

Appendix 2g - Braybrooke

Comment	KBC Response
<p>Id 68 (Supporting) - Local Green Space</p> <p>Proposed as historically and visually important local green space HVI006</p> <p>We totally agree with this. However, we need you to make clear this is not public open space, but is privately owned with no public access.</p> <p>Also, please explain what PW means in one section of the green space.</p> <p>Please note your map used does not show the 14 houses built on the school site or the two houses built on land behind 16 School Lane</p>	<p>Noted. Additional text will be added to the Pre-submission plan to clarify that Local Green Space is not necessarily publicly accessible.</p> <p>PW stands for place of worship; this is an Ordnance Survey label rather than a designation in the plan.</p> <p>The map is a base map produced by Ordnance Survey; the Council is not able to update this base map. However the Council is fully aware of the level of development which has taken place in Braybrooke and this has been taken into account when preparing the plan.</p>
<p>Id 67 (Supporting) - Local Green Space</p> <p>Proposed as historically and visually important local green space HV1006</p> <p>We totally agree with this. However we need you to make clear this is <u>NOT</u> public open space, but is privately owned with no public access.</p> <p>Also, please explain what PW means in one section of the green space.</p>	<p>Noted. Additional text will be added to the Pre-submission plan to clarify that Local Green Space is not necessarily publicly accessible.</p> <p>PW stands for place of worship; this is an Ordnance</p>

Appendix 2g - Braybrooke

<p>Please note your map used does not show the 14 houses built on the school site or the two houses built on land behind 16 School Lane</p>	<p>Survey label rather than a designation in the plan.</p> <p>The map is a base map produced by Ordnance Survey; the Council is not able to update this base map. However the Council is fully aware of the level of development which has taken place in Braybrooke and this has been taken into account when preparing the plan.</p>
<p>Id 121 (Supporting) - The village has a pub, garage and a significant residential home all of which provide employment opportunities with high speed broadband for home working.</p> <p>The village has good infrastructure in place (including a flood alleviation scheme) and has a regular bus service.</p> <p>Previous developments have sold quickly demonstrating latent demand.</p> <p>The nominated land is available and has been for some years, has good access and is not overlooked, The existing Beech tree is an asset to development</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Id 122 (Supporting) - The village has a pub, a garage and a significant residential home all of which provide employment opportunities with high speed broadband also supporting home working</p> <p>The nominated land is immediately available and has been for some years, it has good access and is not overlooked. The existing Beech tree will only enhance the development.</p> <p>The village has a first class infrastructure (including a flood alleviation scheme) and has a regular bus service.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Appendix 2g - Braybrooke

<p>Previous developments have sold quickly demonstrating latent demand.</p>	
<p>Id 123 (Supporting) - The village has a first class infrastructure (including a flood alleviation scheme) and has a frequent bus service.</p> <p>The nominated land is available (and has been for some years), it has excellent access and is not overlooked. The protected beech tree will be an asset for the development.</p> <p>The village has a pub, garage and large residential home all of which provide employment opportunities. High speed broadband is available for necessary home working.</p> <p>Demand has already been exhibited by the rapid sale of earlier developments.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Id 145 (Objecting) - Let me say from the start that I do not want to see any redrawing of the village boundary and love the village size as it is. The plans/map they are using is so far out of date that the planners who have presented this to us and the borough councillors could almost be accused of fraud. The map they use does not show the 14 properties on the school site, indeed we are still shown as having a school. Neither does it show the 2 properties behind **** down School Lane. That is still shown as a site with no development on it. Thus giving the incorrect impression that there has not been any development in the village for some time. Nothing could be further from the truth. Our village size has been increased by nearly 11% in the last 2 years and that does not count the addition homes/sites for the travelling community.</p> <p>I now make reference to the 2013 village survey conducted by the PC regarding the views of the whole parish about the village boundary and the development of the village which was supported by officers from KBC.</p> <p>When asked</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Should the village have a clearly defined boundary? 97% replied yes 2. Do you agree with the proposed KBC boundary for the village as outlined in the site specific proposals (It did NOT include the current proposed change of boundary) 70% said yes. Indeed many of the comments in addition to this question said “yes if it helps to prevent further development” 	<p>The map is a base map produced by Ordnance Survey; the Council is not able to update this base map. However, the Council is fully aware of the level of development which has taken place in Braybrooke and this has been taken into account when preparing the plan. Table 12.4 sets out the number of new dwellings which have been completed in Braybrooke since 2011.</p> <p>The results of the 2013 consultation on the settlement boundary are noted, however the views of residents need to be balanced alongside the need to meet housing</p>

Appendix 2g - Braybrooke

<p>3. Should any development (new build) be allowed outside the village boundary? 88% said no.</p> <p>4. The 3 top concerns regard any new development were – Increase in traffic, Lack of facilities and new sites not in keeping with Braybrooke.</p> <p>5. The most important issues to preserve were open spaces 87%, countryside views 80%.</p> <p>I am aware that this survey was some time ago but it is the most recent we have to establish the views of the whole parish regarding the boundary and future development of the village and was accepted as such by the then PC. I presented it also to officers of KBC who were a great help in its development and the officers accepted it on behalf of KBC, That survey now seems to be have ignored. Why???? Should any members of the planning committee or officers of the council wish to have a copy of that survey - please contact me and I will let them have mine</p> <p>I would also make the comment that I do not believe that KBC planners or the developers will restrict development on the proposed site to 3 properties. The site looks to be as big as the school site and you can bet any developer will want to put as many houses as possible in order to maximise their profit. If and when KBC turn that down, any developer will go to appeal and in my opinion would probably win.</p> <p>My final issue would be regarding access onto Griffin road – we all know the number of cars which park at that entrance when using the pub and cars coming out of that entrance is an accident waiting to happen.</p>	<p>requirements set out in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy which identifies a requirement of 480 dwellings in the rural area 2011-2031.</p> <p>The policy would allocate the site for 3 dwellings. The site has a number of constraints, including the Beech Tree and the access which is by a shared private drive which means the yield for the site has been reduced down to 3.</p> <p>Full detail of the proposed access to the site would be considered through a planning application; however NCC Highways has rated the access as a green if accessed by a shared drive. This means that access would require minimal or no mitigation.</p>
<p>Id 146 (Objecting) - There has been no established need for any more development north of the river that I am aware of and therefore there should be no development proposals whatsoever</p>	<p>Sites identified in the SSP2 will contribute to meeting the housing requirement for the rural area of 480 dwellings, which is set out in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy.</p>

Appendix 2g - Braybrooke

<p>Id 147 (Objecting) - I now make reference to the 2013 village survey conducted by the PC regarding the views of the whole parish about the village boundary and the development of the village.</p> <p>When asked</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Should the village have a clearly defined boundary? 97% replied yes 2. Do you agree with the proposed KBC boundary for the village as outlined in the site specific proposals (It did NOT include the current proposed change of boundary) 70% said yes. Indeed many of the comments in addition to this question said “yes if it helps to prevent further development” 3. Should any development (new build) be allowed outside the village boundary? 88% said no. 4. The 3 top concerns regard any new development were – Increase in traffic, Lack of facilities and new sites not in keeping with Braybrooke. 5. The most important issues to preserve were open spaces 87%, countryside views 80%. <p>I am aware that this survey was some time ago but it is the most recent we have to establish the views of the whole parish the boundary and future development of the village and was accepted as such by the then PC. I do not believe that its views can be simply ignored by our current PC but it is their right to do so. Should any councillor require a full copy of that survey I am sure that there copies around for them to look at. If not, please contact me and they can look at mine.</p> <p>I would also make the comment that I do not believe that KBC planners or the developers will restrict development on the proposed site to 3 properties. The site looks to be as big as the school site and you can bet any developer will want to put as many houses as possible in order to maximise their profit. If and when KBC turn that down, any developer will go to appeal and in my opinion would probably win.</p> <p>My final issue would be regarding access onto Griffin road – we all know the number of cars which park at that entrance when using the pub and cars coming out of that entrance is an accident waiting to happen.</p>	<p>The results of the 2013 consultation on the settlement boundary 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.</p> <p>The policy would allocate the site for 3 dwellings. The site has a number of constraints, including the Beech Tree and the access which is by a shared private drive which means the yield for the site has been reduced down to 3.</p> <p>Full detail of the proposed access to the site would be considered through a planning application; however NCC Highways has rated the access as a green if accessed by a shared drive. This means that access would require minimal or no mitigation.</p>
<p>Id 148 (Objecting) - Please send me detail of the housing survey 2014 you refer to - the village</p>	<p>The housing needs survey is</p>

