

Appendix 2p - Pytchley

Comment	KBC Response
<p>322. Policy PYT02 Two field on the outskirts of Pytchley d. Include an assessment to determine the extent and scale of potential archaeological features.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>
<p>422. Chapter 12.13 Pytchley</p> <p>1. We object to the Housing Allocation proposals for Pytchley set out in Policy PYT02 of the draft Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan for Kettering. The Policy proposes the allocation of land on Isham Road Pytchley for the provision of up to 8 residential dwellings. The site is located at the eastern end of the village beyond the village boundary identified in the 1995 Local Plan. The policy sets out the following parameters for development:</p> <p><i>Development will</i></p> <p>a. <i>Include up to 8 dwellings.</i></p> <p>b. <i>Provide on-site turning is essential to make direct access frontages of Isham Road possible.</i></p> <p>c. <i>Respect the pattern of built form along Isham Road, and therefore would be linear in nature and set back from Isham Road.</i></p> <p>d. <i>Include an assessment to determine the extent and scale of potential archaeological features.</i></p> <p>e. <i>Ensure plots sizes are of similar size, including gardens of adjoining properties on Isham Road.</i></p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan is yet to reach a stage where there is significant certainty that the plan will succeed at referendum and be made, therefore policies for Pytchley will take precedent until such time.</p> <p>The development principles set out in Policy PYT01 have been informed by the Options consultation document from March 2012, which was subject to consultation at this time. No comments were received to object to these and therefore have been carried forward to the Draft Plan document.</p> <p>The allocation of sites can include land adjacent to existing settlement boundaries as set out in Policy 11 of the Joint Core Strategy; Local plans...will identify sites within or adjoining the villages to meet the rural housing requirement in Table 5'. The SSP2 is looking to allocate sites in the Rural Area to fulfil the residual housing requirement of 140 dwellings which has been calculated through subtracting the existing commitments and completions from the JCS housing requirement of 480 and allowing a 140 dwelling windfall figure.</p> <p>With regards to settlement boundaries the existing boundary as defined in the 1995 Local Plan does not include the site</p>

Appendix 2p - Pytchley

The Part 2 Local Plan is being prepared alongside an emerging Neighbourhood Plan for the village of Pytchley. The site in Isham Road is similarly identified as a housing allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan mirroring the proposals in the Part 2 Local Plan. However the allocation of this land for development in both plans does not match the objectives of either plan, nor does it address the particular needs of the local community. Policy PYT01 of the Part 2 Local Plan specifies the development principles which will apply in Pytchley as follows:

Development in Pytchley will:

- a. Development should reflect the character of the historic core.*
- b. The gap between Pytchley and Kettering should be maintained.*
- c. Development should front onto and abut the street or where set back stone walls should be used to continue the sense of enclosure.*
- d. Development should reflect the hierarchy of streets in the historic core, with narrow informal streets which create a pedestrian friendly environment.*
- e. Development should contribute towards the following identified improvements to the village:*
 - i. Improvements to the recreation ground,*
 - ii. The creation of a safe pedestrian/cycle route to Kettering,*

and is currently outside of the settlement boundary. However through the Settlement Boundary Defining Principles which are included in the Settlement Boundary Background Paper (update April 2018), under principle 3b), new allocations can be included within the proposed settlement boundary. Therefore if allocated the site will be included with the settlement boundary for Pytchley.

Development of the site would not further extend the extent of built development eastwards towards Kettering, given that there is currently residential dwelling and coach depot on Isham Road. As this is not proposed to be included within the settlement boundary, further development beyond this would be considered to be open countryside and therefore unless it is considered under Saved Local Plan Policy RA5 or Policy 13 of the JCS, would not be supported, under Saved Local Plan Policy 7.

Those issues which have been identified as part of the work undertaken to prepare the Neighbourhood Plan should be based on robust evidence that can be used to justify the inclusion of policies to address these issues.

The level of growth proposed in Pytchley is considered to be

Appendix 2p - Pytchley

iii. Traffic calming throughout the villages

Whilst a number of the development principles can be addressed through the process of detailed design, the development of the Isham Road site is not consistent with the principle of maintaining the gap between Pytchley and Kettering as it will involve further eastward expansion of the village beyond the current extent of the village boundary. Similarly there is nothing within Policy PYT02 to suggest that this allocation should contribute towards any of the improvements which are identified as being required in the village. Because of the proposed scale of the housing allocation, there is no necessity that the scheme should be subject to a S106 obligation and therefore the ability to deliver any off-site improvements such as those identified in Policy PYT01, and which will be exacerbated by further development in the village, will be lost. The allocation is likely to lead to the further development of relatively unaffordable market housing in the village, which will contribute to further pressures on existing facilities and amenities.

