

<b>Section Title - Mawsley</b>
<b>Number of responses - 70</b>
<p><b>Summary of main points</b></p> <p>Total number of Objections - 63  Total number in Support - 2  Total number of neither Object nor Support - 5</p> <p><b>Statutory Consultees:</b></p> <p>Natural England – RA/174 is 1.3km from Birds Spinney and Mawsley Marsh SSSI. Given scale and location of development and distance to the SSSI the development is regarded as higher risk. Only discharges into mains sewers would be acceptable. In addition recreational pressure should be considered, particularly in relation to informal footpaths running through the SSSI. Suggest as a minimum compensation by way of provision of Suitable Alternative Green Spaces at Mawsley to alleviate pressure on the SSSI. These mitigation measures should be specified in the policy. (Id 402)</p> <p>NCC Archaeology – Support for criteria J – Provide appropriate evidence of the archaeological potential and significance of the site (Id 321)</p> <p><b>Other Comments</b></p> <p><b>Support for development in Mawsley</b></p> <p>The scale of the village and associated infrastructure mean Mawsley could accommodate a significantly larger quantum of development than currently planned. (Id 462)</p> <p><b>Objections to more development in the village:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mawsley only meant to have 750 houses, another 200 have already been built, village bigger than originally planned/ Mawsley already contributed enough/ village is complete (Id 1) (Id 2) (Id 9) (Id 75) (Id 14) (Id 80) (Id 76) (Id 33) (Id 82) (Id 86) (Id 144) (Is 188) (Id 265) (Id 266) (Id 335) (Id 338) (Id 340) (Id 346) (Id 371) (Id 372) (Id 516)</li> <li>• Policy 11 of the JCS requires development to meet local need – proposal conflicts with this policy unless there is evidence that the proposed housing allocation is actually needed (Id 81)</li> <li>• Should remain a village not a town/ choose to live in village (Id 9) (Id 80) (Id 76) (Id 142) (Id 371) (Id 516)</li> <li>• Number of properties for sale at any point, no need for another 50. So many new developments already on the area (Id 85) (Id 265)</li> <li>• More difficult to sell existing homes with added competition from new homes (Id 9) (Id 80) (Id 76) (Id 82)</li> <li>• Loss of value of existing property (Id 196) (Id 249)</li> <li>• Extra 200 dwellings has created huge amount of traffic and put a strain</li> </ul>

- on facilities (Id 1)
- Village has been a building site for 10-15 years, should be left to settle (Id 14) (Id 33) (Id 133) (Id 144)
- Roads and drains still not adopted (Id 1) (Id 2) (Id 85) (Id 144) (Id 154) (Id 188) (Id 265) (Id 344) (Id 371)
- Verges, bushes and trees are overgrown (Id 188) (Id 371)
- 50 more dwellings will increase traffic and put pressure on facilities (Id 85)
- Doctors, dentist, school and facilities/ amenities/ infrastructure are already under extreme strain/ over stretched (Id 2) (Id 8) (Id 80) (Id 76) (Id 66) (Id 81) (Id 82) (Id 86) (Id 142) (Id 154) (Id 174) (Id 249) (Id 265) (Id 266) (Id 335) (Id 340) (Id 344) (Id 369) (Id 371) (Id 516)
- School already expanded and no possibility for further expansion (Id 9) (Id 14) (Id 80) (Id 76) (Id 33) (Id 82) (Id 188) (Id 265) (Id 335) (Id 338) (Id 344) (Id 375)
- Crèche and children's activities and events are already oversubscribed (Id 9) (Id 80) (Id 33)
- Can't assume that Mawsley conforms to the national trend of falling birth rates (Id 80)
- Secondary schools assessed as 'good' already oversubscribed (Id 340)
- Increased strain on police, hospitals, fire and ambulance services (Id 9) (Id 80) (Id 76) (Id 82)
- Winding streets and islands make it difficult for construction traffic, any damage could put adoption back (Id 2)
- Access into and out of village already congested at peak times (Id 9) (Id 80) (Id 76) (Id 82) (Id 86) (Id 265) (Id 335) (Id 344)
- A43 junction already busy (Id 9) (Id 80) (Id 76) (Id 82) (Id 266) (Id 335) (Id 344)
- Parking is a major issue in Mawsley, more cars would make it worse/ parking at the school is an issue (Id 2) (Id 174) (Id 188) (Id 265) (Id 338) (Id 340) (Id 369) (Id 516)
- Off peak bus service has been withdrawn/ limited public transport/ no option but to use car/ development would be unsustainable/ unsuitable for resident with accessibility issues or non-car owners (Id 2) (Id 75) (Id 14) (Id 81) (Id 142) (Id 144) (Id 154) (Id 338) (Id 340) (Id 371) (Id 372) (Id 516)
- Pumping station at capacity/ drains substandard (Id 9) (Id 80) (Id 76) (Id 66) (Id 82) (Id 133) (Id 196) (Id 266) (Id 335) (Id 338) (Id 344) (Id 346)
- Sewage treatment works and foul sewage network not yet adopted (Id 86)
- Water supply network regularly disrupted due to leaks in system (Id 86)
- Broadband connection is very slow (Id 9) (Id 80) (Id 76) (Id 82) (Id 266) (Id 335) (Id 344)
- Demand for retirement homes, such as bungalows (Id 2)
- It is understood a planning application will shortly be submitted for 29 retirement flats on the pub site. This will contribute to/ fulfil the rural housing requirement/ should be deducted from the housing requirement (Id 2) (Id 14) (Id 371) (Id 372)

