

User ID	Comment ID	Respondent	Policy/Table / Chapter	Chapter Name	Page Number	Justified	Effective	Positively Prepared	Consistent with National Policy	Legal Requirements	Duty to Cooperate	Summary of Representation	Proposed Actions/Changes	KBC Response	KBC Recommended Change(s)	Attend Examination?
1	1	Resident of Geddington	Policy GED1	Geddington Development Principles	124							None.	None	None	None	
1	2	Resident of Geddington	13	Geddington	123							Proposals concerning Geddington seem reasonable with good controls/ constraints. No mention of type of dwellings, should be good proportion of affordable. GED 2 4 - safe footpath needed to youth club. GED5 - traffic an issue on Grange Road, alternative access proposed. link to full comment	None	The issues raised are adequately addressed by existing policy, including policy 6 and 30 of the JCS, and the criteria proposed through policies GED1, GED2, GED 4 and GED5 of the SSP2.	No changes are recommended.	
2	3	Resident of Broughton	4	Housing	25	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No reference to energy efficiency requirements or any firm policy commitments to address the need for new development to be fit for 21st century living. Kettering could live up to the JCS vision of being at the forefront of modern technology by requiring new development to introduce carbon neutral technology. link to full comment	None	Policy 9 of the JCS and its supporting text sets out the approach to energy efficiency requirements. It is not considered necessary for this to be repeated in the SSP2.	No changes are recommended.	
2	4	Resident of Broughton	2	Outcomes	8	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	The JCS vision makes reference to a low carbon future but there is no positive reference to this in the Local Plan outcomes. It would be more proactive and forward looking to build in plans for electric vehicle infrastructure, Passivhaus standards for new development etc.	None	Paragraph 2.16 sets out how the plan will contribute towards outcome 2 of the JCS - adaptability to climate change. The Government is proposing that building regulations are altered to include electric vehicle infrastructure	No changes are recommended	
2	5	Resident of Broughton	Table 4.3	Housing	26	No	No	No		Yes	Yes	Whilst it is understood that a housing allocation for the rural areas was imposed by JCS it is a little difficult to understand what is trying to be achieved by the locations chosen. The spread is uneven with a significant contribution being made by the two villages, Broughton and Mawley which are the closest to Kettering. If the intention was to provide housing across the Borough to support the rural communities and provide additional housing for young families to remain in their home environment the plan does not fulfil this objective.	None	The Categorisation of Villages: Background Paper (October 2019) sets out the approach taken to the distribution of housing in the rural area. This provides justification for the approach taken.	No changes recommended.	
2	6	Resident of Broughton	Table 19.1	Appendix 4 - Infrastructure Delivery Schedule	213	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Section 19, Appendix 4, Infrastructure delivery. Nothing about electric vehicle infrastructure. This should be part of transport infrastructure policy. There could be policies to move towards electric only buses and taxis in Kettering and EV charging points in car parks. This plan is "business as usual" rather than a blueprint for the future.	None	The Government is proposing that building regulations are altered to include electric vehicle infrastructure requirements. Policies for moves towards electric only buses and taxis are outside the remit of the SSP2.	No changes recommended.	
2	7	Resident of Broughton	Policy HWC2	Protection of Community Facilities and Proposals for New Facilities	51	No	No	No		Yes	Yes	Policy HWC2 Care should be taken when considering the value of a facility in a village. The criteria for a sustainable location includes the presence of a shop, pub etc. Modern life does mean that often these facilities fall due to lack of use and in that case it is fair to say that the property can be used for another purpose. If that decision then results in that community being regarded as unsustainable in planning terms the opportunity to create additional housing in that community will be denied which will lead to "rural" housing being concentrated in ever fewer large villages eventually turning them into towns or more likely exhausting their ability to sustain the population.	None	Noted.	None.	
3	8	Kettering Amateur Swimming Club	Policy HWC3	Sport, Recreation and Physical Activity	53	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	7.21 refers to the Council's Playing Pitch Strategy (2019) and Sports Facility Strategy (2019), neither of which have been published and therefore are unavailable for review in the context of determining whether the Plan is effective. The Sustainability Appraisal provides some of the information with respect to sports facilities but is not adequate to make decisions on the effectiveness of the Plan. Policy HWC3 is positive in its intent, but without sight of the above Strategies it is not possible to determine whether the intent meets the needs of the Borough and is therefore effective.	None	See recommended change.	A Main Modification is proposed to address the issues raised in this response. Refer to the Main Modification Schedule, reference number MM5	No
4	9	Resident of Desborough	Policy DES3	Opportunity Environmental Improvement Sites in Desborough	95	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	DES3 b. The B576 at the Lower Street junction needs a mini roundabout to slow traffic down and make it easier and safer for the large number of vehicles that turn in and out of Lower Street to/from the main road. DES3 c. A double mini roundabout, also incorporating the High Street junction, would help to improve safety at this location. DES3 d. The B576 itself is a road that suffers from excess speeding and a high injury collision rate so much so that it has been classified as a 'Red Route' in the past. Recommendations of Traffic Calming Feasibility Study by Northamptonshire Highways (January 2017) should be implemented at the earliest opportunity. link to full comment .	None	Noted. The areas identified are areas of opportunity for redevelopment, detailed schemes would need to be developed for these areas.	No changes recommended.	No
5	10	Kettering Eco Group	Policy HWC1	Health and Well-being	49	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	The 2019 Air Quality Annual Status Report shows that NO2 (nitrogen dioxide) pollution from traffic at several sites in the Borough are so high that they present a danger to public health on a monthly basis. Issues raised with air quality measurements. East Kettering development will increase traffic flow. Plan does not provide adequate mitigation strategy. link to full comment .	Must include a plan to broaden pollution monitoring to include new sites covering major thoroughfares. Locations suggested. Link to full comment .	The location of pollution monitoring in the Borough is beyond the remit of the SSP2. Policy 8 of the JCS requires design of development to integrate sustainable modes of transport and Policy 15 of the JCS requires design of development to give priority to sustainable means of transport. The Northamptonshire Transportation Plan sets out transport policies, objectives and vision for the longer term. The Northamptonshire Transportation Plan is made up of a suite of documents, these include walking cycling and bus strategies.	No changes recommended.	Yes
6	11	Avison Young on behalf of National Grid	General Comments	Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan-Publication Plan	0							We have reviewed the above document and can confirm that National Grid has no comments to make in response to this consultation.	None.	Noted.	None.	
7	12	Resident of Mawley	Policy MAW2	Land to the West of Mawley	140							Resident of Cransley Rise. Development will increase traffic and related pollution. Cransley Rise is only access and impact of increase traffic on child safety is a concern. If developed there needs to be a focus on: speed bumps, second access, continuation of bike track, trees, green spaces and design to reflect of Cransley Rise. Bungalows to purchase needed and 1, 2 and 3 bed options. link to full comment .	None.	The issues raised have been considered through the site assessment work, the detail of this is included in the Housing Allocations Background Papers (2012, 2013, 2018 and 2019). Where appropriate, criteria have been included in Policy MAW2 to ensure issues identified through the assessment process are adequately addressed.	No changes recommended.	
8	13	Savills on behalf of Eskmuir Securities	5	Employment	34							Eskmuir is the freehold owner of Baron Avenue Trade Park within Telford Way Industrial Estate. Previous comments provided at draft plan stage. Positive to see employment policy has evolved in line with some of the comments made. Further alterations suggested. Comments relate to EMP1 and EMP3. Support for modernisation welcomed. Positive to see EMP3 which sets criteria based policy framework for considering non-employment uses. Six criteria listed, not clear whether one or all need to be satisfied. Detailed comments provided in relation to the criteria. link to full response .	None.	Proposals for non-B class uses in safeguarded employment areas would have to be in accordance with all criteria set out in Policy EMP3. Criteria a) and b) will be merged as it is considered that the use of one criteria can sufficiently cover the contents of the two criteria as currently drafted in the Publication Plan. Criterion a) of Policy EMP3 will also be amended to set out the specific time period, of 12 months in relation to how long the site needs to be marketed for. This is considered to be an appropriate period of time and allows for fluctuations in the market throughout the year. Criterion c) and d) seek to shape development in different ways, criterion c) seeks to prevent non-B class uses from having a negative impact on the day to day operation of adjoining businesses. Whereas criterion d) seeks to prevent the distraction away from the focus on B-class uses in the Safeguarded Employment Areas	A Main Modification is proposed to address these issues. Refer to the Main Modification Schedule MM3	
9	14	NCC Surface Water Drainage Assessment Team	8	Flood Risk and Sustainable Water Management	55							SSP2 should adopt the wording from NPPF paragraph 163. Wording change suggested to paragraph 8.9 to refer to major development.	None.	This wording is already included in the NPPF therefore there is no need for it to be repeated in the SSP2.	A minor modification is proposed to make the amendment suggested to paragraph 8.9. Refer to Additional Modification Schedule AM6.	
10	15	Resident of Ashley	Policy ASH1	Ashley Development Principles	115	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	I fully support all the proposals and the plan for Ashley Village	None.	Noted	None.	No
11	16	Resident of Desborough	Policy DES2	Opportunity Redevelopment Sites within Desborough	94	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	DES2b- With the information that the Lawrences site is to be affordable housing, ahead of this, a full traffic management assessment is required as this development impacts on the other points in DES2. The nearby Gladstone Street already has traffic issues therefore before adding to the problem it should be solved.	None.	Noted	None.	No
11	17	Resident of Desborough	Policy DES3	Opportunity Environmental Improvement Sites in Desborough	95	Yes	Yes			Yes	Yes	DES3 b. The B576 at the Lower Street junction needs a mini roundabout to slow traffic down and make it easier and safer for the large number of vehicles that turn in and out of Lower Street to/from the main road. DES3 c. A double mini roundabout, also incorporating the High Street junction, would help to improve safety at this location. DES3 d. The B576 itself is a road that suffers from excess speeding and a high injury collision rate so much so that it has been classified as a 'Red Route' in the past. Recommendations of Traffic Calming Feasibility Study by Northamptonshire Highways (January 2017) should be implemented at the earliest opportunity. link to full comment .	None.	Noted. The areas identified are areas of opportunity for redevelopment, detailed schemes would need to be developed for these areas.	No changes recommended.	No
11	18	Resident of Desborough	Policy DES5	Land to the south of Desborough	97	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	With planning permission approved, the Desborough public likely to be impacted need to have awareness provided by Kettering Borough Council on when reserve matters is to be discussed and what it contains. This is significant with mitigation required for a site that has 30 % surface water threat which post development will impact on the additional destruction of Tallly Meadow which must be protected.	None.	Noted. Consultation on reserved matters application would be undertaken in accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement.	No changes recommended.	No
11	19	Resident of Desborough	2	Spatial Portrait of Kettering Borough	8	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Looking at carbon emissions and the rise of PM2.5, PM 10 and NoX at roadside, why is there no road side monitoring in Desborough (where shortly we will be invaded by construction site vehicles despite the bypass)? Do KBC seek to add Desborough monitoring?	None.	The location of pollution monitoring in the Borough is beyond the remit of the SSP2.	None.	No
12	20	Chairman Rothwell FC Aztec	Policy HWC2	Protection of Community Facilities and Proposals for New Facilities	51							Comment on behalf of Rothwell FC Aztec. HWC2 indicates that all major developments should provide a contribution to provision of new sports facilities. Rothwell North SUE is one such development. Neither the SSP2 nor Rothwell North SUE includes designated provision for sports facilities. General extent and location of facilities should be included in the SSP2. Provision may not necessarily be located in Rothwell North but may be in wide environs of Rothwell. Extent of settlement under pressure due to development of Truckstop facility and close by cemetery, arguable the settlement now includes these areas and plan should be revised to include them. Ask that area of land in vicinity of Truckstop owned by the Borough should be included as provision to meet HWC2 and improvements necessary could come through planning agreement for Rothwell North SUE. Link to full comment .	None.	Provision of facilities associated with Rothwell North has been considered through the planning application process.	A Main Modification is proposed to HWC3 and its supporting text to clarify the status of the Playing Pitch and Sports Facilities Strategies. Refer to the Main Modification Schedule, MM5	
13	21	Parish Clerk Cranford Parish Council	Policy CRA2	South of New Stone House, Duck End, Cranford	121	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Policy CRA2: Cranford Parish Council are supportive of this housing allocation site	None.	Noted.	None.	
13	22	Parish Clerk Cranford Parish Council	Policy CRA3	Land east of the corner of Duck End and Thrapston Road, Cranford	122	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Policy CRA3 Cranford Parish Council are supportive of this area being allocated for Housing	None.	Noted.	None.	
13	23	Parish Clerk Cranford Parish Council	Policy NEH3	Historically and Visually Important Local Green Spaces	68	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Policy NEH3- Local Green Spaces Designation. Cranford Parish Council are supportive of the HVI areas and Open Spaces identified in the Historically and Visually Important Local Green Space Background Paper (2015) and updates to the Background Paper in (2016) and (2019) for Cranford and feel these areas are crucial important in maintaining the designation of a conservation village.	None.	Noted.	None.	
13	24	Parish Clerk Cranford Parish Council	Policy CRA1	Cranford Development Principles	119	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Policy CRA1. Cranford Parish Council are happy to support the development principles listed in Policy CRA1	None.	Noted.	None.	
13	25	Parish Clerk Cranford Parish Council	Policy CRA3	Land east of the corner of Duck End and Thrapston Road, Cranford	122	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Policy CRA3 Cranford Parish Council are in support of this area being put forward for future housing allocation	None.	Noted.	None.	
14	26	Resident of Mawley	Policy MAW1	Mawley Development Principles	139	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	I am not sure why we appear to be going through this ritual dance each year, I guess until we get bored and submit. Let me be clear, Northampton, Wellingborough and Kettering are all dirty holes, the reason why I moved to Mawley is for the village and country lifestyle, I do not want it spoilt and congested. Our facilities are already creating, the village cannot support any more residents. Please leave us alone and peddle your stupid ideas elsewhere. I have no faith in the council to make any sound judgement on any matter.	None.	Noted. The Categorisation of Villages: Background Paper (October 2019) provides a justification for the distribution of housing in the rural area.	No changes recommended.	
15	27	Sport England	Policy HWC3	Sport, Recreation and Physical Activity	53		No		No	Yes	Yes	To ensure conformity with National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 96 and to ensure policy HWC3 is effective, once the Strategies are completed it the findings (any shortfalls of provision etc) and respective recommendations/requirements should be set out within the supporting text of Policy HWC3 and the Infrastructure Delivery Schedule. Where the Strategies identify the need for new provision at the proposed allocated sites the requirement should be set out in the specific policy. link to full comment .	Once the Playing Pitch Strategy and Sports Facilities Strategy are completed its findings (any shortfalls of provision etc) and respective recommendations/requirements should be set out within the supporting text of Policy HWC3 and the Infrastructure Delivery Schedule. Where the Strategies identify the need for new provision at the proposed allocated sites the requirement should be set out in the specific policy. link to full comment .	See recommended change.	A Main Modification is proposed to HWC3 and its supporting text to clarify the status of the Playing Pitch and Sports Facilities Strategies and to clarify the approach which will be taken to provision of facilities. Refer to the Main Modification Schedule, MM5	No
15	28	Sport England	Policy HWC3	Sport, Recreation and Physical Activity	53	No				Yes	Yes	Sport England welcomes policy HWC3 setting out that the Playing Pitch Strategy (PPS) and Sports Facilities Strategy (SFS) will be a focus for investment. These documents are based on assessment of current and future demand for Kettering Borough. However, Sport England questions the reference to the Local Football Facilities Plan (LFFP), which is not an evidence base document. The LFFP is a local investment plan to deliver the National Football Facilities Strategy. The LFFP only considers football priorities and in certain circumstance this could potentially impact on other sporting activities that take place on a playing field. It is therefore considered that the role of the LFFP should not be given a heightened role over other Strategies prepared by National Governing Bodies.	Reference to the Local Football Facilities Plan (2020) should be removed as it is already covered within the policy under plans or strategies prepared by the National Governing Bodies for sport.	Noted.	Specific reference to the Local Football Facilities Plan will be removed. Refer to the Main Modification Schedule, MM5	No
15	29	Sport England	Policy HWC1	Health and Well-being	49		No			Yes	Yes	The policy as currently drafted fails to set out an approach as to how health and wellbeing of the Borough will be improved through development of existing and new residential sites. The policy would be assisted by making reference to Sport England's Active Design Principles which will support healthy lifestyles by making physical activity an easy, practical and attractive choice.	Additional bullet point- Support healthy lifestyles, including through the use of active design principles of making physical activity an easy, practical and attractive choice;	It is considered that the principles of active design are adequately addressed by other policies in the development plan, including Policy 8 and 15 of the JCS and Policy HWC3 and NEH2.	No changes recommended.	No
16	30	Resident of Mawley	Policy MAW2	Land to the West of Mawley	140	No	No	No				Strong objection to proposal to build additional homes in Mawley. Concerns include: access point unsuitable, everyone needs car, bus service minimal, break from construction needed, still unadopted roads and drains, school can't be extended any further, other schools in area at capacity, impact on Birch Spinney and Mawley March SSSI, the area floods, village larger than planned, 29 retirements flats planned will contribute to the deficit. link to full comment .	None.	The issues raised have been considered through the site assessment work, the detail of this is included in the Housing Allocations Background Papers (2012, 2013, 2018 and 2019). Where appropriate, criteria have been included in Policy MAW2 to ensure issues identified through the assessment process are adequately addressed.	No changes recommended.	

17	31	Resident of Loddington	Policy LOD1	Loddington Development Principles	137	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	I agree with the SSP2 Local Plan proposals for the village of Loddington. We are not a 'sustainable community' and are therefore correctly categorised as a Category A (restricted infill village). Since the 2012 consultation the village shop has closed and the limited bus service has been totally discontinued. **** keeps raising the issue of Neighbourhood Plan with the Parish Council but each time residents make it clear that this is not an option. We have rejected all but restricted infill development. Affordable housing options were rejected in 2012. All development outside the village boundary was rejected. As residents we have accepted a total of eight (8) new home developments since 2012. With a village of around 200 houses this seems reasonable to residents. The three HVI open areas listed in SSP2 Local Plan for Loddington are important to maintain the rural character of the village.	None.	Noted.	None.		
18	32	Resident of Kettering	3	Settlement Boundaries	8	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	Location of Development: Settlement Boundaries my representation is specific to Warkton Village. There is good potential to allow limited dwelling development along Windy Ridge. The council cannot provide where the boundary starts or where it ends. The whole of that location is shown as open countryside. If that was the case where are there dwelling houses and businesses there already? We want our children to remain in this locality and the land owners should be allowed to develop some of their own land. In line with my comments above, the residents of that location Windy Ridge wants to develop their own lands with limited development but the council refused to listen. There seems to be no cooperation or the views of residents taken into consideration.	Show proper settlement boundaries that are consistent with the wishes of the local residents. The council seems very inflexible with their approach.	The settlement boundaries have been drawn in accordance with a robust set of criteria. The Settlement Boundaries Background Papers (February 2012, April 2018 and October 2019) provide the evidence base and justification for the settlement boundaries shown on the policies maps.	No changes recommended.	Yes	
19	33	Specialist Accommodation & Prevention Northants Adult Social Services, Northamptonshire County Council	4	Housing Mix and Tenure	25	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Inclusion of HOPSR modelling data and ambition to include older persons housing in developments of 50 or more welcomed. Lack of reference to specialist housing for younger adults, links to detailed forecasts provided. NCC would welcome attention to town centre design focused around age-friendly town centre principles. Link to full comment.	None.	Noted. The SSP2 identifies areas within the market towns for environmental improvements. The detail of these schemes will need to be developed and could include the type of initiatives listed to help people stay active.	No changes recommended.	No	
20	34	Wildlife Trust for Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire and Northamptonshire	Table 8.1	Designated Natural Assets						No		Pleased to note inclusion of section highlighting significance of natural capital and green infrastructure assets. Biodiversity is a key theme within green infrastructure. Few modifications needed to the section. Local Wildlife Sites should be mentioned in table 8.1. Agree additional policy on biodiversity not needed due to JCS policy. Key change in national policy has taken place since its adoption. NPPF paras 170 and 174 now require developments to make a measurable net gain in biodiversity. Recommend a sentence is added to para 8.15 to cover use of biodiversity metric by developments to demonstrate a measurable net gain in biodiversity. Maps should show wildlife sites. Link to full comment.	None.	Local Wildlife Sites are clearly identified as sites designated at a local level in paragraph 8.13, there is no need for them to be added to table 8.1. Reference to how a measurable net gain in biodiversity should be calculated would be more appropriately included as part of a review of the Joint Core Strategy as well as private equestrian facilities. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reserves are sufficiently protected due to their location in the open countryside. Designated sites of importance for biodiversity will not be altered as a result of the adoption of the SSP2, therefore these have not been shown on the policies maps.	No changes recommended.		
21	35	Resident of Scaldwell	7	Health and Well-being and Community Facilities	48	Yes	No			Yes	Yes	None.	The policy here covers the support and enhancement of facilities by safeguarding of existing facilities...however the policy is ineffective as it does not identify any identifiable remedies that ensures, where criteria are met, how existing facilities are protected...e.g. by declining change of use etc etc	Facilities will be protected through the application of the policy in determining planning applications.	No changes recommended.	No	
21	36	Resident of Scaldwell	Policy HWC3	Sport, Recreation and Physical Activity	53		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	None.	Section 7.21 makes reference to the Sports facility Strategy 2019, in addition throughout the section a number of other documents are referred to, namely, section 7.21 - the Councils Playing Pitch Strategy(2019). The assessing needs and opportunities for indoor and outdoor facilities (July 2019), however none of these have been available for public viewing so it is not possible to determine if the policy accurately reflects the findings in these papers - in fact an analysis of the Sustainability report has apparently identified elements that do not concur with other referenced papers. Section 23 Supplementary planning doc. In order to have a full and open consultation these papers should have been made available to view.	See below.	A Main Modification is proposed to HWCA and its supporting text to clarify the status of the Playing Pitch and Sports Facilities Strategies. Refer to the Main Modification Schedule, MM5	No	
22	37	Resident of Mawley	Policy MAW2	Land to the West of Mawley	140							Mawley Village RA174 Housing Development. Comments: " Restricted access to the site via Cransley Rise and existing properties. " Capacity of the pumping station and sewage system and constraints in relation to water and waste water capacity. The South Eastern half of the site has been identified as being at high risk of ground water flooding. " Impact on amenity and light/noise to adjacent properties. " Impact of additional traffic volumes at both entrances from the C31, based on the recent Road Safety Assessment and VAS data retrieval of over 2,000 vehicle activations, in out of the no- through- route road system. " Capacity for additional patients at Mawley Medical Centre. " Capacity for additional pupils at Mawley Primary School.	None.	The issues raised have been considered through the site assessment work, the detail of this is included in the Housing Allocations Background Papers (2012, 2013, 2018 and 2019). Where appropriate, criteria have been included in Policy MAW2 to ensure issues identified through the assessment process are adequately addressed.	No changes recommended.		
23	38	Resident of Cransley	Policy RS4	Development in the Open Countryside	112	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	This policy fails to cater for testcases where redundant or disused rural buildings possessing no architectural or historic value that are otherwise suitable for redevelopment are in fact prevented from doing so due to the requirement to retain the original exterior features. It seems counter-productive to require a typical 1960s or 70s agricultural building conversion to be required to continue to retain the exterior appearance of the original 1960s or 70s agricultural building. These sites are often considered to be eyesores located in or close to what is otherwise an attractive village setting.	Policy RS4, or possibly Policy RSS should allow for demolition in these circumstances to allow redevelopment of the site, especially where the site is located adjacent to a settlement boundary and where redevelopment of the site would enhance its immediate setting, as indicated by NPPF para 79 (c). Additionally, adding this provision would free up development sites, typically in the rural villages.	The policy is consistent with paragraph 79 of the NPPF which relates to re-use of redundant or disused buildings not the demolition and redevelopment of these buildings.	No change recommended.		
23	39	Resident of Cransley	Table 17.1	Great Cransley	181	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Table 17.1 indicates that Saved Policy 10 covering Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs is to be replaced by SSP2 Policy NEH2. (Section 8). Saved Policy 10 recognises Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs as particularly valuable countryside resources. It provides for protection of these reservoirs against most forms of development which are incompatible with the rural nature and quality of these areas. The proposed replacement Policy NEH2 provides for protection for the Borough green infrastructure network described in the Natural Capital and green Infrastructure Section 8 of the SSP2 but fails to include any reference to Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs. Although a photograph of Cransley reservoir is shown, there is no other reference to the reservoirs. This is a serious omission from the SSP2 as without inclusion, the special protection for these reservoirs could be lost.	The protection afforded by Saved Policy 10 for Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs should be transferred to a new policy within the SSP2, possibly by an addition to Policy NEH2.	Saved Local Plan Policy 10 seeks to set out those circumstances where development of these areas is considered acceptable, it is an exceptions policy. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are both located outside of any existing or proposed settlements boundaries and are therefore considered as being in open countryside. As a result, these areas are afforded a level of protection through existing policy in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS). The relevant JCS policies are referenced in Policy RS4 of the emerging SSP2 Publication Plan. The purpose of this policy is to set criteria that have to be met for development in the open countryside to be considered acceptable. Policy RS4 of the Publication Plan provides additional criteria to that set out in the JCS, in relation to replacement dwellings and the re-use of redundant or disused buildings as well as private equestrian facilities. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are sufficiently protected due to their location in the open countryside. Therefore although, there is no specific policy in relation to both the Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs proposed in the Publication Plan, the level of protection afforded to these two reservoirs will not diminish as a result.	None.		
23	40	Local Resident	18	Appendix 3 - Policies Maps	198	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Para 13.81 at page 131 makes brief mention of the Great Cransley Conservation area, quote: "The Great Cransley Conservation Area Appraisal was adopted in May 1984, but is not mentioned anywhere else in the SSP2. Neither is there any description of what Conservation Area status means for Great Cransley, particularly with regards to any additional level of protection afforded. The Great Cransley Proposal Map is shown at Figure 18.16, page 198. This map shows the proposed settlement boundary but without showing the conservation area boundary. This contrasts with the current Local Plan dated 1995 where the proposal map for Great Cransley shows both the settlement boundary and the conservation area boundary.	Since the 1995 Local Plan will be replaced by the new Local Plan, it is important that the level of protection afforded to the conservation area is given equal visibility in the SSP2 at Section 13 and importantly, that the boundary map is retained at Appendix 3. This is a serious omission from the SSP2.	The policies maps show the changes to the adopted policies map. Conservation Area designations will not be altered as a result of the adoption of the SSP2, therefore these have not been shown on the policies maps.	No changes recommended.	No	
23	41	Resident of Cransley	Policy GRC2	Land to the north of Loddington Road, Great Cransley	133	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Site RA/146 has been designated yet there are three issues which haven't been adequately addressed. Is there a need and justification for the housing? Would site RA/146 provide a suitable location for housing? and Is RA/146 suitable for development? Without a housing needs assessment there cannot be an evidence-based justification for housing development in a rural village. GRC2 fails to comply with JCS Policy 11 part 2, no justification as to why development couldn't be located in a more sustainable settlement. Site should have been discounted through stage 1 of the assessment process. There are failures in the assessment process. Issues include: height difference between site and road, traffic speed, site access, density, achievability of development criteria, impact of views, flooding, ridge and furrow, loss of hedgerow. Link to full comment.	Delete Policy GRC2 and housing site RA/146 for Great Cransley from the SSP2 at Section 13 and from the village map at Section 18.	No changes recommended.	No		
24	42	Resident of Mawley	General Comments		0	No	No	No	No	No	No	Strong Objection to RA/174 - Concerns raised include: loss of hedgerow, loss of countryside view and associated amenity, irrevocable loss of wildlife habitat and impact on animal populations, detrimental to residential amenity, five year land supply exists, 30-40% more houses needed in Kettering, 51% increase on planned size of Mawley, undermines characteristic layout, strain on police, hospitals, fire and ambulance, increased flood risk, little regard to NPPF, preferable to build on brownfield sites around Kettering, existing facilities overstretched Link to full comment.	The Local Plan needs to adhere to the government climate advisory body advice regarding hedgerow and maintaining them due to the climate emergency.	The issues raised have been considered through the site assessment work, the detail of this is included in the Housing Allocations Background Papers (2012, 2013, 2018 and 2019). Where appropriate, criteria have been included in Policy MAW2 to ensure issues identified through the assessment process are adequately addressed.	No changes recommended.	Yes	
25	43	Persimmon Homes Midlands	4	Housing Requirements and Allocations	25					Yes	Yes	Support for the Council's general approach of allocating land through the SSP2 LP. There is a certain tipping point at which over-allocating land in settlements will distort and therefore conflict with the adopted spatial strategy. There is no need to revisit the strategic decisions made about the broad housing requirement figure and the distribution of that requirement as reflected in the NNJCS. The focus of the SSP2 LP is on delivering suitable sites to meet the residual need to the end of the NNJCS plan period, this approach is supported Link to full comment.	None.	Noted.	None.	Yes	
25	44	Persimmon Homes Midlands	Policy HOU2	Older Persons Housing	30	No	No			Yes	Yes	Objection to Policy HOU2 as it is not justified and gives insufficient certainty to stakeholders. It is similarly unclear how the threshold relates to any identified quantitative need and the evidence of local need is unclear how such need will be measured. The 2017 made several recommendations and these would be proportionate ways of addressing demand for this sort of housing. Requiring all developments above the qualifying threshold to incorporate an unspecified level of older persons' housing to meet an unspecified need is not a sound approach and needs to be rethought Link to full comment.	2.9 In order to make the plan as a whole sound Persimmon Homes Midlands would suggest the deletion of Policy HOU2 or it being replaced with a site specific policy to encourage sites at or above the threshold to incorporate older persons' homes in common with the approach of Policy 30 of the NNJCS in respect of the SUE's	The need for older persons housing is identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) Update, 2015 which identified that 56% of the total projected housing growth for Kettering between 2011 and 2031 was for 65+ households. To meet the need identified it will be important for non strategic sites to contribute towards meeting provision, however Policy HOU2 is flexible to ensure viability of schemes as well as site specific circumstances are taken into account.	No changes recommended.	Yes	
25	45	Persimmon Homes Midlands	Policy HOU4	Self-Build and Custom Build Housing	32	No				Yes	Yes	Objects to Draft Policy HOU4 on the basis that it is not soundly evidenced or justified. It is recognised that whilst the demand for custom and self-build housing might be higher than what is reflected in the register, there is no evidence to account for such a substantial increase in demand within such a short time. The likely scale and distribution of need should be considered at the plan-making and the case for 5% custom and self-build has not been made out. Fundamental objection to the principle of delivering custom and self-build housing through large-scale housing developments due to logistical problems and lead-in time. Link to full comment.	2.16 For the above reasons, draft policy HOU4 should be deleted for plan soundness as it is not justified.	The Self and Custom Build Background Paper sets out the approach for determining the contents and subsequent thresholds included in Policy HOU4. It is recognised that the level of demand, as determined by the register in March 2019, as the base data for the aforementioned background paper, does not match the level of potential supply and delivery of self and custom build plots as identified in the Self and Custom Build Background Paper. However, as set out in the background paper the register is unlikely to show the true extent of demand in the borough, as it is reasonable to assume not all interested parties who have interest in building their own home are likely to be on the register. As a result, additional sources of data have been used to model the likely demand over the longer term. The data from the Three Dragons report has been used to calculate this demand over the next 10 years, towards the end of the plan period. It is also recognised that single dwelling schemes have the potential to be self-build or custom build schemes as stated in the Three Dragons report. The amount of single dwellings schemes matches closely to that to the number of entries on the register, however although this is an indication of delivery of self-build and custom build properties, there is no guarantee that these permissions represent self-build and custom build projects. Therefore, given that the evidence presented in the Self and Custom Build Background Paper presents a much larger demand for this type of housing as determined by the register, it is considered that using a threshold and percentage based policy is a proactive mechanism. It is considered that it will deliver a reliable and consistent supply for this type of housing in the long term, based on the potential demand as determined by the Three Dragons report. It also represents a pro-active approach to the delivery of this type of housing in the Borough. Government guidance does not require the specific preferences as indicated through the register, the only requirement of the local authority is that the sufficient permissions are granted in accordance with the level of demand that has been determined by the register. Whilst the logistical issues relating to the delivery of this type of housing are recognised, it is considered that Policy HOU4 sufficiently addresses these issues, specifically in relation to marketing of plots which remain unsold after 6 months can be built out by the developer. This timeframe is considered reasonable and practicable.	No changes recommended.	Yes	
25	46	Persimmon Homes Midlands	Policy ROT3	Land to the West of Rothwell	104					Yes	Yes	The site promoter states that it is evident that the broad development principles and criteria set out in Policy ROT3 can be complied with. General supports Policy RO for the allocation of Land West of Rothwell for up to 300. Objection to point h. of the policy which states that Land West of Rothwell can only commence development once the Strategic Link Road delivered as part of the Rothwell North SUE is complete because this clause is completely unnecessary. The projected completions for Land West of Rothwell and Rothwell North are realistic and reasonable. Link to full comment.	Clause h. is therefore unnecessary and unsound and should be deleted for plan soundness.	Noted. It is considered that clause h. of the policy is necessary. It would not be appropriate for the development to come forward without this section of the strategic link road. While the comment demonstrates that this section of the road will be delivered in advance of the allocation this is not a reason to remove the criteria.	No changes recommended.	Yes	
26	47	Hawkins and Harrison on behalf of landowner of Old Nursery Site, Grafton Road, Geddington	Policy GED4	Old Nursery Site, Grafton Road, Geddington	127	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	I act on behalf of the owners of land at the Old Nursery, Grafton Road, Geddington and write to make representations to the Publication Version of the Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan. My clients land is allocated in the emerging Plan under Policy GED4, a housing allocation of up to 10 dwellings. The site has been continually promoted during the preparation of the Part 2 Local Plan, with supporting reports, including a Tree Survey, Flood Risk Assessment and highway details, that show the site's allocation is robust and deliverable. Having read the wording of Policy GED4, my client wishes to confirm that they have no objections to the requirement set out in the Policy and is content that all relevant information could be delivered in a future planning application to allow the delivery of the allocation. As such, my client fully supports the Publication Version of the Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan.	None.	Noted.	None.		
27	48	Local Resident	8	Natural Environment and Heritage	55							The new plan replacing Policy 10 is reducing the protection from development on Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs. Both are special wildlife sites which need protection from development. I bought Thorpe Malsor Reservoir some 25 years ago for conservation in order to protect the wildlife. The reservoir is surveyed each month by a volunteer from British Trust of Ornithology under the Wetland Bird Survey plan and the records kept and available for perusal. It is a special habitat for widgeon both overwintering and breeding. The sites should continue to be protected from development.	None.	Saved Local Plan Policy 10 seeks to set out those circumstances where development of these areas is considered acceptable, it is an exceptions policy. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are both located outside of any existing or proposed settlements boundaries and are therefore considered as being in open countryside. As a result, these areas are afforded a level of protection through existing policy in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS). The relevant JCS policies are referenced in Policy RS4 of the emerging SSP2 Publication Plan. The purpose of this policy is to set criteria that have to be met for development in the open countryside to be considered acceptable. Policy RS4 of the Publication Plan provides additional criteria to that set out in the JCS, in relation to replacement dwellings and the re-use of redundant or disused buildings as well as private equestrian facilities. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are sufficiently protected due to their location in the open countryside. Therefore although, there is no specific policy in relation to both the Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs proposed in the Publication Plan, the level of protection afforded to these two reservoirs will not diminish as a result.	None.		
28	49	Resident of Thorpe Malsor	8	Natural Environment and Heritage	55							We are concerned that the update to the local plan (SSP2) for the Borough proposes to reduce the protection afforded to Thorpe and Cransley Reservoirs. These are beauty spots on the footpath network so are enjoyed by many in the Borough and are also very important wildlife sites. We believe that Policy 10 should be retained as it provides very considerable assets.	None.	Saved Local Plan Policy 10 seeks to set out those circumstances where development of these areas is considered acceptable, it is an exceptions policy. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are both located outside of any existing or proposed settlements boundaries and are therefore considered as being in open countryside. As a result, these areas are afforded a level of protection through existing policy in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS). The relevant JCS policies are referenced in Policy RS4 of the emerging SSP2 Publication Plan. The purpose of this policy is to set criteria that have to be met for development in the open countryside to be considered acceptable. Policy RS4 of the Publication Plan provides additional criteria to that set out in the JCS, in relation to replacement dwellings and the re-use of redundant or disused buildings as well as private equestrian facilities. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are sufficiently protected due to their location in the open countryside. Therefore although, there is no specific policy in relation to both the Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs proposed in the Publication Plan, the level of protection afforded to these two reservoirs will not diminish as a result.	None.		

