

Section Title – 12.1 Ashley
Number of responses – 64
Summary of main points
Total number of Objections - 48 Total number of Support - 16 Total number of neither Object nor Support - 0
Statutory Consultees
<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Ashley Parish Council support paragraph 12.32, and would like the Conservation Area to cover the entire village including the protection of ridge and furrow lines that surrounds the village. (id. 37, 333)- Ashley Parish Council would also like the Welland villages to be protected by a special landscape area designation, due to its location on the boundary of Leicestershire and Northamptonshire. (id. 38)- The George pub has protected status as a registered community asset. The village and Ashley Parish Council see its continuation as a public house (id. 39)- Ashley Parish Council support the three HVI green spaces, which are key to protecting the character/shape of the village. (id. 40)- Ashley Parish Council support the SSP2 proposals for the village (id. 37, 38, 39, 40)
Other Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Support extension of the Conservation Area across the whole village (id.46, 56, 161, 168)- Generally support most of the draft plan (id. 160, 168, 177, 178, 184, 228, 327, 337)- Objection to paragraph 12.1. Disagreement with the description of the village (id. 156)- Object to include the whole village is within the Conservation Area (id.156, 179, 305, 325,368)- Object to amending the existing Conservation Area (id. 313)- The principles of Policy ASH01 are supported to protect the layout and historic character of the village (id. 58, 337).- Development that is sympathetic to the wider village in size/form/character should be encouraged. (id. 325)

- Support conservation of the village against unsympathetic development (id.104).
- The George public house is an important village asset/ is protected as a registered community asset and should be retained as such through protection within the plan (id. 39, 47, 57, 105, 171, 209, 229, 283, 296, 331, 334, 364, 367)
- Support the three areas of HVI are important/key to protecting the character of the village. (id. 48, 64, 149, 168, 169, 170, 175, 201, 203, 213, 230, 231, 347, 366)
- Support HVI01 and HVI002 (id. 310)
- Support the protection of trees, open space and views along lanes which are an important featured contributing to the attractiveness in the village (id. 170)
- Object to designation of HVI002 as it has been an eyesore for 10+ years (id. 330)
- Object to designation of HVI001. Land north west, and north of the stream is now private garden/lawn, with the remainder used to graze animals and inaccessible due to the unpredictable behaviour of the animals (id. 330).
- Object to HVI081 as incoherent and illogical. The site has no road/public access, is outside the settlement boundary and not distinguishable from other green spaces surrounding the village (id. 310).
- Support Policy ASH01(id. 58, 202, 332, 347)
- Object to Policy ASH01, sub-paragraph (j) because it is too limiting. Criteria (j) of Policy RS04 offers exemptions to buildings such as “exceptional quality / innovative, contemporary design” which would be more appropriate (id. 307)
- Contemporary architecture/building materials (e.g.aluminium, timber, etc) should be embraced within policy ASH01 (e.g. criteria ‘K’) (id. 326, 337).
- Support paragraph 12.40. The HVI surrounding the Manor is supported due to its important location behind St Marys Church (id. 48)
- Objection on a number of grounds. HVI081 comprises 2 fields. The field north of no.7 Main Street falls outside of the Conservation Area and village boundary, and is inaccessible by road. In addition, the field has no historical importance, with no public access or views, and the land is demonstrably special. (ID. 36)
- Objection to the designation of HVI081 because there is no justification; the land is simply grazed, and falls outside of the settlement boundary (id.

330)

- Objection. HVI081 and HVI002 have not been adopted in consultation with the village or respective landowners. The land falls outside of the settlement boundary and therefore outside scope of future development (id. 181)
- Support paragraph 12.40. HVI081 must be protected (id.172).
- Support paragraph 12.40. Every field abutting the Conservation Area or Village Boundary should be declared HVI status (id. 172)
- Support no new housing allocations for the village (id. 104, 170, 229, 347)
- Object to Paragraphs 12.34 and 12.36, as the potential for infill has been absorbed through historic development, and there is no more capacity to provide for growth. The proposed plan therefore seeks to protect the status quo (id. 183).
- Object to paragraph 12.32 as Ashley needs some housing growth (id. 325)
- Object to paragraph 12.35. Available land has been historically developed, and an appropriate level of growth needs to be planned for (id. 301).
- Support the settlement boundary (id.106, 160, 168, 170, 203, 213, 229, 230, 231, 306, 347,368)
- Its important to reference the adopted village design statement in any consultation (id. 231)
- Do not support new dwellings outside the village boundary (id.106; 160, 170)
- Do not support new dwellings on the HVI areas identified in map 12.4. (id.106)
- Object to any new development on the approach to the village from the west (id.106)
- A review of the Conservation Area with full consultation is supported. (id. 206, 213, 228, 347)
- The Local Plan should include the proposed Welland Valley Cycle Way along the old railway line, which the Council should support [could attract young families to the village] (id. 209, 213, 229, 367)
- A landscape area designation for the Welland Valley is supported and could attract wildlife enhancements (id. 213, 231)
- Support the provision of some low cost housing within the village (id. 229)