- KBC have a five year land supply (Id 9) (Id 80) (Id 76) (Id 82) (Id 335)
- Will set a precedent for future development (Id 9) (Id 80) (Id 81)
- Objection (Id 3) (Id 4)
- Objection to paragraphs 12.161 and 12.164 – infill development and access to development (Id 77)
- Objection to Para 12.167 and MAW01 – provision of allotments and Mawsley Development Principles (Id 78)
- Objection to paragraphs 12.152 – 12.168 – all proposals for Mawsley (Id 143)
- Objection to paragraph 12.153 – unique character and design (Id 336)

Objection to whole document (Id 365)

### **RA/174/ MAW02**

- Opposed to the development of RA/174 (Id 2) (Id 9) (Id 75) (Id 14) (Id 80) (Id 76) (Id 33) (Id 81) (Id 82) (Id 85) (Id 86) (Id 133) (Id 142) (Id 144) (Id 174) (Id 249) (Id 265) (Id 266) (Id 335) (Id 340) (Id 344) (Id 348) (Id 353) (Id 354) (Id 358) (Id 369) (Id 371) (Id 372) (Id 372) (Id 375) (Id 516)
- Objection to MAW02 (Id 75) (Id 79) (Id 91) (Id 376)

### **Site Specific Objections to RA/174/ MAW02:**

- Development of RA/174 takes no account of wishes of villagers expressed through objection to RA/115/ Village is against the proposed development, this should be taken into account/ objection last time proposal was consulted upon (Id 9) (Id 80) (Id 76) (Id 33) (Id 82) (Id 174) (Id 197) (Id 266) (Id 335) (Id 344)
- Loss of field adjacent to property (Id 9) (Id 80) (Id 76)
- Light pollution during and after development for adjacent property (Id 9) (Id 80) (Id 76) (Id 33)
- Noise pollution during and after development for adjacent properties (Id 9) (Id 80) (Id 76) (Id 33) (Id 81) (Id 82) (Id 266) (Id 372)
- Dust pollution during development for adjacent properties/ Dust and air pollutants from construction would impact on health of residents/ increase in traffic during construction (Id 266)
- Loss of privacy/ overlooking/ over shadowing (Id 9) (Id 80) (Id 76) (Id 33) (Id 81) (Id 133) (Id 354)
- Access along Cransley Rise limited and insufficient room for visibility splays. Access point is on a narrow bend in a sharp estate road and will be dangerous/ blind bend/ already busy road/ parking an issue/ not salted in winter. Cransley Rise not suitable for access. (Id 9) (Id 75) (Id 14) (Id 80) (Id 76) (Id 33) (Id 82) (Id 133) (Id 144) (Id 154) (Id 196) (Id 249) (Id 265) (Id 266) (Id 340) (Id 344) (Id 353) (Id 371) (Id 372) (Id 516)
- Proposed development has been rejected previously on highways grounds (Id 372)
- Cransley Rise about to be adopted and construction traffic will damage

