

## Appendix 2c – Spatial Portrait, Vision and Outcomes

Comment	KBC Response
<p><b>Id 98</b> - Sport England supports SSP2 Draft vision having regard to promotion of a healthy lifestyle.</p> <p>We would draw your attention to our guidance on Active Design which should help to deliver JCS outcome 7 and health community objectives and JCS Outcome 10 enhanced quality of life</p> <p>Active design - Sport England, in conjunction with Public Health England, has produced "Active Design" (October 2015), a guide to planning new developments that create the right environment to help people get more active, more often in the interests of health and wellbeing. The guidance sets out 10 key principles for ensuring new developments incorporate opportunities for people to take part in sport and physical activity. The Active Design principles are aimed at contributing towards the Government's desire for the planning system to promote healthy communities through good urban design. Sport England would commend the use of the guidance in the master planning process for new residential developments. The document can be downloaded via the following link: <a href="http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/planning-tools-and-guidance/active-design/">http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/planning-tools-and-guidance/active-design/</a></p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p><b>Id 235</b> - Such words and visions for policies and outcomes are all very well, if - but only if - they do in fact impose a meaningful obligation to conform to the actual words and visions set out here, when considering in detail the planning proposals and allocations for individual local communities, especially in the case of the rural villages. It seems that, instead, the undoubtedly good words included here as policies and visions have been totally ignored when it comes to looking at the details.</p> <p>JCS Outcome 1 - Empowered and Proactive Communities</p> <p>2.13 "... this will mean providing locally specific policies which focus on issues which are important to local communities".</p> <p>2.14 "... identifying open space to be protected".</p> <p>In the case of Braybrooke, and the proposed allocation RA128, it appears to have been conveniently forgotten that in the 2012 consultation over 95% of all respondents strongly objected to any re-drawing of the village boundary and to any inclusion of the RA128 site for housing. Because here, yet again, is a renewed proposal to re-draw the Braybrooke village boundary to include RA128 as a housing allocation. Local communities are certainly NOT empowered by such total disregard of their collectively and legitimately expressed views.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The outcomes are overarching objectives which the policies and proposals in the plan will contribute to as a whole. In terms of empowering communities this needs to be balanced against the need to achieve other parts of the vision and outcomes. If site RA/128 is progressed then it will be recommended that an additional criteria requiring an ecological survey and mitigation of impacts is added.</p> <p>The rural housing requirement is borough wide and not specific to Braybrooke, the SSP2 needs to identify sites across the rural area to meet this requirement.</p>

## Appendix 2c – Spatial Portrait, Vision and Outcomes

Comment	KBC Response
<p>JCS Outcome 3 Distinctive Environments that Enhance and Respect Local Character and Enhance Biodiversity</p> <p>2.19 "... this will mean protecting and enhancing the characteristics of the different settlements which make them special"</p> <p>2.20 "... identifying development principles for sites which ensure the ... landscape of ... villages [are] protected", and "... which protect and enhance biodiversity".</p> <p>In the case of Braybrooke, and the proposed allocation RA128, it appears to have been conveniently forgotten that to replace the current wild meadow-type biome with a new housing allocation will do little or nothing to protect and enhance the landscape which makes the settlement special, nor to protect and enhance the biodiversity of the site.</p> <p>JCS Outcome 8 Vibrant Well-Connected Towns and Productive Countryside</p> <p>2.34 "... focussing development in sustainable locations in accordance with strategy set out in JCS", and "identifying housing ... allocations to meet local needs in the rural areas"</p> <p>In the case of Braybrooke, and the proposed allocation RA128, it appears to have been conveniently forgotten that the 2014 Housing Needs Survey identified a need for only 3 affordable homes in Braybrooke, and that since 2014 the former Primary School site has been developed to include 4 affordable homes and 10 market-value homes, while other windfall and backlot developments have added a further 3 or 4 additional market-value houses. Thus, there is no "need" for allocation of more market-value houses in what cannot be described as a sustainable setting within the borough.</p> <p>JCS Outcome 10 Enhanced Quality of Life for All Residents</p> <p>2.38 "Protection open space [sic]", and "...identifying green space which is protected from development", and "allocation of sites which provide for a mix of type and tenure to meet local needs".</p> <p>As above, in the case of Braybrooke, and the proposed allocation RA128, it appears to have been conveniently forgotten that there is no need for allocation of any further housing sites, but rather, an area of green space that (in accordance with this policy and outcome) ought to be protected from development by remaining excluded from the village boundary.</p>	
<p><b>Id 318</b> – 2.14 green infrastructure and open space- this should also include a consideration of the</p>	<p>Noted. The text will be updated to</p>

