

Appendix 2j – Geddington

Comment	KBC Response
<p>94. Support - Grafton Road, south east (Old Nursery Centre), Geddington</p>	<p>Your comment is noted.</p>
<p>159. 12.5 Geddington GED03. Agree that small scale growth could in turn benefit the village and the services it is able to provide.</p> <p>Disagree that site RA109 is a suitable housing allocation- this site provides key vista as you drive into the village and therefore this view should be retained. This proposal ignores the previous wishes of myself and other villagers when objecting the development.</p> <p>With already high noise levels an increase in the number of homes will inevitably further increase the traffic within the village which will have an adverse effect on road safety and no doubt further the issues of nuisance parking.</p>	<p>The Council is required to identify sufficient housing sites to fulfil the rural housing need over the plan period as set out within the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy. This is necessary, in order to secure housing in the most appropriate locations and maintain a strong case to defend against speculative proposals for housing development in less favourable locations. Site RA/109 was promoted in a response for a call for sites and is identified as available and deliverable. It was assessed along with other rural housing sites within the borough using assessment criteria with relevant Sustainability Appraisal objectives. The site scored favourably, whereas some other sites did not. As part of this assessment process, impacts on noise, highway capacity and access were considered in consultation with statutory consultees, and no outstanding objections which could not be overcome were raised. As a result the site has been recommended as a potential housing allocation within the draft SSP2 Local Plan.</p>
<p>173. Map. The map, as drawn, shows some of my garden within the village boundary and some of it outside. I discussed this with the planners at the roadshow who explained that the plan had been drawn from satellite images rather than with reference to land registry and was asked to raise this as a comment. I assume my log in details will be displayed to you and I await your contact.</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. A site visit has been undertaken to re-appraise the proposed settlement boundary in relation to this property. Defining the settlement boundary to follow the edge of the woodland accords with settlement boundary defining principles 1 and 2(c), as this garden area is enclosed by rural fencing, co-joined with the garden, and has a contrasting character to the open paddock located to the east and is contained and visually separated. It is not considered that inclusion of the triangular area of woodland within the settlement boundary would harm the form, structure or character of the settlement and would not conflict with principle 3(e). Although</p>

Appendix 2j – Geddington

	<p>the garden is relatively large, it is not significantly so. As it is not visually open, inclusion of this land within the settlement boundary would not conflict with principle 3(d). It is therefore recommended that the garden land be included within the settlement boundary. This recommendation will inform an update to the settlement boundary background paper and the pre-submission SSP2 Local Plan.</p>
<p>523. 12.5 Geddington. We refer to the planning consultation regarding the Car Park Land included within a class of HVI016 of the local plan. Attached is a plan identifying the land in question and is hatched.</p> <p>We wish to have this land removed from the classification as the land is a tarmaced car park and attached to a premises with commercial planning. The views from the car park are restricted due to a natural hedge and tree boundary. The views into the car park are also therefore restricted. Access to the land is via New Road as shown on the enclosed plan.</p> <p>We do not believe the land should be included within the classification of HVI016.</p>	<p>A site visit has been undertaken to re-appraise the extent of the HVILGS. The area of land (included within the HVILGS) is a landscape/verge area serving the pub car park. The car park itself is laid to tarmac, with additional sections surfaced with gravel chippings. The majority of the tree lined landscaping falls outside of the car park area, and is separated by a post and wire fence. The majority of the land is turfed, with 3 lamp standards, a birch tree and a second ornamental tree present. The land has a functional and managed appearance and clearly associated with the White Horse Public House. It is agreed that the views into the car park are restricted largely to a small section of New Road which the car park access adjoins. Views from the south (from public right of way GL/005) are also limited to the landscape features which sit adjacent to the site and beyond the recently permitted equestrian site. The land in question was included within HVILGS on the basis that it formed part of 'an extensive open space in the centre of the village, provides views to the church and the conservation area and helps create the rural feel of the village'. However, it is clear from the site visit, that the land sits outside of the main open space area referred to within the Historically and Visually Important Open Space : Background Paper (September 2015) and does not meet the criteria for defining HVILGS. As a result, it will be recommended that this area of land is removed from</p>

