievable and the site would not be progressed for allocation.

Access to site RA/127 was dependent on the demolition of Meadow Grange off Grange Road. However it had been confirmed by the site promoter's agent for this site, that the residents of this property were aware of this and that access could be made off Grange Road to serve the development. This would be the preferred approach by NCC Highways.

The issue of noise had been highlighted by KBC Environmental Protection Team, given the site's close proximity to the A43, although not significant, it was likely to be addressed through appropriate mitigation measures at planning application stage.

For this site, there was a concern in relation to the proposed density of the site. In 2014, it was identified that the anticipated yield for the site would be 10 dwellings. However, as part of the information submitted by the agent for this site, the proposed yield was considerably higher than this, at 26 dwellings. It was considered that a lower density scheme more a kin to the 10 units originally proposed would be more appropriate for this site given its location, being adjacent to open countryside, the density of the nearby residential area and its proximity to the conservation area to the south. In order for this site to be looked on favourably, further discussions would be required.

It was reported that a late submission had been received by an interested party promoting land to the west of Darlow Close, which was previously considered as site RA/096. Officers were currently looking at a preliminary access improvement plan. The site would provide a parent pick up/drop off point of 36 spaces, a play area, overflow parking and 50 dwellings. If the committee agreed this site could be reviewed and further information brought back to a future meeting.

It was recommended that further work be completed on the three sites in Broughton as described above with the addition of the late submission and that officers continue to engage with the Neighbourhood Plan group about the emerging Neighbourhood Plan.

Hillary Bull addressed the committee and raised concerns that the sites identified by officers were completely different to the sites identified in the Broughton Neighbourhood Plan, which was one week away from pre consultation submission. She requested that the Broughton Neighbourhood Plan be upheld and the suggested sites in the report not be progressed.

Councillor Ruth Groome addressed the committee and raised concerns regarding the capacity of Broughton Primary School.

Councillor Jim Hakewill addressed the committee and outlined his concerns including what he perceived to be short notice for Parish Councils of the Planning Policy Committee meeting. He also commented on the adoption of the Broughton Neighbourhood Plan, the amount of development having already taken place in Broughton, development in Mawsley and Geddington, pressures on the local primary school, and existing issues with the A43.

Some members raised concerns that the Broughton Neighbourhood plan had not been taken into consideration when identifying sites. Officers confirmed that the Broughton

Neighbourhood Plan in its current state carried no weight, but when it had been adopted, the plan would be a statutory document and the content would need to be incorporated into this process going forward. Members were assured that they were not being asked to approve the allocations at this committee.

Geddington

Members heard that at the Planning Policy Committee meeting on 30th January 2014, Members resolved that all sites in Geddington under consideration should be progressed as housing allocations.

Site RA/107 was occupied by a small scale operational sawmill, with the potential for mixed employment and residential. The site agent proposed that the existing sawmill use be retained over a reduced area, with the remaining area developed with its own separate access for up to 10 dwellings.

It was noted that soil contamination may be present on the site due to chemical residues associated with the existing sawmill use, although there was no reason why this could not be mitigated, which would be determined by further investigation and assessment. Anglian Water had identified that water assets were affected by the site, which needed to be explored further through assessment; as a result, the site was scored amber in terms of their RAG rating. As with many rural sites, this site generally scored poorly in terms of accessibility to facilities, but the site offered scope to deliver up to 10 dwellings which would contribute towards the identified rural housing need. The site was recommended for progression as a possible housing allocation site.

Site RA/109 was visible from Grafton Road and the recreation park to the north-east / east, but largely screened from Kettering Road by an existing tree belt, of which some would be lost to provide sufficient access to the site. Sensitive design and landscaping and mitigation of impacts to an acceptable level should be possible.

It was noted that there was a sewerage treatment works nearby, which would usually require a 100 metre buffer, the impact of which would need to be investigated.

The indicative site layout demonstrated that direct vehicular access from the highway to the site could be achieved. NCC Highways score the site 'green' in the RAG rating.