Appendix 2g - Braybrooke

<p>undertook a survey in 2013 which did not identify any need for any development and following the closure of the school we have had far in excess of the 3 houses you refer to - 16 in total.</p>	<p>available using the following link: https://www.kettering.gov.uk/downloads/file/242/braybrooke_housing_needs_survey_march_2014 Paragraph 12.43 of the draft plan notes that the housing needs survey identified a need for 3 affordable homes in intermediate tenure, it then goes on to note that 4 affordable homes were provided through the development of the school site.</p>
<p>Id 155 (Objecting) – Table 12/4 - It is incorrect - 14 houses on old school site - 2 houses behind school lane - one house on Newland street.</p> <p>Please provide details of the 3 existing housing commitments - where are they going to be built??</p>	<p>The base date for the table was 1st April 2017. One of the properties at School Lane was still under construction at this time so is included in the table under the existing housing commitments. The remaining two commitments at this date were KET/2014/0261 (Construction of agricultural building and 1 dwelling at Firs Farm) and KET/2016/0694 (Conversion of agricultural building to 1 dwelling at Windie Rydge Farm)</p>

Appendix 2g - Braybrooke

<p>Id 387 (Supporting) - I support the Historically and Visually Important local green space, but I am concerned that most of my garden has been taken up by this plan.</p> <p>In the proposed Open Space I have mostly lawn, with garden seats, children's climbing frame, swings, plus various plants and trees.</p> <p>Can you please confirm this will still be my garden</p>	<p>The Local Green Space designation doesn't change the existing use of land which is often private land; however it restricts future development on the land which would only be considered acceptable in very special circumstances.</p>
<p>Id 418 (Neither) – Braybrooke RA/128 The site specific policy BRA02 would be strengthened by the adding the word 'character' and replacing 'protect' with 'sustain' to reflect NPPF wording, such as:- "c) Sustain protect and enhance the <u>character and</u> setting of The Old Rectory Grade II Listed Building and the Conservation."</p>	<p>Noted. The policy will be amended as suggested.</p>
<p>Id 176 (Objecting) - SITE SPECIFIC PART 2 LOCAL PLAN – 12.2 Braybrooke/Top Orchard RA/128</p> <p>Before commenting on the proposals I think it necessary to ask if at all times in the preparation of these proposals there has been no "conflict of interest" or indeed "undue influence" on the inclusion of the area RA/128 by its current owner as a member of KBC.</p> <p>I also ask if there is a "need" for and "support" of additional housing within the village. The sale of all values of properties within the village has been difficult for some years but this is not because of the prices but that younger families:</p> <p>Will not come to or stay in a village without a school.</p> <p>Will not come to or stay in a village surrounded by the uncertainty aroused by illegal traveller sites.</p> <p>We have recently been advised that Desborough Surgery is no longer accepting patients from Braybrooke on their list.</p> <p>The Plan provided is out of date and does not show the development that has taken place in Braybrooke. In the past 20 years the number of houses has increased by approximately 25% (the</p>	<p>Members and officers of the Council are required to adhere to strict Codes of Conduct. Members are advised of their responsibilities with regards these requirements, and the Council's Head of Democratic & Legal Services monitors that this is being satisfied.</p> <p>The need for development in the rural area is identified in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy which sets a requirement for 480 dwellings in the rural area in the period 2011-2031. The SSP2 will allocate sites across the rural area to meet</p>

Appendix 2g - Braybrooke

School site alone is 14 properties not shown on the plan) whilst at the same time amenities have disappeared i.e. the School and Village Shop/Post Office.

In response to the proposed boundary changes I comment as follows:

The village has grown up around the 2 oldest buildings, the listed Church to the North and the listed Old Rectory to the South. The historic core of the village is both North and South of the river and currently the Conservation area lies mainly to the South of the River.

The option of no growth beyond the village boundary should be maintained. The boundary around sites RA/128 should not be changed. The 1993 Local Plan excluded all sites that would have extended the village boundary. KBC and the Planning Inspector at Appeal refused an application in that year on this site. Reasons given were 'development outside the village boundary would have an adverse effect on the Listed Building, the Conservation Area and conflict with the Local Plan policies. The Inspector stated "It is therefore my view that the village boundary in the vicinity of the appeal sites as shown on the draft Local Plan is properly delineated" Other reasons were that this area was backland development and not in keeping with the general pattern of the village, it would undermine the character of the Conservation area, affect views of the village from the Jurassic Way and be detrimental to the setting of the Listed Building, The Old Rectory. Applications to develop the northern part of site RA/128 were also turned down in 1996, 1997 and 1998 when it was refused by KBC and dismissed on Appeal.

Site RA128: Should not be developed for the valid planning reasons stated in the paragraph above. If the development of the entire site would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the special interest of the neighbouring Grade II Listed Building (The Old Rectory) how is it possible to mitigate a small part of the southern element of the site as acceptable for small scale development given the whole area of RA128 wraps around the Listed Building? A secondary entrance/escape road from the site into Griffin Road used to exist but this was lost with the closure of the Shop/Post Office and that site development. Vehicle access to Griffin Road is dangerous and further complicated by street parking of visitors to the Swan Public House. The Southern part of RA128 is just as sensitive as the Northern part and should not be

this requirement.

The map is a base map produced by Ordnance Survey; the Council is not able to update this base map. However the Council is fully aware of the level of development which has taken place in Braybrooke and this has been taken into account when preparing the plan.

The site has been assessed against a set of assessment criteria. The assessment for this site took into account the impact of development on the Conservation Area and Listed Building. To mitigate this impact a requirement has been added to the policy for this site to ensure that development would enhance the setting of the Listed Building and Conservation Area.

Full detail of the proposed access to the site would be considered through a planning application; however

Appendix 2g - Braybrooke

<p>considered for development.</p> <p>I disagree with the proposed settlement boundary because RA128 should be designated as a visually important open space. KBC 2012 Background Paper: Settlement Boundaries also confirms that RA128 should not be included because it represents an open area that is visually detached from the settlement. The paper also confirms that boundaries should exclude open space at the edge of settlements (existing or proposed) and that boundaries will exclude new allocations.</p>	<p>NCC Highways has rated the access as a green if accessed by a shared drive. This means that access would require minimal or no mitigation.</p> <p>The settlement boundary criteria have been amended since 2012 in response to comments made to the SSPLDD Issues Paper Consultation. The criteria now include new allocations within the settlement boundary, with the exception of new allocations for affordable housing.</p>
<p>Id 185 (Objecting) – BRA02 - I object to the proposed development outlined in this policy for the following reasons:</p> <p>1.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Id 186 (Objecting) – BRA02 - I object to the proposed development for the following reasons:</p> <p>1. The new housing would represent "backland" development - i.e. development behind existing housing, further destroying the open character of the village.</p> <p>2. The access to the development would be immediately next to the entrance to the public house, only a few yards from a T junction with limited visibility, and within 100 yards of an already dangerous blind corner. Neither the public house nor the village hall has adequate parking, resulting in vehicles being parked on the pavement whenever either of those amenities is being</p>	<p>With careful design, this site could provide a logical extension to the village which doesn't impact on the character of the village.</p> <p>Full detail of the proposed access to the site would be considered through a</p>