29	50	Resident of Rothwell	8	Natural Environment and Heritage	55									I am concerned to read that the level of environmental protection afforded to Cransley Reservoir is to be reduced and that public access may be increased. As a member of the British Trust for Ornithology I take part in their Wetland Bird Survey (WeBS). This involves me in counting the numbers of the various species of water birds on the reservoir on a specified date each month. This month I counted a total of 248 birds of 15 species. The reservoir is Y shaped, the dam being at the foot of the Y. The two arms are the areas of greatest importance to wildlife (and not only to birds). If public access to the reservoir is increased I suggest that it should be confined to the main body of water near the dam and that admission to the arms should be denied. The reservoir is a wintering site for several species of birds, notably the following ducks: Wigeon, Teal, Gadwall, Pochard, Shoveler, Tufted Duck and Mallard. In some years, Goldeneye also winter on the reservoir. In summer, many birds nest in the vegetation on the banks, including Moorhen, Coot, Great Crested Grebe, Mallard, Mute Swan, Reed Warbler and Sedge Warbler while, in the adjacent woodlands, many common species breed. I think its importance as a local wildlife site needs to be maintained.	None.	Saved Local Plan Policy 10 seeks to set out those circumstances where development of these areas is considered acceptable, it is an exceptions policy. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are both located outside of any existing or proposed settlements boundaries and are therefore considered as being in open countryside. As a result, these areas are afforded a level of protection through existing policy in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS). The relevant JCS policies are referenced in Policy RS4 of the emerging SSP2 Publication Plan. The purpose of this policy is to set criteria that have to be met for development in the open countryside to be considered acceptable. Policy RS4 of the Publication Plan provides additional criteria to that set out in the JCS, in relation to replacement dwellings and the re-use of redundant or disused buildings as well as private equestrian facilities. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are sufficiently protected due to their location in the open countryside. Therefore although, there is no specific policy in relation to both the Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs proposed in the Publication Plan, the level of protection afforded to these two reservoirs will not diminish as a result.	None.	
30	51	Resident of Great Cransley	8	Natural Environment and Heritage	55									I, as an individual -not as Parish Clerk- state that I wish to retain Policy 10 for the protection of birds and wildlife in the future.	None.	Saved Local Plan Policy 10 seeks to set out those circumstances where development of these areas is considered acceptable, it is an exceptions policy. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are both located outside of any existing or proposed settlements boundaries and are therefore considered as being in open countryside. As a result, these areas are afforded a level of protection through existing policy in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS). The relevant JCS policies are referenced in Policy RS4 of the emerging SSP2 Publication Plan. The purpose of this policy is to set criteria that have to be met for development in the open countryside to be considered acceptable. Policy RS4 of the Publication Plan provides additional criteria to that set out in the JCS, in relation to replacement dwellings and the re-use of redundant or disused buildings as well as private equestrian facilities. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are sufficiently protected due to their location in the open countryside. Therefore although, there is no specific policy in relation to both the Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs proposed in the Publication Plan, the level of protection afforded to these two reservoirs will not diminish as a result.	None.	
31	52	Resident of Braybrooke	Policy BRA1	Braybrooke Development Principles	116	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes			BRA1 e) Protect and enhance the character of the conservation area and setting - It is hard to conceive that this wild site can be enhanced by development. The conservation has many green spaces and this is another. f) Make adequate provision for off road parking - Limitations of the site mean that additional off-road parking can only be for the dwellings proposed. The site is completely unsuited to the addition of public amenity parking.	None.	Noted. It is not the intention for public amenity parking to be provided within the site.	No changes recommended.	No
31	53	Resident of Braybrooke	Policy BRA2	Top Orchard, Braybrooke	118	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes			BRA2 The outline of the site Top Orchard (RA/128) is shown in Appendix 3 Policies Map Housing Allocation. However the site boundary is inconsistent with a planning applications submitted (KE1/2005/0603, amended KET/2010/0171, amended KET/2013/0257, highly significant given that the map included with the approved planning applications shows a projection of land into the access strip effectively halving its width and creating a pinch-point for access to the site from Griffin Road. The matter was raised at the Stoke Albany viewing event on 20.01.20 with a Kettering Officer who appeared unaware of the problem. Site inspections which concluded that access to the site is not overly narrow are thereby likely to have been based on incorrect documentation. There is a policy that states a private drive is limited to 5 dwellings. With regard to the above where planning permission has already been given for 1 new dwelling accessed from the same point as 12 and 14 Griffin Road, this would mean that RA/128 Top Orchard will provide only a maximum of 2 dwellings not 3 as stated. On the Rural Masterplanning Report 2012 Braybrooke, Section SHLAA Findings quote RA/128 as performing poorly in terms of accessibility. No changes have occurred at the junction of this site with Griffin Road and yet it has now been given a Green assessment by Highways. What evidence can be provided to justify this change in assessment?	None.	The Housing Allocations Background Paper shows the assessment of the site against a range of sustainability criteria. The Council considered that the criteria in Policy BRA1 sufficiently shape future development of the site. The SHLAA reference to the site performing poorly in terms of accessibility relates to the distance to services and facilities rather than access into the site. The access has been assessed based on the site area promoted for development.	No changes recommended.	No
32	54	Resident of Warkton	2	Spatial Portrait, Vision and Outcomes	8	No	No	No	No	No	No			My representation relates to development at Warkton Lodge Farm. Considering the amount of development going ahead in this area I have been aware that we are even in the settlement boundary of Warkton yet have been included in Warkton events and registered as Warkton residents for the 30+ years I have been living at Warkton Lodge Farm. We are currently considered to be in Open Countryside which makes it very difficult to develop on our land and as there is considerable development taking place within clear view of the area this makes it very frustrating when trying to improve aspects of our settlement. There seems to be no settlement boundary for a settled group of dwellings which have existed for many years.	Please explain and define settlement boundary on our settlement which I believe currently has more dwellings than Newton which has a defined settlement boundary. We are currently on no mans land yet we are a considerable settled group of dwellings just a stones throw from major developments and the Ise Lodge estate	The settlement boundaries have been drawn in accordance with a robust set of criteria. The Settlement Boundaries Background Papers (February 2012, April 2018 and October 2019) provide the evidence base and justification for the settlement boundaries shown on the policies maps.	No changes recommended.	Yes
33	55	Theatres Trust	Policy HWC2	Protection of Community Facilities and Proposals for New Facilities	51	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes			The Trust welcomes revision which has strengthened this policy in line with the recommendation we made within our comments at the previous stage of consultation.	None.	Noted.	None.	
34	56	Historic England	General Comments	Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan-Publication Plan	0						Yes	Yes		Following formal announcement of the scheme at the end of March, it would be helpful to embed the Kettering High Street Heritage Action Zone in policy and/or supporting text to provide additional strength.	Historic England would be very happy to assist with wording for an additional town centre policy and supporting text and agree by SOCG.	The SSP2 does not cover Kettering town centre. This area is covered by the Kettering Town Centre Area Action Plan (KTCAAP). The KTCAAP will be reviewed once the SSP2 is adopted, this document would be the most appropriate place to include reference to the Heritage Action Zone.	None.	No
34	88	Historic England	Policy TCE4	Residential Development within the Town Centres	44	No	No				Yes	Yes		There is concern regarding potential loss of retail units in town centres, although criteria e is welcomed. Is this policy necessary.	Deletion or greater reference to the importance of retail and mixed use at ground floor level.	It is considered that the policy and supporting text adequately address the importance of protecting retail and other town centre uses at ground floor level.	No changes recommended.	No
34	90	Historic England	8	Natural Environment and Heritage	55	No	No				Yes	Yes		The supporting text is welcomed, together with the detailed village policies. To provide strength and local detail, a heritage policy(ies) should be proposed, in accordance with paragraphs 20 and 185 of the NPPF, as are also being proposed at East Northamptonshire. The Local Plan Part 2 represents an opportunity to provide detailed separate policies on specific heritage assets such as Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, Registered Parks and Gardens, Scheduled Ancient Monuments, archaeology and non-designated heritage assets. A policy relating to historic shopfronts would be welcomed. This would future proof the plan, ensuring soundness.	Historic England would be very happy to assist with wording for historic environment policies and agree by SOCG.	National legislation and national and strategic policy provide adequate protection for the Boroughs heritage assets.	No changes recommended.	No
34	92	Historic England	Policy NEH3	Historically and Visually Important Local Green Spaces	68	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Policy NEH3 is welcomed.	None.	Noted.	None.	No
34	93	Historic England	Policy KET7	Factory adjacent to 52 Lawson Street	78	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Criteria d is welcomed.	None.	Noted.	None.	No
34	94	Historic England	Policy BLA4	Land to the West of Kettering Road, Burton Latimer	89	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		The site is within the Conservation Area. Criteria a is welcomed.	None.	Noted.	None.	No
34	95	Historic England	Policy DES2	Opportunity Redevelopment Sites within Desborough	94	No					Yes	Yes		DES2 relates to a very sensitive site, including the key building within the Conservation Area, the Lawrence Factory. Please refer to our previous advice on the Lawrence Factory. Policy DES2, criteria b does not include reference to its sensitivities, importance as a key building or location within the Conservation Area.	Criteria b is amended to include reference to the Lawrence Factory, its importance and position within the Conservation Area. Historic England would be happy to agree this change by SOCG.	Policy DES2 includes a list of opportunity redevelopment sites for Desborough and the most suitable redevelopment uses for each of these. Any proposals will be required to consider the impact on the conservation area, through the development management process where existing policies exist to protect the character and setting of the site within the conservation area. Therefore it is not considered necessary for any changes to DES2 to be made.	No changes are recommended.	No
34	97	Historic England	Policy ROT1	Centre Development Principles	101	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Criteria h is welcomed.	None.	Noted.	None.	No
34	99	Historic England	Policy ROT3	Land to the West of Rothwell	104	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Criteria g is welcomed. Please also ensure that our previous comments in relation to site RO/088a are taken into account.	None.	Noted.	None.	No
34	100	Historic England	Policy RS2	Category B villages	109	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Policy RS2 is welcomed.	None.	Noted.	None.	No
34	101	Historic England	Policy RS5	General Development Principles in the Rural Area	113	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Criteria i-g are welcomed.	None.	Noted.	None.	No
34	102	Historic England	13	Rural Area General Policies - Policy ASH1, CRA1, GE D1, GRA1, HAR1, LOA1, LOD1, STA 1, SUT1, WAR1, WE K1, WES1 and WIL1	106	No					No	Yes	Yes	For all Village specific development principles policies, the inclusion of a materials criteria is welcomed to ensure the use of historically appropriate materials. However it must ensure that the use of materials is site specific and specific to its setting within the village to ensure that the criteria is not read as a list of potential materials when in some circumstances one would be preferable to another within the list. Amendment to the criteria to include site specific / village setting specific reference would help to address this issue.	The following wording should be added to the end of the materials criteria 'dependant on the individual site and its specific setting within the village'.	See recommended change.	A number of Main Modifications are proposed to address the issue raised in this response. Refer to the Main Modification Schedule, reference numbers MM32, MM33, MM35, MM36, MM37, MM38, MM39, MM40, MM43, MM44, MM45, MM46, MM47	No
34	103	Historic England	Policy BRA2	Top Orchard, Braybrooke	118	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Criteria c, d and l are welcomed.	None.	Noted.	None.	No

34	105	Historic England	Policy CRA1	Cranford Development Principles	119	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Criteria e is welcomed.	None.	Noted.	None.	No
34	106	Historic England	Policy GED1	Geddington Development Principles	124	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Criteria d, h, i and j are welcomed.	None.	Noted.	None.	No
34	107	Historic England	Policy GED2	Geddington Sawmill, Grafton Road, Geddington	125	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Criteria e and f are welcomed.	None.	Noted.	None.	No
34	109	Historic England	Policy GED3	Geddington South East	126	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Criteria a is welcomed.	None.	Noted.	None.	No
34	110	Historic England	Policy GED4	Old Nursery Site, Grafton Road, Geddington	127	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Criteria h and i are welcomed.	None.	Noted.	None.	No
34	112	Historic England	Policy GRA1	Grafton Underwood Development Principles	130	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	This policy is welcomed.	None.	Noted.	None.	No
34	113	Historic England	Policy GRC1	Great Cransley Development Principles	131	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Criteria c is welcomed.	None.	Noted.	None.	No
34	114	Historic England	Policy STA2	Land to the south of Harborough Road, Stoke Albany	147							Criteria a is welcomed.	None.	Noted.	None.	No
34	116	Historic England	13	Policy HAR1, Policy LOK1, Policy LOD1, Policy MAW1, Policy NEW1, Policy PYT1, Policy RUS1, Policy STA2, Policy SUT1, Policy THM1, Policy WAR1, Policy WEX1, Policy WES1 and Policy WIL1	106	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The policies are welcomed.	None.	Noted.	None.	No
34	117	Historic England	Policy WES2	Home Farm, Weston by Welland	154	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Criteria a is welcomed.	None.	Noted.	None.	No
34	118	Historic England	18	Appendix 3 - Policies Maps	183					Yes	Yes	It would be helpful to show the location of Broughton RPAG on the map.	None.	Noted.	None.	No
34	119	Historic England	18	Appendix 3 - Policies Maps	183	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	The Historically and Visually Important Local Green Space designations are welcomed.	None.	Noted.	None.	No
35	57	Resident of Great Cransley	8	Natural Environment and Heritage	55							I write (AS MYSELF) a lifetime resident of Cransley to request that KBC continues to give maximum protection to Cransley and Thorpe Reservoirs under Policy 10. These two reservoirs are essential to the bird life of our two parishes and of course further afield. They provide stopping off points for migrating birds as well as our indigenous population of water fowl. In these days it is ever more important that the outgoing Local Authorities do not fail at the last hurdle and hand on to the Unitary Authority a reduced protection standard. The need to protect our Biodiversity and the unique mid Northants flora and fauna is so important and on my own land in Cransley I have over 60 acres of unfarmed private wildlife areas which form an important part of my life.	None.	Saved Local Plan Policy 10 seeks to set out those circumstances where development of these areas is considered acceptable, it is an exceptions policy. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are both located outside of any existing or proposed settlements boundaries and are therefore considered as being in open countryside. As a result, these areas are afforded a level of protection through existing policy in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS). The relevant JCS policies are referenced in Policy RS4 of the emerging SSP2 Publication Plan. The purpose of this policy is to set criteria that have to be met for development in the open countryside to be considered acceptable. Policy RS4 of the Publication Plan provides additional criteria to that set out in the JCS, in relation to replacement dwellings and the re-use of redundant or disused buildings as well as private equestrian facilities. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are sufficiently protected due to their location in the open countryside. Therefore although, there is no specific policy in relation to both the Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs proposed in the Publication Plan, the level of protection afforded to these two reservoirs will not diminish as a result.	None.	No
36	58	Local Resident	8	Natural Environment and Heritage	55							I'm writing to you with my concerns regarding the council's proposal to remove the policy 10 plan from Thorpe Malsor and the surrounding area. I have recently taken over the running of the trout fishery located on Thorpe Malsor reservoir and am working towards creating a unique, exclusive business utilising and enhancing the natural beauty and tranquility that the area has to offer. I'm concerned that the removal of Policy 10 would leave vital elements of the protection toward bio and geo diversity in the area susceptible to interpretation towards developments, that may harm the natural balance, green infrastructure and beauty of the area.	None.	Saved Local Plan Policy 10 seeks to set out those circumstances where development of these areas is considered acceptable, it is an exceptions policy. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are both located outside of any existing or proposed settlements boundaries and are therefore considered as being in open countryside. As a result, these areas are afforded a level of protection through existing policy in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS). The relevant JCS policies are referenced in Policy RS4 of the emerging SSP2 Publication Plan. The purpose of this policy is to set criteria that have to be met for development in the open countryside to be considered acceptable. Policy RS4 of the Publication Plan provides additional criteria to that set out in the JCS, in relation to replacement dwellings and the re-use of redundant or disused buildings as well as private equestrian facilities. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are sufficiently protected due to their location in the open countryside. Therefore although, there is no specific policy in relation to both the Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs proposed in the Publication Plan, the level of protection afforded to these two reservoirs will not diminish as a result.	None.	No