Appendix 2j – Geddington

	<p>the HVILGS HVI016.</p>
<p>439. Site RA/110 Policy GED04 - Old Nursery Site, Grafton Road is within Flood Zone 2. The selection of this site has to be subject to the flood risk sequential test.</p>	<p>The draft site allocation was made after the site was assessed along with other rural housing sites within the borough using assessment criteria with relevant Sustainability Appraisal objectives. The site scored favourably, whereas some other sites did not. As part of this assessment process, flood risk was considered in consultation with statutory consultees, including the Environment Agency. Previously the Environment Agency highlighted that part of the site falls within flood zone 2 and that proposed development should be considered under the Environment Agency’s standard advice. In response to this, the site promoter undertook a flood risk assessment, and proposes to focus built development solely within flood zone 1 area in accordance with national policy, employ raised floor levels, leaving solely greenfield land within flood zone 2. SUDS will also be employed. As a result, the development is not located within flood zone 2 and a flood risk sequential approach has been applied to development of the site. The issue of flood risk is identified in criteria (e) of Policy GED04, however these is scope</p>

Appendix 2j – Geddington

	to refine this further by placing a requirement for a sequential test to be applied in future development of the site, or to exclude flood zone 2 area from the site allocation.
316. GED04. This should be supported by an appropriate level of archaeological assessment.	Your comment is noted. This point has sought to be addressed through criteria (f), but can be made more explicit in line with the comment received.
328. Policy GED03 Geddington South East, Site RA/109. Disagree with development of Site 109, as building a large number of homes on this site will have a significant impact on my privacy. Windows to much of the living area face this site and the proximity of my home to the boundary provides no opportunity for screening. Noise and light pollution during and after construction will be considerable. The boundary to the current houses is a natural soft edge of native planting and a low minimal fence, I have no confidence that development of this site will be discreet, and the loss of a soft natural view of the countryside around the village will be gone forever.	Your comment is noted. An additional development principle criteria is proposed for the site (Policy GED03) which will require development to be laid out and designed in a way which incorporates a scheme of measures to protect the amenity (including protecting privacy, and impacts from noise and light pollution) of occupiers of properties to the north. The scheme of measures will include an appropriate separation buffer between properties and their curtilages, as well as appropriate boundary treatments. This will be included within the Pre-submission SSP2 Local Plan.
359. Policy GED03. Reference is made to the preparation of a scheme to assess the impact of odour from a Water Recycling Centre in Anglian Water's ownership. To be effective it is suggested it is made clear that the layout of the site will need to be designed to ensure that a suitable distance is maintained between occupied land and buildings and Geddington Water Recycling Centre based upon an assessment of odour impact. This would ensure that there would be no adverse impact on future occupants of regularly occupied land and buildings, arising from the proximity of the proposed development to the Geddington Water Recycling Centre and that allocated site does	Your comment is noted. Criteria (i) of Policy GED04 sought to address the issues raised, however, further amendment to criteria (i) is proposed to be included in the Pre-submission SSP2 Local Plan to fully address concerns raised. The agreed wording is <i>'incorporate a scheme for the assessment of potential risk of odour associated with the nearby Geddington Water Recycling Centre (WRC) which shall demonstrate that an acceptable impact on the occupiers of the new dwellings is achieved without detriment to the continuous operation of the</i>