Appendix 2g - Braybrooke

<p>used. The existing danger to pedestrians and other road users would be exacerbated by this development, which should not be considered until existing parking problems have been resolved.</p>	<p>planning application; however NCC Highways has rated the access as a green if accessed by a shared drive. This means that access would require minimal or no mitigation.</p>
<p>Id 187 (Objecting) - I object to the proposed development for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The new housing would represent "backland" development - i.e. development behind existing housing, further destroying the open character of the village. 2. The access to the development would be immediately next to the entrance to the public house, only a few yards from a T junction with limited visibility, and within 100 yards of an already dangerous blind corner. Neither the public house nor the village hall has adequate parking, resulting in vehicles being parked on the pavement whenever either of those amenities is being used. The existing danger to pedestrians and other road users would be exacerbated by this development, which should not be considered until existing parking problems have been resolved. 	<p>With careful design, this site could provide a logical extension to the village which doesn't impact on the character of the village.</p> <p>Full detail of the proposed access to the site would be considered through a planning application; however NCC Highways has rated the access as a green if accessed by a shared drive. This means that access would require minimal or no mitigation.</p>
<p>Id 471 (Objecting) - I am writing to object to the proposal to develop land behind the Swan public house, Griffin Road, Braybrooke for three houses. My objections are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Entry and exit from the site will cause a danger due to the narrow road, the village hall corner and particularly the frequency with which visibility will be obscured by parked cars on that part of Griffin Road 2. The proximity of the pub to the proposed development is unlikely to provide the owners with quiet enjoyment of their properties 3. The infrastructure of the village is unsuited to take further development 4. The proposal is outside the current village envelope and local residents have stated 	<p>Full detail of the proposed access to the site would be considered through a planning application; however NCC Highways has rated the access as a green if accessed by a shared drive. This means that access would require minimal or no mitigation.</p> <p>It is not uncommon for pubs</p>

Appendix 2g - Braybrooke

<p>overwhelmingly that the envelope should be respected,</p>	<p>to be located in residential areas. Environmental Health officers have been consulted through the site assessment process and had not identified any issues in relation to this site.</p> <p>Infrastructure providers have been consulted through the site assessment process and no overriding constraints have been identified in relation to this site.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The SSP2 will allocate sites across the rural area to meet this requirement. To enable this need to be met the SSP2 will need to identify sites which are located outside settlement boundaries</p>
--	--

Appendix 2g - Braybrooke

	identified in the 1995 Local Plan.
<p>Id 205 (Objecting) - I think that the accident risk on Griffin Road will increase due to the access road to the development. At this point Griffin Road is narrow and the proposed access is close to a blind corner, the entry to the **** farm and the pub. The pub's main market is a destination for meals with a significant proportion of customers arriving by car and parking their cars on Griffin Road, very often encroaching on the footpath. An access road at this point will increase the accident risk from the traffic from the three proposed houses plus the building plot where construction has thus far not been prosecuted.</p> <p>Braybrooke is a village with narrow streets with some houses with no off street parking. The pub itself is highly popular. There is a particular parking problem associated with these factors which is not easily resolved. The development of a further access point on Griffin Road used by the traffic from four dwellings would in my view increase the accident risk significantly and worsen the situation.</p>	<p>Full detail of the proposed access to the site would be considered through a planning application; however NCC Highways has rated the access as a green if accessed by a shared drive. This means that access would require minimal or no mitigation.</p>
<p>Id 207 (Objecting) - The housing need identified in the Braybrooke Housing Need Survey, March 2014, was fulfilled by the school development in 2017.</p> <p>Also, in the Braybrooke Housing Need Survey, March 2014, it states, "Based on the housing needs survey results alone there is not a need to develop accommodation specifically as affordable housing for local residents". It goes on to say "However there may be a need to develop attractive down sizing opportunities and accommodation for those wishing to set up home for the first time", which was fulfilled by the subsequent development of the old school site.</p>	<p>The contribution made by the School site to affordable housing is noted in paragraph 12.43 of the draft SSP2.</p> <p>The need for development in the rural area is identified in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy which sets a requirement for 480 dwellings in the rural area in the period 2011-2031. The SSP2 will allocate sites across the rural area to meet this requirement.</p>
<p>Id 218 (Objecting) - I am against the proposed development on R/128 because it is Back-land</p>	<p>With careful design this site could provide a logical</p>

Appendix 2g - Braybrooke

<p>development would not be in keeping with the village character, which goes against JCS 11, 2b.</p> <p>With regards to 'The Housing Allocations – Assessment of Additional Sites and Update' consultation, the results of including R128 had 1 person strongly agreed, 1 of no opinion, 2 disagreed and 9 strongly disagreed. From this, the summary of the public consultation in the Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan says, "some support for including this site as an allocation", I feel that is a little disingenuous and a skewing of the figures and goes against the public's views given.</p>	<p>extension to the village which doesn't impact on the character of the village.</p> <p>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.</p>
<p>Id 219 (Objecting) - Access and egress to Griffin Road would be dangerous. There is a high amount of parking alongside the kerbline adjacent to R128 (significantly reducing the width of the carriageway) and vision splays would be non-existent. Thus making it very dangerous to other motorists, cyclists and motorbikes, particularly when trying to access onto Griffin Road.</p>	<p>Full detail of the proposed access to the site would be considered through a planning application; however NCC Highways has rated the access as a green if accessed by a shared drive. This means that access would require minimal or no mitigation.</p>
<p>Id 220 (Objecting) - I am not opposed to suitable development in a suitable location. However, R128 would be an inappropriate development in an inappropriate location.</p> <p>I object to the development of R128 for the following reasons:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The facilities in Braybrooke are limited to a pub, making it an unsustainable location, which would be in contradiction to the Joint Core Strategy. • One would also have to consider the residential amenity of any potential residents of R128, who would be entitled to the peaceful enjoyment of their property. Building behind a busy 	<p>The scale of development proposed on the site is proportionate to the level of facilities which include a pub, 2 places of worship and a village hall.</p> <p>It is not uncommon for pubs to be located in residential</p>

Appendix 2g - Braybrooke

pub garden would deprive them of this and is also against JCS 11, 2b.

- As the Council are aware, the Planning Inspectorate have already refused an appeal for housing on R128 and their reasons then, would still apply today and indeed even more so.
- According to Northamptonshire County Council's, Notes for Developers, Highway Engineers and Planners, a shared private driveway, the length of the drive between the dwelling and public highway, should not exceed 45m. This would be exceeded in order to serve the proposed dwellings to the south of the paddock and the allocation should now be removed.
- According to Northamptonshire Highway Development Management Strategy, Policy DM 15 - Northamptonshire County Council will not allow more than 5 dwellings independent of their own direct highway frontage to be served off a shared private drive. There is no guarantee that a developer would push to increase the development from 3 dwellings to 5 dwellings.

I know that this point is not a planning issue, however I make the following observation. It does appear that the council is favoring some villages in allocating potential sites, over others. Example. In the Background Paper: Settlement Boundaries (Update) 2014, Grafton Underwood Question – “Do you agree with the proposed settlement boundary, subject to the inclusion of new allocations?”. There were 2 objections. Then under the Proposed Amendments, the councils response “....Site RA/114 has been discounted due to a large number of objections received through the SSPLDD – Options Paper consultation, limited services and facilities within the village and limited local need for new development.” That equates to 1.3% of the population. But when the same question was asked of RA128 to Braybrooke residents, 87 disagreed, that's 23% of the village population, is somehow ignored. It would appear that some favoritism is in play here and the village is very suspicious of the driving forces.

areas. Environmental Health officers have been consulted through the site assessment process and had not identified any issues in relation to this site.

While decisions in the past have been made to refuse development on the site the site has been promoted for development and has therefore been assessed against a set of criteria, alongside other sites.

When a private drive exceeds 45m NCC policy sets out specific requirements that need to be met. They relate to access for the Fire Service. The requirements would affect the layout of development and the design of the access route. These are issues which would be dealt with at planning application stage rather than at site allocation stage.