37	59	Resident of Geddington	Policy GED3	Geddington South East	126	No	No	No	No	No	No	Having reviewed the information provided the scale of development for up to 11 dwellings is too high for the proposed site. Kettering road is already noise polluted and traffic heavy (despite the by-pass). The entrance to the properties from the main road has not been carefully considered as the access is on a bend making it dangerous for vehicles on that stretch of road. The planners need to ensure that Privacy remains for the existing properties and key vista for the village is retained. The infrastructure of the village was designed to support 700 homes, as per the original plan. There are now approximately 1,000 homes. The infrastructure is struggling to cope with present demand and further development can only exacerbate this situation. 1. The loss of countryside views will have an adverse effect on the value of my property. 1. The spirit throughout the village is fantastic and events at the community centre are well supported and very well attended. For example the recent children's Halloween party sold out quickly leaving a number of children very disappointed. I believe the forthcoming Christmas party has also sold out, no doubt presenting the same issues. Obviously an increase in the number of families is going to create more of these problems. An increase in the number of homes will inevitably increase the traffic within the village which will have an adverse effect on road safety and no doubt further the issues of nuisance parking. The current access point to the field is fairly restricted and those living in its immediate vicinity will experience problems with large vehicles negotiating tight and twisty roads. There are already parking issues in this area I envisage this will create further road safety problems, and Central Government has indicated there is the 'need' for a substantial increase in the number of homes in Northamptonshire. Whether this is true is quite subjective but the negatives this local proposal will bring far out-weigh the alleged benefits. Distinct lack of control of speed and traffic number of accidents increased Noise levels are too high already	Reduce the number of dwellings proposed, ensure the properties are set back from the main road to ensure key views are retained. Finally review how the properties will be accessed from Kettering Road as it is on a dangerous bend of the road	The Housing Allocations Background Paper shows the assessment process and the conclusions from this in relation to this site, including an assessment of the access and capacity of the highway. The yield of 11 dwellings of this site as considered suitable for the site. The criteria set out in Policy GED3 adequately shape development of the site.	No changes recommended.	Yes	
38	60	Resident of Mawsley	Policy MAW2	Land to the West of Mawsley	140	No	No	No	No	No	No	Access to the site off Cransley Rise is restricted and on a blind bend. The site is constantly flooded during heavy rainfall and has been underwater since October 2011. With the current climate changing to warmer/wetter winters, this is only going to make matters worse. How will this impact on the existing housing surrounding the site if water is to be channelled elsewhere? More houses will mean more people in the village with more cars on already congested roads. Cars are already parking in alternative streets to where the occupants live. Village only accessible by the C31. This is not designed for any additional traffic. Secondary schools are at capacity with children from the village not able to get into their nearest Kettering school as considered too far away for placement. Medical centre is operating at its limit. Primary is already extended to its maximum capacity. Lots of children already in the village. Additional traffic will jeopardise safety. Restricted access on a blind bend to accommodate any large site construction vehicles. The village is only accessible by car now. The bus service has been cut to a bare minimum and cannot offer a mode of transport for residents reliant on the bus to take them to and from work. This is the same for school children who would rely on a public bus service to get them to and from school. A proposal for 29 retirement flats was rejected. Why would you propose 50 new houses yet reject retirement flats. During the previous consultations there was a concern around the capacity of the existing sewage system. Nothing has changed so why is this being considered again?	Do not build any more houses in Mawsley. It is already over the original allocated numbers and it has not been designed to accommodate anymore. To summarise I am strongly objecting to this plan and believe that development should take place in deprived town centres rather than on green countryside land that is currently used for effective food production from farming.	The issues raised have been considered through the site assessment work, the detail of this is included in the Housing Allocations Background Papers (2012, 2013, 2018 and 2019). Where appropriate, criteria have been included in Policy MAW2 to ensure issues identified through the assessment process are adequately addressed.	No changes recommended.	Yes	
39	61	Resident of Kettering	2	Outcomes	8	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	Kettering Borough Council adopted a policy to put the Climate Emergency at the forefront of everything it does. The current plan and proposed outcomes refer to environmental considerations but these are not put first. The plan still envisages carbon growth (albeit 'low').	This plan must reflect the need to reduce the carbon impact of our local settlements	Climate change is a strategic issue which will be considered through the review of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy.	No changes recommended.	Yes	
40	62	Estate Manager Boughton Estates Limited	4	Housing Requirements and Allocations	25	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Concerns about the approach regarding windfall sites. There is no evidence provided on the windfall allowance in either the SSP2 or any background papers. Settlement boundaries will limit the number of appropriate sites for windfall dwellings. Windfall dwellings should not contribute to the supply in Rural Areas. The 10% allowance should be taken across the Borough as a whole. The plan should not rely on windfalls to meet this requirement the housing requirement and should allocate enough land to deliver the residual requirement for 305 homes in the rural area within the plan period to full comment.	None.	Evidence on the windfall allowance is included in the Housing Land Supply Background Paper (October 2019). The Housing Land Supply Background Paper sets out the justification for the 10% flexibility allowance and the approach taken in applying this to Kettering, Burton Latimer, Desborough and Rothwell but not the rural area.	No changes recommended.	Yes	
40	63	Boughton Estates Limited	13	Rural Area General Policies	106	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	3.14 The plan identifies the rural area of Kettering Borough as that land that is outside of Kettering, Barton Seagrave, Desborough, Rothwell and Burton Latimer (paragraph 13.1). The overarching strategy for development in the rural area is set by Policy 11 of the JCS. 3.15 The plan appropriately recognises that some small scale growth to meet local needs in villages can have positive benefits including supporting local services (paragraph 13.5)	None.	Noted.	None.	Yes	
40	64	Boughton Estates Limited	13	Village Categories	107	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	The designation of Geddington as a Category A village through Policy RS1 and Newton as a Category B village through Policy RS2 is supported link to full comment.	None.	Noted.	None.	Yes	
40	65	Boughton Estates Limited	Policy GED1	Geddington Development Principles	124	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	There should be scope to explore the continued relevance of the drivers for the policy criteria set out in GED1, and enable the implications of those design requirements to be explored through site specific masterplanning processes with the participation of the applicant and local community as required by the Framework. Broad support for the development principles identified for Geddington through GED1 and for Newton through NEW1 link to full comment.	3.26 With this in mind we are of the view that the GED1 as currently drafted is too prescriptive and lacks the flexibility required by the framework to enable development to respond to relevant circumstances. If adopted in its current form it could have the effect of preventing viable development from coming forward on the allocated sites in Geddington and preventing a constraints based masterplan process being employed to arrive at sustainable development. 3.27 In our view GED1 should be modified to introduce balancing clauses (i.e. where appropriate, where viable etc.) and employ flexible wording (seek, where practicable etc.). GED1 should also refer to the ability for planning applications to be supported by site specific masterplan processes which justify design.	At planning application stage, the criteria would be applied where appropriate to the proposal under consideration. It is not considered necessary for this wording to be added to the policy. A planning application can be supported by a site specific masterplan which justifies the design, the policy does not need to require this.	No changes recommended.	Yes	
40	66	Boughton Estates Limited	Policy GED2	Geddington Sawmill, Grafton Road, Geddington	125	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	The Geddington Sawmill site is deliverable and Policy GED2 is supported. The interplay of these policy requirements (Policy GED2) has the potential to restrict the delivery of the allocation. The policy should provide for the possibility of tree removal being necessary along the site frontage in order to accommodate an appropriate layout. There are no known technical issues and can contribute to the land supply for Kettering. Support for the allocation of Geddington Sawmill for housing development (Policy GED2), Geddington South East for housing development (GED3) and Geddington South West for employment development (GED5) link to full comment.	3.31 In our view, GED2 should also be modified to cross reference the requirement for site-specific master planning in GED1 or to introduce balancing clauses (i.e. where appropriate, where viable etc.) and employ flexible wording (seek, where practicable etc.). 3.32 We also note that the wording of GED2 is explicit in identifying the allocation for 'up to' 10 dwellings. Whilst the Estate are comfortable with this quantum of development we are mindful of the need for flexibility and it is not commonplace in this respect to see planning policies which set maxima. We consider the policy should be modified with wording such as 'approximately' or 'around' to enable a masterplan process to be undertaken which arrives at a sensible amount of development having regard to housing need and the size of units desired as well as design requirements. 4.6 Policies GED2 and GED3 should also be modified to cross reference the requirement for site-specific master planning in GED1 or to introduce balancing clauses (i.e. where appropriate, where viable etc.) and employ flexible wording.	Refer to response to rep.65. It is considered appropriate for the policy to identify the site for up to 10 dwellings, this is flexible in allowing the site to come forward for a lower number if the masterplanning process identifies that this is appropriate.	No changes recommended.	Yes	
40	67	Boughton Estates Limited	Policy GED3	Geddington South East	126	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Full support for the allocation in Policy GED3. The settlement boundary should be repositioned commensurate with the rear garden boundaries at Steele Way to the north east of the allocation, and to run south to the existing south east corner of the allocation. Policy GED2 is overly restrictive with the potential to prevent the delivery of the allocation. Support for the allocation of Geddington Sawmill for housing development (Policy GED2), Geddington South East for housing development (GED3) and Geddington South West for employment development (GED5) link to full comment.	3.37 Whilst we are pleased to see GED3 reference the need for a masterplan in respect of the easement and our impacts. In our view, the policy wording should be modified with wording such as 'approximately' or 'around' and enable a masterplan process to be undertaken which considers all design matters and enables a sensible amount of development to be planned having regard to housing need and the size of units desired as well as design requirements. 4.6 Policies GED2 and GED3 should also be modified to cross reference the requirement for site-specific master planning in GED1 or to introduce balancing clauses (i.e. where appropriate, where viable etc.) and employ flexible wording. 4.7 In the absence of any defensible features the settlement boundary (and therefore allocation boundary) associated with Policy GED3 Geddington South East should be repositioned to maintain the relationship between the existing built form and the surrounding countryside (See Appendix A).	Refer to response to rep.65. It is considered appropriate for the policy to identify the site for up to 11 dwellings, this is flexible in allowing the site to come forward for a lower number if the masterplanning process identifies that this is appropriate. The settlement boundary has been drawn based on the area of the allocation considered through the assessment process. It would not be appropriate to alter the boundary at this stage.	No changes recommended.	Yes	
40	68	Boughton Estates Limited	Policy NEW1	Newton Development Principles	141	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Small, proportionate development should be enabled at Newton in the form of dwellings at Dovecote Farm. development of 4 new homes would an opportunity to enhance the setting of the village, its Conservation Area and Dovecote House (Grade II listed) whilst providing a level of housing which is in keeping with the existing character of the settlement. There are no known technical issues and, subject to a grant of planning permission, the site is deliverable within 5 years and capable of contributing to the land supply for Kettering. Broad supports for the development principles identified for Geddington through GED1 and for Newton through NEW1. link to full comment.	3.48 The settlement limit for Newton should be amended to include the southern part of the Dovecote Farm complex or Policy NEW1 and the proposal map should be modified to include an allocation for around 4 new homes (See Appendix B).	The Council acknowledge the fall back positions via permitted development rights. Site NEW1 has been discounted through the site assessment process. The detail of this is set out in the Housing Allocations Background Paper (2012, 2018 and 2019) and the Housing Allocations Assessment of Additional Sites and Update (2013). The settlement boundaries have been drawn in accordance with a robust set of criteria. The Settlement Boundaries Background Papers (February 2012, April 2018 and October 2019) provide the evidence base and justification for the settlement boundaries shown on the policies maps	No changes recommended.	Yes	
40	70	Estate Manager Boughton Estates Limited	Policy GED5	Geddington South West, New Road, Geddington	128	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	4.4 The Estate supports the allocation of Geddington Sawmill for housing development (Policy GED2), Geddington South East for housing development (GED3) and Geddington South West for employment development (GED5).	None.	Noted.	None.	Yes	
41	69	Resident of Kettering	Statement 1	Joint Core Strategy Vision	10	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	2 - Vision Kettering Borough will have a strong growing economy built upon skilled jobs and opportunities for businesses to grow. A place where high quality new homes are well designed, reflect the characteristics of the local area and provide good access to services and facilities. As Kettering Borough Council passed a motion to formally declare a Climate Emergency, they have and committed to a target of making the area covered by the Borough Council carbon neutral by 2030. As this makes no reference to housing being environmentally sustainable, it does not comply with this motion.	The text should read: "Kettering Borough will have a strong growing economy built upon skilled jobs and opportunities for businesses to grow. A place where high quality new homes are well designed, environmentally sustainable, reflect the characteristics of the local area and provide good access to services and facilities.	The vision for North Northamptonshire includes that the area will be a showpiece for modern green living and well managed sustainable development and that it will be an exemplar for construction based innovation and the delivery of low carbon growth. The SSP2 vision builds on this for Kettering Borough and does not need to replicate the strategic vision for the area.	No changes recommended.	No	
42	71	Thorpe Malsor Estate	Policy NEH4	Open Spaces	70	No			No	No	No	Land west of Short Lane, Thorpe Malsor, there is no evidence to support the designation. The site does not qualify for open as it has little demonstrable local value. remainder of the site is formed of allotments, but these are privately run and based on private leasing arrangements. The introduction Policy NEH4 as a new policy at publication stage is not appropriate and there are concerns about the lack of evidence that supports this designation. There is no published evidence available to support the proposed designation and therefore Policy NEH4 is unsound, is not justified nor consistent with national and should be deleted link to full comment.	3.10 We therefore consider that the publication Plan is unsound in that Policy NEH4 is not justified due to the lack of supporting evidence and not consistent with national policy in the lack of supporting evidence and lack of engagement prior to its inclusion in the draft Plan. The policy should therefore be deleted to ensure that the Local Plan is sound.	Private allotments are included within the open space audit because these make an important contribution to meeting need for allotment provision.	A Main Modification is proposed to address the issues raised in this response in relation to Policy NEH4. Refer to the Main Modification	Yes	
42	73	Thorpe Malsor Estate	Policy NEH4	Open Spaces	70	No			No	No	No	Land West of Short Lane, Thorpe Malsor - Concerns as to the designation of the site as Open Space. The late introduction of this designation is against paragraph 4.5 of the NPPF and does not demonstrate early or effective engagement. The allotment label on the Policies Map is misleading and is inaccurate and does not constitute valid reason for the designation of land which is only arable land and as such unremarkable in both the immediate and wider localities link to full comment.	4.5 Having regard for the above we consider the Open Space to the west of Short Lane, Thorpe Malsor should be removed as it is unsound as it is neither justified nor consistent with national policy. These comments are without prejudice to the publication of any additional evidence and we of course reserve the right to update these views in such a scenario.	Please refer to response to Rep 71.	None.	Yes	
43	72	Northamptonshire County Council Highways	General Comments	Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan Publication Plan	0							None.	Thank you for consulting Northamptonshire County Council Highways on the Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan - Publication Plan Consultation. We note that the Plan is planning for 2,576 additional dwellings over that identified in the North Northants Joint Core Strategy (taking into account completions, commitments, allocations and windfall allowance). Whilst overall it is not expected that this will be cumulatively significant in transport terms due to it being spread across the borough, each development will need to be subject to a transport assessment at a future date to identify the impact on the local road network in the immediate vicinity of the allocations and to identify appropriate mitigation, where required. It is presumed that assessments have been undertaken to ensure that access arrangements are appropriate at each of the allocated sites. The outputs of the spreadsheet transport model work to look at the impact on the highway of housing options in Rothwell and Desborough as part of early option testing identified that the site at Rothwell North (Land to west of Rothwell will impact on the A14 junction 3 and the A6/Rothwell link road junction. We therefore welcome the wording of Policy ROT31 and h, and strongly support a. and b. to encourage active travel. The outputs also identified that the trip generation from the Land to South of Desborough (DE210) will result in 90 or more additional vehicles at a number of junctions in the AM peak that have already been identified as being overcapacity. The junctions are naturally constrained due to being located within an urban area, however it is expected that mitigation can be achieved within the highway boundary. We therefore welcome the policy wording in DESS3, and k.	Noted.	None.	None.	Yes
44	74	Local Councillor	12	Land west of Rothwell	100	No	Yes; No	Yes; No	Yes; No	Yes	Yes	Rothwell North is well behind schedule for the plan period. No further allocations should be permitted until the Town has absorbed the current volume of housing. Additional housing would need to be considered on the basis of what is planned currently being built out and analysis of the impact on the infrastructure of the town especially transport. The current additional housing proposal flies in the face of national policy for limiting trips to work and shopping to reduce our carbon footprint.	None.	An additional housing allocation is needed to meet housing requirements identified in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy. The Housing Land Supply Background Paper (October 2019) provides the justification for the number of allocations proposed in each of the settlements.	No changes recommended.	Yes	

44	96	Local Councillor	Table 17.1		181	Yes	Yes	Yes	No			Policy 10 Protects an extremely valuable area of the Borough. It has stood the test of time and it would be entirely wrong to remove and dilute its significance at this time. It is a unique area surrounded by three attractive villages and a network of footpaths which are enjoyed by residents further afield. As Kettering grows and the desire for access to open countryside and stretches of water increases Policy 10 gives significant protection to this area. A specific policy covering the two reservoirs essential to attract and retain water based leisure facilities and the tranquil nature of the reservoirs and their hinterland. There is no reason to discard this policy which can be removed from the present local plan to this one without modification or use of resources. Retaining Policy 10 will continue to give confidence that this area is precious and worth identifying as unique and not being diluted into a policy which might give less protection and more scope for modification by random planning applications elsewhere in the Borough.	Recognition of the importance of securing areas of significant rural character. This would not be the case if Policy 10 is set aside.	Saved Local Plan Policy 10 seeks to set out those circumstances where development of these areas is considered acceptable, it is an exceptions policy. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are both located outside of any existing or proposed settlements boundaries and are therefore considered as being in open countryside. As a result, these areas are afforded a level of protection through existing policy in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS). The relevant JCS policies are referenced in Policy RS4 of the emerging SSP2 Publication Plan. The purpose of this policy is to set criteria that have to be met for development in the open countryside to be considered acceptable. Policy RS4 of the Publication Plan provides additional criteria to that set out in the JCS, in relation to replacement dwellings and the re-use of redundant or disused buildings as well as private equestrian facilities. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are sufficiently protected due to their location in the open countryside. Therefore although, there is no specific policy in relation to both the Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs proposed in the Publication Plan, the level of protection afforded to these two reservoirs will not diminish as a result.	None.	Yes
44	104	Local Councillor	13		139		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Mawsley is a new village built from around the year 2000 and completed in its original form around five years ago. The original masterplan was for 750 houses which part way through the development was contested and allowed on appeal and increase in the density within the defined village limits which now has created a village of some 950 homes. The infrastructure and facilities were designed around a village of 750 with the recognition for example of the Doctor's surgery and school that it would be hub for services for surrounding villages, which it is. The village should be allowed to settle for a period of years, for the community to mature, before consideration of additional housing out with the current village "boundary". The open countryside that cuts into the village at this point is not dissimilar to other villages where open countryside adds to the character and feel of a village. The vision was always for a traditional Northamptonshire Village, not an estate in the open countryside. This has been achieved. "Filling in" this open countryside would be detrimental to the character of the village and give the impression that it is simply an estate in the open countryside. The roads within the village were specifically designed to inhibit speeding and physically (as much as possible) keep traffic at 20 mph (which is the village-wide limit). The access roads to the development are not suitable either for construction traffic or the increase volume of traffic that additional housing would generate. Many of the original residents of the village have endured the disruption of construction traffic and the disturbance to their lives caused by the final building. It would seem unreasonable at this time to create additional disruption to residents. Furthermore both Broughton and Mawsley have received significant growth within the current plan period whilst unfairly in my opinion Geddington, a village of similar size has received and has planned significantly less housing requirement in this SPP2. Whilst it is not given, Geddington has been bypassed and has facilities which could and would benefit from additional housing, which happens in many cases where a bypass has been built. In a simple trade off between an additional 55 houses in Mawsley or Geddington there are greater benefits in allocating in a village which has had significant public funds invested in a bypass. Equally locations in Geddington are largely accessed from the old A43 directly onto former A road rather than through an established residential area. I have de this point before that the distribution of housing in Broughton and Mawsley is unfair and less practical that would be the case in Geddington. My suggestion is that this additional development in Mawsley is not well located or well considered in relation to other options available in a similar sized village and should be deleted from the plan being considered.	None.	The issues raised have been considered through the site assessment work, the detail of this is included in the Housing Allocations Background Papers (2012, 2013, 2016 and 2019). Where appropriate, criteria have been included in Policy MAW2 to ensure issues identified through the assessment process are adequately addressed.	No changes recommended.	Yes
45	75	Resident of Ashley	13	Ashley	114	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	13.27. Ashley Parish Council fully support the proposed plans as proposed by Kettering Borough Council. We would request that all planning applications are considered baring in mind the Village design statement, AVDS. The AVDS has been adopted by Kettering borough Council as a 'material consideration' when dealing with any applications in Ashley. The AVDS goes into detail about the many historical buildings in the village and the pattern of historical growth. Any development should be sympathetic to the AVDS and the principles it lays out. We are pleased this is noted in point 13.27. We wish to stress the importance of the George pub within the village. It is registered as an asset of community value and is our last public house and the villagers strongly wish to keep it open, we are pleased to see it noted in point 13.27.	None.	Noted.	None.	No
45	76	Resident of Ashley	Policy ASH1	Ashley Development Principles	115	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	additional comments, plus the addition of an area of open green space.	Ashley parish council is not opposed to new housing within the village boundary; however, we feel a mix of housing should be promoted, i.e. affordable starter cottages as well as medium and larger properties. Ashley Parish Council fully support the creation of the three areas designated HV1, HV1001, HV1002, HV1001 and the two areas of open green space in the playground and the church grave yard. Ashley Parish Council requests that the new recreation ground and sports facilities, in the two former fields to the north of the playground up to the top of Church Hill be designated as open green space. Equally that the tennis court, petanque court, football pitch and the cricket net be noted as such on the plan.	See recommended change.	A main modification is proposed to the policies map to ensure that the areas of open space referred to are identified on the map. Refer to the Main Modification Schedule, reference number MM48	No
46	77	Resident of Mawsley	Policy MAW2	Land to the West of Mawsley	140	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Objection to the proposed housing allocation RA174. This will have an adverse effect on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties and the proposal for infill development would materially harm the character of Mawsley. Concerns about the proposed number of dwellings and flooding on the site and may impact on road safety. A further increase in the number of households in the village will stretch the infrastructure, especially with limited connectivity to public transport. This proposal conflicts with Policy 11 (JCS). Link to full comment.	None.	The issues raised have been considered through the site assessment work, the detail of this is included in the Housing Allocations Background Papers (2012, 2013, 2016 and 2019). Where appropriate, criteria have been included in Policy MAW2 to ensure issues identified through the assessment process are adequately addressed.	No changes recommended.	No
47	78	Anglian Water	Policy KET3	Kettering Fire Station, Headlands	75	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	As noted in the Council's assessment of housing sites there is existing Anglian Water infrastructure within the boundary of the site. We would ask that this be considered as part of the site design and layout to ensure that we can continue to serve our customers. In the event that there is a need to divert our existing assets formal application to Anglian Water would be required.	Add new paragraph to supporting text to read: There is an existing sewer and water main in Anglian Water's ownership within the boundary of the site and the site layout should be designed to take these into account. This existing infrastructure is protected by easements and should not be built over or located in private gardens where access for maintenance and repair could be restricted. The existing sewer and water main should be located in highways or public open space. If this is not possible a formal application to divert Anglian Water's existing assets may be required. Add new criterion to Policy KET3: 'the safeguarding of suitable access for the maintenance of foul drainage and water supply infrastructure.'	See recommended change.	A Main Modification is proposed to address this issue. Refer to the Main Modifications Schedule, MM10	Yes
47	79	Anglian Water	Policy KET4	Land west of Kettering, Gipsy Lane	76	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	As noted in the Council's assessment of housing sites there is existing Anglian Water infrastructure within the boundary of the site. We would ask that this be considered as part of the site design and layout to ensure that we can continue to serve our customers. In the event that there is a need to divert our existing assets formal application to Anglian Water would be required.	Add new paragraph to supporting text to read: There is an existing sewer and water main in Anglian Water's ownership within the boundary of the site and the site layout should be designed to take these into account. This existing infrastructure is protected by easements and should not be built over or located in private gardens where access for maintenance and repair could be restricted. The existing sewer and water main should be located in highways or public open space. If this is not possible a formal application to divert Anglian Water's existing assets may be required. Add new criterion to Policy KET4: 'the safeguarding of suitable access for the maintenance of foul drainage infrastructure.'	See recommended change.	A Main Modification is proposed to address this issue. Refer to the Main Modifications Schedule, MM12	Yes
47	80	Anglian Water	Policy KET5	Glendon Ironworks, Sackville Street	77	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	As noted in the Council's assessment of housing sites there is existing Anglian Water infrastructure within the boundary of the site. We would ask that this be considered as part of the site design and layout to ensure that we can continue to serve our customers. In the event that there is a need to divert our existing assets formal application to Anglian Water would be required.	Add new paragraph to supporting text to read: There is an existing sewer in Anglian Water's ownership within the boundary of the site and the site layout should be designed to take these into account. This existing infrastructure is protected by easements and should not be built over or located in private gardens where access for maintenance and repair could be restricted. The existing sewers should be located in highways or public open space. If this is not possible a formal application to divert Anglian Water's existing assets may be required. Add new criterion to Policy KET5: 'the safeguarding of suitable access for the maintenance of foul drainage infrastructure'	See recommended change.	A Main Modification is proposed to address this issue. Refer to the Main Modifications Schedule, MM13	Yes
47	81	Anglian Water	Policy KET7	Factory adjacent to 52 Lawson Street	78	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	As noted in the Council's assessment of housing sites there is existing Anglian Water infrastructure within the boundary of the site. We would ask that this be considered as part of the site design and layout to ensure that we can continue to serve our customers. In the event that there is a need to divert our existing assets formal application to Anglian Water would be required.	Add new paragraph to supporting text to read: There is an existing water main in Anglian Water's ownership within the boundary of the site and the site layout should be designed to take these into account. This existing infrastructure is protected by easements and should not be built over or located in private gardens where access for maintenance and repair could be restricted. The existing sewers should be located in highways or public open space. If this is not possible a formal application to divert Anglian Water's existing assets may be required. Add new criterion to Policy KET7: 'the safeguarding of suitable access for the maintenance of water supply infrastructure.'	See recommended change.	A Main Modification is proposed to address this issue. Refer to the Main Modifications Schedule, MM15	Yes
47	82	Anglian Water	8	Flood Risk and Sustainable Water Management	55	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Policy NEH1 does not refer to relevant documents produced by Anglian relating to the adopting of SuDS. The supporting text in the Kettering Part 2 Local Plan should be amended for consistency with the requirements of Policy 5 of the adopted Core Strategy. Link to full comment.	It is therefore suggested that Policy NEH1 be amended as follows: 'Have regard to the Flood Toolkit and Local Standards and Guidance for Surface Water Drainage in Northamptonshire, together with the guidance produced by Anglian Water and the water sector (and successor documents), and w W here appropriate, demonstrate how the proposal has had regard to these documents. We would also ask that the supporting text of Policy NEH1 be amended as follows: '8.9 Major n N new developments must address surface water drainage requirements as set out in the Northamptonshire Flood Toolkit and local guidance. Development proposals should also address Anglian Water's surface water policy/guidance and water sector wide guidance relating to the adoption of SuDS (or any successor documents) where SuDS features are proposed to be adopted by Anglian Water. The Council will continue to explore alternative sources of funding to undertake feasibility studies in order to improve our understanding of local flooding issues and identify viable solutions that would alleviate future flooding or minimize the impact. It is the guidance only applies to major schemes however in light of the findings of the Kettering SWMP, stricter requirements on surface water drainage proposals for sites located in areas draining into the CDCs will be required for all development schemes. The particular measures used to reduce flood risk off-site will depend on site specific circumstances to the scale of development. Sites should look to discharge their surface water to as sustainable location as possible. Planning applications involving discharging surface water to foul sewers are unlikely to be supported as a surface water connection will only be accepted by Anglian Water in exceptional circumstances where it can be demonstrated that there are no alternatives.'	See recommended change.	A Main Modification is proposed to address the issues raised in this response. Refer to the Main Modification Schedule, reference number MM7	Yes
47	83	Anglian Water	Policy KET1	Scott Road Garages	73	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	As noted in the Council's assessment of housing sites there is existing Anglian Water infrastructure within the boundary of the site. We would ask that this be considered as part of the site design and layout to ensure that we can continue to serve our customers. In the event that there is a need to divert our existing assets formal application to Anglian Water would be required.	Add new paragraph to supporting text to read: There is an existing sewer in Anglian Water's ownership within the boundary of the site and the site layout should be designed to take these into account. This existing infrastructure is protected by easements and should not be built over or located in private gardens where access for maintenance and repair could be restricted. The existing sewers should be located in highways or public open space. If this is not possible a formal application to divert Anglian Water's existing assets may be required. Add new criterion to Policy KET1: 'the safeguarding of suitable access for the maintenance of foul drainage infrastructure'	See recommended change.	A Main Modification is proposed to address this issue. Refer to the Main Modifications Schedule, MM8	Yes
47	84	Anglian Water	Policy KET8	Land to the rear of Cranford Road	79	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	As noted in the Council's assessment of housing sites there is existing Anglian Water infrastructure within the boundary of the site. We would ask that this be considered as part of the site design and layout to ensure that we can continue to serve our customers. In the event that there is a need to divert our existing assets formal application to Anglian Water would be required.	Add new paragraph to supporting text to read: There is an existing sewer in Anglian Water's ownership within the boundary of the site and the site layout should be designed to take these into account. This existing infrastructure is protected by easements and should not be built over or located in private gardens where access for maintenance and repair could be restricted. The existing sewers should be located in highways or public open space. If this is not possible a formal application to divert Anglian Water's existing assets may be required. Add new criterion to Policy KET8: 'the safeguarding of suitable access for the maintenance of water supply infrastructure'	See recommended change.	A Main Modification is proposed to address this issue. Refer to the Main Modifications Schedule, MM17	Yes
47	85	Anglian Water	Policy KET10	Land at Wickstead Park, east of Sussex Road and Kent Place	82	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	As noted in the Council's assessment of housing sites there is existing Anglian Water infrastructure within the boundary of the site. We would ask that this be considered as part of the site design and layout to ensure that we can continue to serve our customers. In the event that there is a need to divert our existing assets formal application to Anglian Water would be required.	Add new paragraph to supporting text to read: There are existing four and surface water sewers in Anglian Water's ownership within the boundary of the site and the site layout should be designed to take these into account. This existing infrastructure is protected by easements and should not be built over or located in private gardens where access for maintenance and repair could be restricted. The existing sewers should be located in highways or public open space. If this is not possible a formal application to divert Anglian Water's existing assets may be required. Add new criterion to Policy KET10: 'the safeguarding of suitable access for the maintenance of foul and surface water drainage infrastructure.'	See recommended change.	A Main Modification is proposed to address this issue. Refer to the Main Modifications Schedule, MM20	Yes
47	86	Anglian Water	Policy BLA5	Land adjacent to The Bungalow, Higham Road, Burton Latimer	90	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Policy BLA5 Land adjacent to Bungalow, Higham Road, Burton Latimer As noted in the Council's assessment of housing sites there is existing Anglian Water infrastructure within the boundary of the site. We would ask that this be considered as part of the site design and layout to ensure that we can continue to serve our customers. In the event that there is a need to divert our existing assets formal application to Anglian Water would be required.	Add new paragraph to supporting text to read: There are existing foul sewer in Anglian Water's ownership within the boundary of the site and the site layout should be designed to take these into account. This existing infrastructure is protected by easements and should not be built over or located in private gardens where access for maintenance and repair could be restricted. The existing sewers should be located in highways or public open space. If this is not possible a formal application to divert Anglian Water's existing assets may be required. Add new criterion to Policy BLA5: 'the safeguarding of suitable access for the maintenance of foul water drainage infrastructure.'	See recommended change.	A Main Modification is proposed to address this issue. Refer to the Main Modifications Schedule, MM24	Yes
47	87	Anglian Water	Policy BLA6	Bosworth Nurseries and Garden Centre, Finendon Road, Burton Latimer	91	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	As noted in the Council's assessment of housing sites there is existing Anglian Water infrastructure within the boundary of the site. We would ask that this be considered as part of the site design and layout to ensure that we can continue to serve our customers. In the event that there is a need to divert our existing assets formal application to Anglian Water would be required.	Add new paragraph to supporting text to read: There are existing foul sewer in Anglian Water's ownership within the boundary of the site and the site layout should be designed to take these into account. This existing infrastructure is protected by easements and should not be built over or located in private gardens where access for maintenance and repair could be restricted. The existing sewers should be located in highways or public open space. If this is not possible a formal application to divert Anglian Water's existing assets may be required. Add new criterion to Policy BLA6: 'the safeguarding of suitable access for the maintenance of foul water drainage infrastructure.'	See recommended change.	A Main Modification is proposed to address this issue. Refer to the Main Modifications Schedule, MM26	Yes