- road/ cause accidents/ result in disputes about responsibility for repairing roads (Id 9) (Id 81) (Id 82) (Id 133)
- Vehicular, cycle and pedestrian access from Cransley Rise not sufficient for additional traffic (Id 86)
  - Cransley Rise unsuitable for construction traffic (Id 66) (Id 81) (Id 85)
  - When cars park on Cransley Rise it is unlikely an emergency vehicle could get through (Id 9) (Id 340)
  - Road layout will cause major traffic congestion / development would increase volume of traffic/increase wear and tear on road/ increase pollution/ effect road safety/ streets are winding (Id 9) (Id 75) (Id 80) (Id 76) (Id 33) (Id 66) (Id 81) (Id 82) (Id 142) (Id 188) (Id 279) (Id 335) (Id 344) (Id 371) (Id 372) (Id 375) (Id 516)
  - Roads are narrow to reduce speeding and allow careful consideration when driving around the village (Id 279)
  - Safety of children walking to school, currently low levels of traffic and few large vehicles, building work would require this/ will make walking to school dangerous (Id 133)
  - Adverse impact on size, form, character and setting of the village (Id 9) (Id 80) (Id 82) (Id 266) (Id 335) (Id 344)
  - Loss of valuable agricultural land (grade 3) (Id 9) (Id 80) (Id 76) (Id 33) (Id 82) (Id 266) (Id 335) (Id 344) (Id 353) (Id 372)
  - Loss of countryside view (Id 9) (Id 76) (Id 33) (Id 82) (Id 249) (Id 266) (Id 335) (Id 371) (Id 372) (Id 516)
  - Loss of wildlife/ impact on wildlife (Id 9) (Id 80) (Id 76) (Id 33) (Id 82) (Id 266) (Id 335) (Id 344) (Id 371) (Id 372) (Id 516)
  - Effect on established mature trees located behind Birch Spinney (Id 372)
  - Detriment to residential amenity (Id 9) (Id 80) (Id 76) (Id 82)
  - Increased flood risk to Malaslea, Birch Spinney and Cransley Rise/ existing properties (Id 80) (Id 76) (Id 82) (Id 266) (Id 344)
  - The area floods/ poor drainage of the site/ there is a natural spring (Id 9) (Id 14) (Id 33) (Id 81) (Id 133) (Id 144) (Id 154) (Id 196) (Id 265) (Id 335) (Id 353) (Id 371) (Id 516)
  - Low level land with surface water potential. Flood risk major concern. Drains currently not cleared (Id 372)
  - Little regard has been had to the spirit of the NPPF e.g. para 17, 24, 74, 76 (Id 9) (Id 80) (Id 76) (Id 82) (Id 335) (Id 344)
  - Impact on Birch Spinney and Mawsley Marsh SSSI/ close to SSSI (Id 14) (Id 144)
  - SSSI borders the site (Id 265)
  - Object that little surveying of the proposed site appears to have taken place, have traffic / parking surveys/ flood risk been undertaken? (Id 50)
  - Waste strip backing onto Birch Spinney is an SSSI, if the field is built on it would upset the water table and destroy flora and fauna (Id 50)
  - Landowner hasn't been approached about the proposal (Id 66)
  - Houses on Cransley Rise designed to front onto open space (Id 81)
  - Proposal would harm the character of Mawsley and be contradictory with principle (a) of Policy MAW01 (Id 81)

- Mawsleys unique design layout should be preserved/ proposal would harm unique character (Id 9) (Id 80) (Id 76) (Id 82)
- 50 houses does not take account of existing parameters set out in relation to existing properties (Id 353)
- Proposal would be more harmful than the development which the Article 4 direction seeks to control (Id 81)
- Concern over density and over development of the site/ town cramming (Id 9) (Id 80) (Id 76) (Id 81) (Id 82)
- Other land around the village could be developed which would not impact the roads or cause issues for existing properties, these are in the same land ownership as the proposed site and should be explored (Id 133) (Id 266)
- Cycleway is a minor consideration and doesn't justify the development. If development goes ahead it should be completed (Id 196)
- Build standard in Mawsley is poor, further low quality building should be prevented (Id 196)
- Need to keep hold of green land (Id 338)
- Land could not support 50 family homes and be in keeping with existing development (Id 353)
- Proposal wouldn't meet criteria a or b of MAW02 – there is on-going legal action regarding water treatment works (Id 353)
- K – no evidence other policies have been complied with (Id 353)
- No longer have right to peaceful enjoyment of possessions. Proposal would impact on private and family life as stated under Article 8 of the Human Rights Act (Id 354)
- The proposed development does not satisfy the principles set out (Id 358)
- No room to fit more houses into the village (Id 369)
- Negatives of the proposal out-weigh the alleged benefits (Id 33)
- Development protrudes beyond the natural outline of the village, should be realigned. Protruding line causes over shadowing and overlooking to adjacent properties (Id 372)
- No allotment allocation within the development, housing should be reduced to account for allotments (Id 372)