Appendix 2j – Geddington

<p>not prejudice the continued operation of the existing site.</p>	<p><i>WRC. As part of the scheme to be approved, a detailed masterplan will be submitted which demonstrates that occupied land and buildings within the site are at a suitable distance from the WRC to address potential risk of odour impact to a standard to be agreed by Anglian Water’.</i></p>
<p>540. 12.5 Geddington. The Boughton Estate has promoted two sites for residential development through the Local Plan Part 2 process, both of which are proposed allocations in the Draft Plan; Geddington Sawmill (RA/107/GED02) and Geddington South East (RA/109/GED03). The Boughton Estate supports the allocations of these two sites.</p>	<p>Your comment is noted.</p>
<p>541. Policy GED01 Geddington Development Principles. 29.The Estate has the following comments on the proposed development principles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part b) preserve and enhance the green corridor running through the centre of Geddington – this part of the policy is considered to be ambiguous and requires further information on the importance of the green corridor and how it should be preserved and enhanced. It should also be made clear that enhancement measures are only required where there will be a negative impact upon this area. • Part h) contribution towards the provision of a footpath along the River Ise / traffic calming / public realm improvements - Schemes for the above improvements should be identified as it is not currently clear if these improvements are deliverable through developer contributions arising from the 30 dwellings proposed in Geddington. Developer contributions should be 	<p>Your comments are noted. Through the emerging Pre-submission SSP2 Local Plan, the Local Planning Authority has decided it is more appropriate to address issues covered by criterion (b) of the development principles of Policy GED01, to be included within Policy ENV01 (Local Green Infrastructure Corridors) instead, as these are more general and will apply to the whole borough. Policy ENV01 will therefore be strengthened further as a result of other comments received through the draft SSP2 Local Plan consultation. Aside from this, the Green Corridor is largely covered either by HVILGS, protected outdoor sports facilities or amenity open space, or the River Ise. As a result, criteria (b) [which will be addressed through amendments to Policy ENV01] accords with the prevailing approach to protect this green corridor. The concept of ‘preserving or enhancing’ is widely accepted within current planning legislation such as the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and does not need to be expanded upon within the policy. However, supportive text could provide further context if this is considered ambiguous in isolation.</p>

Appendix 2j – Geddington

<p>sought in accordance with Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 in that they are a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; b) directly related to the development; and c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part i) reflect the positive character of the historic core – this part of the policy is considered to be ambiguous and further description should be provided on what the Council is aiming to achieve. • Part j) use high quality materials – any future proposals would be informed by a design code that reflect the character of the surrounding area whilst being economically viable. • Part k) high quality fenestration using natural materials – any future proposals would be informed by a design code that reflect the character of the surrounding area whilst being economically viable. 	<p>With respect of criterion (h) of policy GED01, the policy clearly states that ‘development’ will ‘contribute towards’ enhancements referred to. This will be necessary in order to mitigate against the negative impacts from increased use of these routes arising from inhabitants of new development, but can only be required where development yield triggers the requirement for a S106 agreement. The River Ise is a key feature running through Geddington, which benefits all residents (existing and new). Stamford Road / New Road / Kettering Road is a key arterial route serving the village.</p> <p>With respect of criterion (i) of policy GED01, further reference can be given, to highlight the special character of the historic core including the street enclosure, use of traditional building materials, etc.</p> <p>With respect of criterion (j) and (k) of policy GED01, the JCS does not explicitly require a design code to be prepared; this is normally a requirement for larger schemes, and is not necessarily applicable to smaller schemes, such as individual dwellings and/or extensions to existing dwellings. The requirement for the use of high quality materials is something which should be retained.</p>
<p>542. Policy GED02 Geddington Sawmill, Grafton Road. This site is owned by the Boughton Estate. Further to the call for sites submission prepared in 2016, a noise assessment was carried out and submitted to the Council in April 2017. This concluded that the development of the site for housing could be made acceptable in noise terms through a variety of mitigation measures. The Council’s Environmental</p>	<p>Your comments are noted. Criteria (b) of Policy GED02 seeks to achieve a clear sense of street enclosure as achieved within the historic core by the positioning of buildings along the highway; this can also be achieved through the use of boundary walls, which also reinforces a key historic feature present within the town.</p>

Appendix 2j – Geddington

<p>Protection Team confirmed that the assessment was satisfactory and the Council has progressed with a proposed allocation. The allocation of the site for 10 dwellings is supported.</p> <p>The Estate broadly accepts the proposed policy requirements at parts a) to f) of GED02, although further explanation of what the Council is trying to achieve in part b) (clearly defined street enclosure to the west of the site) should be provided. Part g) of the policy seeks to retain mature trees as part of the development. However, in order for the development to front on to the street (a proposed policy requirement of GED01), some non-mature trees along the western frontage will require removal. Trees along the southern boundary would be retained. A tree survey will be submitted as part of the proposals which will assess the quality of existing trees. However, the policy should make it clear that the removal of trees along the site frontage in order to accommodate an appropriate layout would be acceptable.</p>	<p>In response to your comment, it is recommended to revise criteria (g) so that conflict between policy requirements (i.e. criteria (b)) is minimised. Instead, it is recommended that a tree management scheme is provided, which would incorporate a survey and management plan and could set out a justification for the retention/loss of trees.</p>
<p>543. 32. This site is owned by the Boughton Estate. Further to representations prepared in 2016, an odour assessment which assessed the potential impacts of the Geddington wastewater treatment works on the site was carried out and submitted to the Council in August 2017. In response to this assessment, a revised layout was prepared which demonstrated how the delivery of 10 dwellings could be achieved without adverse odour impacts (appended to these representations). The opportunity was also taken at this stage to address officers' comments about the design of the scheme. Dwellings were positioned to face out on to</p>	<p>Your comments are noted. Site RA/109 Geddington South East previously covered a larger area. The site was originally considered through the Kettering Borough Rural Masterplanning Report (February 2012), where a recommendation was followed to reduce the site size in order to respect the character of the area and deliver a gateway development on this site. As a result, the Council is not minded to re-extend the site boundary. With respect of the requirement for noise assessment, the site will be located within close proximity of the primary highway route running through Geddington to Corby. Although the route is a 30mph highway, the volume of traffic is significant. As a</p>