47	89	Anglian Water	Policy ROT3	Land to the West of Rothwell	104	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	As noted in the Councils assessment of housing sites there is existing Anglian Water infrastructure within the boundary of the site. We would ask that this be considered as part of the site design and layout to ensure that we can continue to serve our customers. In the event that there is a need to divert our existing assets a formal application to Anglian Water would be required.	Add new paragraph to supporting text to read: There are existing foul sewer and water main in Anglian Water's ownership within the boundary of the site and the site layout should be designed to take these into account. This existing infrastructure is protected by easements and should not be built over or located in private gardens where access for maintenance and repair could be restricted. The existing sewers should be located in highways or public open space. If this is not possible a formal application to divert Anglian Water's existing assets may be required. Add new criterion to Policy ROT3: 'the safeguarding of suitable access for the maintenance of foul water drainage and water supply infrastructure.'	See recommended change.	A Main Modification is proposed to address this issue. Refer to the Main Modifications Schedule, MM317?	Yes	
47	98	Anglian Water	Policy GED3	Geddington South East	126	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	None.	None.	Noted.	None.	No	
47	111	Anglian Water	Policy NEH2	Green Infrastructure	63	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Anglian Water is supportive of the objectives of Policy NE2 but has some comments about how it would be applied particularly for any major development proposals relating to water and water recycling infrastructure. Reference is made to major development providing a net gain of green infrastructure in the district through on-site provision or off-site contributions to green infrastructure. In our earlier comments we had raised concerns that Policy ENVO1 (now NEH 2) does not define how this requirement would be applied to development proposals within the Borough. As currently drafted it appears to apply all major developments including those proposed by Anglian Water as an infrastructure provider as defined in the Development Management Procedure Order 2015. It remains unclear what form contributions would take particularly for developments that would not be expected to have a recreational impact.	It is therefore proposed that Policy NEH2 be amended as follows: 'a. Major development will deliver on-site and/or make off-site contributions to achieve a net gain of green infrastructure in accordance with the Aims and Objectives set out in the Kettering Green Infrastructure updated documents). Any contributions would be proportionate to scale and nature of proposals including whether there is a need for recreational access.'	These issues would be considered at planning application stage, it is not considered necessary for this wording to be added to the policy.	No changes recommended.	Yes	
48	91	Clerk - Thorpe Malsor Parish Council	8	Natural Capital and Green Infrastructure	55	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Chapter 8 does not sufficiently identify and protect all the natural assets and green infrastructure in the Borough. Local Wildlife Sites are not recognised Table 8.1. As stated in paragraph 8.14, the JCS, particularly Policy 4, seeks to protect, enhance and restore biodiversity assets and we believe the Local Plan should recognise and include these Local Wildlife sites within Table 8.1. Cranstley Reservoir is not a designated natural asset. The GI policy for the Borough is not easy to comprehend and not all designated Local Corridors are identified correctly. The Plan does not recognise or map all local wildlife-rich habitats and wider ecological networks and there are concerns that the protection afforded to this area has been removed by superseding Policy 10 with Policy NEH2. Link to full comment.	None.	Saved Local Plan Policy 10 seeks to set out those circumstances where development of these areas is considered acceptable, it is an exceptions policy. Cranstley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are both located outside of any existing or proposed settlements boundaries and are therefore considered as being in open countryside. As a result, these areas are afforded a level of protection through existing policy in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS). The relevant JCS policies are referenced in Policy RS4 of the emerging SSP2 Publication Plan. The purpose of this policy is to set criteria that have to be met for development in the open countryside to be considered acceptable. Policy RS4 of the Publication Plan provides additional criteria to that set out in the JCS, in relation to replacement dwellings and the re-use of redundant or disused buildings as well as private equestrian facilities. Cranstley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are sufficiently protected due to their location in the open countryside. Therefore although, there is no specific policy in relation to both the Cranstley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs proposed in the Publication Plan, the level of protection afforded to these two reservoirs will not diminish as a result.	A minor modification is proposed to address concerns raised in relation to Figure 8.1. Please refer to Additional Modifications Schedule, AM11	Yes	
49	120	Natural England	Policy DESS	Land to the south of Desborough	97							Policy DESS should include a requirement for a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) to prevent sediment pollution in the River Ise. Priority habitats should be identified within your plan. It is disappointing that the floodplain meadow associated with Tailby Meadow (MG4) is not included within the SSP2. It is critical that the LPP2 does consider the importance of MG4 and provide a requirement for a CEMP. Link to full comment.	None.	The need for a condition requiring a Construction Environmental Management Plan will be considered through the planning application process. Criteria 1 requires an assessment of the impact on biodiversity and ecology and provision of mitigation where required.	No changes recommended.		
49	121	Natural England	Policy TCE2	Proposals for a Medium Sized Foodstore	42							Natural England are pleased that Policy TCE2 includes our advice provided on 27 July 2018 (Our Ref: 250421) regarding GI corridors, within point (e).	None.	Noted.	None.		
49	122	Natural England	Policy NEH1	Local Flood Risk Management Policy	57							We are pleased that a section on flood risk and sustainable water management has been included, as well as policy NEH1.	However within Q4 paragraph 2 of our 27 July 2018 response we feel our following advice still needs to be included. 'We advise that to ensure the plan is sound and compliant with para's 20, 171 and 175c of the revised NPPF that wording is included in the SSP2 that: 'Ensures development firstly avoids impacts on designated sites, and that the policy follows the avoid, mitigate, compensate hierarchy; protects and enhances the River Ise and Meadows SSSI from adverse impacts (including direct and indirect impact pathways of development). In particular, Natural England would support a policy within SSP2 which states that increased sediment [and nutrient] loading upstream of River Ise and Meadows SSSI will be avoided.'	Policy 4 of the Joint Core Strategy sets out the principle of refusing development where significant harm cannot be avoided mitigated or compensated. It is not necessary to repeat this in the SSP2.	No changes recommended.		
49	123	Natural England	Policy KET9	McAlpine's Yard, Pycshley Lodge Road	81							None.	We note that South Field Farm Marsh SSSI and Slade Brook, which are important ecological assets, are not mentioned with respect to KE184a. We advise that they are.	The Slade Brooke is referenced in paragraph 9.23.		A minor amendment is proposed to update the supporting text to make reference to South Field Farm Marsh SSSI. Refer to the Additional Modification Schedule, reference numbers AM16	
49	124	Natural England	General Comments	Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan - Publication Plan	0							None.	Biodiversity Net Gain is not explicitly defined within the plan, or committed to. We advise your authority that Biodiversity Net Gain should have its own policy, and that the type of net gain being referred to is clarified throughout the Plan. We advise this particularly in light of the SA conclusions, which rely on the provision of biodiversity net gain to conclude the plan will achieve a 'significant positive effect'	Policy 4 of the JCS requires a net gain in biodiversity. This does not need to be repeated in the SSP2.	No changes recommended.		
49	125	Natural England	General Comments	Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan - Publication Plan	0							None.	Biodiversity Net Gain is not explicitly defined within the plan, or committed to. We advise your authority that Biodiversity Net Gain should have its own policy, and that the type of net gain being referred to is clarified throughout the Plan. We advise this particularly in light of the SA conclusions, which rely on the provision of biodiversity net gain to conclude the plan will achieve a 'significant positive effect'	Policy 4 of the JCS requires a net gain in biodiversity. This does not need to be repeated in the SSP2.	No changes recommended.		
49	126	Natural England	General Comments	Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan - Publication Plan	0							The protection of soil resources or Best and Most Versatile land is not mentioned within the plan. We again advise this is included, since it is a requirement of the NPPF.	None.	The protection of Best and Most versatile agricultural land has been taken into account through the site assessment process.	No changes recommended		
49	127	Natural England	General Comments	Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan - Publication Plan	0							None.	The Plan also does not mention how it will protect priority species, or prioritise development towards brownfield sites. We again advise this is included, since it is a requirement of the NPPF.	Policy 4 of the JCS sets out the approach to protection of priority species and Policy 6 of the JCS prioritises the re-use of previously developed land. There is no need for the SSP2 to repeat these policies.	No changes recommended.		
49	128	Natural England	Policy NEH2	Green Infrastructure	63							None.	We welcome the commitment in NEH2 regarding new GI. However we advise the wording 'where achievable' is removed.	This wording is necessary as it will not always be possible for this to be achieved.	No changes recommended.		
49	129	Natural England	Policy MAW2	Land to the West of Mawsley	140							None.	We are pleased that SANGS are mentioned within LP Policy MA02 (i) as a potential mitigation measure in response to our comments on the allocation of RA/174. However, we do advise that the wording this could include is removed. As we wrote in 2018, the SANG is a minimum requirement at this location to protect Birch Spinney and Mawsley Marsh SSSI. Further, MAW2 will also require a commitment to provide a CEMP within the policy. Note, the watercourses and drains associated with this SSSI may be sensitive to development, and any potential for impact need to be investigated.	MAW2 I has been worded flexibly to ensure mitigation is informed by the assessment required to be undertaken.	No changes recommended.		
49	131	Natural England	General Comments	Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan - Publication Plan - Habitats Regulations Assessment	0							1. The HRA conclusion in section 6 (page 26) is based on the assumption that golden plover fly 4km away from the SPA. However, it is known that golden plover can fly up to 15-20km away from the SPA. Therefore impact needs to reasonably assessed using this distance criteria. Until this assessment has taken place, we disagree with the conclusions of the HRA, and advise that your justifications are revised. 2. This information comes from Natural England's evidence-based Impact Risk Zones. The IRZs covered in our guidance aims to protect the SSSIs and their designated bird populations, as afforded by Part II of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and through the Conservation of Species & Habitats Regulations 2017 (as amended); for those SSSIs that are also classified as Special Protection Areas (SPAs). Note that two factors are taken into consideration when deciding on appropriate IRZs for SSSIs designated for bird populations: the Potential Impact Distance of development and the extent of Functionally Linked Land used by designated bird populations.	None.	The SSP2 is a part 2 plan and sits beneath the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS) which is the Part 1 Local Plan. An HRA was completed for the JCS. The 4km zone used in the HRA for the SSP2 was chosen to match the JCS HRA where the use of that zone was agreed with Natural England. Further advice has been sought from Natural England and Natural England has advised that this threshold requires updating. It has been agreed with Natural England that for the purposes of the SSP2 a range of 10km will be used. An update to the HRA has been prepared and is currently being finalised. The conclusion of this updated assessment is that the SSP2 will not have a Likely Significant Effect (LSE) on the SPA in relation to the loss of functionally linked land. Officers will seek agreement from Natural England that this update addresses their concerns in relation to the HRA.	None.		
49	132	Natural England	General Comments	Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan - Sustainability Appraisal	0							Within Table 11.6 'summary of effects', we disagree with the 'score' for biodiversity because: (a) Biodiversity net gain is not explicitly defined or committed too within the Plan. A specific overarching policy for biodiversity net gain is required within the Plan. (b) Natural England disagree with the conclusions of the HRA (c) As indicated above, there are policy wording changes and additions that are required to ensure all policies are sound.	None.	The SSP2 needs to be read alongside the North Northamptonshire JCS which is the Part 1 Local Plan. JCS Policy 4 requires a net gain in biodiversity and Policy 19 a net gain in Green Infrastructure, policy NEH2 also sets a requirements for net gain in GI. The score for biodiversity is therefore considered to be appropriate.	No changes recommended.		
49	133	Natural England	19	Appendix 4 - Infrastructure Delivery Schedule	213							We are aware of concerning phosphate levels regarding the Ise SSSI. We note that Appendix 4 of the Publication Plan suggests there may be an borough-wide update on the North Northamptonshire detailed water cycle study from 2009, however when this will be undertaken is unclear.	None.	Noted.	None.		
49	134	Natural England	Policy DESS	Land to the south of Desborough	97							We are pleased that Policy DE/210 includes a requirement for a Surface Water Drainage Assessment. We advise that relevant policies are updated when new strategic water cycle information is available.	None.	Noted.	None.		
50	130	Resident of Mawsley	Policy MAW2	Land to the West of Mawsley	140	No	No	No	No	No	No	The need for growth in is unlikely at present, given the age of the village and the capacity of existing infrastructure is not sufficient as this is not a small scale development. No consideration to the existing form character and setting of the village and any increase needs to be proportionate and considered as to its needs. Link to full comment.	The plan needs to be reduced in size and take into consideration the need by existing residents and their families of which at the moment there is no evidence. The lack of infrastructure needs addressing. Consideration and respect need to be given to Mawsley's village status. At the moment it is being ignored. The unique features of the village need to be maintained and enhanced with any development. Existing built area of Cranstley rise and Birch Spinney should not be extended beyond all (RA/174 13.106), the word significantly needs removing. (MAW2)	The Categorisation of Villages: Background Paper (October 2019) provides a justification for the distribution of housing in the rural area. The issues raised have been considered through the site assessment work, the detail of this is included in the Housing Allocations Background Papers (2012, 2013, 2018 and 2019) Where appropriate, criteria have been included in Policy MAW2 to ensure issues identified through the assessment process are adequately addressed.	No changes recommended.	Yes	
51	135	Resident of Mawsley	Policy MAW2	Land to the West of Mawsley	140	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	The plan does not take into account the original concept of the village layout. The village now has over 900 dwellings and that should not be increased for at least 50 years	None.	The Categorisation of Villages: Background Paper (October 2019) provides a justification for the distribution of housing in the rural area.	None.		
52	137	Carter Jonas LLP	Policy KET4	Land west of Kettering, Gipsy Lane	76	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	It has been demonstrated through the planning application process and the Sustainability Appraisal that the site is suitable for the proposed development, and since development has not started it would be appropriate to allocate the site in the Part 2 Local Plan. The site is suitable, available and deliverable for the proposed development specified in Policy KET4. If appropriate a Statement of Common Ground could be prepared between the Council and PDBF to confirm that Site Allocation KET4 is suitable for allocation in the Part 2 Local Plan. Link to full comment.	No changes are needed in respect of Policy KET4, and it is requested that this policy and the associated site allocation are retained.	Noted.	None.		
53	138	CRES Ltd on behalf of Wacoal Europe Ltd	Policy DES3	Opportunity Environmental Improvement Sites in	95	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Given the number of delivery vehicles that need ready access to their site daily, Wacoal are conscious of the impact on their business. This includes any changes in capacity or use that could increase the likelihood for traffic incidents that could impede or curtail the use of the B576 and specifically servicing access to their premises. Wacoal would be opposed to any narrowing of the B576, or the reduction in carriage width at any of the various road junctions along the B576 within Desborough and will increase the potential risk of collisions. A cycle way should be provided on the route of the B576. Link to full comment.	None.	The intention of Policy DES3 is to provide opportunities to create a more attractive town centre. These opportunities were identified in the Desborough Urban Design Framework. The detail of these schemes needs to be developed and would take into account potential impacts of any scheme on the road network.	No changes recommended.	No	

53	139	CRES Ltd on behalf of Wacoal Europe Ltd	Policy DES6	Land adjacent to Magnetic Park, Harborough Road, Desborough	96	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Policy DES6 - Given the number of delivery vehicles that need ready access to their site daily, Wacoal are conscious of the impact on their business. This includes any changes in capacity or use that could increase the likelihood for traffic incidents that could impede or curtail the use of the B576 and specifically servicing access to their premises. Whilst Wacoal would support the designation of this site for employment. The access arrangements for the site need to be carefully considered to minimise the risks of any traffic incidents. A condition should be placed upon developers such that they will be required to place a median barrier on the centre line of the carriageway to prevent any right turns into or out of the development from the B576. Link to full comment.	None.	Northamptonshire County Council highways has been consulted through the site assessment process. They have not identified the mitigation proposed as a requirement. Therefore, it is not considered appropriate to include a criteria requiring the proposed mitigation. Through the planning application process detailed assessment would be undertaken to ensure that the proposed access to the site does not have an unacceptable impact on the highway network.	No changes recommended.	No	
54	140	Shoomitha LLP on behalf of landowner	Policy NEH3	Historically and Visually Important Local Green Spaces	68	No				No		HV1028 - Policy NEH3. HV1028 does not meet the requirements of NPPF, paragraph 100 (b); it is not demonstrably special to the local community nor does it hold local significance. The designation of HV1028 as Local Green Space is based on an assessment that it is "a key open space in the setting of the village and for numerous listed buildings. It provides views to the Grade II Listed Church and creates the rural character for the village". However, in so far as that is correct the settings of the listed buildings and of the village is already afforded enough and appropriate statutory protection by virtue of their listing and the designation of the Loddington Conservation Area. Link to full comment.	The deletion of HE1028	The Historically and Visually Important Local Green Spaces have been identified through a robust assessment process. The Historically and Visually Important Local Green Space Background Papers (September 2015, June 2016 and October 2019) provide the evidence base and justification for the Historically and Visually Important Local Green Space identified on the policies maps.	No changes recommended.	Yes	
55	141	King West	General Comments		0	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	None.	None.	Noted.	None.	No	
56	142	Resident of Kettering	Table 8.1	Designated Natural Assets	59					Yes	Yes	8.1 Problems have been identified with our bodies of water being polluted. Public campaigns can be conducted alongside practical measures to try and improve the quality of the water. The potential shortage of water identified in this document needs to be tackled. Also, a project would be welcomed as part of which residents can contribute in person or financially to the planting of trees. I propose planting a new tree for every resident born in the Kettering area, with the parents receiving a certificate and an approximate location of the tree. This system is already in operation in Wales, where it has been proven to be successful. The fact that 'climate change' is not mentioned anywhere is probably not unlawful, but it gives cause for concern. Particularly since the statement that there are no problems with air quality was based on incorrect figures which have recently been corrected. The corrected figures show that there are air quality problems in the town centre. We cannot take it for granted that these measurements will decline. Although exhaust fumes may become gradually cleaner, the volume is increasing due to increasing traffic flows at the growing population in general. Public transport and cycle lanes are crucial to remedy this proven risk to public health.	None.	Noted. Policy 9 of the JCS requires new residential development to incorporate measures to limit water use.	None.	Yes	
56	143	Resident of Kettering	8	Natural Environment and Heritage	55							Section 8: protection of water bodies. I am concerned to find out that the protection of wildlife in Cransley reservoir may be reduced. We need to protect our wildlife.	None.	Saved Local Plan Policy 10 seeks to set out those circumstances where development of these areas is considered acceptable, it is an exceptions policy. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are both located outside of any existing or proposed settlements boundaries and are therefore considered as being in open countryside. As a result, these areas are afforded a level of protection through existing policy in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS). The relevant JCS policies are referenced in Policy RS4 of the emerging SSP2 Publication Plan. The purpose of this policy is to set criteria that have to be met for development in the open countryside to be considered acceptable. Policy RS4 of the Publication Plan provides additional criteria to that set out in the JCS, in relation to replacement dwellings and the re-use of redundant or disused buildings as well as private equestrian facilities. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are sufficiently protected due to their location in the open countryside. Therefore although, there is no specific policy in relation to both the Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs proposed in the Publication Plan, the level of protection afforded to these two reservoirs will not diminish as a result.	None.	No changes are recommended.	
56	144	Resident of Kettering	6	Town Centres	41							6 Town centres - there should be community centres in every ward. There is no community centre in Pipers Hill Ward.	None.	Noted. Policy HWC provides support for proposals for new community facilities.	None.		
56	145	Resident of Kettering	7	Health and Well-being and Community Facilities	48							There is no mention of Climate Change in the plan. This is a huge oversight. Climate change poses a big risk to the public. It should have an impact on how we approach electric vehicle charging points, monitoring air quality, installing cycle paths and walkways, providing storage space for bikes in new developments, etc.	None.	Paragraph 2.16 sets out how the plan will contribute towards outcome 2 of the JCS - adaptability to climate change.	No changes are recommended.		
56	146	Resident of Kettering	4	Housing	25					Yes	Yes	4 Housing requirements: more emphasis should be placed on ground heating pumps. For groups of council houses, ground heating pumps should be the default source of energy, also as a flagship project for other developments. Special advice and support should be available for developments incorporating ground heating pumps. There could be a public awareness campaign to promote them.	None.	Noted.	None.		
56	147	Resident of Kettering	8	Flood Risk and Sustainable Water Management	55							Concerted efforts should be made to clean and maintain our water bodies. Also to look into finding a new way to store water reserves, as suggested in the plan. Sufficient attention should be given to this since water shortages would have drastic implications.	None.	Noted.	Noted.		
57	148	David Lock Associates on behalf of Hanwood Park LLP	9	Kettering and Barton Seagrave	72	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Growth in Kettering is heavily reliant upon the delivery of Hanwood Park. Surprised and disappointed that there is no associated allocation and Hanwood Park-site-specific policy included within the emerging Plan. For the reasons set out, this should be remedied as soon as possible, for the Plan to be effective, deliverable and 'sound'. In addition, the justification for the housing trajectory as indicated in Appendix 1 of the SSP2 is unclear. Table 16.1 and the housing trajectory conflict in terms of the figures provided on the Kettering East SUE. This should be amended and clarified in the Plan. Link to full comment.	In order to meet the tests of soundness in the NPPF, we would request the inclusion of an allocation, inclusion on the Proposals Map and additional housing site-specific policy in Section 9 of the Plan, identifying the Kettering East SUE (Hanwood Park) and seeking to support and reinforce the housing, employment, education, leisure, community and associated infrastructure commitments associated with the on-going development of the site. Whilst significant efforts are underway to ensure timely reserved matters are submitted and approved for the continuation of Phase 1 delivery at Hanwood Park, and for the 'renewal' of the outline planning permission, there is currently no planning policy 'hook' or justification to ensure the principles of the development endure in the emerging Plan and support any future applications, which are vitally important for the delivery of Hanwood Park as a sustainable urban extension to the town.	The Kettering East SUE is a strategic site, the SSP2 only deals with non-strategic sites. A policy relating to this site would need to be considered through a review of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy. The Housing Trajectory is based on figures provided by Hanwood Park for the first five years and on the trajectory agreed through the JCS for the remaining period to 2031. These do not total 5,500 as it is anticipated that the development will continue to be built out beyond 2031.	No changes recommended.	Yes	
57	149	David Lock Associates on behalf of Hanwood Park LLP	5	Employment Allocations	34	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No additional employment allocations for Kettering are stipulated in the SSP2. Notwithstanding this, the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy 2011-2031 (JCS) in addition to the Council relying on the housing numbers of this site, relies on the provision of employment parcels at Hanwood Park to justify employment floorspace and thereby ensure sustainable development across Kettering. Policy 23 of the JCS specifies a job creation target of 8,100 for Kettering Borough in the period 2011-2031, the scale and mix of which will be supported by the committed SUEs, including Hanwood Park. The Employment Land Review and Allocation Background Paper (as referred to in Paragraph 5.21) projects a total of 42,400 sqm of floorspace to be provided at the Kettering East SUE within the plan period up to 2031, yet the KBC SSP2 fails to make explicit how this will be achieved. There is no adequate or effective policy to safeguard the employment supply at the Kettering East SUE.	Therefore, as indicated above, a Hanwood Park site-specific policy for Hanwood Park is essential to support the development of on-site employment, and to achieve the JCS target. Therefore, in order for the Plan to be effective and 'sound', our client considers that a site-specific allocation and policy should be included within the Plan and referred to within Section 5 of the SSP2.	The Employment Allocations Background Paper sets out the Council's approach to employment allocations in the plan period, 2011-2031 covered by the Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan. Hanwood Park is a strategic site and therefore will not be considered for allocation in the Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan and this matter should be dealt with through the future review of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy.	None.	Yes	
57	150	David Lock Associates on behalf of Hanwood Park LLP	Policy NEH4	Open Spaces	70	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Hanwood Park LLP also note reference to the Kettering Open Space Strategy (OSS) in paragraphs 8.45-8.47 and Policy NEH4. However, the Open Space Strategy has not yet been published or available to view as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan and so in light of this, HPL fail to see how Policy NEH4 can be considered to be justified, effective or positively prepared and therefore fails the test of soundness.	HPL request that this document is published as part of the evidence base in the interests of transparency and consider that the policy cannot be justified without the appropriate evidence base.	See below.	A Main Modification is proposed to address the issues raised in this response. Refer to the Main Modification Schedule, reference number MM6	Yes	
58	151	Home Builders Federation Ltd	Policy BLA6	Bosworth Nurseries and Garden Centre, Finedon Road, Burton Latimer	91	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	It is noted that in Policy BLA6 there are more than one criterion references to affordable housing provision, which are not consistent. Criterion (d) includes the provision of a minimum of 30% affordable homes whilst Criterion (h) provides 30% of dwellings as affordable housing in accordance with Policy 30 of the adopted NNJCS.	Before the SSP2 is submitted for examination, Policy BLA6 should be amended to delete Criterion (d) and retain Criterion (h).	See recommended change.	A Main Modification is proposed to remove criteria d. Refer to the Main Modification Schedule, reference number MM7	Yes	
58	152	Home Builders Federation Ltd	Policy HOU2	Older Persons Housing	30	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Policy 30 should not be duplicated by Policy HOU2 of the SSP2. Policy HOU2 is repetitive. The Council's focus should be ensuring that appropriate sites are allocated to meet the needs of specifically identified groups. The SSP2 should ensure that suitable sites are available for a wide range of types of development across a wide choice of appropriate locations. The Council's proposed policy approach on the proportion, type and tenure of older persons housing is somewhat vague, which causes uncertainty for developers. If the policy is to be effective, the Council should provide further clarification of its requirements, which should be justified by supporting evidence on the housing needs of older people. Link to full comment.	Before the SSP2 is submitted for examination, Policy HOU2 should be amended or preferably deleted.	The need for older persons housing is identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) Update, 2015 which identified that 56% of the total projected housing growth for Kettering between 2011 and 2031 was for 65+ households. HOU2 does not duplicate policy 30 of the JCS. To meet the need identified for older persons housing it will be important for non-strategic sites to contribute towards meeting provision, however Policy HOU2 is flexible to ensure viability of schemes as well as site specific circumstances are taken into account.	No changes recommended.	Yes	
58	153	Home Builders Federation Ltd	Policy HOU4	Self-Build and Custom Build Housing	32	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Supportive of Policy HOU5: Single Plot Exception Sites for Custom and Self-Build although the HBF is not supportive of restrictive policy requirements for the inclusion of self & custom build housing on residential development sites. The HBF object to Policy HOU4 and therefore the provision of serviced plots for self & custom build residential development sites of 50 or more dwellings should not be sought. This policy places the burden for delivery of self & custom build plots onto developer's contrary to national guidance. The Council's Self & Custom Build Register alone is not a sound basis for setting a specific policy requirement. The Council's policy approach should be realistic for the policy is to be effective and should be justified by supporting evidence. The Council may aspire for self & custom build, but this should not be pursued at the expense of delivering affordable housing. Link to full comment.	Before the SSP2 is submitted for examination, Policy HOU4 should be deleted. There is insufficient evidence in the Self Build Register to demonstrate significant demand in the Borough, the proposed site threshold is unjustified and policy wording is unclear, which will be ineffective.	The Self and Custom Build Background Paper sets out the approach for determining the contents and subsequent thresholds included in Policy HOU4. It is recognised that the level of demand, as determined by the register in March 2019, as the base data for the aforementioned background paper, does not match the level of potential supply and delivery of self and custom build plots as identified in the Self and Custom Build Background Paper. However, as set out in the background paper the register is unlikely to show the true extent of demand in the borough, as it is reasonable to assume not all interested parties who have interest in building their own home are likely to be on the register. As a result, additional sources of data have been used to model the likely demand over the longer term. The data from the Three Dragons report has been used to calculate this demand over the next 10 years, towards the end of the plan period. It is also recognised that single dwelling schemes have the potential to be self-build or custom build schemes as stated in the Three Dragons report. The amount of single dwellings schemes matches closely to that to the number of entries on the register, however although this is an indication of delivery of self-build and custom build properties, there is no guarantee that these permissions represent self-build and custom build projects. Therefore, given that the evidence presented in the Self and Custom Build Background Paper presents a much larger demand for this type of housing as determined by the register, it is considered that using a threshold and percentage based policy is a proactive mechanism. It is considered that it will deliver a reliable and consistent supply for this type of housing in the long term, based on the potential demand as determined by the Three Dragons report. It also represents a pro-active approach to the delivery of this type of housing in the Borough. Government guidance does not require the specific preferences as indicated through the register, the only requirement of the local authority is that the sufficient permissions are granted in accordance with the level of demand that has been determined by the register. Whilst the logistical issues relating to the delivery of this type of housing are recognised, it is considered that Policy HOU4 sufficiently addresses these issues, specifically in relation to marketing of plots which remain unsold after 6 months can be built out by the developer. This timeframe is considered reasonable and practicable.	None.	Yes	
59	154	Director Armstrong Rigg Planning on behalf of Weetabix	Policy EMP1	Safeguarding Employment Land	36	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Proposed inclusion of land adjacent to the existing Weetabix employment site. The expansion land is key to Weetabix' ability to be able to secure the long-term future of the site and the current employee numbers (700+). Given the dated appearance of many of the buildings, this expansion land will be required in the future to be able to accommodate the relocation/replacement of existing facilities. It may also be required to locate new facilities on site such as a new factory or processing plant. Link to full comment.	Proposed inclusion of the land adjacent to the existing Weetabix site within the allocation of Safeguarded Employment Land associated with Policy EMP1. The Council has proposed to amend the wording of EMP1 to address concerns. Further detail is provided within the full representation. Link to full comment.	A Main Modification is proposed to add the additional wording proposed by the Council. Refer to the Main Modifications Schedule, MM1. The settlement boundaries have been drawn in accordance with a robust set of criteria. The Settlement Boundaries Background Papers (February 2012, April 2018 and October 2019) provide the evidence base and justification for the settlement boundaries shown on the policies maps.	No changes recommended to the settlement boundary.	Yes	
60	155	Williams Gallagher on behalf of P R Kettering Ltd c/o Elandi LLP	2	Vision	8	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No vision is provided for Kettering Town Centre. The need for town centres such as Kettering to evolve and adapt to challenges that are not represented in the KTCAP (2011). There is a need to diversify uses in town centres to address a surplus in retail floorspace. It is necessary for Draft Policy SSP2 to redefine and clarify its vision for Kettering Town Centre. It is up to date town centre issues should be recognised and addressed by a refined vision for Kettering Town Centre and built upon through a review of the KTCAP in due course. Link to full comment.	In view of the above, we consider it would be beneficial for the Draft SSP2 Vision to incorporate a refined vision for Kettering Town Centre. This vision would continue to promote Kettering Town Centre as a focus for the surrounding market towns (and as the focus for retail uses) but also recognise the need for it to diversify in a way that responds to rapid changes in the retail and leisure industries. It would also allow the Centre to adapt following the opening of Rushden Lakes (which has served to divert trade from the Centre) and to address a growth in demand for leisure and entertainment options in town centre locations. Finally, it would set the tone for a revised Area Action Plan for the Town Centre (we note that Para 6.2 of the draft SSP2 states that a review of the KTCAP will take place once the SSP2 is adopted; this review will consider the changing role of Kettering town centre as a result of changes in shopping habits).	It is considered that it would be more appropriate for the vision for Kettering Town Centre to be reviewed through a review of the Kettering Town Centre Area Action Plan rather than the SSP2 as the issues raised will be considered in detail through the review of the AAP.	No changes recommended.	Yes	
60	156	Williams Gallagher on behalf of P R Kettering Ltd c/o Elandi LLP	Policy EMP3	Non Employment Uses (non-B use class) in Safeguarded Employment Areas	38	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Draft Policy EMP3 sets out a series of criteria that would apply where non-employment uses in Safeguarded Employment Areas are proposed. We do not take issue with these criteria, however, to avoid any misunderstanding, it would be beneficial to state that such proposals must also comply with other policies in the development plan. For example, proposals for ancillary retail, cafe or leisure uses must comply with Draft Policies TCE5 and TCE6.	See above - an additional criterion is needed which makes clear that proposals for ancillary non-employment uses in Safeguarded Employment Areas must also comply with other relevant policies in the development plan. This could be made clear in the Policy / supporting text through the inclusion of the following statement: 'Proposals for non-employment uses in Safeguarded Employment Areas must also comply with other policies in the development plan'. This approach has been used elsewhere in the draft Plan (for example Paras 10.7, 11.7, 12.7 and Draft Policies BRA2 and MAW2).	A Main Modification is proposed to address the issues raised. Refer to the Main Modification Schedule, MM2.	None.	Yes	