Why is the proposed allocation to build 50 additional houses higher than larger, less developed villages in the area? (Id 346)

Building another new village or building on brownfield sites around Kettering would be preferable (Id 9) (Id 80) (Id 76) (Id 82) (Id 249)

Disagree with 12.162 which seeks to prevent development beyond the north western extent of RA/174. Policy MAW02 should be amended so that it doesn't preclude land to the west of Mawsley (Id 460)

### **Support for MAW02**

Support MAW02 – Landowner supports the current Local Plan proposals for the site (Id 503)

## **MAW01**

B – unless additional roads are added how will connections to the open countryside improve? Properties surrounding the site enjoy the visual amenity of the site (Id 197)

C – At least 6 properties bordering the site face away from it, most want to expand their gardens as they flood (Id 197)

E – the only sensible place to locate allotments on the site would be along the far edge away from Cransley Rise (Id 197)

The building plan does not meet the design principles:

- MAW 01a - Site could only accommodate 15-20 large family dwellings reflective of the surrounding area. 50 could only be accommodated if they were smaller and tightly packed, not in keeping with character (Id 348)
- MAW01b - Proposal would not have positive impact on connection with countryside and will reduce enjoyment of this. No links proposed. Cycleway could happen anyway (Id 348)
- MAW01c – development will be overlooked by existing development and no opportunity to front onto streets or open spaces (Id 348)
- MAW01e – plan is independent of decision on allotments so illogical to suggest planning development will contribute to allotment provision (Id 348)

## **Settlement Boundary**

Objection to the proposed settlement boundary that runs along the bottom of the rear gardens of numbers 5-12 Orton Close and 54-58 Hawthorn Avenue. Gardens currently too small, wish to extend gardens 6-8 meters into the field beyond changing use from agricultural to garden land; the settlement boundary should be extended to include this area. (Id 20) (Id 21) (Id 22) (Id 23) (Id 26) (Id 27) (Id 30) (Id 35)

Object to settlement boundary (Id 45)

Tightly drawn settlement boundary is at odds with the allocation of Mawsley as a category A village. Mawsley has the capacity to accommodate a far greater level of growth due to its existing facilities/ services and should be expanded to reflect this. Settlement boundary should be amended to include site west of Mawsley (Id 460)

Boundary should be amended to include site west of Mawsley (Id 460) (Id 462)

## **Table 12.23**

Information now out of date. (Id 192) (Id 357) (Id 189)

Idolz Hair Boutique now a pharmacy. Also a clothing shop in Barnwell Court.  
(Id 189)

**Additional sites**

Site west of Mawsley (23.35 hectares) promoted for residential development  
(Id 457)

Proposed approach to housing delivery will fail to meet the specific housing needs of the area. Strategy should be reviewed and the site west of Mawsley allocated for residential development as a suitable location for future growth.  
(Id 457)

**Site RA/115 (Id 339)**

Site RA/115 has been discounted. Assessment has been analysed and the weight afforded to the traffic light system has not been equally applied in relation to the assessment of 'water conservation and management', 'community'. RA/174 is identified as at risk of flooding and the sequential and exceptions test should be applied. This has not been undertaken. RA/115 provides opportunities for provision of allotments, additional parking for community facilities and improved outside play area for the existing day nursery. This has not been taken into account. (Id 339)

RA/115 would be able to provide pedestrian access from Paddock End and provide a link between the settlement and the countryside. (Id 339)

Access is proposed via the existing community building car park. This access is a viable option and should be orange. (Id 339)

These changes would alter the scoring for both sites. RA/115 should be considered further. (Id 339)

**Implications of New National Planning Policy Framework**

The new NPPF maintains the Government's emphasis on boosting the supply of new homes and meeting housing needs.

In the rural area the emphasis is on development reflecting local needs and promoting sustainable development.

**Summary of officer comments**

An additional criteria will be added to the policy requiring proposals assess and mitigate impact on the SSSI.

