

BOROUGH OF KETTERING

PLANNING POLICY COMMITTEE

Meeting held: 28th November 2018

Present: Councillor Mike Tebbutt (Chair)
Councillors Duncan Bain, Ash Davies, June Derbyshire,
Ruth Groome, Mark Rowley and Jan Smith

Also Present: Councillor James Hakewill

18.PP.11 APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Linda Adams, Cedwien Brown and Ian Jelley

It was noted that Councillor Rowley was acting as a substitute for Councillor Brown.

18.PP.12 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor James Hakewill declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in Item 6 on the agenda as a landowner in Braybrooke and indicated that he would leave the meeting room during any discussion on issues relating to Braybrooke.

18.PP.13 MINUTES

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 12th September 2018 be approved and signed as a correct record.

18.PP.14 MATTERS OF URGENCY

None.

18.PP.15 RIGHT TO SPEAK

None.

18.PP.16 **SITE SPECIFIC PART 2 LOCAL PLAN – DRAFT PLAN CONSULTATION**

A report was submitted which informed Members of the responses to the Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan – Draft Plan consultation and which sought endorsement of officer responses set out in the comments schedule and summary sheets. The report also sought agreement for the next steps outlined in the summary sheets for officers to advance in the production of the Pre-submission Plan.

Members noted that 557 comments had been received from 239 individuals or organisations, which included Parish Councils, statutory consultees, residents, local community groups and other interested parties. It was noted that the summary sheets included with the report also assessed the implications of the revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) published in July 2018.

The SSP2 was split into three parts:-

1. Spatial Portrait, Vision and Outcomes for the Borough
2. Topic Based Issues
3. Settlement Specific Policies for the Borough's Towns and Rural Areas

The report under consideration considered chapters from the first two parts of the Draft Plan as outlined above. It was noted that a further report was scheduled for January 2019 and would consider any outstanding sections not considered and the third part of the Draft Plan.

Members considered the following sections:-

Section 1(a) General Comments

Many schools in Northamptonshire were academies. This should be taken into consideration as well as the comments made by Northamptonshire County Council (NCC), although it was acknowledged that academy places were allocated through NCC.

The number of people moving into the area in future should be taken into account, as well as providing for an ageing population.

In discussion, it was felt there was reference to school place provision in terms of where schools needed to be built, but there was an issue regarding where pupils would be allocated places, and this needed to be flagged up.

Members noted that, in terms of education from a policy point of view, there was liaison with NCC regarding the forecasted needs across the Borough.

In terms of care for the elderly there was advice on how to address need from the development section and NCC in terms of health, well-being and types of homes required.

Members welcomed the comments in relation to the inclusion of places of worship in the draft plan.

Having heard a summary of officer comments for this section, the next steps were noted and unanimously agreed, subject to the need to flag up issues relating to the allocation of school places.

Section 1(b) Introduction

Having heard a summary of officer comments for this section, the next steps were noted and unanimously agreed.

Section 1(c) Spatial Portrait, Vision and Outcomes

In discussion, the subject of cycle lanes and accessibility for cyclists and pedestrians was raised, particularly in relation to the need to keep fit and healthy. There was a need to provide secure places for parking cycles in town centres and on new developments.

Having heard a summary of officer comments for this section, the next steps were noted and unanimously agreed.

Section 1(d) Location of Development

It was noted that the policy position in relation to the re-use of existing rural buildings was adequately covered in both the Joint Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Having heard a summary of officer comments for this section, the next steps were noted and unanimously agreed.

Section 1(e) Housing

In discussion, Members noted that reference to self-build and custom-build in the Government White Paper related to the need for a Local Authority to maintain a register, so that people could have the opportunity to be notified of suitable sites for that purpose. This could be seen as beneficial in providing an alternative form of delivery, but on the other hand it should not impact on other development. It was noted that this was being

tested at examination stage. It was felt that such a register would be helpful, as it would give small and medium-sized builders the opportunity to deliver some development and not restrict development to the six large house builders.

Discussion was held on the provision of life-time homes and it was noted that the Joint Core Strategy required all housing to be Category 2. In relation to provision of housing for the elderly, it was suggested that historic policies relating to the provision of bungalows on developments should be revisited with a view to achieving a set ratio of bungalows.

It was noted that, at the East Kettering Liaison Forum, the view was held that developers treated windfall sites with disdain. Members felt that when affordable housing was built, a contribution should be made to the community in relation to infrastructure, and we should ensure this happened.

Members were informed that the process used in relation to developer contribution was S106. Officers would hold out and negotiate for the best possible deal for communities. National policy required account to be taken of viability, in that developers should make a reasonable profit. This could result in arguments about viability, because sometimes housing did not yield as much profit in terms of a particular scheme as the developers would want to see. In such cases, local authorities would have to take the decision to take less than was required to provide all the infrastructure associated with the development, which resulted in a funding gap. This was a common scenario throughout the country.

It was felt that, in relation to East Kettering, S106 obligations were comprehensive and achieved the best the framework allowed, although the NPPF had watered down viability and profitability through alterations to the wording around this subject, which would be tested through the courts in due course.

Having heard a summary of officer comments for this section, the next steps were noted and unanimously agreed subject to the inclusion of work in relation to a requirement for larger sites to provide a small proportion of self-build and custom housing. This would be subject to the provision of evidence.

Section 1(f) Employment

It was noted that a summary to enable a decision on the Employment Land Review and the Surface Water Management Plan would be brought to the next meeting of the Committee to be held in January 2019.

In response to a comment about employment land in Rothwell, it was recognised that Rothwell had struggled with the provision of employment land, although an allocation had been included in Rothwell North.

In discussion, it was felt that employment land should offer a range of employment opportunities and skills as this would encourage people to stay in the area and not commute to work. It was noted that the report would cover this from the point of view of guiding the emerging Plan to ensure that allocated sites are attractive to developers. Office development was less easy to deliver, but it was hoped the market for such development would be interested in coming to Kettering Borough.

Members expressed the view that access to parking provision, especially for lorries, was very important. Existing employment sites (eg Telford Way and Kettering Venture Park) were experiencing difficulties with parking, which also created problems regarding access for emergency vehicles.

Having heard a summary of officer comments for this section, the next steps were noted and unanimously agreed.

Section 1(g) Town Centres

Members felt that town centres would be made more viable and a safer environment for residents if more housing was provided above retail units. It was also felt that the nature of libraries had changed, and they should now be considered as cultural hubs or centres, as the purpose was now not restricted to the lending of books.

Having heard a summary of officer comments for this section, the next steps were noted and unanimously agreed.

It was noted that the remainder of the responses made to the Draft Plan consultation would be reported to the next meeting of the Committee, which was proposed to be held on 22nd January 2019. This report would consider chapters including Natural Environment and Heritage, each of the settlements and Infrastructure.

RESOLVED that

- (i) The comments received during the Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan – Draft Plan consultation be noted and the Officer responses to these be endorsed; and
- (ii) The approach proposed as Next Steps, as set

out in the summary sheets, be agreed for officers to advance in the production of a Pre-submission Plan.

18.PP.17 NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

A report was submitted which informed Members of the progress on Neighbourhood Planning in the Borough.

The Chair congratulated both the Borough and Parish Councils on producing Neighbourhood Plans. It was agreed that the Committee recognise the tremendous amount of work that Broughton Parish Council put into preparing the Broughton Neighbourhood Plan and Broughton Neighbourhood Development Order.

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

(The meeting started at 6.30 pm and ended at 7.35 pm)

Signed
Chair

AI