There are already 2 dwellings accessed from an existing

Appendix 2g - Braybrooke

	<p>access, therefore if the status as a private drive remains then only 3 additional dwellings could be added to conform to NCC highways requirements.</p> <p>All sites have been considered using the same set of criteria. Those which have been assessed as most favourable against the assessment criteria are the ones which have been identified in the draft SSP2.</p>
<p>Id 221 (Objecting) - Access to the proposed development will be between a junction and a blind corner and from a road which is already congested with parked cars from the public house, and will inevitably cause further hazards.</p> <p>The amenity impact will inevitably be negative for neighbouring properties.</p> <p>The development is not in keeping with the village's existing spinal structure.</p> <p>There is no demonstrable need for additional housing in the village (as accepted by KBC in 2013).</p>	<p>Full detail of the proposed access to the site would be considered through a planning application; however NCC Highways has rated the access as a green if accessed by a shared drive. This means that access would require minimal or no mitigation.</p> <p>Criteria (g) of Policy BRA02 seeks to ensure that there is no negative impact on neighbouring properties in terms of amenity.</p>

Appendix 2g - Braybrooke

	<p>With careful design this site could provide a logical extension to the village which doesn't impact on the character of the village.</p> <p>The need for development in the rural area is identified in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy which sets a requirement for 480 dwellings in the rural area in the period 2011-2031. The SSP2 will allocate sites across the rural area to meet this requirement.</p>
<p>Id 222 (Objecting) - Paragraph 12.42 contains errors regarding the layout of the village suggesting the author has scant knowledge of such.</p> <p>The Braybrooke map provided is very out of date, and so fails to show the new developments which have already increased the size of the village substantially over the past few years. This includes a new estate on the site of the primary school. It could be surmised that such a map would be a useful tool to influence those decision makers without detailed knowledge of Braybrooke that the village is due expansion in line with that sought by KBC for rural areas of the Borough.</p>	<p>No detail has been provided on what the errors are in paragraph 12.42, however this paragraph will be reviewed to ensure it is accurate.</p> <p>The map is a base map produced by Ordnance Survey; the Council is not able to update this base map. However the Council is fully aware of the level of development which has taken place in Braybrooke and this has been taken into account</p>

Appendix 2g - Braybrooke

	when preparing the plan.
<p>Id 223 (Objecting) - There are no village specific new housing quotas, although the KBC Rural Area is allocated 480. So, there is no quota for new houses in Braybrooke. However, from the 480 houses Braybrooke has already taken the fourteen from the redevelopment of the school site + two others (2011-17), making it difficult to see where the stated proposed allocation of three comes from.</p>	<p>The proposed allocation of 3 would contribute towards the requirement of 480 dwellings.</p>
<p>Id 224 (Objecting) - Paragraph 12.45 quotes a consultation which seems to have taken place wholly within the Council, and an apparent similar re-consultation. No one at the packed village meeting held in the Village Hall on 31st July 2018 to discuss the document for Braybrooke seemed aware of the nature and content of these consultations prior to their reporting. The paragraph continues with 'It was subsequently agreed', but again, by whom?</p> <p>Paragraph 12.49 quotes the 'Rural Masterplanning Report 2012 Braybrooke'. Looking at this document, and in particular Section 4 'Summary of Housing Need Assessments', the report only identifies a need for affordable housing in the Borough. For this, Braybrooke, according to KBC documentation, is already one ahead.</p>	<p>The consultations referred to in paragraph 12.45 were the consultation of the Site Specific Proposals Local Development Document Options Paper (2012) and the Housing Allocations – Assessment of Additional Sites and Update consultation (2013) both these consultations were public consultations at earlier stages in the preparation of the Draft Plan. The subsequent agreement to designate sites was made by the Council's Planning Policy Committee.</p> <p>The Housing Needs Assessment only identifies need for affordable housing. The need for development in the rural area is identified in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy which</p>

Appendix 2g - Braybrooke

	<p>sets a requirement for 480 dwellings in the rural area in the period 2011-2031. The SSP2 will allocate sites across the rural area to meet this requirement.</p>
<p>Id 225 (Objecting) - In 'Rural Masterplanning Report 2012 Braybrooke, Section 5 SHLAA Findings quoted RA/128 as performing poorly in terms of accessibility, with major constraints to the provision of water and sewerage infrastructure which would be difficult to overcome. The north-east section of the site is abutting the Village Conservation area and the listed curtilage runs along the southern boundary of the Grade II listed Old Rectory and on to Griffin Road. The huge Copper Beech, already with a TPO and a firm favourite with the villagers, will inevitably be affected by any development of the site. The size of the canopy will likely have to be reduced and the roots cropped to allow the development of houses and access, potentially compromising this fine tree. A row of lime trees on the boundary of the site with The Swan PH were felled just a few months ago after we were advised informally that the trees were being reduced slightly. As a consequence, we at the Old Rectory are now sensitised to the vulnerability of trees on the RA/128 site.</p> <p>My interest in wildlife is extensive. The RA/128 'Top Orchard' land is a vital part of the habitat of local wildlife being not built-on or farmed. I have already recorded seven different types of bat in and near to the precincts of the Old Rectory and so adjacent to RA/128, including the rare Barbastelle and Leisler's, and have found a Great Crested Newt near our pond. This biodiversity is now largely gone from the intensively managed farm landscapes which otherwise dominate the countryside immediately outside the village boundary.</p>	<p>The Beech tree is protected by a tree preservation order and any development on the site would be required to protect and enhance the tree. The proposed policy also requires that the setting of Grade II Old Rectory and Conservation Area are protected and enhanced.</p> <p>An additional criterion will be added requiring an ecological survey be undertaken to identify the presence of wildlife in the area, to help understand mitigation necessary.</p>
<p>Id 266 (Objecting) - RA/128 slopes uphill to the south, so any development of the site will inevitably affect the outlook and presence of the Old Rectory more than if the site were flat.</p> <p>RA/128 as a draft housing allocation is presented with access from Griffin Road (12.54), which if undertaken would mean a road with pavement being forced hard against the boundary of the Old Rectory given that there is a pinch-point with the PH's garden. There have been discussions in the Parish Council (official Minutes are available) going back years about health and safety concerns regarding road parking for the PH because its busy car-park and entrance are so near the junction</p>	<p>The proposed policy requires that the setting of Grade II Old Rectory and Conservation Area are protected and enhanced.</p> <p>Full detail of the proposed access to the site would be</p>

Appendix 2g - Braybrooke

<p>with School Lane, where visibility for cars exiting the lane in particular is very limited. I note that a planning application for just south of the PH on the opposite side of Griffin Road was refused some years ago because its entrance from Griffin Road was too near the difficult Griffin Road/ School Lane / PH junction. The RA/128 access suggested in the document is just as close to that junction.</p>	<p>considered through a planning application; however NCC Highways has rated the access as a green if accessed by a shared drive. This means that access would require minimal or no mitigation.</p>
<p>Id 232 (Objecting) - I object to the proposal for Braybrooke for the following reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Extension of the village boundary to include BRA02 would have a detrimental effect on the open nature of the village. 2 The proposed access from Griffin Road would exacerbate the problem which already exists between the dangerous corner at the Village Hall and the junction of Griffin Road and School Lane. This is frequently congested with the cars of those using either the Village Hall or the pub. 	<p>Draft policy BRA02 seeks to maintain the open character of the site through the provision of an area of open space in the northern part of the site. Development would be within the southern part of the site which is located behind existing properties on Griffin Road.</p> <p>Full detail of the proposed access to the site would be considered through a planning application; however NCC Highways has rated the access as a green if accessed by a shared drive. This means that access would require minimal or no mitigation.</p>
<p>Id 241 (Objecting) - The 2014 Housing Needs Survey identified the need for 3 affordable homes. Since 2014 the former Primary School site has been developed providing not only 4 affordable homes but a further 10 market-value homes. Also, a further 2 market-value homes have been added to the village as windfall backlot development. No need has been identified for any additional housing in Braybrooke, which could conceivably justify any further allocation for housing</p>	<p>The Housing Needs Assessment only identifies need for affordable housing. The need for development in the rural area is identified in</p>

Appendix 2g - Braybrooke

<p>in this Plan, and certainly none which justifies the proposed enlargement of the village boundary to include the proposed allocation of site RA128.</p>	<p>the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy which sets a requirement for 480 dwellings in the rural area in the period 2011-2031. The SSP2 will allocate sites across the rural area to meet this requirement.</p>
<p>Id 247 (Objecting) - Two options are presented: either (1) no growth beyond the (then extant) village boundary, or (2) development of the southern part of RA128, followed by the statement:</p> <p>"This site was re-consulted on as a potential housing allocation in the [2013] Housing Allocations - Assessment of Additional Sites and Update consultation as a potential housing option. It was subsequently agreed that site the southern part of RA128 be designated as a draft housing allocation".</p> <p>Reading this statement at face value, without knowing any of the history, one might well be led to believe that the 2013 consultation came down in favour of the designation of RA128 as a housing allocation, and in favour of the associated re-drawing of the village boundary that would be necessary to accommodate this allocation whilst remaining compliant with the long-standing and unequivocal planning rules against any development outside the village boundary.</p> <p>But this totally belies the voice of those more than 95% of respondents who in 2013 objected strongly to any enlargement of the village boundary, and also objected strongly to the designation of RA128 as a housing allocation.</p> <p>The statement says that "it was agreed". By whom? Consulting with whom? Advised by whom? Notifying whom?</p> <p>If that is indeed the case, such "agreement" appears to fly in the face of all the fine policy and vision statements about empowering communities where local planning issues are at stake and protecting against development in rural areas except where a need has been identified.</p>	<p>It was agreed by the Councils Planning Policy Committee that the site be designated as a proposed housing allocation in the draft SSP2, which was then publicly consulted upon.</p> <p>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.</p>