### **Objections to development in the village**

While Mawsley is now bigger than originally planned, the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy identifies a requirement for 480 dwellings in the rural area in the period 2011-31. The SSP2 will need to allocate sites across the rural area to meet this requirement. Mawsley is a relatively large village with a good range of services and facilities. While it has grown larger than its original planned size this is not a reason to prevent further growth. Villages evolve over time and a village with this level of services and facilities is suitable for small scale growth to meet housing need.

The scale of development proposed will not alter the village character of Mawsley.

Impact on sale of existing homes is not a material planning consideration.

Impact on house prices is not a material planning consideration.

NCC highways have been consulted through the site assessment process and in relation to the capacity of the highway network have assessed the impact as capacity limited or insufficient capacity but constraints can be overcome. If the site is progressed as an allocation an additional criteria will be added to the policy requiring proposals to be supported by a transport assessment and to mitigate the impact of development on the highway network.

Issues relating to adoptions of roads and management of open space are management and maintenance issues rather than reasons to prevent the village from growing in the future.

The Rural Settlement Facilities Background Paper (update) (April 2018) sets out the facilities available in Mawsley. Mawsley has a good range of services and facilities and is the only village with a doctor's surgery and dentist.

When assessing sites to meet the rural housing requirement access to services and facilities is part of the assessment. Taking into account the facilities available, it is considered that Mawsley is a suitable location for small scale growth. Where appropriate development would be required to make contributions towards infrastructure such as education, infrastructure, local highway improvements and open space. Through the site assessment work NCC Education has been consulted on provision for education. In Mawsley contributions would be sought towards Primary and Secondary education.

Policy 8 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy requires developments to make adequate provision for parking; the proposed development should not therefore impact on parking in the surrounding area.

Limited bus services are available in the rural area; however the Council is still



required to meet housing needs within these areas.

Draft policy MAW02 requires that development proposals demonstrate that there is adequate capacity in the sewage treatment works and the foul sewage network and that there is adequate capacity in the water supply network.

Using a central postcode in Mawsley the broadband speed checker indicates download speeds of 30.2 mbps and upload speeds of 32.7 mbps. This is high compared with many of the villages in the borough.

An allowance has been made for windfall development in determining how many dwellings the SSP2 needs to allocate. Any applications which are approved which are not identified in the development plan will contribute towards the windfall allowance.

### **Objections to RA/174/ MAW02**

Views of local resident are noted; however the views of residents need to be balanced alongside the need to meet housing requirements set out in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy which identifies a requirement of 480 dwellings in the rural area 2011-2031. The SSP2 will allocate sites across the rural area to meet this requirement.

Location of existing housing backing on to the site is not a planning reason for the site not to be developed.

Policy 8 of the JCS requires development to prevent both new and existing development from contributing to or being adversely effected by unacceptable levels of light or noise pollution.

Policy 8 of the JCS also requires that development proposals do not result in an unacceptable impact on the amenities of future occupiers, neighbouring properties or the wider area, by reason of noise, vibration, smell, light or other pollution, loss of light or overlooking. In addition to this draft policy MAW02 requires proposals to have particular regard to the layout scale, height, design and massing of buildings and landscaping, in order to minimise amenity impact on neighbouring residential properties.

Through the site assessment work discussions have taken place with NCC highways regarding the suitability of gaining access to the site from Cransley Rise. NCC advised that they would be able to accept a loop road serving a maximum of 50 dwellings without the need for Cransley Rise to be widened. The loop road would need to be 5.5 metres wide with 2x2metres footways in accordance with local highway authority standards and tracked for refuse vehicles opposed to a large family car. The detail of the access would be

considered at planning application stage.

Traffic/ parking surveys, if required, would be carried out at planning application stage rather than through the site allocation process.

Any development on the site would need to conform to health and safety and construction standards.

The site is a logical extension to the village and is surrounded on three sides by existing development. Draft policy MAW02 requires that the development be of a high standard of design and reflect the character, layout and density of the surrounding residential area.

Agricultural land classification has been taken into account through the assessment process. This site is grade 3 agricultural land so is preferable to the development of grade 2 agricultural land.

Loss of a countryside view is not a material planning consideration.

Draft policy MAW02 requires proposals to provide appropriate evidence of the ecological potential of the site. Policy 4 of the JCS requires a net gain in biodiversity to be sought. The Birch Spinney and Mawsley Marsh SSSI is located approximately 360m north of the site. An additional criteria will be added to the policy requiring proposals to assess and mitigate impact on the SSSI.