Site RA/110 had a number of key constraints. Enclosing the site along the southern and western boundaries was a group of

mature trees protected by a Tree Preservation Order, which contributed to the character of this part of the Conservation Area. The submitted tree report and indicative layout demonstrated how development of the site may consider this constraint without significant impact. The site was visible from a number of different vantage points.

With respect of highway access, the indicative site layout demonstrated that direct vehicular access from the highway to the site could be achieved. Northamptonshire County Council Highways raised no objection, scoring the site yellow RAG rating

Although the sites did highlight some issues it was recommended that the sites be put forward as potential allocations subject to resolving outstanding issues.

Councillor Rowley reported that Geddington Parish Council were in full support of the suggested sites and were also in support of other sites which had been discounted for various reasons.

Mawsley

At the Planning Policy Committee meeting on 30th January 2014 it was requested that further work be carried out in relation to sites RA/115 and RA/174 in Mawsley before concluding whether the sites should be progressed as housing allocations. In relation to RA/174 it was recommended that further work was required to address some of the issues raised through the consultation process. In relation to RA/115 further work was required, in consultation with NCC Highways, to determine whether access constraints could be overcome. Given the scale of development which could be accommodated on the two sites under consideration in Mawsley it was considered that only one of these sites would need to be progressed as a housing allocation to contribute towards meeting the rural housing requirement in the plan period.

Site RA/115 was located close to the services and facilities of Mawsley, but there were limited opportunities for connectivity between the site and the existing village. The site sloped away from the village to the east and would be visible from the surrounding countryside, there was no natural boundary to the site. Development would extend beyond the existing built form into the countryside.

The capacity of this site was identified in previous consultation documents as 60 dwellings based on 15 dwellings per hectare. The site promoter had put forward approximately 83 dwellings. The site did not have a natural boundary and if the site was progressed then further work would be required in relation to layout to determine the precise boundary of the site and to

ensure a softer edge could be created.

The site promoter was exploring 3 options for consideration which were set out in the report. Options 1 and 2 received a 'red' RAG rating, and it was considered that option 3 would not be a viable option due to visibility splays, construction costs and connectivity.

Further work to address concerns raised through a previous public consultation and reported to Planning Policy Committee on 30th January 2014, has been carried out at site RA/174.

Access via Cransley Rise was raised as a concern. NCC Highways had been consulted in relation to gaining access to the site. They have advised satisfactory access could be achieved but that Cransley Rise would need to be widened.

Capacity of the pumping station, drainage and sewage system was also raised as an issue.

Impact on wildlife was raised as an issue. An ecological assessment would be required to assess and mitigate impact of development if the site was progressed.

Impact on amenity and light/ noise pollution would be considered in detail at planning application stage if the site was progressed. Careful consideration would need to be given to the impact on the amenity of adjacent properties.

The site was reasonably well related in relation to services and facilities in Mawsley and the capacity of this site was identified as 57 dwellings. If the site was progressed then further work would be required in relation site layout to determine the appropriate level of development to be accommodated on the site.

Site RA/174 represented a site that could be better integrated with the existing village and it was recommended to continue negotiations.

Councillor Moreton raised concerns that the sites were not available, achievable or suitable.

Braybrooke

Since the meeting of the Planning Policy Committee in January 2014, planning permission has been granted at site RA/220. This site was now counted as a commitment in the housing numbers and construction of these homes has commenced on site. Only site RA/128, therefore, remained under consideration.

Members heard there was a large beech tree on site RA/128 which was protected by a Tree Preservation Order, this tree would need to be retained and protected. The site is adjacent to the Old Rectory Grade II Listed Building and the Conservation Area.

The site promoter indicated that the indicative yield had been revised down to 3 dwellings to take account of the site constraints. On this basis, the site was recommended for progression as a potential housing allocation with appropriate development principles set out to reflect site constraints and the need to provide for a suitable and sensitively designed scheme.