The emerging Neighbourhood Plan also identifies various issues which need to be addressed within the village and which were identified as a result of consultation with the community through the Neighbourhood Plan process. In particular the following issues were identified as being of concern:

- 1) A lack of low cost starter units.
- 2) Existing recreational facilities at a premium and concern about the quality of existing play facilities.

proportionate to the size of the settlement and the range of facilities and services the village. This is considered through the site assessment process when looking at sites individually as well as a whole when deciding on recommendations to take to Planning Policy Committee. As mentioned above, the level of proposed growth through allocations in the Rural Area of exceeds the residual requirement of 140 with rural allocations in the Draft Plan totalling 171-179. Given the emphasis placed on the protection of the rural area and a limited ability absorb further development, additional growth beyond the proposed levels of development in the rural area is likely to result in harm to the open countryside and put significant strain on existing services and facilities in these settlements.

The promoted site was previously considered in the Rural Masterplanning Report (February 2012) under site reference RA/119, and it was stated that because of a number of reasons such as the scale of development as well as infrastructure capacity and access, the site was not taken forward as a proposed housing option.

The findings of the Rural Masterplanning Report as a whole initially shaped the allocations in the Options paper (March 2012). From this point work has been undertaken to assess sites that have been under consideration as housing allocations. The latest site assessments have been used to inform recommendations and decisions on housing allocations in the SSP2.

This site was considered at options stage and discounted as

Appendix 2p - Pytchley

3) Issues with on street parking.

Again there is nothing in Policy PYT02 to suggest that the Isham Road allocation could, or should, address these problems. Because of the scale of the development, it is again likely to fall below the level at which a S106 Planning Obligation would be needed and will therefore not be required to deliver any affordable housing or open space provision. There is similarly no ability to deliver improvements to existing play facilities or address the village parking problem.

As such there is inconsistency between Policy PYT01 and Policy PYT02 of the Part 2 Local Plan and also inconsistency with the emerging Neighbourhood Plan. The policies will therefore fail to deliver the core objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which seeks to deliver “a wide choice of high quality homes, widen opportunities for home ownership and create sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities”. In particular it states that Local Authorities should “identify the size, type, tenure and range of housing that is required in particular locations, reflecting local demand”. There is nothing within Policy PYT02 to demonstrate how the Isham Road allocation will address local demand, and it is our view that the allocation will specifically fail to address the needs identified in the Neighbourhood Plan which points to a lack of low cost starter units.

In the rural areas the NPPF says specifically that “to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities”. There is nothing in our opinion within Policy PYT02 and the Isham Road allocation which demonstrates that housing development on

a housing option for the reasons set out above. It remained a discounted housing option in the consultation on the Site Specific Proposals Local Development Housing Allocations Assessment of Additional Sites and Update (October 2013) consultation.

Therefore, given that the residual requirement for the rural area has been exceeded by the proposed allocations in the Rural Area and further development is likely to result in harm to the open countryside, the site identified in Pytchley of a scale which is considered to be sufficient. As a result, no further allocations in Pytchley will be considered.

Appendix 2p - Pytchley

this site, at the scale identified, will deliver any benefit to the village and certainly will not help enhance or maintain the vitality of the community, but instead contribute further to the problems which have been identified through the Neighbourhood process.

It is our view that development at the scale proposed is insufficient to meet the needs of the village and that for a village of the size of Pytchley the allocation of a site for only 8 dwellings is relatively low. It is our view that a slightly larger allocation could help deliver much needed community benefit, outweighing any impact of further development. It is also our view that a site more appropriately located at the heart of the village could do more to maintain and enhance the character of the settlement rather than allowing further development on the periphery of the settlement which will only exacerbate the village's spread towards Kettering.

2. *The following site is proposed as part of the alternative strategy advocated above*

Land off Stringers Hill Pytchley

We act on behalf of the owners of the land identified edged in red on the plan which is located at the heart of the village, accessed off Stringers Hill.