60	157	Williams Gallagher on behalf of P R Kettering Ltd c/o Elandi LLP	Policy EMP4	Live Work Units	39	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A - we support the revision to Draft Policy EMP4 (further to our representation dated 31 July 2018 (Comment ID: 162).	N/A - we support the revision to Draft Policy EMP4 (further to our representation dated 31 July 2018 (Comment ID: 162).	Noted.	None.	Yes
60	158	Williams Gallagher on behalf of P R Kettering Ltd c/o Elandi LLP	6	Town Centres	41	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	We would reiterate our previous representation dated 31 July 2018 (Comment ID: 163) that the evidence base underpinning JCS is now out of date; not least because in the intervening period, Rushden Lakes has come forward with further improvements planned (see pending East Northants Application Ref: 19/01062/FUL). There have also been substantial changes to shopping habits and retailer requirements nationally. The retail study supporting the JCS was published in October 2014 and relied upon household surveys undertaken in 2010/11. In light of this, there is a question mark over the reliability of the evidence base underpinning the adopted JCS comparison goods retail floorspace capacity figures for Kettering and therefore whether it is appropriate to refer these at Para 6.3 (although we do support the fact that such retail development will be directed to the Town Centre).	So as not to delay the adoption of the SSP2, we request that this Paragraph be amended to acknowledge that there is an urgent need to revisit retail floorspace capacity figures and to commit to doing so in the near future (ideally as part of the review of the Kettering Town Centre Area Action Plan).	An updated retail assessment will be undertaken to inform the review of the Joint Core Strategy and Kettering Town Centre Area Action Plan.	No changes recommended.	Yes
60	159	Williams Gallagher on behalf of P R Kettering Ltd c/o Elandi LLP	6	Town Centres	41	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	We support the commitment to undertake a review of the Kettering Town Centre Area Action Plan (which is now over 8 years old) once the SSP2 is adopted. We note that this review will consider the changing role of Kettering Town Centre as a result of changes in shopping habits and would request that this is underpinned by an updated retail and town centres study.	N/A	Noted.	None.	Yes
60	160	Williams Gallagher on behalf of P R Kettering Ltd c/o Elandi LLP	Policy TCE2	Proposals for a Medium Sized Foodstore	42	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Proposals for a medium size food store serving the Rothwell and Desborough catchment should also be required to undertake a retail impact assessment. This is because the evidence base that underpins the identified need for such a food store can no longer be considered reliable. Indeed, the retail study supporting the JCS was published in October 2014 and relied upon household surveys undertaken in 2010/11 - since this time, convenience goods shopping patterns, like comparison goods patterns, have changed significantly. In the absence of an update to the retail capacity study, further qualitative justification is required. There is also a need to consider changes to convenience goods provision in the catchment since the household survey was conducted (the fact that Rushden Lakes does not meet local data needs is insufficient in this regard).	In the absence of an update to the retail capacity study, further qualitative justification is required. There is also a need to consider changes to convenience goods provision in the catchment since the household survey was conducted (the fact that Rushden Lakes does not meet local data needs is insufficient in this regard).	Support for a medium sized food store in Rothwell or Desborough is established in the JCS, policy TCE2 sets out criteria to be applied to any proposals which come forward. Through the review of the JCS a retail needs assessment will be undertaken, the findings of which would be a material consideration.	No changes recommended.	Yes
60	161	Williams Gallagher on behalf of P R Kettering Ltd c/o Elandi LLP	Policy TCE5	Application of the Sequential Test and Locally Set Impact Assessment Threshold	45	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Object to the wording of Policy TCE5. It provides insufficient clarity as to what proposals would be required to undertake a sequential assessment and allows for misinterpretation. The definition of 'small-scale' proposals must be defined. Concerns that neither the JCS or the SSP2 seek to define the scale and composition of the local centres that would be considered appropriate for the Borough's proposed SUEs. The scale and composition of the proposed local centres should be defined and a requirement for an impact and sequential assessment be specified where a proposal for a local centre as part of a SUE exceeds a defined threshold.	Policy TCE5 must define what is meant by small scale and refer to Section 7 of the NPPF, not Section 9. Moreover, the scale and composition of the proposed SUE local centres should be defined and a requirement for an impact and sequential assessment be specified where a proposal for a local centre exceeds a defined threshold.	It is considered that it would be too prescriptive to set a specific size threshold for 'small-scale' as this could be different depending on the individual circumstances of a proposal. An Additional Modification is proposed to update the reference to the relevant section of the NPPF. Refer to the Additional Modification Schedule, AM7	None.	Yes
61	162	Local Resident	8	Natural Environment and Heritage	55							I would like to retain Policy 10, the protection it gives Cransley and Thorpe reservoirs. The reason being that these reservoirs have been protected up until now by Policy 10 which has been retained in the Local Plan since 1995 as it is widely agreed that these reservoirs are an important wildlife resource in our area. They are also beauty spots, close to Kettering and are connected by the footpath network. They are also part of an important wildlife corridor that stretches from Mawsley Marsh (a SSSI) to Cransley Reservoir (a Local Wildlife Site) and onto Thorpe Reservoir. Wetland birds (both migratory and British residents) are able to use this interconnected resource for feeding, nesting and raising young. Policy 10 has stood the test of time, has been accepted and valued as an important planning policy tool and is much needed, going forward, to protect a very significant part of our local green infrastructure.	None.	Saved Local Plan Policy 10 seeks to set out those circumstances where development of these areas is considered acceptable, it is an exceptions policy. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are both located outside of any existing or proposed settlements boundaries and are therefore considered as being in open countryside. As a result, these areas are afforded a level of protection through existing policy in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS). The relevant JCS policies are referenced in Policy RS4 of the emerging SSP2 Publication Plan. The purpose of this policy is to set criteria that have to be met for development in the open countryside to be considered acceptable. Policy RS4 of the Publication Plan provides additional criteria to that set out in the JCS, in relation to replacement dwellings and the re-use of redundant or disused buildings as well as private equestrian facilities. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are sufficiently protected due to their location in the open countryside. Therefore although, there is no specific policy in relation to both the Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs proposed in the Publication Plan, the level of protection afforded to these two reservoirs will not diminish as a result.	None.	
62	163	Resident of Great Cransley	8	Natural Environment and Heritage	55							I wish to comment on Policy NEH2, which has apparently replaced the original Policy 10. Cransley Reservoir is a magnificent site. It is very important to wildlife. The views across it from Northfield Road, and from the public footpath across the dam are a joy to behold. It is also used by a Sailing Club. The site of a dozen or so sails travelling across the water enhances the view. Of course sail boats are not polluting. Stand on the dam and watch the sun rise, or stand there and feel the breeze on a windy day whilst watching the water birds, and 'listening' to the silence, there is no better place in Kettering Borough. Local wildlife corridor 8 passes over the Reservoir. You will know from planning applications that have been made by the current and previous owners, that both have attempted to use the Reservoir for commercial gain. The site was recently put up for sale, and was marketed as having 'Development Opportunities'. This unique and valuable asset to the Borough, should be protected. Policy NEH2, does not offer the same level of protection as Policy 10. I urge the Borough Council to reinstate Policy 10.	None.	Saved Local Plan Policy 10 seeks to set out those circumstances where development of these areas is considered acceptable, it is an exceptions policy. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are both located outside of any existing or proposed settlements boundaries and are therefore considered as being in open countryside. As a result, these areas are afforded a level of protection through existing policy in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS). The relevant JCS policies are referenced in Policy RS4 of the emerging SSP2 Publication Plan. The purpose of this policy is to set criteria that have to be met for development in the open countryside to be considered acceptable. Policy RS4 of the Publication Plan provides additional criteria to that set out in the JCS, in relation to replacement dwellings and the re-use of redundant or disused buildings as well as private equestrian facilities. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are sufficiently protected due to their location in the open countryside. Therefore although, there is no specific policy in relation to both the Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs proposed in the Publication Plan, the level of protection afforded to these two reservoirs will not diminish as a result.	None.	
63	164	Local Resident	8	Natural Environment and Heritage	55							Please reconsider your proposals to potentially compromise the environmental protection afforded to the above by retaining policy 10 and not enforcing NEH2, with consequential potential to further erode the countryside I had the benefit of enjoying, thus depriving future generations of the joys of rural Britain.	None.	Saved Local Plan Policy 10 seeks to set out those circumstances where development of these areas is considered acceptable, it is an exceptions policy. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are both located outside of any existing or proposed settlements boundaries and are therefore considered as being in open countryside. As a result, these areas are afforded a level of protection through existing policy in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS). The relevant JCS policies are referenced in Policy RS4 of the emerging SSP2 Publication Plan. The purpose of this policy is to set criteria that have to be met for development in the open countryside to be considered acceptable. Policy RS4 of the Publication Plan provides additional criteria to that set out in the JCS, in relation to replacement dwellings and the re-use of redundant or disused buildings as well as private equestrian facilities. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are sufficiently protected due to their location in the open countryside. Therefore although, there is no specific policy in relation to both the Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs proposed in the Publication Plan, the level of protection afforded to these two reservoirs will not diminish as a result.	None.	
64	165	Resident of Loddington	8	Natural Environment and Heritage	55							It has just been brought to my attention that our Local Plan SSP2 is being updated. As a resident of Loddington for over 20 years I have a keen interest in my local area and am horrified to discover that the most stunning part of my community seems to have been overlooked. Cransley Reservoir is visible from my property. It is the most beautiful asset in our area and I am lucky to be able to benefit from its glory every single day. I am quite shocked to discover that going forward, if the current proposed documents are passed, that both Cransley and Thorpe Malsor Reservoirs will lose their current planning protection. The reservoirs are a haven for wildlife and we are lucky enough to be able to enjoy their beauty by walking the public footpaths and partaking in the recreational activities of fishing and sailing currently on offer. Such peaceful and rural green sites are rare and need protection from development. Please amend the current proposed documentation and retain Policy 10. These reservoirs deserve to remain protected, help us preserve them for future generations to enjoy.	None.	Saved Local Plan Policy 10 seeks to set out those circumstances where development of these areas is considered acceptable, it is an exceptions policy. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are both located outside of any existing or proposed settlements boundaries and are therefore considered as being in open countryside. As a result, these areas are afforded a level of protection through existing policy in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS). The relevant JCS policies are referenced in Policy RS4 of the emerging SSP2 Publication Plan. The purpose of this policy is to set criteria that have to be met for development in the open countryside to be considered acceptable. Policy RS4 of the Publication Plan provides additional criteria to that set out in the JCS, in relation to replacement dwellings and the re-use of redundant or disused buildings as well as private equestrian facilities. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are sufficiently protected due to their location in the open countryside. Therefore although, there is no specific policy in relation to both the Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs proposed in the Publication Plan, the level of protection afforded to these two reservoirs will not diminish as a result.	None.	
65	166	Resident of Loddington	8	Natural Environment and Heritage	55							I am aware our Local Plan (SSP2) is being updated. Policy 10 has worked well for these reservoirs. Having lived in Loddington for over 12 years and enjoyed walking around Thorpe and Cransley Reservoir many times. The abundance in bird and wildlife must be protected and our local green infrastructure.	None.	Saved Local Plan Policy 10 seeks to set out those circumstances where development of these areas is considered acceptable, it is an exceptions policy. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are both located outside of any existing or proposed settlements boundaries and are therefore considered as being in open countryside. As a result, these areas are afforded a level of protection through existing policy in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS). The relevant JCS policies are referenced in Policy RS4 of the emerging SSP2 Publication Plan. The purpose of this policy is to set criteria that have to be met for development in the open countryside to be considered acceptable. Policy RS4 of the Publication Plan provides additional criteria to that set out in the JCS, in relation to replacement dwellings and the re-use of redundant or disused buildings as well as private equestrian facilities. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are sufficiently protected due to their location in the open countryside. Therefore although, there is no specific policy in relation to both the Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs proposed in the Publication Plan, the level of protection afforded to these two reservoirs will not diminish as a result.	None.	
66	167	Henry H Bletsoe & Son	Policy CRA2	South of New Stone House, Duck End, Cranford	121	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	None.	None.	Noted.	None.	No
66	169	Henry H Bletsoe & Son	Policy CRA3	Land east of the corner of Duck End and Thrapston Road, Cranford	122	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	None.	None.	Noted.	None.	No
66	170	Henry H Bletsoe & Son	Table 4.3		26	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Objection to Table 4.3 1 and the Council's analysis of how the required housing land supply directed by the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) should be addressed in terms of allocations within the Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan (SSP2). Object to the housing provisions for the rural areas set out in Table 4.3 given the reliance on windfall development. It is inappropriate to account for windfall development when making housing allocations. We feel that the Plan should not rely on similar sites, such as that at Braybrooke, coming forward in the current plan period. There have only been two years where the level of windfall development has reached the level allowed in years 4-10 of the plan period. The windfall allowance is overly ambitious and certainly falls short of the requirements of the NPPF. Proposed windfall allowance of 8 dwellings per annum and on this basis the SSP2 is not making ample provision for rural housing within the plan period. This could be addressed through the inclusion of an additional site or sites and this representation will address one such site which would be suitable for consideration.	None.	The Housing Land Supply Paper (October 2019) provides the justification and evidence for the windfall allowance made. The approach taken is in accordance with the NPPF and provides an analysis of past trends, expected future trends and considers market conditions. The approach taken is considered to be robust and justified. In the most recent monitoring year 2018/19 21 dwellings were delivered on windfall sites in the rural area.	No changes recommended.	Yes
66	171	Henry H Bletsoe & Son	Policy PYT2	Two fields on the outskirts of Pynchley	143	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Object to the Housing Allocation proposals for Pynchley set out in Policy PYT2. The allocation of this land for development in both plans does not match the objectives of the SSP2 or the Neighbourhood Plan for Pynchley and does not address the needs of the local community. The allocation is likely to lead to the further development of relatively unaffordable market housing in the village and does not seek to address the issues identified in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan. There is inconsistency between Policy PYT1 and Policy PYT2 of the SSP2 and inconsistency with the emerging Neighbourhood Plan. Policy PYT2 doesn't demonstrate how the Isham Road allocation will address local demand, specifically the needs of the Neighbourhood Plan. There is nothing in our opinion within Policy PYT2 to demonstrate that housing development on this site, will deliver any benefit to the village to the community, but instead exacerbate existing issues.	Promotion of alternative site - Land off Stringer's Hill, Pynchley for 30 dwellings. Further information is shown within the full representation. Link to full comment.	Land off Springers Hill, Pynchley was considered and discounted through the site assessment process. The detail of the site assessment process is set out in the Housing Allocations Background Papers (2012, 2018 and 2019), the Housing Allocations Assessment of Additional Sites and Update and the Rural Masterplanning Report (2012). It was considered that the site would have unacceptable impact on landscape and character of Pynchley as the scale was too large given the size of the settlement and its character. Other constraints identified included highway access, accessibility and the capacity of water sewage infrastructure. The level of growth proposed in Pynchley is considered to be proportionate to the size of the settlement and the range of facilities and services the village. This was 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. The Categorisation of Villages: Background Paper (October 2019) provides the justification for distribution of housing in the rural area.	No changes recommended.	Yes
67	168	Local Resident	8	Natural Environment and Heritage	55							I am writing to express my disappointment in the proposed Local Plan. The exclusion of Cransley and Thorpe Malsor Reservoirs seems short sighted and is of concern. I am a local farmer and I work tirelessly to preserve the natural environment. As my farmland borders the Cransley Reservoir I am seeking reassurance that the proposed documents will be amended to protect this area of outstanding beauty and wildlife. Both local reservoirs are assets which need protection. Development of these areas should be strongly controlled to ensure no harm is caused. Point 3.46 of Policy 10 states 'The disused reservoirs of Cransley and Thorpe Malsor are particularly valuable countryside resources'. As far as I am concerned nothing has changed and this is still the case! Please help to protect them from the dangers of intensification and ensure both reservoirs survive for future generations by retaining Policy 10.	None.	Saved Local Plan Policy 10 seeks to set out those circumstances where development of these areas is considered acceptable, it is an exceptions policy. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are both located outside of any existing or proposed settlements boundaries and are therefore considered as being in open countryside. As a result, these areas are afforded a level of protection through existing policy in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS). The relevant JCS policies are referenced in Policy RS4 of the emerging SSP2 Publication Plan. The purpose of this policy is to set criteria that have to be met for development in the open countryside to be considered acceptable. Policy RS4 of the Publication Plan provides additional criteria to that set out in the JCS, in relation to replacement dwellings and the re-use of redundant or disused buildings as well as private equestrian facilities. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are sufficiently protected due to their location in the open countryside. Therefore although, there is no specific policy in relation to both the Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs proposed in the Publication Plan, the level of protection afforded to these two reservoirs will not diminish as a result.	None.	
68	172	Local Resident	8	Natural Environment and Heritage	55							Why is it necessary to change Policy when it has been effective and proven to work perfectly well. The new proposals as set out below are flawed as they do not include Cransley and Thorpe Malsor Reservoirs. Both these reservoirs have been protected up until now by Policy 10 which has been retained in the Local Plan since 1995 as it is widely agreed that these reservoirs are an important wildlife resource in our area. They are also beauty spots, close to Kettering and are connected by the footpath network. They are also part of an important wildlife corridor that stretches from Mawsley Marsh (a SSSI) to Cransley Reservoir (a Local Wildlife Site) and onto Thorpe Reservoir. Wetland birds (both migratory and British residents) are able to use this interconnected resource for feeding, nesting and raising young. Policy 10 has stood the test of time, has been accepted and valued as an important planning policy tool and is much needed, going forward, to protect a very significant part of our local green infrastructure. In short this is a big 'watering down' of planning protection for these two reservoirs. It shows a picture of Cransley Reservoir but doesn't even mention it in the list of assets and Thorpe Reservoir or its paramount importance for future generations.	None.	Saved Local Plan Policy 10 seeks to set out those circumstances where development of these areas is considered acceptable, it is an exceptions policy. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are both located outside of any existing or proposed settlements boundaries and are therefore considered as being in open countryside. As a result, these areas are afforded a level of protection through existing policy in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS). The relevant JCS policies are referenced in Policy RS4 of the emerging SSP2 Publication Plan. The purpose of this policy is to set criteria that have to be met for development in the open countryside to be considered acceptable. Policy RS4 of the Publication Plan provides additional criteria to that set out in the JCS, in relation to replacement dwellings and the re-use of redundant or disused buildings as well as private equestrian facilities. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are sufficiently protected due to their location in the open countryside. Therefore although, there is no specific policy in relation to both the Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs proposed in the Publication Plan, the level of protection afforded to these two reservoirs will not diminish as a result.	None.	
69	173	Local Resident	8	Natural Environment and Heritage	55							I have just become aware of the above and with some surprise, given that you must be aware of the illegal occupation adjacent to the reservoir and the ongoing planning applications appears etc. Surely this consultation should have been brought to the notice of the Parish Councils concerned? I apologise if this did happen. And given the above, it would be entirely inappropriate and premature to consider any interference or change to policy 10 and the protection it affords the disputed areas. As to the proposed revisions, I object most strongly to any weakening of the protections policy 10 provides to the wildlife and areas of Cransley and Thorpe reservoirs. In particular interfering with the wildlife corridor from Mawsley Marsh to Cransley and Thorpe Reservoirs would have a devastating effect on the wildlife in this area and altering the ecosystem permanently. Those protections were put in place in 1995. As a result wildlife has flourished there so that there is now a greater need for those protections not a lesser one. Please ensure that interested parties are kept informed.	None.	Saved Local Plan Policy 10 seeks to set out those circumstances where development of these areas is considered acceptable, it is an exceptions policy. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are both located outside of any existing or proposed settlements boundaries and are therefore considered as being in open countryside. As a result, these areas are afforded a level of protection through existing policy in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS). The relevant JCS policies are referenced in Policy RS4 of the emerging SSP2 Publication Plan. The purpose of this policy is to set criteria that have to be met for development in the open countryside to be considered acceptable. Policy RS4 of the Publication Plan provides additional criteria to that set out in the JCS, in relation to replacement dwellings and the re-use of redundant or disused buildings as well as private equestrian facilities. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are sufficiently protected due to their location in the open countryside. Therefore although, there is no specific policy in relation to both the Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs proposed in the Publication Plan, the level of protection afforded to these two reservoirs will not diminish as a result.	None.	

70	174	Gladman Land	General Comments	Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan - Publication Plan - Sustainability Appraisal	0	No	No	No	No	No	No	Council has applied a 10% flexibility allowance. The Council states that there is no evidence to suggest that higher levels of delivery, above 10% flexibility allowance, are necessary to achieve the JCS targets or to secure a 5-year supply of housing. Assessments against various percentages have not been undertaken. It is unclear therefore how the Council have arrived at the decision that a higher buffer of sites is unreasonable. The Plan is jeopardising the delivery of meeting the borough's housing needs in full due to the reliance on Sustainable Urban Extensions (SUEs) to deliver the majority of the borough's housing requirement. Significant concerns with the assessment of reusable alternatives for the allocation of additional housing land. The Council has considered land at Braybrooke Road as a reasonable alternative for housing but was considered for employment use instead. The SA fails to explain why land off Braybrooke Road was not included as a reasonable alternative for residential development. Link to full comment.	Gladman consider the SA should be revisited to test the Plan's ability to deliver an increased buffer of sites. The SA in its current form fails to explain why land off Braybrooke Road was not included as a reasonable alternative for residential development given that it was subject to a live planning application. Gladman consider that it is necessary for the housing sites within the SA to be reassessed in this regard.	The SA clearly sets out why it was not considered reasonable to increase the flexibility allowance above 10%. In addition to this the Housing Land Supply Background Paper (October 2019) provides further justification for the approach taken to the flexibility allowance. In Desborough both housing allocations included in the SSP2 have planning permission. The Housing Land Supply Background Paper provides detail of the supply of sites in Desborough. This demonstrates that the supply in Desborough is significantly in excess of the JCS requirement plus 10% flexibility allowance. Therefore there is not a need for additional sites in Desborough to be identified in the SSP2.	No changes recommended.	Yes
70	175	Gladman Land	Policy LOC1	Settlement Boundaries	24	No	No	No	No	No	No	Concerned with the proposed approach to settlement boundaries as it provides no flexibility for the Council to respond to change. Does not provide enough clarity and consistency in how proposals outside of development boundaries will be assessed. The Council's approach to development beyond the settlement boundary is far too restrictive and conflicts with the NPPF. It also may result delivery problems over the course of the plan period due to the significant reliance of SUEs. The Council's approach needs to be reworded to provide a more flexible approach; the proposed wording can be found in the full representation. Link to full comment.	None.	The settlement boundaries have been drawn in accordance with a robust set of criteria. The Settlement Boundaries Background Papers (February 2012, April 2018 and October 2019) provide the evidence base and justification for the settlement boundaries shown on the policies maps. Settlement Boundaries provide a clear distinction between the open countryside and the built up form of settlements. The use of settlement boundaries is in conformity with the NPPF. The SSP2 allocates sites to meet the Borough's housing requirements plus a flexibility allowance in Kettering and the Market Towns. The Housing Land Supply Background Paper (October 2019) demonstrates that sufficient flexibility has been provided to ensure that housing requirements are achieved.	No changes recommended.	
70	176	Gladman Land	Policy HOU1	Windfall and Infill Development: Principles of Delivery	28	No	No	No	No	No	No	4.3.1 Similar to the concerns raised in response to Policy LOC1 above, Policy HOU1 only relates to windfall and infill development within settlement boundaries and silent on what forms of development would be considered acceptable beyond these artificial limits.	4.3.2 Gladman reiterate the concerns already raised and consider additional flexibility should be provided by the SSP2 to allow consideration of sustainable development opportunities across the Borough that are located outside of settlement boundaries but are well related to settlement.	The SSP2 allocates sites to meet the Borough's housing requirements plus a flexibility allowance in Kettering and the Market Towns. The Housing Land Supply Background Paper (October 2019) demonstrates that sufficient flexibility has been provided to ensure that housing requirements are achieved. Policy RS4 sets out the approach to development in the open countryside.	No changes recommended.	Yes
70	177	Gladman Land	Policy HOU2	Older Persons Housing	30	No	No	No	No	No	No	4.4 Policy HOU2: Older Persons Housing 4.4.1 The above policy requires provision of a proportion of dwellings that are suitable to meet the needs of older people on all sites of 50 dwellings or more or 1.6ha. 4.4.2 In principle, Gladman support the Council's efforts to ensuring suitable provision is made to meet the needs of older people over the plan period. However, it is entirely unclear how the Council has arrived at the decision of all sites of 50 dwellings or more to provide a proportion of dwellings for older people. 4.4.3 Despite the need for older persons accommodation, there are challenges to those in this development sector and the economics of type of accommodation are substantially different from that of general needs housing. In summary, the differences are higher build costs associated to specific design requirements and features to better suit the needs of older people, the requirement to provide a significant floor area for shared facilities, which are not saleable, and lack of phasing and other sales issues such as no units can be sold until communal areas are complete which means substantial capital outlay before any return is received.	A requirement for all housing developments above 50 dwellings to accommodate older person risks jeopardising the delivery of sustainable development opportunities to meet housing needs. Accordingly, it is recommended that greater flexibility is provided, and the following wording is put forward for the Council's consideration: 'The Council will seek to encourage the provision of a proportion of dwellings that are suitable to meet the needs of older people.'	It is considered that the policy is sufficiently flexible to take into account the concerns raised without the proposed wording.	No changes recommended.	Yes
70	178	Policy Gladman Land	Policy HOU4	Self-Build and Custom Build Housing	32	No	No	No	No	No	No	4.5.1 The above policy requires housing developments of 50 or more dwellings or with a site area of 1.6ha or more, should provide 5% of plots to be made available as self-build or custom build serviced plots. 4.5.2 Whilst it is noted that these serviced plots can revert to market use after a period of 6 months, it is unclear why this policy is being pursued when the housing register as of July 2019 only contains 41 interested persons. Whilst this may indicate an interest in this type of housing it cannot be reliably translated into actual demand should self-build/custom build housing be made available and clearly indicates the lack of interest in this form of housing. 4.5.3 Whilst it is supported that the Council should be seeking to encourage the delivery of this form of development, there are difficulties associated with build housing as part large housing sites in terms of potential health and safety concerns and also the practical difficulties in terms of aligning their development with construction activity of the site. This form of development should therefore be at the discretion of the developer, rather than forming part of the overall housing mix of individual schemes.	4.5.4 Although the principle of allowing sites to revert to market housing after a period of 6 months is supported, this is likely to result in a consequential delay in development of those plots coming forward due to the limited interest of this form of housing. Accordingly, the policy should be modified, and the following wording is put forward for consideration: 'Proposals for self-build and custom build housing will be supported in suitable locations. The Council will actively maintain a register of interest and prospective self and custom build house builders.'	The Self and Custom Build Background Paper sets out the approach for determining the contents and subsequent thresholds included in Policy HOU4. It is recognised that the level of demand, as determined by the register in March 2019, as the base data for the aforementioned background paper, does not match the level of potential supply and delivery of self and custom build plots as identified in the Self and Custom Build Background Paper. However, as set out in the background paper the register is unlikely to show the true extent of demand in the borough, as it is reasonable to assume not all interested parties who have interest in building their own home are likely to be on the register. As a result, additional sources of data have been used to model the likely demand over the longer term. The data from the Three Dragons report has been used to calculate this demand over the next 10 years, towards the end of the plan period. Therefore, given that the evidence presented in the Self and Custom Build Background Paper presents a much larger demand for this type of housing as determined by the register, it is considered that using a threshold and percentage based policy is a proactive mechanism. It is considered that it will deliver a reliable and consistent supply for this type of housing in the long term, based on the potential demand as determined by the Three Dragons report. It also represents a pro-active approach to the delivery of this type of housing in the Borough. Whilst the logistical issues relating to the delivery of this type of housing are recognised, it is considered that Policy HOU4 sufficiently addresses these issues, specifically in relation to marketing of plots which remain unsold after 6 months can be built out by the developer. This timeframe is considered reasonable and practicable. Policy 33 of the Joint Core Strategy provides support for self and custom build housing and therefore Policy HOU4 seeks to introduce a policy mechanism to see the delivery of this type of housing to the meet the demand not only required by the register but that recognised through the work undertaken by the Three Dragons.	None	Yes
70	179	Gladman Land	Policy EMP1	Safeguarding Employment Land	36	No	No	No	No	No	No	4.6.1 Gladman support the inclusion of the above policies, which recognise the importance of safeguarding and maintaining employment land uses at Desborough. These policies combined clearly serve as a reminder that these locations play an integral part to Desborough's local economy and that of the Borough. As such, it is considered that Desborough is capable of accommodating further residential development which will assist the continued operation of these employment areas for future generations.	None.	Noted.	None.	Yes
70	180	Gladman Land	Policy NEH3	Historically and Visually Important Local Green Spaces	68	No	No	No	No	No	No	Gladman does not consider that the approach taken to HVI is positively prepared or consistent with national policy. The approach taken is clearly not in accordance with the requirements of national policy as the designation of land as LGS only relates to the land which is designated and not adjacent land which has no significance. Concerns regarding the lack of a methodical approach to inform the selection of sites. Gladman highlight a number of decisions which have considered this issue – full representation. Link to full comment.	4.7.6 Whilst information has been prepared by KBC in an attempt to justify the proposed LGS, it is notable that a number of sites cover extensive tracts of land. In this regard, Gladman recommend the Council consider the findings of the above examined LGS report and reconsider its methodology and assessment of land against the three tests required for designation before submitting the SSP2 for examination.	Policy NEH3 does not seek to protect land surrounding the designations. Policy DES5 relates to a specific area of HVI with particular characteristics which in this case mean that development in close proximity of the HVI should not detrimentally impact on the character and setting of the HVI. All sites identified as Historically and Visually Important Local Green Space meet the requirements of the NPPF. The Council does not consider that any of the sites identified are extensive tracts of land. The justification and evidence for the designation of these areas of land is set out in the Historically and Visually Important Local Green Space Background Papers (2015, 2016 and 2019)	No changes recommended.	No
70	182	Gladman Land	Policy NEH4	Open Spaces	70	No	No	No	No	No	No	4.8.1 The above policy relates to the protection of existing open spaces and to providing investment for the provision of new open spaces. The policy states to achieve these goals, development will be made in accordance with the Open Space Strategy for Kettering Borough (2019), or any subsequent update and the Open Space Developer Contributions SPD. 4.8.2 As currently worded, Policy NEH4 is not consistent with the requirements of national policy. Gladman take this opportunity to remind the Council that SPDs cannot be used as a fast track means to set policies and should not be prepared with the aim of avoiding the need for examination or reinventing existing planning policy which should be examined. Indeed, SPDs are not subject to the same degree of examination and consultation as policies contained in local plans and therefore should only provide additional information to those bringing forward development proposals across the borough. The NPPF 2019 confirms this where it defines SPDs as: 'documents which add further detail to the policies in the development plan. They can be used to provide further guidance for development on specific sites, or on particular issues, such as design. Supplementary Planning Documents are capable of being a material consideration in planning decisions but are not part of the development plan.'	4.8.3 As such, this policy should be modified so that development proposals have regard to SPDs rather than requiring strict adherence to such documents.	A Main Modification is proposed to clarify the approach being taken to open space. Refer to the Main Modifications Schedule, MM6	None.	Yes
70	183	Gladman Land	Policy RS1	Category A Villages	108	No	No	No	No	No	No	4.9.1 The above policies relate to rural villages across the borough. Gladman reiterate the comments made in response to Policy LOC1 and the need for greater flexibility. The Government expects local planning authorities to identify opportunities for villages to thrive, especially where this would support services and help meet the need to provide homes for local people who currently find it hard to afford to live where they grew up. It is clear that improving the availability and affordability of homes in rural areas is vital for sustaining rural communities, alongside action to support jobs and services. There are opportunities for the plan to go further to support a good mix of sites and meet rural housing needs, especially where scope exists to expand settlements in a way which is sustainable and helps provide homes for local people. This is especially important in those rural areas where a high demand for homes makes the cost of housing a particular challenge for local people. As such, Gladman consider that the level of development allocated to villages should be a meaningful contribution to ensure the ongoing vitality and viability of the rural settlements and should take a flexible and positive approach to supporting new sustainable development opportunities, recognising that the level of development considered acceptable in these locations should take account of their needs and ability to support further sustainable growth.	None.	The SSP2 allocates land in the rural area to meet local needs. The Categorisation of Villages Background Paper (October 2019) sets out the approach taken to distributing housing in the area. The distribution of housing was informed by detailed site assessments and a rural masterplan approach.	None.	Yes
70	185	Gladman Land	Policy RS4	Development in the Open Countryside	112	No	No	No	No	No	No	4.10.1 Gladman reiterate the comments made in response to Policy LOC1.	None.	Noted.	None.	Yes
70	186	Policy Planner Gladman Land	4	Housing Trajectory	25	No	No	No	No	No	No	The Council's assumptions made in respect of the housing trajectory risks the deliverability of the SSP2. There is a significant shift in the Council's position on all assumed delivery rates (Appendix 1) in the SSP2 compared to the NNJCS and the AMRS. Clear evidence is required to demonstrate that committed sites are deliverable, can deliver homes in the next five years and will come forward as anticipated. The delivery on SUEs in requires immediate action from the LPA to correct. There is a need for additional policies to be included by way of modification that take a responsive and flexible approach to sustainable development at the edge of sustainable settlements to ensure positive action can be taken where monitoring indicates that a five year housing land supply is unlikely to be maintained. Link to full comment.	5.1.7 Given the above, it therefore stands to reason that the buffer proposed may fall away and SUEs may further stall and place the Council in a precarious situation where they are unable to demonstrate a housing land supply. In order to secure the deliverability of the Plan in full, Gladman consider that KBC must take the following steps. The Plan's strategy must allow for additional flexibility so that sites not identified through the Plan are capable of coming forward to accommodate any slippage in the predicted delivery of the Council's delivery rates that are likely to occur. This will also aid the Council in delivering additional housing above the minimum housing requirement, both in the mix and location of sites proposed.	The Council acknowledges that the SUE's have been slower in coming forward than envisaged in the JCS. However significant progress has been made in the delivery of the SUE's with a number of parcels at Kettering East being built out, preliminary work has begun on site at Rothwell North and Desborough North is progressing towards the submission of reserved matters applications. The Housing Land Supply Background Paper (October 2019) provides evidence for the housing trajectories provided for these sites. The updated definition of 'deliverable' has been used when assessing whether sites should be included in the first five years of the plan period. The Council has taken a proactive approach to ensuring that it can maintain a five-year housing land supply and this is reflected in the approach taken in the SSP2, including the 10% flexibility allowance which makes provision above the JCS housing requirements. The Council's proactive approach is apparent in the results of the Government's housing delivery test which were 129% for 2018 and 130% for 2019.	No changes recommended.	Yes
70	187	Gladman Land	11	Housing Site Policies - Desborough	92	No	No	No	No	No	No	Promotion of residential site at Desborough, on land off Braybrooke Road. This site presents an ideal opportunity to create a sustainable, distinctive residential development to the west of Desborough and can deliver both market and affordable housing to meet current and future housing needs. The site can also provide public open space and biodiversity net gains. Link to full comment.	6.1.5 The site is available and achievable for the delivery of 245 dwellings. Given the issues raised in section 5 of these representations, this site should be considered for allocation within the SSP2 to allow for flexibility in the Council's housing land supply. Gladman are keen to work with the Council to bring this site forward as a high quality residential development and invite the Council to contact us in this regard.	In Desborough both housing allocations included in the SSP2 have planning permission. The Housing Land Supply Background Paper provides detail of the supply of sites in Desborough. This demonstrates that the supply in Desborough is significantly in excess of the JCS requirement plus 10% flexibility allowance. Therefore there is not a need for additional sites in Desborough to be identified in the SSP2.	No changes recommended.	Yes
71	181	Resident of Loddington	8	Natural Environment and Heritage	55							I am writing regarding Policy 10, and wish this policy to remain in place.	None.	None.	None.	None.
72	184	Local Resident	8	Natural Environment and Heritage	55							I have today been made aware that changes to the existing policy 10 document are being considered. These policies are there to protect the countryside and the wild that resides within these areas. With all the development taking place across the country and destruction of significant important areas it is imperative that those who have the powers to maintain the protection for these sites do indeed protect them. With the above in mind I would strongly object to changes of policy on Mawley Marsh (a SSSI) and Cranley and Thorpe Reservoir (local wildlife sites) and that they remain protected vigorously and hope you will do everything within your powers to make sure this happens.	None.	None.	None.	None.
73	188	Local Resident	8	Natural Environment and Heritage	55							Policy 10 should be retained as it has been since 1995. Table 8.1 in Policy NEH2 should list all County (Local) Wildlife Sites otherwise it is simply an inaccurate list of green assets in the Borough. Thorpe Malsor Reservoir should get a mention in the text of NEH2 as an important wetland habitat which is interested and connected to a local SSSI and County Wildlife Site. Link to full comment.	None.	None.	None.	None.