Appendix 2g - Braybrooke

<p>Id 264 (Objecting) - I strongly object to the proposed enlargement of the village boundary to include the southern part of RA128, and I strongly object to the proposed designation of the southern part of RA128 as a housing allocation.</p> <p>My strong objections reflect:</p> <p>(a) my agreement with the collectively and clearly expressed wishes of more than 95% of respondents to the 2013 consultation.</p> <p>(b) my dissatisfaction with the lack of resistance offered by the planning authority in relation to proposals for unneeded and unwanted developments in rural villages.</p> <p>(c) my desire to see the empowerment of residents in the local community where I live to determine appropriate development controls for our own settlement, as promised in this Plan, rather than to be powerlessly subjected to what often seems to be arbitrary behind-closed-doors decision making in Kettering. Decision making which appears to totally disregard the loud and clear voice of the local community. Decision making which (or so I understand it has been alleged) was subjected to undue influence exerted by parties interested in development gain from the site.</p> <p>(d) my understanding that the development of 14 houses (inclusive of 4 affordable homes) on the former Primary School site, together with 2 additional windfall backlot houses, has already more than satisfied - by a factor of more than 5 times - the need for only 3 additional affordable homes within Braybrooke village that was identified by the 2014 Housing Needs Survey, such that there can be no legitimate justification whatever today, on the grounds of "housing need", for the designation of any further housing allocation within the village.</p> <p>(d) my considered opinion as a construction professional that in planning terms this particular site is not suitable for housing development because:</p> <p>(i) although the site forms part of the curtilage of The Old Rectory, it does not form part of the immediate cultivated garden of that property, but instead it is a piece of open land which lies on the edge of the settlement and is visually separated from the settlement with its characteristic linear</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Each site which has been assessed has been assessed against the same assessment criteria and those sites which have been assessed as more favourable have been identified as proposed housing allocations.</p> <p>The Housing Needs Assessment only identifies need for affordable housing. The need for development in the rural area is identified in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy which sets a requirement for 480 dwellings in the rural area in the period 2011-2031. The SSP2 will allocate sites across the rural area to meet</p>
--	--

Appendix 2g - Braybrooke

<p>development, to a greater degree than it is visually separated from the open countryside which it immediately abuts and to which its character is more closely related.</p> <p>(ii) residents of the proposed houses would be adversely impacted by their immediate proximity of the site to the back of the pub, from the point of view both of late night noise and of cooking smells.</p> <p>(iii) residents of the proposed houses would be adversely impacted by their close proximity to the sewage treatment works, the site lying within the generally accepted 400m exclusion radius of the "cordon sanitaire" for odour.</p> <p>(iv) additional sewerage flows from the proposed new houses would add to an already overloaded and frequently problematic sewer in Griffin Road.</p> <p>(v) adverse vehicle / pedestrian / cyclist safety considerations in relation to the existing parking conflicts on Griffin Road caused by patrons of the pub, together with the existing poor visibility both at the corner of Griffin Road by the village hall and at the junction of Griffin Road and School Lane.</p> <p>However, having said all that, I am nothing if not a pragmatist.</p> <p>Pressure on the planning authority by interested parties to permit development of this site will not go away just because no-one (else) needs it and no-one (else) wants it.</p> <p>And therefore, if it is unavoidable that 3 further houses must be allocated somewhere in Braybrooke, to keep planners and interested parties quiet and happy, then my opinion is that it would be better to allocate them on the southern part of RA128 than anywhere else in the village. And if it is unavoidable that 3 houses must be allocated on the southern part of RA128, then my opinion is that it would be appropriate to include that site within a redrawn village boundary.</p> <p>The site in question is undoubtedly an eyesore currently, and in its current state it certainly detracts visually from the appearance of the centre of the village (although equally undoubtedly it provides an ideal biome and habitat for all manner of ecologically interesting and valuable biodiversity). It</p>	<p>this requirement.</p> <p>Members and officers of the Council are required to adhere to strict Codes of Conduct. Members are advised of their responsibilities with regards these requirements, and the Council's Head of Democratic & Legal Services monitors that this is being satisfied.</p> <p>Draft policy BRA02 seeks to maintain the open character of the site through the provision of an area of open space in the northern part of the site. Development would be within the southern part of the site which is located behind existing properties on Griffin Road.</p> <p>With careful design this site could provide a logical extension to the village which doesn't impact on the character of the village.</p> <p>It is not uncommon for pubs to be located in residential</p>
---	---

Appendix 2g - Braybrooke

<p>seems that its owners have allowed it to become an eyesore over many years perhaps as a tit-for-tat for the objections to its development. Development of (only) 3 houses in the southern part of the site (if the design is sensitively handled to protect important areas of habitat from destruction) could undoubtedly improve the visual amenity of this area, while impacting the amenity of the immediately neighbouring residents only minimally.</p> <p>If such development of (only) 3 houses were to be permitted, then it becomes paramount that all the policies set out in BRA02 must be strictly enforced, especially the allocated yield, such that the permitted development could not ever be ratcheted-up by a greedy landowner or developer once the allocation has been included in the Plan, in order that the amenity of the surrounding residents would be impacted to the least possible extent.</p> <p>There is a great deal of cynicism in the village about the will and the ability of the planning authority to resist such ratcheting-up, and such cynicism appears to be largely at the root of the strident opposition to this allocation both in the past and at present. It lies within the remit and responsibility of the planning authority to exercise effective control in relation to development of this sensitive site, if it wants to obtain and maintain the goodwill of village residents.</p> <p>Whilst all the policies in BRA02 are evidently important, my particular personal concerns are with items (b) and (g). The proposed development of (only) 3 houses must remain fully screened from Latymer Close by retention of all the substantial existing mature trees along the southern boundary of the site, to the extent that I consider they should be immediately protected by Tree Protection Orders as a pre-requisite before inclusion of this proposed allocation.</p> <p>I also consider that an additional policy specifically relating to biodiversity should be included within BRA02, requiring the design of the proposed development to preserve areas of natural grassy meadow, and all of the perimeter hedgerows and trees, and to include the construction of a suitable SUDS pond, in order to provide and protect habitats for all appropriate species.</p>	<p>areas. Environmental Health officers have been consulted through the site assessment process and had not identified any issues in relation to this site.</p> <p>The site is not within the 400m cordon sanitaire.</p> <p>Anglian Water has been consulted through the site assessment work and no issues have been raised in relation to the capacity of the sewer.</p> <p>If the site is progressed as an allocation the criteria would apply to any proposals for development on the site.</p> <p>An additional criteria relating to biodiversity will be added.</p>
<p>Id 270 (Neither) - Minor errors do not affect the thrust of this plan but undermine its credibility so should be corrected.</p> <p>In 12.42 it would be more accurate to say the historic core of the village is centered round the</p>	<p>Noted. Paragraph 12.42 will be updated to reflect comments.</p>

Appendix 2g - Braybrooke

<p>grade 2* listed church in the North (<i>other listed buildings are Bridge House, Wantage House, 2 Newton Way and the Road Bridge</i>) and the grade 2 listed Old Rectory in the South (<i>other listed buildings are Bleak House and Pipewell Cottage</i>).</p> <p>The map omits the redevelopment of what is still shown as the Primary School, and the two back-built large houses to the south-east of School Lane</p>	<p>The map is a base map produced by Ordnance Survey; the Council is not able to update this base map. However the Council is fully aware of the level of development which has taken place in Braybrooke and this has been taken into account when preparing the plan.</p>
<p>Id 271 (Neither) - A significant visual feature of present day Braybrooke is parked cars, especially down Griffin road during pub opening hours, and at night along School Lane. Cars are parked on pavements forcing pedestrians into the road. With blind corners at School Lane/Griffin Road and at the Village Hall, this is dangerous. Part of the answer may be police enforcement but there is a design/planning in the provision of off-road parking. Recent planning decisions (approvals, rejections and even the present proposed housing allocation) seem to ignore the point. We suggest that the problem should be noted in this plan, and policies put in place to resolve it. In that way future planning applications should be forced to address it.</p>	<p>Noted. Policy 8 of the Joint Core Strategy requires proposals to make provision for parking, however additional text will be added to the SSP2 highlighting this as an issue and criteria will be added to policies BRA01 and BRA02 to require adequate parking provision in new developments.</p>
<p>Id 272 (Objecting) - On 31 July a village meeting, attended by about 50 people, discussed the SSP and focussed particularly on the redrawing of the village boundary to include this land, and the associated allocation to housing. The overwhelming majority would object to the proposal for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Safety concerns over the position of the proposed access on Griffin Road - Development of this site will not preserve or enhance the character of the conservation area and its setting. 	<p>Noted. Full detail of the proposed access to the site would be considered through a planning application; however NCC Highways has rated the access as a green if accessed by a shared drive. This means that access would require minimal or no mitigation.</p>