- Issue raised regarding inadequate surface water drainage (id. 229).
- An informal footpath through a private garden/pony paddock is not required (id. 327).
- Protection of the Public House and Church cannot form part of the SSP2 Local Plan (id. 156)
- There should be a more positive approach in this plan to development given the wealth of social/community infrastructure available within the village (id. 362).

Implications of New National Planning Policy Framework

Section 5 (NPPF) focuses on delivering a sufficient supply of homes through the provision of a sufficient amount and variety of land. Paragraph 60 states that strategic policies should be informed by a local housing needs assessment, conducted using the standard method in national planning guidance. Policy 28 (JCS) sets out the housing requirement for Kettering Borough, with a further breakdown set out within Policy 29. Paragraph 61 (NPPF) states that the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community should be assessed and reflected in planning policies. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment informed the Joint Core Strategy in terms of the housing need for the area, whilst local housing needs surveys (where available) informed specific requirements at a local level. A local housing needs survey does not currently exist for Ashley village.

Paragraph 77 – 79 (NPPF) specifically focus on rural housing issues. In particular, in order to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. The draft housing allocations were first identified through a call for sites and then assessed using the assessment criteria with relevant Sustainability Appraisal objectives. As a result, potential housing sites in the least sustainable settlements have typically resulted in being less preferable compared to those settlements which benefit from a wider range of services and facilities. In this instance, there are no housing sites proposed for Ashley.

Section 9, Paragraph 102 states that transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan making and development proposals, so that [amongst other things] opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport use are identified and pursued. Of relevance are consultation comments (comments id. 209 and 367) received which seek for a Welland Valley Cycle Way to be supported through the plan. Although this will primarily offer a recreational route, feasibility of its connection as a transport route could be investigated.

Section 16 (NPPF) focuses on conserving and enhancing the historic environment. Due to the historic character of Ashley, development principles for the village set out within Policy ASH01 seeks to protect and enhance

heritage assets and historic features/characteristics where present.

Summary of officer comments

- HVI081 has been rigorously assessed and no justifiable grounds for a review have been submitted.
- There is no case to include all of Ashley within a Conservation Area, but there is a case for a review which can be undertaken separately to the emergence of the SSP2 Local Plan. Important views will be identified when a formal review is carried out and the presence of historic ridge and furrow will be taken into account where it is considered relevant to the historic interest of the Conservation Area.
- There is not a need to provide a specific Special Landscape Area designation or policy for protection of the Welland Valley, due to the lack of evidence to suggest that the current policy is insufficient.
- Policy TCE6 (page 40 of the draft SSP2 Local Plan) is sufficient to protect The George Public House. The fact that the pub is a registered asset of community value will be highlighted in the supporting text of the pre-submission SSP2 Local Plan.
- Consultation support for designation of the 3 HVI's, amended settlement boundary, no growth within Ashley, or just general support of the SSP2 Local Plan is noted. Although there is currently no growth planned for Ashley, although new sites may still come forwards as windfall.
- The existing settlement boundary has been amended slightly to account for historic development built out since the settlement boundary was originally adopted, and address any other discrepancies identified through the settlement boundary defining principles. It is understood that support is given to this new amended boundary which was set out within the consultation document.
- The village description is based on a factual assessment and there are no plans to designate the entire village as a Conservation Area. St Marys Church is Grade I listed and as a result is considered by the Secretary of State (for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport) to be of special architectural or historic interest; as grade I property, it is of exceptional interest. As part of the plan making process, the role of the Parish Council is limited to being a statutory consultee. Comments received relating to Parish Council involvement in preparing the plan are therefore not relevant.
- Trees within a Conservation Area or covered by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) require consent before specific works can be carried out on them, and therefore benefit from a degree of initial protection through the planning system already.