## Appendix 2c – Spatial Portrait, Vision and Outcomes

Comment	KBC Response
<p>historic environment GI is not only about the natural environment.</p> <p>2.19 this should also include a consideration of the historic environment GI is not only about the natural environment.</p>	<p>ensure that it is clear that consideration of GI includes the historic environment.</p>
<p><b>Id 157</b> - We support the recognition of the differing roles of the centres in the retail hierarchy with Kettering remaining as the main town centre within the Borough supported by complementary market towns and village centres.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p><b>Id 158</b> - We object to the current wording of bullet point 4 because while the objective of minimising travel is understood and laudable, there also needs to be a focus on the importance of access to different sustainable modes of transport. This is because Kettering will and should remain the focus for retail, services and civic uses which the residents of the borough will need to access on a regular basis. Accordingly, improving and giving access to sustainable travel choices while also recognising the ongoing importance of the car in a rural borough to allow residents to travel to the main town centres is appropriate and necessary. Kettering town centre requires residents to visit to ensure that it can thrive, therefore spreading uses across the borough where they are best centralised simply to minimise movement is unlikely to be the most sustainable solution to support the vitality and viability of the town centre / improvement of business growth in the future. Accordingly, a focus on supporting the main town centres should remain with sustainable travel options being improved wherever possible.</p>	<p>The purpose of this statement is not to spread development to minimise movement but to locate development where it would be close to existing services and facilities, this approach would support Kettering as the focus for retail, services and civic uses, as growth town and the focus for future growth. The wording of the statement will be reviewed to ensure that its purpose is clear.</p>
<p><b>Id 233 - Comments made on behalf of Desborough Town Council</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kettering...supported by THRIVING MARKET TOWNS.... and town centre regeneration- A good principle for Desborough as is...</li> <li>• section 2.22 - "protecting &amp; enhancing the role of...Desborough, in providing local services &amp; facilities"</li> </ul>	<p>Noted</p>
<p><b>Id 284</b> - It is considered that some of the JCS outcomes will not be achieved without amendments to Draft SSKLP, including those outcomes related to services and facilities (Outcome 4), sustainable transport (Outcome 7) and housing needs (Outcome 10).</p> <p><u>JCS Outcome 4. Excellent Services and Facilities Easily Accessed by Local Communities and Businesses</u></p> <p>Paragraphs 17 and 70 of the NPPF 2012 seek to provide support for services and facilities, including health facilities [Paragraph 20 of NPPF2 2018 expects sufficient provision to be made for community</p>	<p>The outcomes are overarching objectives which the policies and proposals in the plan will contribute to as a whole. Burton Latimer has already exceeded its housing requirement and only one small site is identified within the town. Further development at Burton Latimer of the scale proposed would dilute the</p>

## Appendix 2c – Spatial Portrait, Vision and Outcomes

Comment	KBC Response
<p>facilities including health facilities]. As set out in representations to Chapter 13, Burton Latimer Medical Centre (off Higham Road in Burton Latimer) is now fully occupied, and there is no internal space available for expansion and no capacity to expand into the car park without the loss of parking spaces. It is considered that additional land is required to enable the Medical Centre to expand.</p> <p>The proposed residential development at land south of Higham Road in Burton Latimer could provide land to enable the capacity of Burton Latimer Medical Centre to increase. Therefore, in respect of health facilities in Burton Latimer, it is considered that JCS Outcome 4 will not be achieved without additional residential allocations being identified in Burton Latimer that are capable of delivering increased capacity in health care facilities .</p> <p><u>JCS Outcome 7 - More Walkable Places and an Excellent Choice of Ways to Travel</u></p> <p>Paragraphs 30 and 34 of the NPPF 2012 seek to encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport in order to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and congestion [Paragraphs 102 and 103 of NPPF2 2018 contain similar provisions]. The land south of Higham Road in Burton Latimer is promoted for residential development. The site is within walking and cycling distance of the town centre, and the existing services and facilities within it. In addition, there are existing bus stops on Higham Road which provide opportunities for the use of sustainable modes of transport to and from the site. New cycle ways have been created along Higham Road in conjunction with the recent development on the opposite side of the road.</p> <p>New development should be directed to locations which are accessible by sustainable modes of transport. The proposed development at land south of Higham Road in Burton Latimer represents a sustainable location in transport terms. Therefore, JCS Outcome 7 could be achieved with an additional allocation in Burton Latimer, and specifically at land south of Higham Road.</p> <p><u>JCS Outcome 10 - Enhanced Quality of Life for All Residents</u></p> <p>JCS Outcome 10 seeks to meet housing and affordable housing needs. Paragraph 47 of NPPF 2012 seeks to boost significantly the supply of housing, and expects local planning authorities to meet objectively assessed needs for housing and affordable housing [Chapter 5 of NPPF2 2018 also seeks</p>	<p>focus of development on the Growth Town of Kettering.</p>