This is a discrete land parcel owned by a family trust and is approximately 9 acres in size. It is grazed by a local farmer but is not a viable land holding in its own right. Whilst we do not advocate development on the entire area, we do believe that the land parcel should be treated as an entity for development purposes and as such there is the opportunity to create areas of

Appendix 2p - Pytchley

open space within the site, both formal and informal, to enable public access and enhance the recreational offer of the village. Public footpaths run along the eastern and southern boundaries of the site, enhancing the site's integration into the village and offering outward recreational access from the site. Existing trees and hedgerows within the site can be retained to further enhance the recreational provision and a small brook running through the site can be utilised as a focus for a linear belt of informal open space running north-west to south-east through the site and linking Stringers Hill to public footpath GW2. We would anticipate the provision of a more formal area of play space within any development which should include provision of children's play facilities.

There is also potential within any development to provide off road parking facilities particularly for those properties in Stringers Hill and Lower End.

The location of the site at the heart of the village offers the unique opportunity to deliver a contained and integrated form of development and one which will maintain the compact character of the settlement rather than promoting outward linear expansion. New residents will have immediate access to existing village amenities such as the School, Pub, Village Hall and Church, by foot, and a design led approach to development would ensure that development is complimentary to and compatible with the conservation area, within which a northern portion of the land falls.

We would propose a scale of development in the region of 25-30 units for the site. This would include a mix of house types and sizes to meet all needs but would include a proportion of starter

Appendix 2p - Pytchley

<p>units. It would also include the required level of affordable housing specified in the Joint Core Strategy, being 40%. The specific tenure mix would be determined by specific needs assessment, but with the anticipation that a range of tenures will be delivered in line with NPPF requirements.</p> <p><u>3. Conclusions</u></p> <p>We believe that there is conflict and inconsistency between the development policies for Pytchley in the emerging Part 2 Local Plan. We do not believe that the proposed allocation of land off Isham Road for 8 units is consistent with the development principles set out in policy PYT01, nor does it address the issues that have been identified in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan. We promote as an alternative, the allocation of land off Stringers Hill for the development of between 25-30 dwellings. We would advocate that the development should deliver a mix of housing types and tenures, including starter units and 40% affordable units. The scheme should include both formal and informal open space provision, including provision of children’s play facilities. The scheme should integrate with the public rights of way system and housing design should be of a high standard focussing on the need to conserve and enhance the character of the conservation area</p>	
<p>429. Chapter 12.13 Pytchley</p> <p>This note has been prepared on behalf of **** of Geddington Farm as part of the draft Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan (SSP2) and is submitted to Kettering Borough Council for consideration.</p> <p>It is made in respect of Land south of Isham Road, Pytchley which</p>	<p>The site that has been promoted has yet to be considered for allocation at any stage during work on the SSP2. The site identified in Pytchley of a scale which is considered to be sufficient.</p> <p>The level of growth proposed in Pytchley is considered to be</p>

Appendix 2p - Pytchley

<p>extends to circa 1.4 hectares and identified on Figure 1.1 below.</p> <p>Figure 1.1 Land south of Isham Road, Pytchley</p> <p>It is our belief that the proposed approach to housing delivery and subsequent allocations in the SSP2 are insufficient to meet the housing needs of the rural areas.</p> <p>The Site</p> <p>The site is located to the north east of Pytchley on land to the south of Isham Road. The site is rectangular in shape and adjoins an existing residential property to its west, with The Elms farmstead beyond. Residential dwellings, including a new proposed allocation (RA/117) lie immediately to the north and open countryside to the east and south. The site is currently in agricultural use.</p> <p>Pytchley is considered to be a sustainable location for development and includes a number of facilities / services including a primary school, public house, church and community building.</p> <p>The allocation of this site would be a natural continuation of the existing linear form of development in the village. It is anticipated that the site could accommodate a minimum of 16 dwellings.</p> <p>Draft SSP2 Policies</p> <p>This section of the report will consider the draft policies of the SSP2. The various subheadings of this part of the report will follow</p>	<p>proportionate to the size of the settlement and the range of facilities and services the village. This is considered through the site assessment process when looking at sites individually as well as a whole when deciding on recommendations to take to Planning Policy Committee. As mentioned above, the level of proposed growth through allocations in the Rural Area of exceeds the residual requirement of 140 with rural allocations in the Draft Plan totalling 171-179. Given the emphasis placed on the protection of the rural area and a limited ability absorb further development, additional growth beyond the proposed levels of development in the rural area is likely to result in harm to the open countryside and put significant strain on existing services and facilities in these settlements.</p> <p>The windfall allowance used was used in the preparation of the JCS in the identification of the rural housing requirement. A paper will be prepared to accompany the consultation on the pre-submission plan which will provide the evidence used in identifying the level of windfall development in the rural area.</p>
--	--

Appendix 2p - Pytchley

those used in the SSP2 to ensure easier cross reference.