Groundwater flooding has been identified as a constraint in relation to this site, to address this a criteria has been added to Draft policy MAW02 which requires proposals to include a site specific Flood Risk Assessment which addresses groundwater flooding.

Full regard has been had to the NPPF in developing the plan.

Representations have been submitted on behalf of the landowner promoting the site for development and supporting the identification of the site as a potential housing allocation.

This site is not located in the area covered by the Article 4 direction.

The Council has considered sites which have been promoted for development in Mawsley using a set of sustainability appraisal criteria, the site identified in the Draft Plan performs better than alternative sites which have been promoted when considered against these criteria

Development would be required to meet building regulation requirements.

The proposal would not impact on existing residents peaceful enjoyment of their possessions. The provision of homes on this site would not impact on

the rights set out in Article 8 of the Human Rights Act.

MAW02 e. requires that build development does not extend significantly beyond the existing properties on the western edge of Cransley Rise and Birch Spinney.

MAW01 required development proposals to contribute towards the provision of allotments. This could be on-site or through off-site contributions, the detail of this would be dealt with at planning application stage.

The strategy for development set out in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy focuses development at Kettering with some growth at the market towns and limited growth in the rural area. The number of dwellings being planned for through the SSP2 in the rural area is not large enough to deliver a new village.

The site assessment for RA/174 – land to the west of Mawsley considered the impact of development of the existing character of the settlement and landscape. To mitigate the impact of development the assessment highlighted the need to ensure built development did not result in a significant extension to the current build form. The criteria in MAW02 is required for this reason.

### **Support for MAW02**

Support is noted.

### **MAW 01**

Criteria b seeks to improve connections to the open countryside through pedestrian access, it doesn't seek to provide additional roads.

Criteria c seeks to ensure that open space and roads are overlooked to provide natural surveillance.

If allotments were provided on the site the location of these would be considered through the application process. Proposals could also make a financial contribution towards the provision of allotments off site.

The proposed development would need to provide a mix of housing in accordance with policy 30 of the JCS. Draft policy MAW02 requires that the development be of a high standard of design and reflect the character, layout and density of the surrounding residential area. Detail of the size and mix of housing would be determined through the planning application process.

The requirements of policy MAW01 apply to all proposals in Mawsley, criteria b. would need to be applied where there are particular opportunities to connect the settlement to the countryside.

Development would only be required to front onto open spaces where there is open space to front onto. There will be streets and open space within the proposed development which development would be expected to front on to.

Criteria e has been added to enable development to contribute to the provision of allotments where appropriate.

### **Settlement Boundary**

Mawsley is a new settlement. The planning applications for these plots (5-12 Orton Close and 54-58 Hawthorn Avenue) would have been considered by a planning officer at the time and the area of garden land deemed acceptable. The garden sizes are comparable with other garden sizes in Mawsley.

The land in question is open countryside. Planning policy strictly controls development in the open countryside and development is only allowed in exceptional circumstances.

Given the presumption in policy against development in the open countryside and the fact that the size of garden would have been considered through the original applications for the properties relatively recently there is not sufficient justification for altering the proposed settlement boundary in this location.

The settlement boundaries have been drawn using a set of principles which have been developed through consultation. The boundaries will include sites which are allocated for development. The purpose of settlement boundaries is to provide a clear distinction between the settlement and the open countryside. The SSP2 will identify enough land to meet housing requirements.

### **Table 12.23**

The facilities were correct at the point they were surveyed, however facilities do change over time. These will be updated in the next version of the Rural Settlement Facilities Background Paper.

### **Additional Sites**

The site west of Mawsley is of a strategic scale and would result in a level of growth beyond that which would be envisaged in the hierarchy for development set out in the North Northamptonshire JCS for this location. Development of a site of this scale in this location would not conform to the hierarchy for development in the JCS.

Comments relating to site RA/115 are noted, however while it is stated that access can be achieved by providing access across the community centre car park, no evidence has been provided to demonstrate that this can be achieved. This option requires the use of third party land and it is not clear

whether any agreement has been reached with third parties which would allow the development to be accessed across this land.

**Next steps**

- Add an additional criteria to policy MAW02 requiring transport assessment.
- Add an additional criteria to policy MAW02 requiring assessment and mitigation on impact on the SSSI.