Appendix 2g - Braybrooke

<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Development of this site will detrimentally impact the setting of the grade II listed Rectory- Absence of any housing allocation requirements or identified unsatisfied need.- Lack of local amenities and infrastructure.- Proximity to public house (one of only two community buildings in the village): potential for impacts on new residents from noise, and on viability of public house due to potential of noise complaints from new residents.- Impact on biodiversity of the site <p>A full response covering these points will be made in due course.</p>	<p>The assessment for this site took into account the impact of development on the Conservation Area and Listed Building. To mitigate this impact a requirement has been added to the policy for this site to ensure that development would enhance the setting of the Listed Building and Conservation Area.</p> <p>The need for development in the rural area is identified in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy which sets a requirement for 480 dwellings in the rural area in the period 2011-2031. The SSP2 will allocate sites across the rural area to meet this requirement.</p> <p>Given the scale of development proposed, the local amenities and infrastructure are considered adequate.</p> <p>It is not uncommon for pubs to be located in residential</p>
---	--

Appendix 2g - Braybrooke

	<p>areas. Environmental Health officers have been consulted through the site assessment process and had not identified any issues in relation to this site.</p> <p>An additional criteria relating to biodiversity will be added.</p>
<p>Id 273 (Neither) - I recognise that the conditions attached to this proposal try to meet all the objections to development on this site. And provided they can be reliably enforced, it seems to me that they do.</p> <p>But the condition about providing safe access from Griffin Road would involve resolving the very difficult and dangerous parking situation by providing much more parking space for pub customers and ensuring unencumbered access to existing residences. Provided this can be done as an enforceable condition of the development - and I think it would need to be stated quite explicitly - I would support it.</p> <p>If resolving the parking problem cannot be made an unavoidable condition, I believe the development is unthinkable. Making a new junction there and adding even a small amount of new traffic would considerably worsen an already very serious and dangerous problem, well described in other submissions.</p>	<p>Full detail of the proposed access to the site would be considered through a planning application; however NCC Highways has rated the access as a green if accessed by a shared drive. This means that access would require minimal or no mitigation.</p> <p>The new development will not add to on-street parking in Griffin Road, the properties are expected to be provided with sufficient parking to meet their own need. It would be inappropriate to require a development proposal to either address the existing issue of parking and enforcement, or restrict the occupants from using the public highway, along with</p>

Appendix 2g - Braybrooke

	other users.
Id 315 (Neither) – RA/128 – Be supported by an appropriate level of archaeological assessment.	Noted. This criterion will be added to policy BRA02.
<p>Id 360 (Neither) – 12.45 - I do not understand what is meant in this paragraph by consultation. Presumably there is a statutory procedure for this, but clearly it is only meaningful if a significant number of relevant people air their views. At the village meeting on 31st July around fifty people attended, presumably because they are now interested in the outcome of the Plan and yet few considered they had ever been consulted before.</p> <p>Other contributors have indicated that in informal consultations the majority of villagers were in favour of 'No growth beyond the village boundary' and yet 'It was subsequently agreed that (site) the southern part of RA/128 be designated as a draft housing allocation'. Who was it agreed by and how many people who were consulted were in favour?</p>	The consultations referred to in paragraph 12.45 were the consultation of the Site Specific Proposals Local Development Document Options Paper (2012) and the Housing Allocations – Assessment of Additional Sites and Update consultation (2013) both these consultations were public consultations. The subsequent agreement to designate sites was agreement by the Council's Planning Policy Committee.
<p>Id 370 (Objecting) – 12.47, 12.48 and map - I agree with both 12.47 and 12.48 but only in so far as they refer to the Settlement Boundary as it now stands and not the proposed change.</p> <p>The current boundary essentially follows the bottom of the gardens of all the properties on the outside of all the peripheral roads. This means that very few houses back onto the land of others. In my opinion this is one of the significant differences between village living and a town or urban layout and should be maintained wherever possible.</p> <p>I do not understand why when proposing a future change the map used to illustrate it is so out of date. The Kettering BC Planning website has a digital map which shows all the recent 'new dwellings (2011-2017)'. This map suggests that the village still has Primary School and not a significant number of new properties.</p>	The map is a base map produced by Ordnance Survey; the Council is not able to update this base map. However the Council is fully aware of the level of development which has taken place in Braybrooke and this has been taken into account when preparing the plan.
Id 373 (Objecting) – 12.43 - In the 2013 Housing Allocations - Assessment of Additional Sites and	Views of local resident are

Appendix 2g - Braybrooke

Update consultation, 95% of respondents responded with an objection. The Council holds these consultations and then chooses to ignore the voice of the community.

In 12.43 it states that there was a need of 3 affordable homes and goes on to admit that this has been achieved by the school development. The remaining houses sold on the old school site must have gone towards some other allocation and probably exceeded it, therefore R128 is not required as a potential site for any new homes.

BRA02 (f) - Access to the site is compromised and the NPPF states, “safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users” and goes on, “Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe”.

I deeply object the boundary being redrawn to include R128, as there is no identified need subsequent to the completion of the old school site.

The Council cannot guarantee that there would only be 3 houses built on the proposed site.

There are no facilities in the village apart from the pub and should look for more sustainable locations that have facilities like a shop and post office.

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 houses provided on the school site and other sites across the rural area which have been completed since 2011 have been counted towards the requirement of 480 dwellings. However there remains a need for 140 dwellings to be allocated in the rural area in the SSP2.

Full details of the proposed access to the site would be considered through a planning application; however NCC Highways has rated the access as a green if accessed by a shared drive. This means that access would require minimal or no mitigation.

All sites have been

Appendix 2g - Braybrooke

	<p>considered using the same set of criteria. Those which have been assessed as most favourable against the assessment criteria are the ones which have been identified in the draft SSP2.</p>
<p>Id 374 (Objecting) – RA/128 and Policy BRA02 - As stated in a previous comment I object to the extension of the village boundary to cover this land and so it follows that I also object to development on this site in general. Notwithstanding this I make the following comments about the proposal.</p> <p>12.52 The beech tree is currently undisturbed on private land and provides a large environmental area for wildlife. Despite being covered by a TPO, as soon as development work takes place it will be subject to considerably more safety considerations. We have all heard of cases where developers have managed to find a specialist who claims it is 'diseased' and it is quickly felled over a weekend in the name of H and S. Any fine would be considered 'a cost of the job'. I would have fears for its well being if such a proposal were adopted as it clearly will be difficult to work around it.</p> <p>12.54 The access to the site from Griffin Road as proposed is quite unsuitable:</p> <p>1 As outlined by many people before me the connection with Griffin Road will be a significant hazard due to the proximity of the nearby junction and pub, made worse by the narrowness of the road and frequent parking issues.</p> <p>2 Due to the location of the land belonging to the pub and brewery the access road will be forced to run right up to the boundary of the Old Rectory and Conservation Area. It is hard to see how this does not conflict with BRA02/c.</p> <p>3 The dwelling land may be restricted to the southern most part of the site but this is a considerable distance from the entry point. Who would maintain the roadway and remaining land? Prospective customers for new build properties are likely to want it neatly landscaped which again</p>	<p>The Beech tree is protected by a tree preservation order. A TPO provides a high level of protection for the tree and contravening a Tree Preservation Order is an offence.</p> <p>Full detail of the proposed access to the site would be considered through a planning application; however NCC Highways has rated the access as a green if accessed by a shared drive. This means that access would require minimal or no mitigation.</p> <p>The proposal is for the site to be accessed by a private drive, the maintenance of the drive would therefore be the responsibility of the developer/ future occupiers of the site.</p>