1. *Housing Requirements Section*

Table 4.1 shows the housing requirement for each of the four towns in Kettering Borough and the rural area including details of the historical dwelling completion rate, residential commitments and proposed allocations. In the rural areas, a need of 280 dwellings remains once commitments and allocations have been accounted for. It is expected 140 dwellings of these will be delivered through windfall sites (10 dwellings per annum).

This strategy, which ultimately underpins the housing allocations, is inappropriate given that national planning policy is clear that windfall sites should not be relied upon to meet housing targets unless there is compelling evidence for them to do so. Paragraph 48 of the National Planning Policy Framework is clear when it states *“Local planning authorities may make an allowance for windfall sites in the five-year supply if they have compelling evidence that such sites have consistently become available in the local area and will continue to provide a reliable source of supply. Any allowance should be realistic”*.

Whilst it is acknowledged that there has been a historic delivery of windfall sites, we are not aware of there being any robust evidence having been prepared to demonstrate why the Council believe this rate of delivery will continue. It is also important to note that windfall sites are a finite resource and possibilities for infilling have and will continue to diminish, resulting in a significantly slower delivery of windfall sites. Therefore to assume that windfall sites in the rural areas will continue to be developed at the same historic

Appendix 2p - Pytchley

rate would be in appropriate. Many of the historically delivered windfall sites are likely to have been 'easy win' sites for which planning permission was easier to secure. In reality, it is likely that future windfall sites will come forward at a significantly slower rate. This will be compounded by tightly defined settlement boundaries which will further restrict delivery.

In conclusion, the reliance of the SSP2 on the delivery of windfall sites to meet half of the rural area requirement is not consistent with the approach set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. For the reasons given above, the Council must review its policy and take an active role in allocating more sites in the rural areas.

2. Rural Areas Section

As above, Table 12.1 repeats the housing targets for the rural areas, noting that 140 of the 280 required dwellings will come forward as windfall sites.

Policy RS01 defines Pytchley as Category A village.

Paragraph 12.12 states that the scale of development in individual villages will be predominantly led by locally identified housing requirements through this plan as well as Neighbourhood Plans. One of the key considerations recognises that the proximity of the village to nearby settlements of a larger size will also be an important consideration in considering housing delivery.

Paragraph 12.13 states that a number of villages in the Rural Area provide a wider range of services and facilities than that provided

Appendix 2p - Pytchley

in smaller rural settlements and are able to provide a sustainable local service centre role. Therefore development should be focused in these areas.

While this is an appropriate designation for the village, it is not agreed that villages should only accommodate local growth particularly when they are sustainable locations. Pytchley is a village located in close proximity to facilities and services of Kettering. Indeed, this is recognised by Policy RS01 Category A villages which states that “Development in these villages will need 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”.

Due to its proximity to Kettering, Pytchley is considered to be a sustainable location for growth. Accordingly, it should also be recognised in the SSP2 that the village can accommodate more growth than that allocated for in Table 12.26 ‘Pytchley’. As a result, Land South of Isham Road should be allocated the SSP21 thus accommodating a greater quantum of housing than SSP2 presently allows for.

The need for additional housing allocations in the rural areas is evident by our comments above on the ‘Housing Section’ above, in particular that the strategy to deliver half of the requirement through windfall sites is unrealistic and inappropriate.

3. *Pytchley Section*

Table 12.26 proposes the allocation of just one site in Pytchley to provide 8 dwellings over the plan period. This is wholly inadequate

Appendix 2p - Pytchley

and should be increased to reflect its sustainable location.

Map 12.13 defines the settlement boundary for Pytchley where development may be permitted.

This tightly defined boundary excludes many areas of developable land and is clearly at odds with the allocation of Pytchley as a Category A village, which has a greater ability to accommodate growth due to its existing facilities / services and its proximity to Kettering. As detailed above, it is clear that Pytchley represents a sustainable rural settlement which has sufficient infrastructure to accommodate a greater level of growth due to its proximity to Kettering.

In considering the settlement boundary, whilst it is noted that they are an appropriate mechanism for development plans, the SSP2 seems to have created a situation in Pytchley, and indeed the other Category A villages, where the village boundary is defined to support the positive planning for growth, and yet restricts it by leaving limited sites suitable for future development. The settlement boundary should be redrawn to identify areas within the village boundary that can allow a greater level of growth to come forward to meet local needs. It is therefore proposed that the settlement boundary is extended to include Land South of Isham Road, Pytchley.

