

## Appendix 1e - Housing

**Section Title:** Housing

**Number of responses:** 47

**Summary of main points**

Total number of Objections - 11

Total number of Support - 10

Total number of neither Object nor Support - 26

Statutory consultees:

Northamptonshire County Council – Adult Social Services

- A quarter of new homes should be affordable rents **(114 and 115)**  
Recommend that 25% of all new homes are built to lifetime home standards. **(114 and 115)**
- Need to work with Housing Associations to deliver affordable rents for Extra Care housing schemes. **(114 and 115)**
- Large opportunity in the private market to develop Extra Care apartments **(114 and 115)**
- Support for an approach to tackle poor conditions from private landlords **(114 and 115)**
- Lifetime homes should also be considered for rural developments **(114 and 115)**

Highways England

- Need to understand cumulative impact of development on the A14 **(518)**
- The cumulative impact of growth should be assessed through the development management process **(521)**
- Transport Assessments should be undertaken the impact and mitigation required for larger sites **(521)**

Other consultees:

Older Persons Housing – Question 2

Need clarity on what % of homes that are delivered, are suitable for those who are disabled, elderly or have a low income. (1) **(60)**

The location of housing for older people should be carefully considered. (1). **(11)**

Support the inclusion of policy which requires developments above a certain threshold to make a provision for older persons housing (1) **(152)**

Concern that the options for the elderly who wish to downsize are limited to flats in retirement living schemes. (1). **(83)**

Need far more housing for the elderly (3) **(111)**

## Appendix 1e - Housing

Need to consider the needs of working age adults who require care beyond that provided in large extra care schemes (1)

Support for (Question 2) (4) **(239) (252) (275), (278)**

A policy requirement for older persons housing is too rigid and will reduce the delivery of affordable housing and infrastructure (1) **(191)**

The recommendations from the study dated March 2017 have not been carried through into the SSP2 (1) **(191)**

The Plan should allocate sites for older person accommodation (1) **(191)**

The Plan should not include policy requirement for older persons housing (1) **(191)**

A policy requirement for thresholds on developments for older persons housing is unnecessary and is therefore not supported (2) **(477), (554)**

Further evidence is required to understand the local need of each area and requirement for any provision (1) **(508)**

### Category 3 Homes – Question 1

Lack of mobility will be growing issue and so Category 3 housing will be important and should not be overlooked (1) **(10)**

Support for (Question 1) (4). **(151), (237), (251), (275)**

There is no evidence to support a policy that would require a certain proportion of homes to Category 3 standards (1) **(190)**

Application of enhanced standards have significant implications on housing range, build cost, affordability, cumulative policy burdens, viability, and housing delivery. (1) **(190)**

A policy requirement for Category 3 dwellings will worsen existing challenges in relation to viability, is too rigid and will reduce the delivery of affordable housing (1) **(190)**

A more flexible approach should be taken where viability is considered and be assessed on a case by case basis (1) **(190)**

No further details are required in the SSP2 in relation to housing mix, space standards, accessible and affordable housing, as Policy 30 is sufficient (1) **(475)**

The SSP2 should not include a policy requirement for Category 3 homes (2) **(190), (476)**

## Appendix 1e - Housing

Relevant evidence showing the local need must be provided to justify a policy requirement for category 3 homes (3) **(190), (487) (507)**

### Self Build Housing

A policy requiring a percentage of self build housing on sites is rigid and prescriptive within insufficient flexibility which can also obstruct and delay the delivery of housing and is therefore not supported. (1) **(193)**

There is insufficient evidence to justify a policy for self-build plots (1) **(193)**

Self build housing creates logistical problems where plots are provided on larger schemes making them impractical (1) **(193)**

Support for proposals which encourage self/custom build housing (1) **(479)**

Support for a policy to allow single plot exception sites in rural areas, although support is not given for a requirement on residential development sites in other areas. (1) **(479)**

Any policy requirement for self/custom build housing on residential development sites should be fully justified and evidenced (1) **(479)**

### Housing Requirements/Windfall

Additional strategic allocations are required to meeting affordable housing needs (1) **(287)**

The strategy which underpins the housing allocations, is inappropriate when considering paragraph 70 of the NPPF (1) **(446)**

Further justification and evidence is required in relation to the windfall rate (1) **(446)**

Future windfall sites will be more constrained and come forward slower, which will be exacerbated by the tight settlement boundaries (1) **(446)**

The approach to windfall sites is not consistent with the NPPF (1) **(446)**

More sites must be allocated in the rural areas (1) **(452)**

Need to maximise housing supply with a range of size and market location to enable house builders to offer the widest range of products (1) **(469)**