- Whether land touches the boundary of a Conservation Area is not a defining criteria for deciding whether to include it as HVILGS, and cannot be used to justify designation of additional land as HVILGS.
- HVI081 and HVI002 are both considered suitable for designation as set out within the Background Paper: Historically and Visually Important Open Space (September 2015). The reason given for not designating the land as HVI [*sites were proposed by Ashley Parish Council*] is insufficient to justify its removal.
- The notional Welland Valley Cycle Way needs to be explored further with Northamptonshire County Council Highways – Rights of Way team through a scoping exercise to establish the merits of introducing a new right of way.
- Regarding lower cost housing, no rural exception sites have been promoted through the plan making process or call for sites. In addition, as a no growth option is proposed for the village, it is unlikely that affordable housing will come forwards within the village.
- Although a no-growth option is being pursued within Ashley, the Council anticipates that limited growth will still come forwards over the plan period through windfall development. This decision has been based on an absence of sites being identified or coming forwards through the plan making process. Although the settlement boundary has been tightened up in places in accordance with the settlement boundary defining principles, it is not considered that this will preclude limited windfall development coming forwards.
- With respect of criterion (j) of Policy ASH01, there may be some exceptional circumstances where high quality modern materials may be acceptable, particularly if the proposed development is of very good design. The current wording of criterion (j) of Policy ASH01 is not restrictive in preventing contemporary materials from being used where they are of high quality, as it refers to a list of traditional materials as possible examples rather than a definitive list. As a result, the existing draft policy ASH01 is considered sufficient to address concerns over support the use of alternative materials in the right context.
- Highway access is not a criteria applied when considering the designation of Historically and Visually Important Local Green Space areas. Criteria for defining an HVILGS is set out within the Open Space and Allotments Background Paper (KBC, February 2012) available at https://www.kettering.gov.uk/download/downloads/id/191/open_space_and_allotments_february_2012.pdf
- The designation of villages into 3 category types evolves from the original Local Plan for Kettering Borough (1995) which sought to distinguish villages by virtue of their character and the degree of growth which could be acceptable within these locations. Through the plan making process for

the Core Spatial Strategy 2008, an additional tier of villages to serve as local centres was not pursued because whilst these villages may have more services/facilities readily available than other rural settlements, they would not necessarily provide a strong enough offer to support focused growth for the rural area. This was carried through into the Joint Core Strategy 2016. As a result, a large number of villages fall within category A where there is an emphasis to protect their environment due to their limited ability to absorb further development. Identified housing site allocations have taken into account local needs as well as the character of the villages, and whilst some villages have better transport links or are closer proximity to main towns than others, they all fall within category A as they share a number of other similar characteristics.

- It is unclear where an informal footpath through a private garden and/or pony paddock is required by the plan as none of the paragraphs referred to by the comment make such a reference. As a result, no action will be taken within the further iteration of the plan.
- The matter of untidy land at HVI002 falls outside of the scope of this SSP2 Local Plan.
- The justification for the proposed designation of HVI081 is set out within https://www.kettering.gov.uk/downloads/file/18274/historically_and_visually_important_open_space_update_june_2016 . The criteria for designating Historically and Visually Important Local Green Space is set out within the Open Space and Allotments Background Paper (KBC, February 2012) available at https://www.kettering.gov.uk/download/downloads/id/191/open_space_and_allotments_february_2012.pdf; public access is not a requirement.
- Retrospective planning permission KET/2016/0109 granted planning permission for part of the HVILGS to be used as domestic garden subject to condition which removed permitted development rights in order to protect the character and appearance of the area. Although the site HVI001 was included within the September 2015 SSPLDD Historically and Visually Important Open Space Background Paper, and was assessed before planning permission was granted, it is considered that the conditions attached to the planning permission are sufficient to protect the land from inappropriate development in accordance with the HVILGS designation, and that this should not be amended.
- The NPPF is supportive of housing growth, in terms of there being a presumption in favour of sustainable development. With respect of rural housing, paragraph 77 (NPPF) states that planning policies should be responsive to local circumstances and support housing developments that reflect local needs, particularly in terms of bring forwards rural exception sites that provide affordable housing. There is no up-to-date Housing Needs Survey available for Ashley to provide an evidence base of identified need, and no housing sites have been promoted within or on the edge of the village. In addition, Ashley has limited community facilities to

support significant growth. As a result, a no growth option has been proposed for the village, which relies on limited growth through a windfall development.

Next steps

- Scope the potential for the creation of a Welland Valley Cycle Way with Northamptonshire County Council Highways – Rights of Way team;
- Highlight the designation of The George Public House as a registered Community Asset within the supporting text relating to Ashley village.