## Appendix 2c – Spatial Portrait, Vision and Outcomes

Comment	KBC Response
<p>to boost the supply of housing, and introduces new methods to deliver more housing including a housing delivery test].</p> <p>As highlighted in representations to Table 4.1, a very limited amount of residential development is directed to Burton Latimer in Draft SSKLP. Housing delivery in Burton Latimer has historically been strong, with previous housing targets met and residential developments delivered quickly. In contrast there has been significant delays to the delivery of development at Desborough North and Rothwell North, and these developments will deliver 20% affordable housing which is lower than is required at other market towns.</p> <p>Therefore, it is considered that JCS Outcome 10 will not be achieved through an over-reliance on Desborough North and Rothwell North, and other strategic developments in these towns. It is requested that an additional strategic allocation should be made in Burton Latimer, at land south of Higham Road, in order to maintain a sufficient housing land supply and meet housing and affordable housing needs.</p>	
<p><b>Id 274</b> - I support the forward-looking and attractive vision of North Northamptonshire becoming a showpiece for modern green living and well managed sustainable development. In that respect, I recommend that the air quality is measured regularly, also in the A6 towns, to pre-empt and detect any problem areas. Secondly, I believe that a strong commitment to cycle lanes and cycle routes forms an essential requirement to achieve this vision.</p>	Noted
<p><b>Id 484 - Draft Vision</b></p> <p>The Draft Vision for SSP2 states (page 13):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>"Kettering Borough will be... A place where high quality new homes are well designed, reflect the characteristics of the local area and provide good access to services and facilities..."</i></li> <li>• <i>"Rothwell town centre will be an attractive thriving historic town. The focus will be on protecting and preserving the historic core and enhancing the viability of the town centre."</i></li> <li>• <i>"Within Kettering's villages appropriate small-scale development will be allowed to meet local needs, there will be a focus on ensuring development reflects the character of villages and maintains the important features and characteristics of these villages."</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Whilst general support is given to the Draft Vision as it reflects the sentiments of the NPPF (2018), it is suggested that stronger emphasis should be given to the benefits of residential development in supporting the vitality of towns and villages alike in accordance with the</p>	Noted. It is not considered that this additional emphasis is needed in the vision, the benefits of residential development are adequately addressed through policies in the plan, e.g. town centre development principles.

## Appendix 2c – Spatial Portrait, Vision and Outcomes

Comment	KBC Response
<p>NPPF (2018).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Paragraph 85 (f) of the NPPF 2018 states that planning policies should “<i>recognise that residential development often plays an important role in ensuring the vitality of centres and encourage residential development on appropriate sites.</i>”</li> <li>• Paragraph 78 of the NPPF 2018 states: “<i>To promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services. Where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby.</i>”</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Id 406 - 2. Spatial Portrait, Vision and Outcomes</b>  <b>SSP2 Draft Vision</b>            Reference to the historic environment is strongly welcomed.</p> <p>Outcomes            It is disappointing that the historic environment is not referenced within the JCS outcomes.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p><b>Id 424</b> - Paragraph 2.38 – there is little mention of taking steps to improve health and wellbeing such as reducing pollution.</p>	<p>Noted. Further consideration will be given to the need to include more specific references to health and wellbeing in the plan.</p>