Conclusions

In light of the above, it is clear that there are serious deficiencies in the SSP2 strategy and proposed allocation in the rural areas. The heavy reliance on windfall sites is not based on clear and

Appendix 2p - Pytchley

compelling evidence and is contrary to the advice contained in the National Planning Policy Framework.

Development plans have a role in both reflecting the wishes of the community and proactively pursuing growth for the future. The SSP2 should therefore take the initiative to support further allocations in rural communities where they are a sustainable form of development that can support local services for the future.

The site at Land South of Isham Road, Pytchley is a logical choice as it follows the existing linear pattern of development in the village and is located adjacent to existing residential properties on Isham Road. The site is also within a short walk of local services and facilities and those contained within Kettering.

The allocation of the site would also address deficiencies with the current strategy, in particular that half of the housing development in the rural areas will come via windfall sites. On the basis that the majority of the infill sites have already been developed, it is likely that future windfall sites will come forward at a significantly slower rate than they have in the past. This will be compounded by the tightly defined village boundaries resulting in a significant deficiency in the rural areas.

For the reasons given above, it is suggested that the rural housing strategy and allocations in SSP2 is reviewed and Land South of Isham Road is allocated for residential development on the basis that it offers a sustainable and logical site for future growth in the village. This will ensure that the Plan meets national planning policy, provides for the needs of the local community and provides

Appendix 2p - Pytchley

<p>a sustainable future for the village of Pytchley.</p> <p>In addition to the allocation of the site, it is also suggested the Borough Council also adjust the village boundary to include Land South of Isham Road, Pytchley so that it can be brought forward for development.</p>	
<p>445. Chapter 12.13 Pytchley</p> <p>This note has been prepared on behalf of Home Farm Pytchley Ltd in relation to the draft Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan (SSP2) and is submitted to Kettering Borough Council for consideration.</p> <p>It is made in respect of Land South of Home Farm, Pytchley which extends to circa 0.35 hectares and identified by Figure 1.1 below.</p> <p>Figure 1.1 Site Plan</p> <p>It is our belief that the proposed approach to housing delivery and subsequent allocations in the SSP2 are insufficient to meet the housing needs of the rural areas.</p> <p>The Site</p> <p>The site forms part of the Home Farm estate which is situated at the southern end of Butchers Lane. Planning permission was granted under planning application Ref. KET/2013/0006 for the demolition of various farm buildings and the erection of 8 dwellings. This permission was implemented through the construction of an access road.</p> <p>The site subject to these representations lies immediately to the</p>	<p>A site covering a similar area to that proposed was put forward at the Options stage consultation but was subsequently assessed and discounted in the Housing Allocations Assessment of Additional Sites and Update (Oct 2013). At this stage it was stated the reason for this was significant access and highway constraints.</p> <p>The level of growth proposed in Pytchley is considered to be proportionate to the size of the settlement and the range of facilities and services the village. This is considered through the site assessment process when looking at sites individually as well as a whole when deciding on recommendations to take to Planning Policy Committee. As mentioned above, the level of proposed growth through allocations in the Rural Area of exceeds the residual requirement of 140 with rural allocations in the Draft Plan totalling 171-179. Given the emphasis placed on the protection of the rural area and a limited ability absorb further development, additional growth beyond the proposed levels of development in the rural area is likely to result in harm to the open countryside and put significant strain on existing services and facilities in these settlements.</p>

Appendix 2p - Pytchley

<p>south of the consented scheme and includes various agricultural barns which are no longer in use. The site was not included within the scope of the previously consented scheme as it was still in agricultural use at the time. The allocation of this site would result in a natural continuation of the consented development at Home Farm.</p> <p>Access to the site can be secured by various means including the new access road which will serve the KET/2013/0006 proposals. On the basis that the site is under the same ownership, these arrangements would be straightforward.</p> <p>Pytchley includes a number of facilities and services including a primary school, public house, church and community building, all of which are within easy walking distance of the site. It is a sustainable location for growth and is well related to Kettering allowing further access to excellent transport links and employment uses.</p>	<p>Therefore, given that the residual requirement for the rural area has been exceeded by the proposed allocations in the Rural Area and further development is likely to result in harm to the open countryside, the site identified in Pytchley of a scale which is considered to be sufficient. As a result, no further allocations in Pytchley will be considered.</p>
<p>448. Chapter 12.13 Pytchley</p> <p>Table 12.26 proposes the allocation of just one site in Pytchley to provide 8 dwellings over the plan period. This is wholly inadequate and should be increased to reflect the villages sustainable location and the need for more housing allocations in the rural areas (please see our comments in Section 1 above).</p> <p>Map 12.13 defines the settlement boundary for Pytchley where development may be permitted. This tightly defined boundary excludes many areas of developable land and is clearly at odds with the allocation of Pytchley as a Category A village and its ability to accommodate growth due to its existing facilities and its</p>	<p>The level of growth proposed in Pytchley is considered to be proportionate to the size of the settlement and the range of facilities and services the village. This is considered through the site assessment process when looking at sites individually as well as a whole when deciding on recommendations to take to Planning Policy Committee. As mentioned above, the level of proposed growth through allocations in the Rural Area of exceeds the residual requirement of 140 with rural allocations in the Draft Plan totalling 171-179. Given the emphasis placed on the protection of the rural area and a limited ability absorb</p>