Case No.	Year	Applicant	Policy	Site Name	Area	HA	MA	NS	NSP	Other	Comments	Decision	Notes	Other		
73	189	Local Resident	Policy LOC1	Settlement Boundaries	24						In addition to our concern with Policy 10 we also note that Policy 7 has been reworded in a way that 'waters down' planning protection in the countryside. Policy 7 'planning permission for development within the open countryside will not be granted except where otherwise provided for in this plan'. Is being replaced by LOC1 'development in the open countryside is carefully managed to safeguard the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside'. What is the legal definition of 'intrinsic character and beauty'? It is too vague. LOC1 needs to be far clearer. Surely we should be tightening controls on building in our green countryside spaces in the light of the global concern for Climate Change and Habitat Loss, not relaxing the controls! This is illogical in 2020. To conclude: LOC1 should be much clearer and robust in its attempts to protect our open countryside or it could be subject to abuse in the future.	None.	Policy LOC1 defines settlement boundaries which provide a clear distinction between the built form of a settlement and the open countryside. Policy RS4 sets out the circumstances in which development may be acceptable in the open countryside. It is considered that this provides a clear approach to development in the open countryside.	No changes recommended.		
73	190	Local Resident	General Comments	Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan-Publication Plan	0						Thorpe Malsor Village Parish Plan We ask that this document, put together in 2012 by a number of hardworking village volunteers be listed in the appropriate place within the emerging updated Local Plan. We were assured back in 2012 that the Council would adopt any plans that villages managed to produce and we assumed this had already been done for Thorpe Malsor. The Plan highlights what villagers cherish about their village and what their comments and their voices recognised. Thorpe Malsor's Village Plan should be listed with other Parish Plans and Village Design Statements as was promised to the village back in 2012.	None.	The Thorpe Malsor Village Plan has not been adopted by the Council as informal policy. The Council are in discussions with representatives of the Parish Council to review the document but until such time as a review has taken place it is not possible to make reference to the document in the SSP2.	No changes recommended.		
74	191	Berrys on behalf of Cranford Estates	Policy CRA2	South of New Stone House, Duck End, Cranford	121	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Object to the wording of proposed Policy CRA1, given that it is unrealistic, not effective and unjustified. The policy therefore lacks clarity and is ineffective. The reference to the Rural Masterplanning (2012) document is unjustified and should be deleted. The policy requirement in relation to materials is too restrictive and does not allow for localised variation or different types of building. Link to full comment.	Suggested amendments to Policy CRA. The proposed wording can be found in the full representation. Link to full comment.	Criterion a) of Policy CRA1 is considered sufficient in setting out the need for further development in Cranford to deliver affordable housing to meet any remaining need. The approach to development outside of the settlement, with regards to the delivery of affordable housing is already set out in Policy 13 of the Joint Core Strategy and therefore the need to replicate this here is not required. Criterion b) is considered to provide sufficient clarity of the requirement for development to assist in facilitating the list of identified improvements, where appropriate. No changes are required. In relation to criterion b, iv), the references to the bridge and gully on Duck End (south) over the former railway line as a landmark feature, were sourced from the Rural Masterplanning Report and the Cranford Conservation Area Appraisal. There is no reason as to why the findings of these reports should be removed from Policy CRA1 as they continue to be considered as important opportunities to create/enhance landmark features in Cranford. Criterion c), d) and h) provide sufficient clarity on shaping development in the village regards to principles based on design, character and materials and more specifically street treatments and street furniture. Therefore no amendments to this set out of criteria will be made.	No changes recommended.	Yes
74	192	Berrys on behalf of Cranford Estates	18	Appendix 3 - Policies Maps	195	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	HV1080 - The approach to HV1 designations should not be a blanket approach where large swathes of land are designated. No further benefit would be gained by additional designations. The arable field has no recreational value, ecological value or any significant historic value, or landscape beauty. Question the suitability of the two sites allocated for Cranford village. The designation of HV1 open space in respect of Cranford is not consistent and the requirements paragraph 100 of the NPPF has not been demonstrated in any of the Council's assessments regarding public access. Link to full comment.	1.18 We therefore object to the extent of HV1 designation as it applies to the northern part of the Cranford site reference HV1080. Its inclusion within Policy NEH3 is insufficiently justified by the Council's assessments and should be excluded from this policy designation.	In relation to this designation of HV1080, both the Historically and Visually Important Open Space Background Paper (September 2015) and a subsequent update in June 2016 set out the Council's approach the designation of this site as Historically and Visually Important Open Space. This included recommendations put forward by a third party and the site has been subsequently identified in the SSP2. The concerns in relation to the northern part of the site were considered when the site was looked at again in 2016 following the 2015 consultation. However it was concluded that the northern part of the site is important to the context of the village and should not be removed from the site boundary. The importance of this part of the site is recognised as it provides a connection between Cranford St. John and Cranford St. Andrew as well providing a setting for the village structure. This clearly demonstrates the local significance of HV1080. It is acknowledged that this site is not publicly accessible. Public access is not a requirement of the HV1 designation. It is therefore considered that given the extent of assessment of the site which clearly demonstrate the need to include the entirety of HV1080 as a proposed Historically and Visually Important Local Green Space the site will be progressed as such and as mentioned above.	None.	Yes
74	193	Berrys on behalf of Cranford Estates	Policy CRA2	South of New Stone House, Duck End, Cranford	121	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Support the approach taken in Policy CRA2 and Policy CRA3 to deliver affordable housing. Disagree that the two sites allocated are either appropriate or viable and therefore not deliverable, therefore the Plan is not positively prepared. The Plan is also not effective as there is uncertainty regarding the deliverability of the sites identified. It is not clarified in the Policy if the 5 or 6 dwellings will be supported by additional private market housing or whether the estimated capacity includes any supporting market housing. The viability is questioned given constraints relating to surface water flooding and the approach taken to materials. No evidence has been provided to show that these sites are achievable, and deliverable given the lack of intent shown. The proposed allocations are not to be justified. The approach taken in the HV1 report is not justified. The proposed allocations are not consistent with national policy and not deliverable. Link to full comment.	Suggested deletion of policies CRA2 and CRA3. New wording suggested for policies to allocate the two promoted sites. The proposed wording can be found in the full representation. Link to full comment.	The Housing Allocations Background Paper sets out the Council's approach to the allocation of housing sites in the Borough. The two proposed allocations have been through the site assessment process and have been considered suitable for housing. The contribution that these sites make towards the fulfillment of the housing requirement for the rural area of Kettering Borough, as set out in Policy 29 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy.	No changes recommended.	Yes
75	194	DLP Planning Ltd on behalf of Buccleuch Property	5	Employment	34	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	North Kettering Business Park is identified in draft Policy EMP1 as a safeguarded employment area, which is supported. The policy wording should cross-refer to draft Policy EMP3 in Safeguarded Employment Areas and draft Policy EMP1 should therefore confirm that non-B class uses, which are ancillary to the employment uses, are also acceptable in safeguarded employment areas. Amendments to the wording are required to confirm that uses which are ancillary to the employment use are acceptable in safeguarded employment areas and set out the criteria for non-ancillary uses. The principle of allocating additional employment is a sound approach. Link to full comment.	Suggested amendments to policies EMP1 and EMP3. The proposed wording can be found in the full representation. Link to full comment.	See recommended change.	Main Modifications are proposed to address the issues raised in this comment. Refer to Main Modification Schedule, MM1	Yes
76	195	Harris Lamb on behalf of Tata Steel (UK) Limited	11	Desborough	92							This representation relates to DE/063 - Land off Pipewell Road. Support the reinstatement of this site within the settlement boundary and there is no reason not to include this land as a residential allocation, the site would also contribute to the 5-year housing land supply. This approach would be consistent with the proposed allocation of DE54. We anticipate the sale of the site will be complete before the hearing sessions commence and we would welcome the opportunity to discuss the wording of the policy for this site with Officers. Link to full comment.	Add a policy to the plan, which allocates site DE/063E Land off Pipewell Road, Desborough for residential use.	The SSP2 includes this site within the settlement boundary as the site has planning permission. Site DE/063 was discounted as a potential housing allocation due to unresolved issues regarding the capacity of the one way railway bridge in place. The site was identified as allocations in the SSP2 are sufficient to fulfil the residual housing requirement for Desborough. The Publication is accompanied by a Housing Land Supply background paper setting out additional information on the Council's housing trajectory and five year land supply position. The SSP2 will allocate sufficient sites to meet housing requirements identified in the JCS in accordance with the spatial strategy set out in the JCS. A policy does not need to be included for this site.	No changes recommended.	Yes
76	196	Harris Lamb on behalf of Tata Steel (UK) Limited	11	Desborough	92							This representation relates to DE/064 - Land off Pipewell Road. This follows our representations to the previous consultations in relation to the earlier versions of the Part 2 Plan. We can confirm that this site remains available and that the landowner would actively look to bring the site forward should it be determined through the Part 2 Plan process that additional sites are needed to meet the housing need for Desborough as a whole. With the site located on the edge of Desborough, which is identified as a Market Town, it is in a sustainable location to make up a shortfall in housing sites. Our previous representations confirm why we consider this site should be considered deliverable. This position has been improved with the sale of DE/063 to Lovell, a housebuilder, which means that this site would form an extension of this initial phase. We would expect a full application to follow the allocation and commencement to start on site shortly after the grant of planning permission. We would also expect certain efficiencies as a result of combining the sites.	Add a policy to the plan, which allocates site DE/064 - Land off Pipewell Road, Desborough for residential use.	Site DE/064 has been discounted through the site assessment process. A robust assessment of sites has been undertaken, this is set out in the Housing Allocations background papers (2012, 2018 and 2019) and the Housing Allocations Assessment of Additional Sites and Update (2019). In Desborough both housing allocations included in the SSP2 have planning permission. The Housing Land Supply Background Paper provides detail of the supply of sites in Desborough. This demonstrates that the supply in Desborough is significantly in excess of the JCS requirement plus 10% flexibility allowance. Therefore there is not a need for additional sites in Desborough to be identified in the SSP2.	No changes recommended.	Yes
76	200	Harris Lamb on behalf of Tata Steel (UK) Limited	4	Housing	25	No	No	No	No			There is no reference to the trigger which relates to the performance of the SUEs against the trajectory in Annex A of the NNJCS. There is also no reference to the SUE trigger in the Publication Plan or the AMR, and the public realm that Council have been monitoring the SUE trigger and there is no breakdown of the completion data for each year on a site by site basis, this data should be published. It is evident from the data available that the SUEs in Kettering Borough Council have not delivered as predicted. The absence of the breakdown of past completions undermines the transparency of the process and does not allow for a full review of the Part 2 Plan and its relationship with the NNJCS. Link to full comment.	A site by site and year by year breakdown of the completion figures since the start of the plan period should be provided. A review of the SUE monitoring trigger should be provided and appropriate commentary/adjustments stated if required.	The SUE trigger has been monitored. This monitoring was reported to the Joint Planning Committee at its meeting on the 25th July 2019 under agenda item 5.	No changes recommended.	Yes
76	202	Harris Lamb on behalf of Tata Steel (UK) Limited	4	Housing	25	No	No	No	No			There is no evidence to demonstrate a supply of deliverable or developable sites. Major sites with outline permission, proposed allocations and sites on the brownfield register cannot be considered as deliverable and a 5 year supply would not exist. The predictions in terms of the starts on site and the delivery rates were overly optimistic for the SUEs and the predicted completions, for Kettering East substantially higher than those predicted through the NNJCS. There is clear evidence available that the completions predicted for Kettering East are well in excess of what have been delivered on other SUEs in North Northamptonshire and across the country in a variety of market areas. We would expect the evidence provided to demonstrate why this site is going to break new ground and deliver at these substantial rates. Link to full comment.	The evidence to support the conclusions in relation to the following need to be published for review: which sites meet the definition of deliverable / developable, what needs to be done to secure completions on a site, the date completions will commence, and the predicted delivery rates thereafter.	The Housing Land Supply Paper (October 2019) provides evidence of the deliverability/ developability of sites identified in the site schedule, this sets out the timescales for delivery and build out rates have been determined and provides a justification for the approach taken. The Council has worked closely with site promoters in preparing the site schedule.	No changes recommended.	Yes
77	197	Harris Lamb on behalf of landowner	Policy NEH3	Historically and Visually Important Local Green Spaces	68	No			No			The proposed designation of HV1057a is not supported by Paragraph 100 of the National Planning Policy Framework. This site does not have local significance or value and has a strong urban context. It is contained by new residential developments on two sides, which have already irreversibly altered the sites context and users experience of it, and the Public Right of Way is protected by other legislation. Consequently, we object to the proposed designation of HV1057a and request its removal from the plan. Link to full comment.	Proposed designation HV1057a should be removed from the plan.	HV1057a was put forward for inclusion as an area of HV1 through the consultation on the Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan - Draft Plan consultation. The Historically and Visually Important Local Green Space Background Paper (Update October 2019) provides a robust justification for the designation of this area of land as HV1.	No changes recommended.	Yes
77	199	Harris Lamb on behalf of landowner	10	Burton Latimer	85							This representation relates to Land off Gardener Road, Burton Latimer (see attached for site plans). This follows representations to the previous consultations in relation to the earlier versions of the Part 2 Plan. We can confirm that this site remains available and that the landowner would actively look to bring the site forward should it be determined through the Part 2 Plan process that additional sites are needed to meet the housing need at a Borough or Town level. With the site located on the edge of Burton Latimer, which is identified as a Market Town, it is in a sustainable location to make up a shortfall in housing sites. Our previous representations confirm why we consider this site should be considered deliverable/developable.	Add a policy to the plan that allocates the site known as Land off Gardener Road, Burton Latimer for residential use.	The site was previously considered by the Council and discounted as a housing site allocation (referred to as site BL051 in the SSP2) due to lack of safe access to the site and impact on biodiversity and inclusion of Burton Latimer pocket park within the site boundary. Since then a planning application (K/2017/0902) for 84 dwellings was refused because development of the site would not accord with the settlement hierarchy or sustainable development objectives of the spatial vision for the area. The Council is able to demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing. The allocations in the SSP2 fulfil the remaining residual housing requirement when existing completions and commitments are taken into account. The Housing Land Supply Background Paper (May 2018) provides information on the need for housing allocations in Burton Latimer. This demonstrates sufficient sites have been identified in Burton Latimer to meet housing requirements plus a flexibility allowance.	No changes recommended.	Yes
78	198	Harris Lamb on behalf of Robert Dixon Ltd	5	Employment	34							Site promoted on Pychley Lodge Road for residential development. Request the site is allocated for residential development. Access to the proposed residential site would be secured through Thurston Drive. Existing and proposed residential schemes adjacent to this site will provide a strong residential context to the site and will underpin its continued industrial operation. In considering the impact of removing the employment designation of the site, we note that demand for units of this size identified in the ELR, however, we also note that this demand predominately relates to new build / good stock, which this is not. Link to full comment.	Remove the Site from the area safeguarded for employment Allocate the Site for residential development.	The Employment Allocations Background Paper informed by the Employment Land Review undertaken by Aspinall Verdi sets out the approach to safeguarded areas in the Borough. It is considered that sufficient Pychley Lodge Road, are justified and sufficient Pychley Lodge Road, are justified in these documents. The Housing Allocations Background Paper sets out the Council's approach to housing allocations in the Borough. It is evident that the Council has identified sufficient land to meet the minimum requirements as set out in Policy 29 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy. No further housing allocations are required in Kettering.	No changes recommended.	Yes
79	201	Resident of Thorpe Underwood	18	Appendix 3 - Policies Maps	199	No	No	No	No	No	No	Settlement Boundary for Harrington I believe this boundary is unjust as it completely excludes the properties to the east of the village on the Rothwell Road. In doing so, it has closed off several minor development areas. The restricted infill policy has left no where for affordable houses or smaller retirement properties to be built in the village. Having lived and worked in the Parish for most of my life on a rented farm in Thorpe Underwood, I would wish to remain in the Parish when I retire and have the opportunity to build a small retirement property in Harrington on a piece of land called 'The Woodyard' situated between Appleton Farm & Windridge on the roadside. I consider this piece of land is completely within the village boundary. Previous sale documents describe the piece of land as 'useful building plot' and it is where the White Bear Public House formerly stood. Being a country person, I would not wish to retire away from what I've known all my life and live in a town.	None.	The settlement boundaries have been drawn in accordance with a robust set of criteria. The Settlement Boundaries Background Papers (February 2012, April 2018 and October 2019) provide the evidence base and justification for the settlement boundaries shown on the policies maps.	No changes recommended.	Yes
79	207	Resident of Thorpe Underwood	18	Appendix 3 - Policies Maps	199	No	No	No	No	No	No	Harrington HV1021 There are two separate fields under separate ownership. The smaller 'L' shaped field situated SW of 'The Falls' is totally separate to the larger area. The owners of the small field were never contacted by the Borough Council regarding the decision to designate this area as an HV1. I contest this decision most strongly as there are limited views, as there is only a small road frontage between a house and a tall hedge. The Land Registry clearly shows ownership details and yet Kettering Borough Council failed to consult owners regarding this matter. The road frontage area is a potential building plot for a starter or retirement home	The HV1 directive needs removing from the smaller field	The Council consulted all landowners about the HV1 designations in October 2015, the comments received through this consultation were considered in the Historically and Visually Important Local Green Space Background Paper - Summary of Landowner and Town/ Parish Council Consultation and Site Assessment Update (June 2016).	No changes recommended.	Yes
80	203	Resident of Loddington	8	Natural Environment and Heritage	55							I refer to the above policy which I understand is up for renewal. I would like to object to any changes regarding the Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs. This is an important wildlife area and should be protected. They are natural beauty spots and habitats for the Kettering area as a whole.	None.	Saved Local Plan Policy 10 seeks to set out those circumstances where development of these areas is considered acceptable, it is an exceptions policy. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are both located outside of any existing or proposed settlements boundaries and are therefore considered as being in open countryside. As a result, these areas are afforded a level of protection through existing policy in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS). The relevant JCS policies are referenced in Policy RS4 of the emerging SSP2 Publication Plan. The purpose of this policy is to set criteria that have to be met for development in the open countryside to be considered acceptable. Policy RS4 of the Publication Plan provides additional criteria to that set out in the JCS, in relation to replacement dwellings and the re-use of redundant or disused buildings as well as private equestrian facilities. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are sufficiently protected due to their location in the open countryside. Therefore although, there is no specific policy in relation to both the Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs proposed in the Publication Plan, the level of protection afforded to these two reservoirs will not diminish as a result.	None.	
81	204	Resident of Rothwell	8	Natural Environment and Heritage	55							I have received information to the effect that Policy 10 is to have important changes made to it in the near future, to the detriment of our local wildlife and community. As you are aware, Policy 10 has been in the Local Plan since 1995, and proved useful in protecting the very necessary natural wildlife corridor in this area. I understand that both Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs will be adversely affected by these changes too, and this is a great concern us and the community. Both my wife and I would like to express our opposition to these changes, as we feel that any 'watering down' of protections to both reservoirs and wildlife is against the interests of the people, environment, and our community.	None.	Saved Local Plan Policy 10 seeks to set out those circumstances where development of these areas is considered acceptable, it is an exceptions policy. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are both located outside of any existing or proposed settlements boundaries and are therefore considered as being in open countryside. As a result, these areas are afforded a level of protection through existing policy in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS). The relevant JCS policies are referenced in Policy RS4 of the emerging SSP2 Publication Plan. The purpose of this policy is to set criteria that have to be met for development in the open countryside to be considered acceptable. Policy RS4 of the Publication Plan provides additional criteria to that set out in the JCS, in relation to replacement dwellings and the re-use of redundant or disused buildings as well as private equestrian facilities. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are sufficiently protected due to their location in the open countryside. Therefore although, there is no specific policy in relation to both the Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs proposed in the Publication Plan, the level of protection afforded to these two reservoirs will not diminish as a result.	None.	
82	205	Resident of Loddington	8	Natural Environment and Heritage	55							I refer to the above policy, which is part of the local plan SSP2. Until now, both Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are important wildlife resources in this area and are well-known beauty spots. In fact, they are linked by the countryside footpath network, which is part of an important wildlife corridor that stretches from Mawsley Marsh to Cransley reservoir to Thorpe Malsor reservoir. Wetland birds are able to use this interconnected resource for breeding and nesting. This includes both migratory and British birds. Policy 10 can be classed as an important, much needed tool to protect our countryside and wildlife: it is vital that this remains in place in any changes to the local plan.	None.	Saved Local Plan Policy 10 seeks to set out those circumstances where development of these areas is considered acceptable, it is an exceptions policy. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are both located outside of any existing or proposed settlements boundaries and are therefore considered as being in open countryside. As a result, these areas are afforded a level of protection through existing policy in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS). The relevant JCS policies are referenced in Policy RS4 of the emerging SSP2 Publication Plan. The purpose of this policy is to set criteria that have to be met for development in the open countryside to be considered acceptable. Policy RS4 of the Publication Plan provides additional criteria to that set out in the JCS, in relation to replacement dwellings and the re-use of redundant or disused buildings as well as private equestrian facilities. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are sufficiently protected due to their location in the open countryside. Therefore although, there is no specific policy in relation to both the Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs proposed in the Publication Plan, the level of protection afforded to these two reservoirs will not diminish as a result.	None.	