The approach to allocating smaller non-strategic sites for housing is supported (1) **(469)**

Suggestion to use a 20% contingency buffer when allocating sites, rather than 10% (2) **(469), (556)**

## Appendix 1e - Housing

Full justification should be provided for the use of a 10% buffer (1) **(469)**  
Those sites identified as deliverable sites for the first 5 years of the Plan should only be considered deliverable where there is clear evidence they will begin on site within five years (1) **(506)**

Objection to the use of windfall sites towards housing supply in relation to paragraph 70 of the NPPF (1) **(506)**

The approach to garden development and settlement boundaries, there is no evidence to suggest the windfall figure will be delivered (1) **(506)**

The 10% contingency buffer should be applied to all areas of Kettering Borough not just the Growth Town and the Market Towns (1) **(506)**

Objection to the housing allocations at Rothwell and Broughton (1) **(478)**

Support for a 10% buffer to the supply of housing, consideration is required as to whether this is sufficient (1) **(485)**

A housing trajectory should be produced to show the need to allocate additional sites (1) **(485)**

Concerns over the delayed delivery of all SUEs, hence further sites should be considered for allocation (2) **(501)**

A 5 year housing land supply cannot be robustly demonstrated (1) **(504)**

### Promotion of further sites

Request that an additional site is considered for allocation in Burton Latimer to meet future housing and affordable housing needs (1) **(286)**

Burton Latimer is a suitable settlement to accommodate a higher housing requirement (1) **(285)**

The promoted site will assist with the provision of infrastructure enhancements as well meet local needs and aspirations, for example supported living and/or retirement apartments (2) **(287 and 289)**

The promoted site at Land South of Home Farm (Pytchley) would make a significant contribution to future housing delivery (1) **(446)**

The promoted site Land to the Rear of 18-20 Glebe Road (Broughton) would make a significant contribution to future housing delivery (1) **(452)**

The promoted site at Mawsley would make a significant contribution to future housing delivery (1) **(458)**

Promotion of a site 'Land off Gardener Road' for consideration as a housing allocation (1) **(501)**

## Appendix 1e - Housing

### Other comments

Support the need for more social housing for rent in Kettering Borough (1) **(52)**

Need for infrastructure to support the housing development, including green spaces (1) **(60)**

Objection to Policy KET01 unless the wording should be strengthened to prevent curtilages from being divided **prior** to a planning application being made to develop the site. (1) **(130)**

All of the garden of 62 Headlands, Kettering should be included within the area covered by policy KET01 (01) **(130)**.

### **Implications of New National Planning Policy Framework**

Paragraph 61 requires the housing needs of different groups to be reflected in planning policies (including, but not limited to, those who require affordable housing, families with children, older people, students, people with disabilities, service families, travellers, people who rent their homes and people within to commission or build their own homes).

Paragraph 70 requires that when an allowance for windfall has been made that it must have regard to historic windfall delivery rates; hence evidence of this nature is required to justify the 10% figure included for the rural area.

Paragraph 68 requires 10% of the housing requirement to be met through the identification of sites of 1ha or less. Therefore evidence must be gathered to ensure that this requirement can be fulfilled.

### **Summary of officer comments**

There is evidently strong support for the inclusion of a policy which requires a percentage of homes to be suitable for the elderly. Policy will be required in making provision for more homes for the elderly, if evidence is available to support it.

There is support for the inclusion of a policy relating to category 3 housing, further work will be carried out to support the preparation of a policy.

Previous evidence of delivery rates in the rural area indicates that on average 10 dwellings are delivered on windfall sites on an annual basis. A background paper will be prepared setting out the evidence which supported the identification of this figure.

Although the self-build register does indicate a level of demand, it is

## Appendix 1e - Housing

anticipated that the true demand may be higher than this and therefore as a result further evidence is required.

The rural windfall allowance used was that used in the identification of housing requirements in the JCS. A background paper will be prepared setting out the evidence for this windfall allowance.

The promoted sites will be considered under the settlement specific chapters.

### **Next steps**

- Prepare a background paper to provide information on housing requirements and five year land supply, and to provide justification for the 10% buffer and the rural windfall figures, using historic delivery figures.
- Gather evidence to justify the inclusion of a policy requiring a percentage of Category 3 homes.
- Carry out additional work to determine whether developments above a certain threshold should make provision for older persons housing.
- Carry out additional work to determine whether a policy on self-build and custom build housing should be included and how/what it should contain.