Appendix 2g - Braybrooke

<p>does not fit well with the conditions of BRA02 or environmental considerations.</p>	
<p>Id 377 (Objecting) – 12.50 Policy BRA02 - I strongly object to the development of site RA/128 based on the following:</p> <p>In KBC’s document, Settlement Boundaries (update April 2018), paragraph 3.2 states,</p> <p>“Boundaries will exclude: a) Playing fields or open space at the edge of settlements (existing or proposed); ... d) Large gardens and other open areas which are visually open and relate to the open countryside rather than the settlement; e) Large gardens or other area whose inclusion or possible development would harm the structure, form and character of the settlement.’</p> <p>In the Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan Document, paragraph 12.3 states: “...although development in villages is limited it is important to ensure that development which does take place is sensitive to and reflects their individual character.”</p> <p>Moreover, para 12.49 states “New development should seek to protect and enhance the character of the Conservation Area and its setting.”</p> <p>Therefore, the development of this site would change forever and have an unacceptable impact on the character of this village which is (and grew as) a typical farming village where housing follows the main ‘spinal’ routes through the village.</p> <p>Redrawing the settlement boundary to include this site is completely at odds with the principles set out in this document – currently site RA/128 <u>is</u> ‘open space at the edge of the settlement’ and <u>is</u> ‘visually open’ and relates to ‘the open countryside rather than the settlement’.</p> <p>In summary, I do not believe this is the right site in the village for this type of development, and I believe that further site assessments should be undertaken so that development in Braybrooke is in keeping with its historical character.</p>	<p>While the settlement boundary criteria exclude open spaces at the edge of settlements they do include new allocations within the settlement boundary.</p> <p>With careful design this site could provide a logical extension to the village which doesn’t impact on the character of the village.</p>
<p>Id 511 (Objecting) - I apologise that my submission has been delayed. Unfortunately at the village meeting erroneous information regarding the timing of the submission was announced.</p>	<p>Reference is made to the 14 properties built on the school site and off School Lane in</p>

Appendix 2g - Braybrooke

<p>The information provided by KBC about Braybrooke village is woefully out of date in respect of the number of new houses that have been built. Specifically I refer to 14 properties built on the School site and 2 properties off School Lane.</p> <p>The listed building 'The Old Rectory', the conservation area and views from the Jurassic Way will be adversely affected by building on RA/128. The exit from this site onto Griffin Road will create problems/accidents due to street parking by visitors to the Public House and Village Hall.</p> <p>When both The Planning Inspector and KBC itself have refused applications for this and other sites that would change the village boundary in the years, 1993, 96, 97 and 98, what has changed for KBC to even reconsider this application.</p>	<p>table 12.4 which identifies 16 new dwellings completed 2011-2017 and 3 existing housing commitments. The map is a base map produced by Ordnance Survey; the Council is not able to update this base map.</p> <p>The assessment for this site took into account the impact of development on the Conservation Area and Listed Building. To mitigate this impact a requirement has been added to the policy for this site to ensure that development would enhance the setting of the Listed Building and Conservation Area.</p> <p>Full detail of the proposed access to the site would be considered through a planning application; however NCC Highways has rated the access as a green if accessed by a shared drive. This means that access would require minimal or no mitigation.</p>
--	--

Appendix 2g - Braybrooke

	<p>While decisions in the past have been made to refuse development on the site, the site has been promoted for development and has therefore been assessed against a set of criteria, alongside other sites.</p>
<p>Id 527 (Objecting) - 12.2 Braybrooke</p> <p>I request that you take my following observations and comments regarding the above into consideration. I feel very strongly this Boundary change should be refused.</p> <p>12.42</p> <p>There are not “many” listed buildings in Braybrooke and the 6 I know of are evenly distributed to the north and south of the River Jordan.</p> <p>12.43</p> <p>The housing needs survey of 2014 only mentions the need for 3 <u>affordable</u> homes in Braybrooke. Acknowledgement was suitably mentioned that 4 had actually been built. <u>But</u> why at this point was no mention made that another 10 houses had been built on the same site? Especially necessary as they have not been shown on the map. Neither have the other 2 houses built elsewhere since that 2014 survey.</p> <p>Options for Growth</p> <p>12.45</p> <p>Why is this Boundary Change yet again being considered when <u>several</u> other applications by the owner of the land been refused for development on RA/128: even on Appeal being refused by</p>	<p>There are five Listed Buildings/ Structures located north of the river and three located south of the river. Paragraph 12.42 will be reviewed to ensure the information contained in it reflects this.</p> <p>Reference is made to the 14 properties built on the school site and off School Lane in table 12.4 which identifies 16 new dwellings completed 2011-2017 and 3 existing housing commitments. The map is a base map produced by Ordnance Survey; the Council is not able to update this base map.</p> <p>While decisions in the past have been made to refuse development on the site, the</p>

Appendix 2g - Braybrooke

<p>Planning Inspectors.</p> <p>This also leads to when taking the Inspector's comments into considerations:- Why has this site even being "re-consulted" on? Also who "subsequently agreed" to it being designated as a draught housing allocation?</p> <p>Especially as surveys have also clearly indicated that any development on this site would be totally inappropriate.</p>	<p>site has been promoted for development and has therefore been assessed against a set of criteria, alongside other sites.</p>
<p>Id 529 (Objecting) – Policy BRA02 - Housing:- RA/128</p> <p>I am particularly concerned that the requirements relating to this proposal will <u>not</u> be adhered to for the following reasons:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The owner of this land should already be "protecting and enhancing" the Beech tree covered by a T.P.O. This has <u>not happened</u> in the many years I have lived in the village. 2. "Protect and enhance existing planting and trees within and along the boundaries on the site". This has happened in some areas – <u>but</u> approximately 2 years ago <u>all</u> the shrubs and trees were removed from the boundary of RA/128 adjacent to the public house. 3. "Protect and enhance the setting of the Old Rectory Grade II Listed Building and Conservation Area". Only this year the owner of RA/128 had 2 <u>very</u> large and healthy trees totally cut down. Being sceptical, I do now wonder <u>if</u> this <u>could</u> have been done to keep the access road as far away as possible from the Old Rectory? However, if that was not the reason, removal of the trees so close to the Conservation Area and the Grade II listed building was certainly not conducive to good management of the plot of land. 4. If this development goes ahead, and the open space would clearly have to be designated – who would be responsible for it? 5. Development is not wanted nor required on this site. In the past 18 years the number of houses in Braybrooke has increased by 25%! If housing requirements are looked at as a whole for an area – please build any more houses which I acknowledge are required, in other areas and village which have not facilitated such a large proportion as has Braybrooke. 6. This is a huge concern – providing <u>safe</u> vehicular, cycle and pedestrian access from the site 	<p>The management and maintenance of open space would be agreed at the planning application stage.</p> <p>The need for development in the rural area is identified in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy which sets a requirement for 480 dwellings in the rural area in the period 2011-2031. The SSP2 will allocate sites across the rural area to meet this requirement.</p> <p>Full detail of the proposed access to the site would be considered through a planning application; however NCC Highways has rated the access as a green if accessed by a shared drive. This means that access would require</p>