83	206	Bletsoe on behalf of Local Resident	18	Appendix 3 - Policies Maps	211	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Object to the Settlement Boundary at Weston by Welland. Do not agree that the area highlighted orange accord with the principles. The boundary should be reappraised and amended as shown red on the enclosed plan. This boundary is a clear demarcation between open countryside and the built-up framework of the settlement. Do not agree that the proposed change in this location accords with principle 1 or principle 3(d) of the Settlement Boundary Defining Principles. The proposed boundary change does not follow the defined hedgerow feature and cuts into the built-up framework of the settlement in an illogical form. The newly bounded proposed would maintain a continuous and logical line. Accepts that the land forms garden land, but it is not a particularly large garden and it is not visually open. The clear boundary line which we suggest as an alternative route for the settlement boundary forms the visual barrier between the open countryside and the built framework of the settlement. Link to full comment.	None.	The Settlement Boundary Background Paper (Update April 2018) sets out the defining principles which have been used to define the proposed settlement boundaries in the SSP2. These are referenced below, in relation to the site. The land in question is included within the existing settlement boundary for Weston by Welland which was set out in the 1995 Local Plan. However in a review of these settlement boundaries, which has been used to define new settlement boundaries, this area has been excluded in accordance with principles 1 and 3(d). It is considered that the exclusion of this area of this land from the proposed settlement boundary, is justified and will not be amended as a result of these comments.	No changes recommended.	Yes
84	208	Local Resident	8	Natural Environment and Heritage	55							We have received information regarding the possible change to Policy 10 and I am writing to request that Policy 10 is retained for Cransley Reservoir and Thorpe Malsor and the protection that it gives to these areas. This is an area of important environmental and wildlife activity, a naturally beautiful area, and would be hugely damaging to the local area if lost. There should be no reasons allowable that would lead to this area being damaged or the local wildlife lost and Policy 10 is essential help protect this area.	None.	Saved Local Plan Policy 10 seeks to set out those circumstances where development of these areas is considered acceptable, it is an exceptions policy. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are both located outside of any existing or proposed settlements boundaries and are therefore considered as being in open countryside. As a result, these areas are afforded a level of protection through existing policy in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS). The relevant JCS policies are referenced in Policy RS4 of the emerging SSP2 Publication Plan. The purpose of this policy is to set criteria that have to be met for development in the open countryside to be considered acceptable. Policy RS4 of the Publication Plan provides additional criteria to that set out in the JCS, in relation to replacement dwellings and the re-use of redundant or disused buildings as well as private equestrian facilities. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are sufficiently protected due to their location in the open countryside. Therefore although, there is no specific policy in relation to both the Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs proposed in the Publication Plan, the level of protection afforded to these two reservoirs will not diminish as a result.	None.	
85	209	Berrys on behalf of Pynchley Estate Settlement 1996	18	Appendix 3 - Policies Maps	204	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Object to Figure 18.22 specifically related to the settlement boundary and proposed Green Infrastructure (GI) Corridor at Home Farm Pynchley. Seek to amend settlement boundary to enable net biodiversity gain. The site, Home Farm does not currently positively contribute to the goal set out in paragraph 8.17. The inclusion of land and buildings at Home Farm is neither in accordance with the NPPF definition of Green Infrastructure, help to achieve the JCS Outcome 3 or is in accordance with Policy 19 of the JCS. Home Farm does not presently meet the NPPF definition as it cannot be comprising a 'multi-functional green space' nor does the current arrangement. It is to be noted that the inclusion of Home Farm Pynchley as part of the GI Corridor is not consistent with national policy and therefore the plan is not sound. The inclusion of Home Farm as part of the GI Corridor does not currently help to meet the JCS Outcome 3. The plan is not currently effective and therefore the plan cannot be sound. Link to full comment.	The site should be incorporated into the settlement boundary for Pynchley. Kettering Borough Council failed to re-evaluate the site as the new access road consented as part of KET/2013/0006 has overcome access issues. Seek to amend the settlement boundary to enable Home Farm to be re-developed which would present opportunities to provide a net gain to biodiversity on the site and provide a multifunctional green space for the enjoyment of the residents of Pynchley. Link to full comment.	Settlement boundaries are used to make a distinction between the open countryside and the built form of settlements and provide certainty over where development is likely to be acceptable. The settlement boundaries have been drawn in accordance with a robust set of criteria. The Settlement Boundaries Background Papers (February 2012, April 2018 and October 2019) provide the evidence base and justification for the settlement boundaries shown on the policies maps. This area is not included within the existing settlement boundary for Pynchley and has not been included within the proposed settlement boundary in accordance with principle 3(c) 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. Two amendments have been made in relation to the site to the north, which have been made in accordance with principle 2a), given that the site has planning permission. The principle ensures existing commitments for built development are included within the proposed settlement boundary.	No changes recommended.	Yes
85	214	Berrys on behalf of Pynchley Estate Settlement 1996	Policy NEH4	Open Spaces	70	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Object to Policy NEH4 specifically in regard to the village of Mawsley. The Open Space Strategy for Kettering Borough (2019) cannot be found within the collection of background papers for the Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan nor can it be found on the Council's website. Emerging Policy NEH4 and proposed open space designations were not based on an evidence basis. The plan is not justified and therefore cannot be deemed to be sound. Open Space and Allocations (2012) is not considered a date and should not be used to justify Policy NEH4. The Publication draft is not consistent with national policy and therefore the plan cannot be found to be sound. Open Space designations shown on Figure 18.20 would prohibit future growth of Mawsley. Link to full comment.	1.9 We therefore consider that prior to the submission of the SSP2 Local Plan to the Secretary of State, that an additional public consultation should be carried out once the Open Space Strategy for Kettering Borough (2019) is published. Until this is carried out, we consider the plan not to be sound.	See recommended change.	A Main Modification is proposed to policy NEH4 and its supporting text to clarify the status of the open space strategy. Refer to the Main Modification Schedule, MM6. The identified open spaces in Mawsley are existing open spaces which have been identified through the audit of open space	Yes
85	215	Berrys on behalf of Pynchley Estate Settlement 1996	13	Broughton	118	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Objection to Broughton chapter. Broughton is a sustainable location for development. The Draft SSP2 Local Plan policies included policies and designations for Broughton at this time it had yet to be 'made'. Broughton Neighbourhood Plan was made in October 2018 and included an allocation for 5-7 units. Housing allocation should be made in Broughton. Windfall sites are a finite resource and therefore possibilities for infilling have and will continue to diminish. The assumption that rural areas will continue to be developed at a rate similar to the historic rate is inappropriate. Future windfall sites will be more constrained and come forward slower. The evidence in Appendix 4 not consistent paragraph 70 of the NPPF and therefore the plan is not consistent with national policy. The Plan is not justified as the rural housing delivery has not been based on reasonable evidence justifying future windfall delivery. Link to full comment.	To reduce the reliance on rural windfall development we propose that additional housing allocations should be made within the most sustainable rural locations to reduce the reliance on windfall sites. 1.13 Representations were submitted on behalf of our clients as part of the Draft Plan Summer 2018 consultation which promoted land rear of 18-20 Glebe Road as a housing allocation. The site is well related to the existing settlement of Broughton and its infrastructure and is bound to its south and west by existing residential development. We are of the view that this site should be allocated as a housing allocation within Broughton. 1.14 The site is not designated as Existing Open Space or Local Green Space within the made Broughton Neighbourhood Plan which could prohibit development and is our view that the allocation of land rear of 18-20 Glebe Road as a housing allocation would reduce the Council's reliance on windfall development to contribute to the Borough's rural housing supply.	Broughton Neighbourhood Plan is part of the Development Plan and therefore no policies have been included within the Publication Plan for Broughton. No further allocations are required in Broughton to meet the housing requirement set out in Policy 29 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy. The Housing Land Supply Paper (October 2019) provides the justification and evidence for the windfall allowance made. The approach taken is in accordance with the NPPF and provides an analysis of past trends, expected future trends and considers market conditions. The approach taken is considered to be robust and justified. In the most recent monitoring year 2018/19 21 dwellings were delivered on windfall sites in the rural area.	No changes recommended.	Yes
86	210	Resident of Thorpe Malsor	8	Natural Environment and Heritage	55							As residents of Thorpe Malsor for the last 32 years, my wife and I would like to register our disapproval of the proposed replacement of Policy 10 with NEH2. Thorpe Malsor and Cransley reservoirs are areas of outstanding natural beauty and as committed conservationists, we consider the implementation of Policy 10 would have a considerable detrimental effect on the flora and fauna. Policy 10 has been an operational success during the last 25 years and proved to be a very successful important planning and policy tool and certainly needs to be retained.	None.	Saved Local Plan Policy 10 seeks to set out those circumstances where development of these areas is considered acceptable, it is an exceptions policy. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are both located outside of any existing or proposed settlements boundaries and are therefore considered as being in open countryside. As a result, these areas are afforded a level of protection through existing policy in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS). The relevant JCS policies are referenced in Policy RS4 of the emerging SSP2 Publication Plan. The purpose of this policy is to set criteria that have to be met for development in the open countryside to be considered acceptable. Policy RS4 of the Publication Plan provides additional criteria to that set out in the JCS, in relation to replacement dwellings and the re-use of redundant or disused buildings as well as private equestrian facilities. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are sufficiently protected due to their location in the open countryside. Therefore although, there is no specific policy in relation to both the Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs proposed in the Publication Plan, the level of protection afforded to these two reservoirs will not diminish as a result.	None.	
87	211	Mather Jamie on behalf of Parker Strategic Land	Policy ROT3	Land to the West of Rothwell	104	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Promotion of site in Rothwell North of the town and East and North-East of the cricket club. The site directly adjoins the allocated Rothwell North urban extension and has previously been favourably assessed by the Borough Council. Support the vision for Rothwell set out in the emerging relating to the town centre. Sufficient residential development should be enabled at Rothwell to support expenditure in the town centre. Contend the proposed allocations in Rothwell. The approach to delivery of housing at Desborough is unsound, this is because of the rigid application of housing targets in the JCS. Rothwell North is not deliverable, resulting in a shortfall of housing. Objection to proposed allocations and instead the promoted site at Rothwell North should be considered. Link to full comment.	None.	This site has been considered through the site assessment process and discounted as a potential housing site. The site identified in ROT3 performed better against the site assessment criteria than this site. Detail of the site assessment process is set out in the Housing Allocations Background Papers (2012, 2018 and 2019) and the Housing Allocations Assessment of Additional Sites and Update (2013). Reserved Matters applications have been granted at Rothwell North and preliminary work has begun on site. The Housing Land Supply Background Paper demonstrates that sufficient land has been allocated at Rothwell to meet the JCS requirement plus a 10% flexibility allowance. No further allocations are required in the town.	No changes recommended.	Yes
88	212	RDC Development Consultants	4		25	No	No	No	No			Concerns relating to SUE delivery, the housing target for Desborough and 5YHLS. Also concerns relating to Desborough North SUE remain, as well as the other SUE's, no review of progress published or 5YHLS information. Lack of site by site breakdown of completions, performance against the SUE monitoring target and delivery rate of Kettering East our concerns remain. The Council cannot demonstrate a 5-year supply therefore more allocations are required. Site DE/067 can assist. The site is outside of the settlement boundary but is deliverable. Desire to put forward site if required. Link to full comment.	Add a policy to the plan that allocates the site known as Land off Harrington Road, Desborough for residential use.	The Council acknowledges that the SUE's have been slower in coming forward than envisaged in the JCS. However significant progress has been made in the delivery of the SUE's with a number of parcels at Kettering East being built out, preliminary work has begun on site at Rothwell North and Desborough North is progressing towards the submission of reserved matters applications. The Housing Land Supply Background Paper (October 2019) provides evidence for the housing trajectories provided for these sites. The updated definition of 'deliverable' has been used when assessing whether sites should be included in the first five years of the plan. The SUE trigger has been monitored. The monitoring was reported to the Joint Planning Committee at its meeting on the 25th July 2019 under agenda item 5. The Council has taken a proactive approach to ensuring that it can maintain a five-year housing land supply and this is reflected in the approach taken in the SSP2, including the 10% flexibility allowance which makes provision above the JCS housing requirements. The Council's proactive approach is apparent in the results of the Government's housing delivery test which were 129% for 2018 and 139% for 2019. In Desborough both housing allocations included in the SSP2 have planning permission. The Housing Land Supply Background Paper provides detail of the supply of sites in Desborough. This demonstrates that the supply in Desborough is significantly in excess of the JCS requirement plus 10% flexibility allowance. Therefore there is not a need for additional sites in Desborough to be identified in the SSP2.	No changes recommended.	Yes
89	213	Local Resident	8	Natural Environment and Heritage	55							Concerns relating to the protection for both Cransley and Thorpe Reservoir. There is a need to protect the wildlife & countryside that is located in and around these areas as previously done by Policy 10. The reservoirs are an important wildlife resource in our area, they are beauty spots, close to Kettering and are connected by footpath network. Strongly objection two changes of the Policy on Mawsley Marsh (a SSSI) and Cransley Reservoir (Local Wildlife Site) & Thorpe Reservoir and they continue to remain protected. We need these policies in place to protect a very significant part of our local green infrastructure. Link to full comment.	None.	Saved Local Plan Policy 10 seeks to set out those circumstances where development of these areas is considered acceptable, it is an exceptions policy. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are both located outside of any existing or proposed settlements boundaries and are therefore considered as being in open countryside. As a result, these areas are afforded a level of protection through existing policy in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS). The relevant JCS policies are referenced in Policy RS4 of the emerging SSP2 Publication Plan. The purpose of this policy is to set criteria that have to be met for development in the open countryside to be considered acceptable. Policy RS4 of the Publication Plan provides additional criteria to that set out in the JCS, in relation to replacement dwellings and the re-use of redundant or disused buildings as well as private equestrian facilities. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are sufficiently protected due to their location in the open countryside. Therefore although, there is no specific policy in relation to both the Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs proposed in the Publication Plan, the level of protection afforded to these two reservoirs will not diminish as a result.	None.	
90	216	Local Resident	8	Natural Environment and Heritage	55							I would like to have on record that I would like KBC to retain Policy 10, with the protection it gives to Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs. I believe that it would be a huge mistake to lessen the protection of our Local Wildlife Site between Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs. This area is much valued by local inhabitants as part of the 'green infrastructure' of our county. I apologise for being late in asking you to include my name in the list of objectors to the proposed change. Thank you for your time.	None.	Saved Local Plan Policy 10 seeks to set out those circumstances where development of these areas is considered acceptable, it is an exceptions policy. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are both located outside of any existing or proposed settlements boundaries and are therefore considered as being in open countryside. As a result, these areas are afforded a level of protection through existing policy in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS). The relevant JCS policies are referenced in Policy RS4 of the emerging SSP2 Publication Plan. The purpose of this policy is to set criteria that have to be met for development in the open countryside to be considered acceptable. Policy RS4 of the Publication Plan provides additional criteria to that set out in the JCS, in relation to replacement dwellings and the re-use of redundant or disused buildings as well as private equestrian facilities. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are sufficiently protected due to their location in the open countryside. Therefore although, there is no specific policy in relation to both the Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs proposed in the Publication Plan, the level of protection afforded to these two reservoirs will not diminish as a result.	None.	
91	217	Resident of Loddington	8	Natural Environment and Heritage	55							Having just had this brought to my attention I would like to state that I would like to retain Policy 10 in order to protect the natural environments of our local reservoirs. I am a resident of Loddington. Please let me know if you need any further information from me.	None.	Saved Local Plan Policy 10 seeks to set out those circumstances where development of these areas is considered acceptable, it is an exceptions policy. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are both located outside of any existing or proposed settlements boundaries and are therefore considered as being in open countryside. As a result, these areas are afforded a level of protection through existing policy in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS). The relevant JCS policies are referenced in Policy RS4 of the emerging SSP2 Publication Plan. The purpose of this policy is to set criteria that have to be met for development in the open countryside to be considered acceptable. Policy RS4 of the Publication Plan provides additional criteria to that set out in the JCS, in relation to replacement dwellings and the re-use of redundant or disused buildings as well as private equestrian facilities. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are sufficiently protected due to their location in the open countryside. Therefore although, there is no specific policy in relation to both the Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs proposed in the Publication Plan, the level of protection afforded to these two reservoirs will not diminish as a result.	None.	
92	218	Brian Barber Associates on behalf of Wicksteed Charitable Trust	Policy KET10	Land at Wicksteed Park, east of Sussex Road and Kent Place	82	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	2.1 The Wicksteed Charitable Trust consider that the Kettering Borough Council Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan (Publication Plan Consultation) has been prepared in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the Joint Core Strategy. This ensures a deliverable plan that continues the sequential and hierarchical approach set out through the Joint Core Strategy and will meet the needs of the Borough. For the delivery of new housing the Plan seeks to meet the objectively assessed housing need for the Borough, enabling the SSP2 Local Plan to be considered sound when considered against the content of Section 3 of the NPPF. 2.2 However, housing requirements are identified as minimums, and the opportunities to offer residential development over and above this level should be viewed as an additional benefit to ensuring the continued delivery and completion of housing. For this reason, although not considered unsound, greater flexibility is argued to be beneficial to the delivery of housing allocation KE/033a, including the potential for the provision of a higher level of dwellings. The suggested alterations and associated benefits are considered in Section 3 below. Link to full comment.	Wicksteed Charitable Trust consider the Kettering Borough Site Specific Policies Part 2 Local Plan document to be sound. Nonetheless, minor alteration to the wording of clause f) of Policy KET10 would offer greater flexibility and deliverability of this allocation, increasing the scale of the development allocated within Policy KET10 to up to 3.5 hectares and 100 - 110 dwellings would also significantly increase the benefits that could be made to Wicksteed Park and the associated public benefits through enhancement and connectivity of the parkland and new ecological and wetland areas to the south. Detail of the proposed alterations are included in the full consultation response. Link to full comment.	The Council recognises that there may be benefits of a larger scheme than that allocated which would enable the provision of wider benefits to the park. At this stage further information is required before a larger scheme could be fully assessed. However it is proposed that additional wording is added to the supporting text to make reference to how an application for a larger area would be considered. A Main Modification is proposed to address this. Refer to the Main Modification Schedule, MM21	A Main Modification is proposed to the wording of criteria f) (i) to address the issue raised. Refer to the Main Modification Schedule, MM21	Yes
93	219	Resident of Broughton	8	Natural Environment and Heritage	55							I would like to retain policy 10 as both cransley and Thorpe malsor reservoirs are important stretches of water for many wildfowl, and also cransley reservoir provides lovely walk along it's public footpath all year round. I live in Broughton and regularly walk this footpath	None.	Saved Local Plan Policy 10 seeks to set out those circumstances where development of these areas is considered acceptable, it is an exceptions policy. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are both located outside of any existing or proposed settlements boundaries and are therefore considered as being in open countryside. As a result, these areas are afforded a level of protection through existing policy in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS). The relevant JCS policies are referenced in Policy RS4 of the emerging SSP2 Publication Plan. The purpose of this policy is to set criteria that have to be met for development in the open countryside to be considered acceptable. Policy RS4 of the Publication Plan provides additional criteria to that set out in the JCS, in relation to replacement dwellings and the re-use of redundant or disused buildings as well as private equestrian facilities. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are sufficiently protected due to their location in the open countryside. Therefore although, there is no specific policy in relation to both the Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs proposed in the Publication Plan, the level of protection afforded to these two reservoirs will not diminish as a result.	None.	
94	220	Local Resident	8	Natural Environment and Heritage	55							Concerns for the protection of both Cransley and Thorpe Reservoir. The new proposed Local Plan is replacing Policy 10 with NEH2. These reservoirs are an important wildlife resource in our area. They are also beauty spots, close to Kettering. Policy 10 has been accepted and valued and is much needed, to protect a very significant part of our local green infrastructure. I would like to strongly urge that the proposed changes are not implemented and that the current Policy 10 is retained thereby protecting these vital wildlife and leisure resources. Link to full comment.	None.	Saved Local Plan Policy 10 seeks to set out those circumstances where development of these areas is considered acceptable, it is an exceptions policy. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are both located outside of any existing or proposed settlements boundaries and are therefore considered as being in open countryside. As a result, these areas are afforded a level of protection through existing policy in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS). The relevant JCS policies are referenced in Policy RS4 of the emerging SSP2 Publication Plan. The purpose of this policy is to set criteria that have to be met for development in the open countryside to be considered acceptable. Policy RS4 of the Publication Plan provides additional criteria to that set out in the JCS, in relation to replacement dwellings and the re-use of redundant or disused buildings as well as private equestrian facilities. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are sufficiently protected due to their location in the open countryside. Therefore although, there is no specific policy in relation to both the Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs proposed in the Publication Plan, the level of protection afforded to these two reservoirs will not diminish as a result.	None.	

95	221	Cranley Sailing Club	8	Natural Environment and Heritage	55										On behalf of the 220 members of Cranley Sailing Club, we wish Kettering Borough Council to continue with the same principles as adopted under Policy 10 in the future with regards to the protection from development (built or otherwise) in the environs of Cranley Reservoir. Since 1892 this has been a wildlife haven and the sailing club and fishermen and local landowners have maintained this wonderful habitat for all to enjoy either on or around the water. Thousands have and continue to enjoy this reservoir and ANY relaxation of the regulations relating to development that would allow inappropriate schemes to be passed will permanently damage this fragile ecosystem. We therefore strongly urge Kettering Borough Council to continue with the protection of this Reservoir in the same vein as Policy 10.	None.	Saved Local Plan Policy 10 seeks to set out those circumstances where development of these areas is considered acceptable, it is an exceptions policy. Cranley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are both located outside of any existing or proposed settlements boundaries and are therefore considered as being in open countryside. As a result, these areas are afforded a level of protection through existing policy in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS). The relevant JCS policies are referenced in Policy RS4 of the emerging SSP2 Publication Plan. The purpose of this policy is to set criteria that have to be met for development in the open countryside to be considered acceptable. Policy RS4 of the Publication Plan provides additional criteria to that set out in the JCS, in relation to replacement dwellings and the re-use of redundant or disused buildings as well as private equestrian facilities. Cranley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are sufficiently protected due to their location in the open countryside. Therefore although, there is no specific policy in relation to both the Cranley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs proposed in the Publication Plan, the level of protection afforded to these two reservoirs will not diminish as a result.	None.	
96	222	Loddington Parish Council	8	Natural Environment and Heritage	55										Loddington Parish Council has looked through this document and could see no particular changes for our village. It has now however been brought to our attention by Thorpe Malsor Parish Council that there is a major issue with the planning protection afforded to both Cranley and Thorpe Reservoir. Both these reservoirs have been protected up until now by Policy 10 which has been retained in the Local Plan since 1995 as it is widely agreed that these reservoirs are an important wildlife resource in our area. Policy 10 has stood the test of time, has been accepted and valued as an important planning policy tool and is much needed, going forward, to protect a very significant part of our local green infrastructure. The new proposed Local Plan replaces Policy 10 with NEH2. Loddington Parish Council would like to retain Policy 10 in order to protect Cranley and Thorpe reservoirs and object most strongly to any weakening of the protections Policy 10 provides to the wildlife and areas of Cranley and Thorpe reservoirs.	None.	Saved Local Plan Policy 10 seeks to set out those circumstances where development of these areas is considered acceptable, it is an exceptions policy. Cranley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are both located outside of any existing or proposed settlements boundaries and are therefore considered as being in open countryside. As a result, these areas are afforded a level of protection through existing policy in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS). The relevant JCS policies are referenced in Policy RS4 of the emerging SSP2 Publication Plan. The purpose of this policy is to set criteria that have to be met for development in the open countryside to be considered acceptable. Policy RS4 of the Publication Plan provides additional criteria to that set out in the JCS, in relation to replacement dwellings and the re-use of redundant or disused buildings as well as private equestrian facilities. Cranley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are sufficiently protected due to their location in the open countryside. Therefore although, there is no specific policy in relation to both the Cranley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs proposed in the Publication Plan, the level of protection afforded to these two reservoirs will not diminish as a result.	None.	
97	223	Local Resident	8	Natural Environment and Heritage	55										I would like to retain policy 10 for the benefit of the protection it gives to Cranley and Thorpe reservoirs. These are areas of vital importance to wildlife and of considerable value to local residents like myself. I meet many, many people walking in the area who take a keen interest in the resident and migratory birds, the wild animals encountered on almost every walk, the flora and the incredible scenery. Any reduction in the protection offered to these areas would be scandalous. Policy 10 seems to have been working quite well for the last 25 years and I can see no benefit in discarding it.	None.	Saved Local Plan Policy 10 seeks to set out those circumstances where development of these areas is considered acceptable, it is an exceptions policy. Cranley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are both located outside of any existing or proposed settlements boundaries and are therefore considered as being in open countryside. As a result, these areas are afforded a level of protection through existing policy in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS). The relevant JCS policies are referenced in Policy RS4 of the emerging SSP2 Publication Plan. The purpose of this policy is to set criteria that have to be met for development in the open countryside to be considered acceptable. Policy RS4 of the Publication Plan provides additional criteria to that set out in the JCS, in relation to replacement dwellings and the re-use of redundant or disused buildings as well as private equestrian facilities. Cranley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are sufficiently protected due to their location in the open countryside. Therefore although, there is no specific policy in relation to both the Cranley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs proposed in the Publication Plan, the level of protection afforded to these two reservoirs will not diminish as a result.	None.	
98	224	Local Resident	8	Natural Environment and Heritage	55										Hi it's been brought to my attention that policy 10 is being taken away, after reading all the details I feel strongly that it should be kept in place. We have to protect our wildlife, that planet is in desperate need of our protection. Please keep policy 10 in	None.	Saved Local Plan Policy 10 seeks to set out those circumstances where development of these areas is considered acceptable, it is an exceptions policy. Cranley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are both located outside of any existing or proposed settlements boundaries and are therefore considered as being in open countryside. As a result, these areas are afforded a level of protection through existing policy in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS). The relevant JCS policies are referenced in Policy RS4 of the emerging SSP2 Publication Plan. The purpose of this policy is to set criteria that have to be met for development in the open countryside to be considered acceptable. Policy RS4 of the Publication Plan provides additional criteria to that set out in the JCS, in relation to replacement dwellings and the re-use of redundant or disused buildings as well as private equestrian facilities. Cranley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are sufficiently protected due to their location in the open countryside. Therefore although, there is no specific policy in relation to both the Cranley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs proposed in the Publication Plan, the level of protection afforded to these two reservoirs will not diminish as a result.	None.	
99	225	Resident of Cranley	8	Natural Environment and Heritage	55										I would like to object to the change to policy no 10 regarding Cranley & Thorpe Malsor reservoir. Not only is it a haven for wildlife in our area, it is also a fantastic beauty spot. My family & I are keen bird watchers & walk around both areas on many occasions. It also helps with many peoples mental health allowing them to get out in our local area in the fresh air, freeing their mind & totally getting away from it all. I would like it to remain in place with no changes.	None.	Saved Local Plan Policy 10 seeks to set out those circumstances where development of these areas is considered acceptable, it is an exceptions policy. Cranley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are both located outside of any existing or proposed settlements boundaries and are therefore considered as being in open countryside. As a result, these areas are afforded a level of protection through existing policy in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS). The relevant JCS policies are referenced in Policy RS4 of the emerging SSP2 Publication Plan. The purpose of this policy is to set criteria that have to be met for development in the open countryside to be considered acceptable. Policy RS4 of the Publication Plan provides additional criteria to that set out in the JCS, in relation to replacement dwellings and the re-use of redundant or disused buildings as well as private equestrian facilities. Cranley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are sufficiently protected due to their location in the open countryside. Therefore although, there is no specific policy in relation to both the Cranley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs proposed in the Publication Plan, the level of protection afforded to these two reservoirs will not diminish as a result.	None.	
100	226	Local Resident	8	Natural Environment and Heritage	55										I assume that you are aware that there is an illegal occupation at Cranley Road, adjacent to the reservoir, that is grinding it way through ongoing planning applications, appeals etc. With this ongoing activity I am absolutely stunned that there are proposed revisions to Policy 10 that weaken a protection to the wildlife and areas of Thorpe and Cranley reservoirs. These protections have worked for many years and is demonstrated by the fact that wildlife has flourished. I would have expected any proposed revisions to enhance and strengthen Policy 10 not weaken them. With the ongoing illegal occupation I find it remarkable that Kettering BC would even entertain, let alone action, weakening Policy 10.	None.	Saved Local Plan Policy 10 seeks to set out those circumstances where development of these areas is considered acceptable, it is an exceptions policy. Cranley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are both located outside of any existing or proposed settlements boundaries and are therefore considered as being in open countryside. As a result, these areas are afforded a level of protection through existing policy in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS). The relevant JCS policies are referenced in Policy RS4 of the emerging SSP2 Publication Plan. The purpose of this policy is to set criteria that have to be met for development in the open countryside to be considered acceptable. Policy RS4 of the Publication Plan provides additional criteria to that set out in the JCS, in relation to replacement dwellings and the re-use of redundant or disused buildings as well as private equestrian facilities. Cranley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are sufficiently protected due to their location in the open countryside. Therefore although, there is no specific policy in relation to both the Cranley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs proposed in the Publication Plan, the level of protection afforded to these two reservoirs will not diminish as a result.	None.	
101	227	Resident of Orton	8	Natural Environment and Heritage	55										I would like to register my opinion that the local plan should give our two important reservoirs, Cranley and Thorpe Malsor, the same protection going forward as they have now under Policy 10. As a local resident I enjoy these wild areas and they are strategically important for over wintering wildfowl.	None.	Saved Local Plan Policy 10 seeks to set out those circumstances where development of these areas is considered acceptable, it is an exceptions policy. Cranley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are both located outside of any existing or proposed settlements boundaries and are therefore considered as being in open countryside. As a result, these areas are afforded a level of protection through existing policy in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS). The relevant JCS policies are referenced in Policy RS4 of the emerging SSP2 Publication Plan. The purpose of this policy is to set criteria that have to be met for development in the open countryside to be considered acceptable. Policy RS4 of the Publication Plan provides additional criteria to that set out in the JCS, in relation to replacement dwellings and the re-use of redundant or disused buildings as well as private equestrian facilities. Cranley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are sufficiently protected due to their location in the open countryside. Therefore although, there is no specific policy in relation to both the Cranley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs proposed in the Publication Plan, the level of protection afforded to these two reservoirs will not diminish as a result.	None.	
102	228	Rosconn Strategic Land	Policy STA2	Land to the south of Harborough Road, Stoke Albany	147	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Rosconn Strategic Land (RSL) represent the owners of the land to the south of Harborough Road, Stoke Albany and fully support the site's allocation under Policy STA2 and confirm that the site is suitable, available and achievable for housing development. A series of detailed surveys and assessments of the site have been undertaken, which show no insurmountable constraints. The allocation of the site to meet housing needs within Stoke Albany. The allocation will also be in accordance with paragraph 78 of the NPPF which highlights that development in one village may support services in a village nearby. Intention progress with an immediate planning application in view of the site's suitability for housing development. Policy STA2 on the whole considered to be appropriate and achievable. Consultation with the local community and Parish Council have been undertaken which has indicated that previous evidence identifying a need for allotments within the village is now out of date and adequate provision exists elsewhere in the village. Consequently, sub criteria (g) should be amended to delete reference to allotments. Criterion (c) should be deleted. The Policies Map for Stoke Albany Figure 18.24 is acceptable. RSL consider the Sustainability Appraisal assessment of certain criteria should be amended as per to more accurately reflect the site's credentials. These relate to contaminated Land, Capacity of Highway, Capacity of Infrastructure, including drainage. Link to full comment.	Policy STA2 Criterion (c) to be deleted. Policy STA2 Criteria (g) should be amended to delete reference to allotments. The Policies Map for Stoke Albany Figure 18.24 be amended to reflect the site boundary as shown in Location Plan Drawing Reference 3430.100 Revision B.	See recommended change.	Criterion c) of Policy STA2 will be deleted, reference to allotments in criterion g) will be amended to make reference to local need. The site boundary and settlement boundary will be amended to reflect the attached plan. Main Modifications are proposed to address this. Refer to the Main Modification Schedule, MM41 and MM49	Yes
103	229	Local Resident	8	Natural Environment and Heritage	55										We are extremely concerned that Policy 10 of the Local Plan is to be replaced with NEH2. Policy 10 has stood the community in good stead since 1995, it is a very important policy in that it protects not only the countryside but also local and migratory wildlife. This policy protects both Cranley and Thorpe Malsor Reservoirs, both of which are extremely important amenities in the local countryside. Enough of our beautiful countryside has been eroded for a variety of reasons and we believe that the time has come to make a stand against further loss. Please retain Policy 10 of the Local Plan.	None.	Saved Local Plan Policy 10 seeks to set out those circumstances where development of these areas is considered acceptable, it is an exceptions policy. Cranley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are both located outside of any existing or proposed settlements boundaries and are therefore considered as being in open countryside. As a result, these areas are afforded a level of protection through existing policy in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS). The relevant JCS policies are referenced in Policy RS4 of the emerging SSP2 Publication Plan. The purpose of this policy is to set criteria that have to be met for development in the open countryside to be considered acceptable. Policy RS4 of the Publication Plan provides additional criteria to that set out in the JCS, in relation to replacement dwellings and the re-use of redundant or disused buildings as well as private equestrian facilities. Cranley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are sufficiently protected due to their location in the open countryside. Therefore although, there is no specific policy in relation to both the Cranley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs proposed in the Publication Plan, the level of protection afforded to these two reservoirs will not diminish as a result.	None.	
104	230	Northamptonshire County Council Education	General Comments	Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan Publication Plan	0										The County Council welcomes the emphasis in the Plan on delivering key infrastructure. Ongoing collaboration on the IDS between partners will be required to ensure it is regularly reviewed and updated. The County Council supports the recognition in Section 14 of the vital role of infrastructure in supporting delivery of the Plan. Ongoing consultation with the county council will therefore be required to ensure that infrastructure is planned and delivered. New housing development creates additional demand for existing and new education provision. There is also an urgent identified need to provide additional capacity at Secondary Education level in the interim. The County Council remains committed to working closely with all interested parties, to ensure that capacity across these areas can be monitored and delivered. Consideration must also be given to the impact of the fire service and libraries and the importance of broadband. The County Council welcomes the development of the Plan and remain committed to working with Kettering Borough Council and other partners in relation to the sustainable delivery of infrastructure provision. Link to full comment.	None.	Noted. The Council will continue to work with NCC to ensure infrastructure is appropriately planned for.	None.	
105	231	Local Resident	8	Natural Environment and Heritage	55										We would like to retain Policy 10, the protection it gives Cranley and Thorpe reservoirs. They are beauty spots, close to Kettering and are connected by the footpath network. They are also part of an important wildlife corridor that stretches from Mawsley Marsh (a SSSI) to Cranley Reservoir (a Local Wildlife Site) and onto Thorpe Reservoir. Wetland birds (both migratory and British residents) are able to use this interconnecting resource for feeding, nesting and raising young. Policy 10 has stood the test of time, has been accepted and valued as an important planning policy tool and is much needed, going forward, to protect a very significant part of our local green infrastructure.	None.	Saved Local Plan Policy 10 seeks to set out those circumstances where development of these areas is considered acceptable, it is an exceptions policy. Cranley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are both located outside of any existing or proposed settlements boundaries and are therefore considered as being in open countryside. As a result, these areas are afforded a level of protection through existing policy in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS). The relevant JCS policies are referenced in Policy RS4 of the emerging SSP2 Publication Plan. The purpose of this policy is to set criteria that have to be met for development in the open countryside to be considered acceptable. Policy RS4 of the Publication Plan provides additional criteria to that set out in the JCS, in relation to replacement dwellings and the re-use of redundant or disused buildings as well as private equestrian facilities. Cranley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are sufficiently protected due to their location in the open countryside. Therefore although, there is no specific policy in relation to both the Cranley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs proposed in the Publication Plan, the level of protection afforded to these two reservoirs will not diminish as a result.	None.	
106	232	Local Resident	8	Natural Environment and Heritage	55										Both these reservoirs have been protected up until now by Policy 10 which has been retained in the Local Plan since 1995 as it is widely agreed that these reservoirs are an important wildlife resource in our area. They are also beauty spots, close to Kettering and are connected by the footpath network. They are also part of an important wildlife corridor that stretches from Mawsley Marsh (a SSSI) to Cranley Reservoir (a Local Wildlife Site) and onto Thorpe Reservoir. Wetland birds (both migratory and British residents) are able to use this interconnecting resource for feeding, nesting and raising young. Policy 10 has stood the test of time, has been accepted and valued as an important planning policy tool and is much needed, going forward, to protect a very significant part of our local green infrastructure. Too much of our countryside is at risk and having enjoyed and both of these have been an integral part of my life for 50 years and is something which needs to be retained for future generations to enjoy too. Please think long and hard about changing these areas.	None.	Saved Local Plan Policy 10 seeks to set out those circumstances where development of these areas is considered acceptable, it is an exceptions policy. Cranley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are both located outside of any existing or proposed settlements boundaries and are therefore considered as being in open countryside. As a result, these areas are afforded a level of protection through existing policy in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS). The relevant JCS policies are referenced in Policy RS4 of the emerging SSP2 Publication Plan. The purpose of this policy is to set criteria that have to be met for development in the open countryside to be considered acceptable. Policy RS4 of the Publication Plan provides additional criteria to that set out in the JCS, in relation to replacement dwellings and the re-use of redundant or disused buildings as well as private equestrian facilities. Cranley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are sufficiently protected due to their location in the open countryside. Therefore although, there is no specific policy in relation to both the Cranley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs proposed in the Publication Plan, the level of protection afforded to these two reservoirs will not diminish as a result.	None.	
107	233	Marrons Planning on behalf of Hatlam Land Management Ltd	4	Housing	25	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	The SSP2 fails to demonstrate specific, deliverable sites for years 1-5 of the plan period. Kettering must deliver a minimum of 11,392 homes Allocating additional small scale sites within the Part 2 Plan is required. The identified supply is very dependent on the three SUEs. The Council's evidence base does not show assumed rates can be achieved. There are concerns about the delays to the other strategic site allocations at Desborough North and Rothwell. The Desborough North SUE has also been significantly delayed. The Rothwell North SUE has also been significantly delayed and no dwellings have been delivered yet. The SSP2 Local Plan reliance on these 3 strategic sites within its five year housing land supply means that the SSP2 Local Plan fails to demonstrate specific, deliverable sites for years one to five of the plan period contrary to Paragraph 67 of the NPPF. Link to full comment.	Additional small-scale site allocations needed are required to maintain a deliverable 5 year supply of housing land in accordance with the NPPF in line with the JCS. The site Higham Road, Burton Latimer provides an opportunity for this and therefore this site should be allocated for 160 dwellings. The site will be able to deliver homes early in the plan period and contribute to the Council's five year housing land supply. The site could contribute to enhancements and projects to enhance the capacity of existing infrastructure such as the medical centre as well as allotments. The site is deliverable there are no significant constraints to development at the site. Suitable access can be achieved to the site. The site also benefits from existing public transport. Link to full comment.	The flexibility allowance is applied to Kettering and the Market Towns not the rural area, this approach is justified in the Housing Land Supply Background Paper (October 2019). The flexibility allowance is different to the buffer used to five year land supply. In accordance with the NPPF a 5% buffer has been applied for this purpose. The Council acknowledges that the SUE's have been slower in coming forward than envisaged in the JCS. However significant progress has been made in the delivery of the SUE's with a number of parcels at Kettering East being built out, preliminary work has begun on site at Rothwell North and Desborough North is progressing towards the submission of reserved matters applications. The Housing Land Supply Background Paper (October 2019) provides evidence for the housing trajectories provided for these sites. The updated definition of 'deliverable' has been used when assessing whether sites should be included in the first five years of the plan period. The Council has taken a proactive approach to ensuring that it can maintain a five-year housing land supply and this is reflected in the approach taken in the SSP2, including the 10% flexibility allowance which makes provision above the JCS housing requirements. The Council's proactive approach is apparent in the results of the Government's housing delivery test which were 129% for 2018 and 130% for 2019. The allocations in the SSP2 fulfil the remaining residual housing requirement when existing completions and commitments are taken into account. The Housing Land Supply Background Paper (May 2018) provides information on the need for housing allocations in Burton Latimer. This demonstrates sufficient sites have been identified in Burton Latimer to meet housing requirements plus a flexibility allowance.	No changes recommended.	Yes
108	234	Local Resident	8	Natural Environment and Heritage	55										to the revised protection that is proposed for Cranley and Thorpe Malsor reservoir, under policy 10. The protection that Policy 10 provides in what is widely agreed an important wildlife resource in our area, has helped these beauty spots to flourish. They are part of an important wildlife corridor that stretches from Mawsley Marsh (a SSSI) to Cranley Reservoir (a Local Wildlife Site) and onto Thorpe Reservoir. Wetland birds (both migratory and British residents) are able to use this interconnecting resource for feeding, nesting and raising young. The ecology of the whole area could easily change if it isn't protected. At the present it is a beautiful part of our local green infrastructure. The new proposed Local Plan is replacing Policy 10 with NEH2 which could see a drastic reduction in planning protection for these two reservoirs. It is my belief that diverse ecological areas like this and areas of such natural beauty must be protected for the pleasure of generations to come	None.	Saved Local Plan Policy 10 seeks to set out those circumstances where development of these areas is considered acceptable, it is an exceptions policy. Cranley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are both located outside of any existing or proposed settlements boundaries and are therefore considered as being in open countryside. As a result, these areas are afforded a level of protection through existing policy in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS). The relevant JCS policies are referenced in Policy RS4 of the emerging SSP2 Publication Plan. The purpose of this policy is to set criteria that have to be met for development in the open countryside to be considered acceptable. Policy RS4 of the Publication Plan provides additional criteria to that set out in the JCS, in relation to replacement dwellings and the re-use of redundant or disused buildings as well as private equestrian facilities. Cranley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are sufficiently protected due to their location in the open countryside. Therefore although, there is no specific policy in relation to both the Cranley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs proposed in the Publication Plan, the level of protection afforded to these two reservoirs will not diminish as a result.	None.	

