

Full Planning Committee - 17 April 2018

Agenda Update

5.1 **KET/2017/0616**

Kettering South (land at) (Off A509 north of Isham) Kettering

It is proposed by Officers to delete the word 'unnecessary' from the recommended HGV Delivery Route Management Plan condition 30 on page 12 of the report.

The applicant has provided a Head of Terms - the contents of which is already set out in the Committee report on pages 14 and 15 with respect to highway related provisions and at section 6 page 26 of the report with regard to other matters. The Heads of Terms does however now also include the appointment of a Community Liaison contact during the construction phase and also the inclusion of the HGV routing plan, the construction management plan and an apprentice scheme.

An additional letter from Isham Parish Council has been received and included a series of points on why the proposal should be refused. These include briefly; impact of increased traffic through the village particularly in the absence of the Isham bypass and its visual impact together with impacts to flooding, wildlife, pollution, heritage assets and dispute the need and benefits of the proposal. These matters are considered throughout the report and are not considered to introduce anything new.

Broughton Parish Council have provided a letter raising concern regarding the use of minor roads being used for HGV traffic in particular and request mitigation measures prior to commencement.

The Highway related provisions associated with the proposal have been discussed within Section 3 (page 14) of the Report and its highway implications are discussed at Section 7.5 (page 32). These comments do not introduce any new matters and in particular a HGV routing plan is proposed by condition 30.

The Wildlife Trust maintain their objection and raises the following points:

- Dispute the amount of actual biodiversity enhancement proposed
- The southfield pasture land to the north-east corner of the site is a Local Wildlife site which contains a good range of wet land plants that should be acknowledged
- The 50m flood mitigation strip should be larger to reflect the site of the Local Wildlife site
- The biodiversity offer proposed is unimaginative, predictable and boring

The overall strategic approach to landscaping and biodiversity has been considered at Section 7.2 (page 27) and 7.8 (page 36) of the report. With the support of the County Ecologist (as the Council's Statutory Consultee on such matters) the proposal, within the parameters of an outline application, is considered to be acceptable and will be dealt with fully in the reserved matters and through the approval of Condition 7 and 8 which require approval of a Landscape, Ecology and

Arboricultural Management Plan and strategies. As such these comments do not introduce any new matters.

In addition ten letters of support (primarily from Kettering residents) and one further objection letter have also been received from a resident of Burton Latimer. These comments are consistent with those already received and detailed with the report.

These updates are not considered to introduce any new matters that would result in a change to the findings of the report.