Appendix 2g - Braybrooke

<p>onto Griffin Road (particularly during the building process) would be nigh impossible. Access from this access is already seriously visibly impaired due to the lack of parking spaces at The Swan for their customers, who park wherever there is a space: and despite notices and common sense, the paths are used for parking on too. All of this close to another visually difficult road junction from School Lane onto Griffin Road. School Lane also having been made into a single road by not only residents, but again clients of the The Swan.</p> <p>All in all, I respectfully request that any development on RA/128 is rejected: and the plot should <u>not</u> be included in the Village Boundary.</p>	<p>minimal or no mitigation.</p>
<p>Id 530 (Objecting) – BRA02 - I do not feel there is a need for additional housing in Braybrooke. The school site has been developed within 14 houses, 4 of which are affordable housing. Another house has been built in Newland Street and 2 large properties behind School Lane.</p> <p>The village boundary should remain as it is at present and there is no need for an extension.</p> <p>The proposed building, should the boundary be extended, will affect us greatly. We bought our house because of the peaceful setting and the noise, mess and general disruption will impact strongly on our day to day lives.</p> <p>Vehicle access to the site during the building process, will be a nightmare. Cars park up on the pavement in Griffin Road and School is congested during opening hours at The Swan to. Site traffic will either have to use Griffin Rd with the sharp bend outside the village hall or School Lane where it is difficult to see traffic coming along Griffin Rd in a car never mind a JCB!!! I do not think that this has been thought through carefully and is just a way to make money, regardless of the potential consequences.</p> <p>If the houses are built, that will also increase regular traffic on Griffin Road and coming out onto a road already packed with cars during pub opening hours will be very dangerous.</p> <p>It was interesting to see that the map provided was very out of date and did not include the school site, how efficient is that on such an important matter.</p>	<p>The need for development in the rural area is identified in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy which sets a requirement for 480 dwellings in the rural area in the period 2011-2031. The SSP2 will allocate sites across the rural area to meet this requirement.</p> <p>Noise/ disruption would be limited to the period during which any development is being constructed.</p> <p>Full detail of the proposed access to the site would be considered through a planning application; however NCC Highways has rated the access as a green if accessed by a shared drive. This means</p>

Appendix 2g - Braybrooke

<p>The Old Rectory is a listed building and should not overlook a building site with all the heavy traffic trundling in and out and was presumably bought as it was not overlooked by other houses.</p> <p>This whole idea will have a detrimental impact on the village and surrounding countryside, not to mention the noise and traffic during building. Who will maintain the remaining land if houses are built or will it just be neglected as it is now.</p>	<p>that access would require minimal or no mitigation.</p> <p>The map is a base map produced by Ordnance Survey; the Council is not able to update this base map.</p> <p>Any impact of construction would only take place during the construction period.</p> <p>Land would be maintained by the developer or future occupiers.</p>
<p>Id 528 (Objecting) - Policy BRA01</p> <p>e. New development on this site RA/128 will <u>NOT</u> “protect and enhance the character of the Conservation Area and its setting”.</p>	<p>Proposals would be required to protect and enhance the character of the Conservation Area and its setting.</p>
<p>Id 565 (Objecting) - The allocation of RA/128 – Top Orchard, Braybrooke</p> <p>A village meeting attracting about 50 Braybrooke residents on 31 July 2018 concluded that Top Orchard is unsuitable for any scale of development and should not be allocated for development or included within the village envelope. They therefore objected to the extension of the village envelope to allow for development, for the following reasons.</p> <p>1. There is no need. Policy 11 of the JCS states:</p> <p><i>“Development in the rural areas will be limited to that required to support a prosperous rural economy or to meet a locally arising need, which cannot be met more sustainably at a nearby larger settlement;”</i></p>	<p>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.</p> <p>The need for development in the rural area is identified in</p>

Appendix 2g - Braybrooke

Development on RA/128 would not comply with this policy. There is no indication within the plan that this site will be developed for people working locally within the rural economy, or that they will provide houses to meet a local need.

Section 4 of the Draft Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan notes that within the rural area 140 houses are required to meet the housing allocation targets. The calculated housing to be provided in rural areas by the draft plan is 170-171. So three houses in Braybrooke are not required to meet the wider housing allocation for the Borough. It should also be noted that Braybrooke has provided 16 new houses in the last five years, including 4 shared ownership homes, a significant amount for a village of its size.

Policy RA/04 requires new development to allow connections to be made for future development on the edge of settlements. This builds in additional development expectations for this site and sets a precedent for further unsuitable development in this location.

- b) Character of the village.** Policy 11 of the Joint Core Strategy requires development to have consideration for the existing character of the settlement. Policy RS/01 of the Draft Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan requires development to show consideration and be sympathetic to the existing size, form, character and setting in the village. Development on this site will not comply with either of these policies. The historical character of the village is of linear development along the main routes, focusing on the two historic cores. The closes and back land development are late 20th century and early 21st century, and have eroded the character of the village. This erosion of character should not be exacerbated by another back land, close style development behind houses on Griffin Road and Latimer Close, with no building frontage onto the existing roads in the village.
- c) Impact on the historic environment.** Site RA/128 is within the setting of the Grade II listed rectory and much of it has historically been associated with the Rectory, whose principle elevation it faces. The historical approach to the Rectory was through it. Redevelopment will impact the setting and ability to understand the historic and evidential value of the Rectory, and therefore its significance. This will be exacerbated by the need for new access into the site against the current boundary of the Rectory, confusing the historic circulation associated with the grade II listed building and visually severing the green space

the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy which sets a requirement for 480 dwellings in the rural area in the period 2011-2031. The SSP2 will allocate sites across the rural area to meet this requirement.

While the draft plan identifies sites which would deliver in excess of the 140 dwelling required to meet the JCS requirement this currently provides a small buffer in case any of the sites identified do not come forward.

The criteria in policy RS04 are general policies which would apply to development proposals where appropriate.

While the proposed development would be located to the rear of properties on Griffin Road, it would have built development on two sides. With careful design this site could provide a logical extension to the village which doesn't impact

Appendix 2g - Braybrooke

from the current Rectory gardens, removing the ability to understand the historic relationship between the two spaces. Historic fabric related to the gardens and drive to the Rectory could be lost.

Development of RA/128 is also likely to impact the character of the conservation area. Its open space is an important part of the setting, and the creation of close style, back land development here will be detrimental to the historic plan form of the southern core of the village.

Therefore, the allocation of site to development is contrary to policy 185 and any development on it is likely to be contrary to national planning policy as defined in sections 16 paras 193, 194, and 196 of the NPPF (revised).

1. **d)** Vehicles would not be able to safely leave or enter the site as they will not be able to pass at the entrance. This would be exacerbated by the already significant issues with car parking due to the presence of the pub and village hall within 20m and 65m of the access respectively. Both have limited on-site parking and most users of both use Griffin Road to park. A blind corner 50 m to the north, and a busy junction 25m to the south of the access, make traffic movements in this area dangerous. There has been a number of accidents, including people overshooting the blind corner, and knocking over the wall to the front of 27 Griffin Road. To make the access safe, trees fronting the road would have to be removed, and a highways style junction created, which would detrimentally impact the character of the conservation area and village.
2. **e)** The proximity of the new development to The Swan public house is likely to result in the loss of amenity to new residents from noise from the public house, particularly during the summer months where the garden is regularly used. The pub is an important community asset and relies on large parties as part of its business. If restrictions are placed on it due to the presence of new houses nearby, this will affect its ability to attract large parties and therefore its viability.
3. **f)** Policy 11 of the Joint Core Strategy requires any development to take account of existing infrastructure. Policy RS/01 requires new development to take into account the level of existing infrastructure and services in the individual villages, as well as the proximity of these to larger settlements. We do not believe development on RA/128 will comply with

on the character of the village.

An additional criteria will be added to the policy requiring archaeological assessment.

The site is located outside the listed curtilage of the Old Rectory. There is no information in the listing description for this land relating to the site.

The assessment for this site took into account of the impact of development on the Conservation Area and Listed Building. To mitigate this impact a requirement has been added to the policy for this site to ensure that development would enhance the setting of the Listed Building and Conservation Area.

Full detail of the proposed access to the site would be considered through a planning application; however NCC Highways has rated the access as a green if accessed

Appendix 2g - Braybrooke

either of these policies. Braybrooke has limited local services: both shop and school have been lost in the past 15 years. Residents look to Desborough and Market Harborough for services but both are stretched by development there: for example the Desborough surgery is no longer taking new patients.

4. **g)** As the site has been left unmanaged for a large number of years it has become a significant area for wildlife. Seven species of bats have been identified in the area, and bat foraging routes through the site have also been identified. We are not confident that enough is understood about the biodiversity value of the site to enable this to be allocated for housing without significantly harming the natural environment.

In summary it is asserted that development on this site is not compatible with national and local policy, and as such this land should not be included within the village envelope, and should not be designated for residential development.

by a shared drive. This means that access would require minimal or no mitigation.

It is not uncommon for pubs to be located in residential areas. Environmental Health officers have been consulted through the site assessment process and had not identified any issues in relation to this site.

All sites have been considered using the same set of criteria. Those which have been assessed as most favourable against the assessment criteria are the ones which have been identified in the draft SSP2.

A criterion will be added requiring an ecological survey and mitigation.