109	235	Resident of Thorpe Malsor	8	Natural Environment and Heritage	55														I live in Thorpe Malsor, with my husband and three children. We hear that our Local Plan is going to be updated and Policy 10 potentially replaced. We don't know much about the political side of it, but we love the reservoirs near here and walk down to Cransley reservoir several times a week. There are incredible wild birds on both reservoirs and we are concerned, particularly with the large amount of development in Kettering, that these will be under threat. The walks and wildlife are not just enjoyed by locals, but many people from Kettering and Corby who drive here to enjoy it. We urge you to do whatever you can to give every protection possible to these wonderful natural habitats and certainly not decrease the protection.	None.	Saved Local Plan Policy 10 seeks to set out those circumstances where development of these areas is considered acceptable, it is an exceptions policy. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are both located outside of any existing or proposed settlements boundaries and are therefore considered as being in open countryside. As a result, these areas are afforded a level of protection through existing policy in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS). The relevant JCS policies are referenced in Policy RS4 of the emerging SSP2 Publication Plan. The purpose of this policy is to set criteria that have to be met for development in the open countryside to be considered acceptable. Policy RS4 of the Publication Plan provides additional criteria to that set out in the JCS, in relation to replacement dwellings and the re-use of redundant or disused buildings as well as private equestrian facilities. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are sufficiently protected due to their location in the open countryside. Therefore although, there is no specific policy in relation to both the Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs proposed in the Publication Plan, the level of protection afforded to these two reservoirs will not diminish as a result.	None.		
110	236	Northamptonshire County Council - Archaeology	8	Natural Environment and Heritage	55														Questioning of lack of heritage policy, text could be modified (8.33) to address this. At present 8.33 is too broad in scope. Several settlements in Kettering Borough are the location of significant archaeological activity, this includes Kettering, Rothwell, Burton Latimer and Desborough. Specific details of these can be found within the full representation. Link to full comment.	None.	Paragraph 8.36 explains why it is not considered necessary to have a specific heritage policy in the SSP2. The proposed wording provides a useful summary, but it is not considered necessary to include this level of detail within the plan	No changes recommended.		
110	237	Northamptonshire County Council - Archaeology	Policy DES2	Opportunity Redevelopment Sites within Desborough	94														In relation to the conversion of (b) the Lawrence's Factory site - an opportunity for mixed use or residential development (DE2). I would hope that DES1 (j) Give priority to the retention and conservation of historic buildings and buildings of local significance would be a major consideration as it should be in relation to all identified buildings of historic and local interest whether designated or not. This is the role of local lists.	None.	Noted.	None.		
111	238	WS Planning & Architecture	Policy MAW2	Land to the West of Mawley	140	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No								The Local Plan is considered unsound as the land proposed to be allocated for housing in Mawley (RA/174) does not perform as well as land previously identified under RA/115. Uncertainty on the allocated site with regards to flooding. The Council have not required any specific community benefits in the list of Criteria identified for Policy MAW2. WS Planning & Architecture have prepared a planning application for a site on land to the east of Mawley, previously identified as site RA/115 in SSP2. The application includes detailed information and will be submitted in Spring 2020. A location plan is provided at WS Appendix 1 identifies the site in question. A number of benefits have been identified which would be delivered through the development of the site. These are available to view in the full representation. Link to full comment.	The Council should reconsider the allocation of land at RA/174 given the substantial community benefits provided by the proposed development of land at RA/115.	Site RA/115 has been considered and discounted through a robust site assessment process. The detail of this is contained in the Housing Allocations Background Papers (2012, 2018 and 2019) and the Housing Allocations and Assessment of Additional Sites and Update (2013).	No changes recommended.	Yes	
111	239	WS Planning & Architecture	13	Mawley	138	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No								The Local Plan is considered unsound as the Council have not carried out the correct assessment within their Sustainability Appraisal. Council have no evidence regarding the purported lack of access to highway and concerns regarding infrastructure in relation to site RA/115. WS Planning & Architecture have prepared a planning application for a site on land to the east of Mawley, previously identified as site RA/115 in SSP2. A number of benefits have been identified which would be delivered through the development of the site. These are available to view in the full representation. The Council have proposed the allocation of site RA/174 without the provision of any additional allotments as required in Para 11.2.73 of the SA. The application site should be assessed in line with the Council's assessment of the land to the west of Mawley. The Council's assessment of Site RA/174 on Page 123 is erroneous for a number of reasons, these can be found in the full representation. Link to full comment.	The Council should reconsider the allocation of land at RA/174 given the substantial community benefits provided by the proposed development of land at RA/115.	Site RA/115 has been considered and discounted through a robust site assessment process. The detail of this is contained in the Housing Allocations Background Papers (2012, 2018 and 2019) and the Housing Allocations and Assessment of Additional Sites and Update (2013).	No changes recommended.	Yes	
112	241	Environment Agency	Policy KET9	McAlpine's Yard, Pityley Lodge Road	81	No					Yes								Given the sites close proximity to a reservoir, it is premature to include this site as an allocation. The Level 1 SFRA identified this site at risk of flooding from a reservoir. In particular, the SFRA states that the site is entirely at risk from Cransley Waters, Thorpe Malsor and Slade Brook Balancing Reservoirs. Given proximity of the site to Slade Brook Balancing Reservoir, warning time is likely to be minimal. There is no evidence (e.g. Level 2 SFRA or site specific flood risk assessment) to demonstrate that the Exception Test can be met and the proposed development can be made safe. In the absence of the Level 2 SFRA or site specific flood risk assessment, this allocation should be removed.	Additional flood risk information was provided by the site promoter, however the Environment Agency has advised that further information is needed particularly in relation to potential risk to property and life if the upstream reservoirs fail, before the site can be allocated in the plan. Officers are continuing to work with the site promoter and the Environment Agency to seek to address the concerns raised. At this stage it is recommended that the site remains in the Submission Plan as an allocation, however if these issues cannot be resolved this site may need to be removed as an allocation.	None		Yes	
112	242	Environment Agency	4	Housing	25	No					No								We note that numerous policies throughout the document state that proposals will be supported by a contaminated land and land stability investigation and appropriate mitigation scheme to address any identified contamination, ensuring that there are no unacceptable risks to human health. We recommend that this should be "...no unacceptable risks to human health and the natural environment". This is to ensure that the potential risk posed to controlled waters (surface waters and groundwater) are also appropriately assessed.	See recommended change.	A Main Modification is proposed to address the issues raised in this response. Refer to the Main Modification Schedule, reference number MM9, MM11, MM14, MM16, MM18, MM19, MM22, MM23, MM25, MM42.		Yes	
113	243	Berrys	Policy LOC1	Settlement Boundaries	24	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes								It is not considered that the Publication Version of the Local Plan is legally compliant or sound. Objection is raised to the proposed settlement boundary in the context of The Manor House, Grafton Underwood. The subject land wholly conforms with principle 2 and should be included within the settlement boundary. To ensure that the proposed Local Plan is sound, the entire area of garden land should be included within the settlement boundary. The inclusion of the subject land within the settlement boundary will accord the NPPF and related policies, as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and relevant local planning policies within the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (NNUCS) and emerging Site-Specific Part 2 (SSP2) Local Plan. Link to full comment.	The settlement boundaries have been drawn in accordance with a robust set of criteria. The Settlement Boundaries Background Papers (February 2012, April 2018 and October 2019) provide the evidence base and justification for the settlement boundaries shown on the policies maps.	No changes recommended.	No		
114	244	Local Resident	8	Natural Environment and Heritage	55														I am concerned with the suggestion that Policy 10 of the Local Plan should be amended. Thorpe and Cransley Reservoirs need to be protected places. They are important for the environment, for wildlife and for leisure pursuits. Migrating birds use the reservoirs each year. They are also part of the footpath network. Policy 10 has stood the test of time and I see no reason for it to be amended.	None.	Saved Local Plan Policy 10 seeks to set out those circumstances where development of these areas is considered acceptable, it is an exceptions policy. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are both located outside of any existing or proposed settlements boundaries and are therefore considered as being in open countryside. As a result, these areas are afforded a level of protection through existing policy in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS). The relevant JCS policies are referenced in Policy RS4 of the emerging SSP2 Publication Plan. The purpose of this policy is to set criteria that have to be met for development in the open countryside to be considered acceptable. Policy RS4 of the Publication Plan provides additional criteria to that set out in the JCS, in relation to replacement dwellings and the re-use of redundant or disused buildings as well as private equestrian facilities. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are sufficiently protected due to their location in the open countryside. Therefore although, there is no specific policy in relation to both the Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs proposed in the Publication Plan, the level of protection afforded to these two reservoirs will not diminish as a result.	None.		
115	245	Local Resident	8	Natural Environment and Heritage	55														I am writing to express my concern at the possible dilution/removal of Policy 10. It is difficult enough for wildlife with developments being built in rural areas, but to allow this around areas where water is available for their survival and habitat is incomprehensible. It will deter them from going there with people and lots of activity. We should be preserving our countryside, especially around reservoirs, not softening the Planning rules to enable our countryside to disappear in years to come. What are we doing to our countryside? Please consider keeping Policy 10 as is. Let's keep our wildlife visiting us and enjoying their presence.	None.	Saved Local Plan Policy 10 seeks to set out those circumstances where development of these areas is considered acceptable, it is an exceptions policy. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are both located outside of any existing or proposed settlements boundaries and are therefore considered as being in open countryside. As a result, these areas are afforded a level of protection through existing policy in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS). The relevant JCS policies are referenced in Policy RS4 of the emerging SSP2 Publication Plan. The purpose of this policy is to set criteria that have to be met for development in the open countryside to be considered acceptable. Policy RS4 of the Publication Plan provides additional criteria to that set out in the JCS, in relation to replacement dwellings and the re-use of redundant or disused buildings as well as private equestrian facilities. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are sufficiently protected due to their location in the open countryside. Therefore although, there is no specific policy in relation to both the Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs proposed in the Publication Plan, the level of protection afforded to these two reservoirs will not diminish as a result.	None.		
116	246	Local Resident	8	Natural Environment and Heritage	55														I write to say that I think that the Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs should remain protected as they were under Policy 10 of the 1995 Local Plan. The two reservoirs provide a wildlife resource for both indigenous birds and migrating wildfowl. The reservoirs provide beauty spots close enough to Kettering to be enjoyed by local people who are interested in wildlife or just prefer to enjoy some peace and quiet in a rural setting. We are being encouraged not to use vehicles with all their emissions needlessly and it is quite a long journey to access other wildfowl areas. The Policy 10 has worked well in the past and I request that it is kept for the two reservoirs for the future so that there are still some places kept for nature after all the very extensive house building has taken place. The NEH2 does not allow for any long term preservation of natural spaces for both humans and nature's own.	None.	Saved Local Plan Policy 10 seeks to set out those circumstances where development of these areas is considered acceptable, it is an exceptions policy. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are both located outside of any existing or proposed settlements boundaries and are therefore considered as being in open countryside. As a result, these areas are afforded a level of protection through existing policy in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS). The relevant JCS policies are referenced in Policy RS4 of the emerging SSP2 Publication Plan. The purpose of this policy is to set criteria that have to be met for development in the open countryside to be considered acceptable. Policy RS4 of the Publication Plan provides additional criteria to that set out in the JCS, in relation to replacement dwellings and the re-use of redundant or disused buildings as well as private equestrian facilities. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are sufficiently protected due to their location in the open countryside. Therefore although, there is no specific policy in relation to both the Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs proposed in the Publication Plan, the level of protection afforded to these two reservoirs will not diminish as a result.	None.		
117	247	Local Resident	8	Natural Environment and Heritage	55														I am writing to say that I think Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs should remain protected as they are under Policy 10 of the 1995 Local Plan. They are a valuable wildlife resource for indigenous birds and migrating birds. The reservoirs provide valuable open beauty spots which can be enjoyed by many who appreciate the space and varied bird species. Policy 10 had worked well in the past and I ask that it is kept for the two reservoirs in the future.	None.	Saved Local Plan Policy 10 seeks to set out those circumstances where development of these areas is considered acceptable, it is an exceptions policy. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are both located outside of any existing or proposed settlements boundaries and are therefore considered as being in open countryside. As a result, these areas are afforded a level of protection through existing policy in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS). The relevant JCS policies are referenced in Policy RS4 of the emerging SSP2 Publication Plan. The purpose of this policy is to set criteria that have to be met for development in the open countryside to be considered acceptable. Policy RS4 of the Publication Plan provides additional criteria to that set out in the JCS, in relation to replacement dwellings and the re-use of redundant or disused buildings as well as private equestrian facilities. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are sufficiently protected due to their location in the open countryside. Therefore although, there is no specific policy in relation to both the Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs proposed in the Publication Plan, the level of protection afforded to these two reservoirs will not diminish as a result.	None.		
118	248	Wilbarston Parish Council	13	Wilbarston	156														13.172 Wilbarston Conservation Area Appraisal was adopted in June 1983. In addition to this, the Wilbarston Village Design Statement was adopted in 2010. This needs to be amended to read the Parish Plan not Village Design Statement. The attached map needs to be amended to include the three highlighted open spaces, playing field, Carlton Road allotments and village green.	None.	See recommended change.	A Main Modification is proposed to add the recreation ground to the policies map, the other two spaces are too small to be included in the open space audit but would be considered on individual merits should an application come forward. Refer to the Main Modifications Schedule, MM51		
119	249	Cransley Parish Council	8	Natural Environment and Heritage	55														Councillors of Great Cransley Parish Council all emphatically agreed that Policy 10 should be retained. It would be detrimental to the whole area, the wildlife, including small mammals and birds, the water quality and the well used public footpaths bordered by wild flowers if it did not have the protection of Policy 10 to secure its future. Cransley Reservoir is enjoyed by the public for its views from the surrounding area and from the footpath over the dam. The sailing boats from the active sailing club give extra interest and enjoyment to the peace and quiet of this local area of countryside which must never be allowed to be commercialised.	None.	Saved Local Plan Policy 10 seeks to set out those circumstances where development of these areas is considered acceptable, it is an exceptions policy. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are both located outside of any existing or proposed settlements boundaries and are therefore considered as being in open countryside. As a result, these areas are afforded a level of protection through existing policy in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS). The relevant JCS policies are referenced in Policy RS4 of the emerging SSP2 Publication Plan. The purpose of this policy is to set criteria that have to be met for development in the open countryside to be considered acceptable. Policy RS4 of the Publication Plan provides additional criteria to that set out in the JCS, in relation to replacement dwellings and the re-use of redundant or disused buildings as well as private equestrian facilities. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are sufficiently protected due to their location in the open countryside. Therefore although, there is no specific policy in relation to both the Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs proposed in the Publication Plan, the level of protection afforded to these two reservoirs will not diminish as a result.	None.		
120	250	North Northamptonshire Joint Planning Unit	General Comments	Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan-Publication Plan	0														It is considered that the Site Specific Part 2 Plan (SSP2) appropriately understands its relationship with the JCS - Part 1 of the Local Plan. The Plan provides appropriate local distinctiveness to the strategic policies of the JCS. The Council should explain in the supporting text to Policy DES6 why an employment site in excess of 5ha is being allocated in the SSP2. It is considered that the approach taken with regards to housing numbers and allocations provides a robust contingency to support housing delivery. The Plan is in conformity with the JCS and identifies the relevant local issues where additional guidance is required. It clearly recognises the existing policy framework within the JCS and the importance of not duplicating this. The JPDU will continue to support Kettering Borough Council in taking the SSP2 forward to submission and beyond this to the Examination. Link to full comment.	None.	See recommended change.	A Main Modification has been proposed to address issues relating to the size of DES6. Refer to the Main Modification Schedule, MM30		

121	251	North Northamptonshire Joint Planning Unit - Health and Planning	2	Vision	8										Para 2.13 SSP2 Vision I welcome the references to health and wellbeing in the vision for Kettering Borough. The wording, revised from earlier versions, reflect the broader ways in which planning and new development can contribute to health and wellbeing as well as reflecting the requirements of National Planning Policy to address health and wellbeing, and the significant health and wellbeing challenges faced in Kettering and the wider county.	None.	Noted.	None.	
121	252	North Northamptonshire Joint Planning Unit - Health and Planning	Policy HWC1	Health and Well-being	49										Policy HWC1 - Wording is quite narrow and doesn't reflect the vision statement. Additional wording in required to address this. This wording is shown in the full representation. A policy requirement for Health Impact Assessments should be included in the SPP2, which would apply to major developments. Link to full comment.	None.	See recommended change.	A Main Modification is proposed to add the additional criteria to HWC1 to create environments that support and encourage healthy and active lives. Refer to the Main Modification Schedule, MM4	
121	253	North Northamptonshire Joint Planning Unit - Health and Planning	Table 15.1		159										Monitoring and review (Table 15.1) A single indicator is identified for the purpose of monitoring delivery of Policy HWC1 and the objective of improving health and wellbeing in the Borough. This indicator is 'Additional floorspace for health infrastructure.' This is a very narrow view of health and wellbeing and is a poor measure of 'improving health and wellbeing in the Borough'. Consideration should be given to better ways of monitoring delivery of this objective.	None.	Noted.	None.	
121	254	North Northamptonshire Joint Planning Unit - Health and Planning	Policy HWC3	Sport, Recreation and Physical Activity	53										Policy HWC3 - Sport, Leisure and Physical activity: We welcome the references to formal sports and leisure provision. However it is important to recognise that creating everyday environments that encourage informal physical activity is important - as well as formal sports and leisure facilities. To this end I welcome the inclusion of the Sport England Active Design principles as guidance that will be used to judge proposals.	None.	Noted.	None.	
121	255	North Northamptonshire Joint Planning Unit - Health and Planning	Policy NEH2	Green Infrastructure	53										We support the requirements for good quality green infrastructure and open spaces, recognising the various health and wellbeing benefits it provides.	None.	Noted.	None.	
121	256	North Northamptonshire Joint Planning Unit - Health and Planning	7	Health and Well-being and Community Facilities	48										We fully support the policy aspirations to improve connectivity and specifically the need to improve infrastructure for active travel.	None.	Noted.	None.	
122	257	Rothwell Town Council	General Comments	Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan Publication Plan	0										Rothwell Town Council (RTC) are of the opinion that commencing the consultation just before the Christmas period and the lack of publicity in promoting the consultation by Kettering Borough Council did not actively encourage community engagement. Furthermore, Kettering Borough Council passed a motion on the 24th July formally declaring a Climate Emergency in Kettering Borough and committed to a target of making the area covered by the Borough Council carbon neutral by 2030. RTC is of the opinion that there are no clear indications that this motion has been fully incorporated within SSP2.	None.	The consultation ran for eight weeks rather than six to allow for the Christmas period. Significant effort was made to engage with the community, this included a consultation event held in Rothwell.	None.	Yes
122	258	Rothwell Town Council	Policy ROT1	Rothwell Town Centre Development Principles	101										Whilst RTC acknowledges that the redevelopment of the library area has been taken out of the SSP2, RTC are of the opinion that specific reference to the Community Library Hub, recognising the importance of this building and the boundary of the current lease agreement with NCC must be included within SSP2. Furthermore, if at a later stage the Fire Station should relocate, any potential use of this site including the current parking area for housing development should be removed and utilised for a car park in view of the lack of parking in the Town, thereby reducing on-street parking in this area. RTC welcome the provisional of additional car parking in the Town which would increase the footfall to the current businesses. RTC fully support any further traffic calming improvements to the Town and whilst RTC are fully supportive of environmental improvements, a percentage of on street parking cannot be avoided and can be seen to act as preventative.	None.	Noted. Policy HWC1 seeks to protect community facilities, it is not necessary to have a specific policy for Rothwell library. The Fire Station site is no longer included as an area of opportunity in the plan, an proposals for the site would need to comply with policies in the development plan	None.	Yes
122	259	Rothwell Town Council	Policy ROT2	Opportunity Environmental Improvement Sites in Rothwell	103										12.11 - RTC fully support improvements to pedestrian and cycle links. 12.12 - It is essential that further investigations take place with the increase in traffic resulting from the Rothwell North Development and the impact on junction 3 of the A14 and the A6/Rothwell link road junction. In addition, the impact on Harrington Road/For Street/Kettering Road by traffic attempting to gain access to junction 4 of the A14 when junction 3 is congested at peak times when exiting off the A6 must also be investigated.	None.	Noted.	None.	Yes
122	260	Rothwell Town Council	Policy ROT3	Land to the West of Rothwell	104										12.16 - RTC strongly recommend that this should be removed and reiterate that this area should be utilised for green infrastructure. Any additional housing (proposed 300 houses) should be deleted from SSP2 and should only be included within the plan at a later date when the impact of the current Rothwell North Development has been completed and improvements to the current infrastructure have taken place. (H) land to West: RTC strongly support that the strategic link road must be built before considering the build of a further 300 houses. RTC are of the opinion that with the current developments taking place significant improvements to the current bus provision are a crucial requirement to the Town and its residents. RTC are of the opinion that improvements are made to the access to Montsaye School directly via a new entrance directly onto the new link road through the Rothwell North Development area. With the development of the area, including a new primary school this will relieve the congestion on Greening Road.	None.	An additional housing allocation is needed to meet housing requirements identified in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy. The Housing Land Supply Background Paper (October 2019) provides the justification for the number of allocations proposed in each of the settlements.	None.	Yes
122	261	Rothwell Town Council	18	Appendix 3 - Policies Maps	192										RTC fully support and reinforce that this land (A marked in red on the attached plan) should be designated as recreational, woodland and an extension for allotment use. This will substantially improve this area environmentally. Any further amendment to designate this area to industrial or employment would increase traffic on the roads and is against the Town Council's policy for reducing traffic, especially HGV traffic	None.	The area of land shown on the plan as 'A' is not designated in the plan, the green shown is the ordnance survey base mapping.	No changes recommended	Yes
123	262	Mather Jamie on behalf of Central England Co-Op Ltd	11	Housing Site Policies	92	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes				Site promoted in Desborough for housing development. The site has a good outlook, can be easily accessed has strong connectivity to existing services. The site has very few technical constraints that would preclude development. The approach to delivery of housing at Desborough is unsound, this is because of the rigid application of housing targets in the JCS. Desborough North is not deliverable, resulting in a shortfall of housing. Objection to proposed allocations and instead the promoted site Manor Farm should be considered. Link to full comment.	Based on an assumed average density of 30 dwellings per hectare, the site is capable of accommodating at least 1,200 dwellings. It is our view that this site should be allocated now to address soundness deficiencies in the emerging SSP2 for the reasons set out below.	In Desborough both housing allocations included in the SSP2 have planning permission. The Housing Land Supply Background Paper provides detail of the supply of sites in Desborough. This demonstrates that the supply in Desborough is significantly in excess of the JCS requirement plus 10% flexibility allowance. Therefore there is not a need for additional sites in Desborough to be identified in the SSP2. The site propose is of a strategic scale and significantly exceeds the 500 dwellings threshold of a strategic site.	No changes recommended.	Yes
124	108	Resident of Braybrooke	Policy BRA1	Braybrooke Development Principles	116	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes				Fully Support the inclusion of RA/128 Top Orchard Braybrooke as indeed was the conclusion recommended by the 1995 Plan Inspector that it would benefit from a sensitive development and that the defined village limits place this area as part of the village of Braybrooke. The policy is in my opinion sound and will create a very attractive development. Support the principles created in the policy for BRA02.	None.	Noted.	None.	Yes
124	115	Resident of Braybrooke	13	Braybrooke	116										The redundant farm buildings to the north of RA/128 should be included within the settlement boundary for Braybrooke. Link to full comment.	None.	The settlement boundaries have been drawn in accordance with a robust set of criteria. The Settlement Boundaries Background Papers (February 2012, April 2018 and October 2019) provide the evidence base and justification for the settlement boundaries shown on the policies maps.	No changes recommended.	Yes