Cranford

At the Planning Policy Committee meeting on 30th January 2014, Members resolved that all sites under consideration in Cranford (RA/170 and RA/173) required further work to be undertaken before concluding which sites should be progressed as housing allocations. It was noted that at the time this decision was made, the threshold for affordable housing in planning policy terms was 5 dwellings across the rural areas. As a result of more recent national changes in affordable housing policy the threshold has altered to 40% of a development of 11 or more dwellings or where the combined gross floor area exceeds 1,000 square metres. Further clarification would need to be sought as to what manner the sites will be brought forward as a result of these policy changes.

Great Cransley

For site RA/146, two options had been proposed, for 10-15 dwellings, the lower yield scheme being linear along Loddington Road, with the 15 dwelling scheme being a higher density scheme. However at this stage it was considered that linear development of the site for the 10 dwellings proposal was more appropriate as it would match more closely with previous indicators of the potential yield for this site. Further discussions would be required with the site promoters in terms of the amount of affordable housing in the light of the change to national planning policy.

Newton

Access to site RA/130 was constrained given the narrow nature of the roads in the village, despite the small size of the site and the proposed yield of 4 dwellings, NCC Highways had given this site a 'red' RAG rating stating that significant highway improvements would be required in order to access the site. Further discussions were required with the site promoter to ascertain if highway issues could be addressed.

The size of the village and the lack of facilities located in Newton

led to questions regarding the sustainability of residential development on this site.

Pytchley

Site RA/117 received a 'yellow' RAG rating from NCC Highways.

It was considered that the scale of development on the site, 8 dwellings, was in keeping with the linear form of development along Isham Road. It was also in proportion to the size of the village, without any significant impact on existing facilities in the village, given that this was the only potential allocation in Pytchley. Therefore it was considered that this site is a favourable site for allocation.

Stoke Albany

At the Planning Policy Committee meeting on 30th January 2014 it was requested that further work be carried out in relation to sites RA/120 and RA/221 in Stoke Albany before concluding whether the sites should be progressed as housing allocations.

Site RA/120 is relatively sensitive. Chemical residues resulting from the existing agricultural use may be present, which together with a nearby historic waste disposal site, would require full assessment and possible mitigation to resolve any identified soil contamination affecting the site. This is not a constraint which would preclude development of the site however.

In conclusion, the site was not affected by significant constraints which could not be mitigated and could deliver 8 dwellings which would contribute towards the identified rural housing need.

The most significant constraint on site RA/221 was access to the local highway network. This is because Harborough Road is effectively a slip road for the adjacent A427. Therefore it would need to be demonstrated that the speed of vehicles on Harborough Road would be travelling at a speed that would be considered safe for traffic joining this road from the proposed site. The requirements and detail of which had been sent to the land owner and results of this would be required, prior to an application being submitted.

The merits of RA/120 needed to be considered against the merits of RA/221. One of the key issues was the locational difference of each site, with RA/221 occupying a central position within the main residential area of the village with residential development either side.

Alex Brodie, the owner of site RA/120 addressed the committee and sought member support to progress the site for housing allocation.

Weston-by-Welland

Site RA/136 had potential issues with access, heritage and contamination. An email was received from the agent of the site reemphasising the benefits of residential use of the farm. The site was considered appropriate within village and would not have adverse impact.

Wilbarston

After contact with the site owner Kettering Borough Council had been informed that there is no ambition for site RA/172 to be developed; therefore this site would not be further considered for allocation.

Following discussions of the rural sites it was noted that consultation would begin when the recommended work had been carried out.

The revised programme for progressing the Part 2 Local Plan was proposed as follows:

- Draft Plan for consultation – March 2017
- Pre-Submission Plan for consultation – July 2017
- Submission to Secretary of State – September 2017
- Examination – December 2017
- Receipt of Inspector’s Report – May 2018
- Adoption – July 2018

It was

RESOLVED that

- (i) Members noted the updates given on the assessment of sites for allocation for housing in the emerging Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan; and
- (ii) Members endorsed the ‘next steps’ outlined in section 5 and 6 of appendix 1 including the late submission received for Broughton.

(The meeting started at 6.30 pm and finished at 8.50 pm)

Signed
Chair

AN