Appendix 2j – Geddington

Kettering Road, mirroring the development on the opposite side of the road. In response to comments from Anglian Water about a potential AW asset within the site boundary, a 6 metre easement was incorporated along the site frontage, to account for the possibility that the asset may sit inside the existing hedgerow.

33. The Estate supports the allocation of the site for 10-11 dwellings.

34. However, the Estate is of the view that the site boundary should be extended in accordance with that shown on the submitted layout. It is considered that this very slightly larger site represents a more suitable option where an enhanced layout and design can be achieved, particularly when taking account of the character of development to the north of the site (the proposed larger site would match up with the extended back gardens of these properties and their hedges and boundaries).

35. In terms of the policy requirements set out at parts a) to m) of GED03, the accompanying layout demonstrates that parts b), c), d), e), g),h) and k) are capable of being met. The Estate accepts that as part of any detailed application, details relating to parts a), f), i), k) and m) would be required by the Council. However with regards to part j), it is the Estate's position that a noise assessment would not be necessary. Kettering Road has been de-trunked, is subject to a 30mph speed limit across the site frontage and sits opposite residential development. The Council should therefore provide further justification of the need for a noise assessment.

result, a noise assessment will be required to identify the extent of the impact and whether any mitigation measures are required to reduce the impacts to an acceptable level.

Appendix 2j – Geddington

<p>493. In respect of the draft Local Plan details received I note that in respect of my land The Paddocks previously designated HVI016 has now been determined a white farmland following the revision of the Village Boundary, previously river line now revised to house and garden line.</p> <p>On discussions for HVI016 you made a site visit and noted my garden area extended into the Paddock to include designated wood. In addition you have noted in 2016 that Planning Authority KE/86/0878 was granted for a Stable Block and food store.</p> <p>In these circumstances with the change of proposed Village Boundary need amendment.</p>	<p>The land was visited on 19th October 2018. It is evident that part of the garden serving the property has been historically enlarged to include part of the adjacent paddock for a considerable period of time and should be included within the settlement boundary [in line with settlement boundary defining principles 1, and 2c] as it is clearly delineated from the wider open countryside by fencing; and is positioned in a way that would not introduce a risk of harmful development or appear visually associated with the wider open countryside. The adjacent paddock itself is both independently accessed and partially visible from the highway and visually open and physically separate from the garden land by post and rail fence and conversely does have a wide open appearance with a strong rural character, emphasised by landscape features and a stable/rural store building. In addition, development of this land could harm the green wedge running through Geddington. Exclusion of this paddock land accords with settlement boundary defining principles 3d and 3e. As a result, this land should remain outside of the settlement boundary in order to afford it sufficient protection. This recommendation will inform an update to the settlement boundary background paper and the Pre-submission SSP2 Local Plan.</p>
<p>531. 12.5 Geddington. Designated Green Space "The two small strips of land to be included in the designated green space areas".</p>	<p>Land south of St. Mary Magdalen's Church and along Church Hill to the west of the church is highway verge / amenity land and is not open space in the sense of falling within one of the PPG17 typologies. In addition, it is located between / adjacent a number of grade I and II listed properties in a central position of the village within the designated Conservation Area. As a result, the land already benefits from a high degree of protection through these constraints and although the land is located within the historic core of the village, it is considered that additional protection through HVILGS designation is not necessary in this instance.</p>