Appendix 2p - Pytchley

<p>proximity to Kettering.</p> <p>Whilst it is noted that settlement boundaries are an appropriate mechanism for development plans, the SSP2 seems to have created a situation in Pytchley, and indeed the other Category A villages, where the village boundary is defined to support the positive planning for growth, and yet restricts it by leaving limited sites suitable for future development.</p> <p>The omission of the remaining Home Farm site is a clear and obvious example of this. It is proposed that the settlement boundary should be redrawn to include the site as being within the village boundary.</p>	<p>further development further development beyond the proposed levels of development in the rural area is likely to result in harm to the open countryside and put significant strain on existing services and facilities in these settlements.</p> <p>Settlement boundaries are used to make a distinction between the open countryside and the urban form of settlements and provide certainty over where development is likely to be acceptable. The principles that have been used to define the settlement boundaries have been formulated through previous work from 2005 and been updated a number of times to ensure they provide an up-to-date and robust evidence base to accurately define the settlement boundary for settlements in Kettering Borough. The Council believes that these principles allow for the defining of settlement boundaries which clearly define the built framework and open countryside. This allows for the simultaneous protection of the open countryside whilst allowing for growth in areas of these settlements in suitable locations within the existing built environment.</p> <p>This area is not included within the existing settlement boundary for Pytchley and has not been included within the proposed settlement boundary in accordance with principle 3c) of the Settlement Boundary Defining Principles in the Settlement Boundary Background Paper (Update) April 2018. This excludes isolated development which is physically or visually detached from the settlement, including farm buildings.</p> <p>Two amendments has been made in relation to the site to the north, which have been made in accordance with</p>
---	---

Appendix 2p - Pytchley

	<p>principle 2a), given that the site has planning permission. The principle ensures existing commitments for built development are included within the proposed settlement boundary.</p>
<p>450. Chapter 12.13 Pytchley</p> <p>It is suggested that the rural housing strategy and allocations in SSP2 is reviewed and Land South of Home Farm is allocated for residential development. It is a sustainable and logical extension to the settlement and is within easy access of local services and the facilities within Kettering.</p> <p>In addition to the allocation of the site, it is also suggested the Borough Council also adjusts the village boundary so that the site can be brought forward for development.</p>	<p>The level of growth proposed in Pytchley is considered to be proportionate to the size of the settlement and the range of facilities and services the village. This is considered through the site assessment process when looking at sites individually as well as a whole when deciding on recommendations to take to Planning Policy Committee. As mentioned above, the level of proposed growth through allocations in the Rural Area of exceeds the residual requirement of 140 with rural allocations in the Draft Plan totalling 171-179. Given the emphasis placed on the protection of the rural area and a limited ability absorb further development further development beyond the proposed levels of development in the rural area is likely to result in harm to the open countryside and put significant strain on existing services and facilities in these settlements. Therefore, the site identified in Pytchley of a scale which is considered to be sufficient.</p> <p>The settlement boundary for Pytchley has been drawn using the Settlement Boundary Defining Principles in the Settlement Boundary Background Paper (Update) April 2018. This site was not included in the proposed boundary and is not within the current boundary from the 1995 Local Plan. The principles that have been used to define the settlement boundaries have been formulated through previous work from 2005 and been updated a number of</p>

Appendix 2p - Pytchley

times to ensure they provide an up-to-date and robust evidence base to accurately define the settlement boundary for settlements in Kettering Borough. The Council believes that these principles allow for the defining of settlement boundaries which clearly define the built framework and open countryside. This allows for the simultaneous protection of the open countryside whilst allowing for growth in areas of these settlements in suitable locations within the existing built environment.

See above comment in relation to 445