<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Number of suggestions</td>
<td>Geddington 123</td>
<td>Proposals concerning Geddington seem reasonable with good controls/constraints. No mention of type of dwellings, should be good proportion of affordable.</td>
<td>GED 2</td>
<td>The assessment process are adequately addressed.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Policy HWC2</td>
<td>Delivery Broughton</td>
<td>No. Policy HWC2 is positive in its intent, but without sight of the above Strategies it is not possible to fully comment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Policy HWC3</td>
<td>Activity Desborough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Policy DES2b</td>
<td>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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Policy HWC1</td>
<td>Health and Wellbeing Desborough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Policy CRA1</td>
<td>Parish Clerk Parish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Policy 8 of the JCS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Policy 9 of the JCS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Policy 30 of the JCS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Save Policy GRC2 and housing site RA/146 for Great Cransley from the SSP2 at Section 13 and [restricted infill village]. Since the 2012 consultation the village shop has closed and the limited bus service has been totally discontinued.  

Restricted access to the site via Cransley Rise and existing properties. * Capacity of the pumping station would be exceeded. * The proposed allocation of the site is inappropriate due to the proximity of the adjacent green belt and the very limited infrastructure to the site. * The proposal is in conflict with paragraph 157 of the NPPF which states that local authorities must make full use of brownfield sites. * The proposal is not a sustainable use of land and does not contribute to a more sustainable settlement. * Site should have been discounted through stage 1 of the assessment process. There are failures in the assessment process. Issues assessed using a set of sustainability criteria as shown in the Housing Allocations Background Papers (2012, 2018 and 2019) and the Housing and Well-being Assessment Report for the site. **

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 the site. Policy RS4, or possibly Policy RS5 should allow for demolition in these circumstances to allow for new build to be accommodated within the village. 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.

saved local plan policy 10 seeks to set out those circumstances where development of these areas is considered acceptable, it is an exceptions policy. It should refer to the local plan policy for the settlement area and the section of the NPPF that deals with the areas identified as different. Since the 1995 Local Plan will be replaced by the new Local Plan, it is important that the level of protection afforded to these two reservoirs will not diminish as a result. No changes recommended. Yes

The Local Plan needs to adhere to the government climate advisory body advise regarding hedgerows and maintaining them due to the climate emergency. General

No changes recommended. Yes

Cambridgeshire key change in national policy has taken place since it's adoption. NPPF paras 170 and 174 now require developments to provide a measurable net gain in biodiversity. This is a proportion of the requirement for the Rural Area has been met through commitments and completions. The issues raised have been considered through the site assessment work, the detail of this is included in the Housing Allocations Background Papers (2012, 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

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

No changes recommended. Yes

No changes recommended. Yes

No changes recommended. Yes

No changes recommended. Yes

No changes recommended. Yes

No changes recommended. Yes

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 to be protected. The proposals for the Great Cransley site are in direct conflict with the protection of these two reservoirs. No changes recommended. Yes

The policy needs to incorporate the most recent updates to the Three Dragons report. The amount of single dwellings schemes matches closely to that to the number of brownfield sites around Kettering which is expected to deliver affordable housing in accordance with Policy 30 of the Joint Core Strategy. 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

Thecomments on table 8.1 need to be added to Table 17.1.  Saved Policy 10 covering Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs is to be replaced by SSP2 Policy NEH2, (Section 8). Saved Policy 10 cannot be transferred to a new policy within the SSP2, possibly by an addition to Policy NEH2.  This is a serious omission from the SSP2.  The Great Cransley Proposal Map is shown at Figure 18.16, page 198.  This map shows the proposed settlement area. Site should have been discounted through stage 1 of the assessment process. There are failures in the assessment process. Issues assessed using a set of sustainability criteria as shown in the Housing Allocations Background Papers (2012, 2018 and 2019) and the Housing and Well-being Assessment Report for the site. **

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 to be protected. The proposals for the Great Cransley site are in direct conflict with the protection of these two reservoirs. No changes recommended. Yes

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 to be protected. The proposals for the Great Cransley site are in direct conflict with the protection of these two reservoirs. No changes recommended. Yes

The comments on table 8.1 need to be added to Table 17.1.  Saved Policy 10 covering Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs is to be replaced by SSP2 Policy NEH2, (Section 8). Saved Policy 10 cannot be transferred to a new policy within the SSP2, possibly by an addition to Policy NEH2.  This is a serious omission from the SSP2.  The Great Cransley Proposal Map is shown at Figure 18.16, page 198.  This map shows the proposed settlement area. Site should have been discounted through stage 1 of the assessment process. There are failures in the assessment process. Issues assessed using a set of sustainability criteria as shown 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

No changes recommended. Yes

No changes recommended. Yes

No changes recommended. Yes

No changes recommended. Yes

No changes recommended. Yes

No changes recommended. Yes

No changes recommended. Yes

No changes recommended. Yes

No changes recommended. Yes

No changes recommended. Yes

No changes recommended. Yes

No changes recommended. Yes

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 to be protected. The proposals for the Great Cransley site are in direct conflict with the protection of these two reservoirs. No changes recommended. Yes

The comments on table 8.1 need to be added to Table 17.1.  Saved Policy 10 covering Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs is to be replaced by SSP2 Policy NEH2, (Section 8). Saved Policy 10 cannot be transferred to a new policy within the SSP2, possibly by an addition to Policy NEH2.  This is a serious omission from the SSP2.  The Great Cransley Proposal Map is shown at Figure 18.16, page 198.  This map shows the proposed settlement area. Site should have been discounted through stage 1 of the assessment process. There are failures in the assessment process. Issues assessed using a set of sustainability criteria as shown 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 addresses.
Saved Local Plan Policy 10 seeks to set out those circumstances where development of these areas is considered acceptable, it is an exceptions

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

considered as being in open countryside. As a result, these areas are afforded a level of protection through existing policy in the North

The Housing and Planning Act 2016 made provisions for the re-introduction of general policy and specific policies in the preparation of the next generation of development plans in England. The Council considered that the Protection of Species policy already existed and that it should continue to be a localised policy for Cransley and Thorpe Malsor

Accordingly the following ducks: Wigeon, Teal, Gadwall, Pochard, Shoveler, Tufted Duck and Mallard. In some years, Goldeneye also winter on the reservoir. In summer, many

buildings as well as private equestrian facilities. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are sufficiently protected due to their location in the open

The Princi

Principles

Principles

The Princi
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Historic Development</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Criteria e is welcomed. None. Noted. None. No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Historic Development</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Criteria d, h, i and j are welcomed. None. Noted. None. No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Historic Development</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Criteria e and f are welcomed. None. Noted. None. No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Historic Development</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Criteria a is welcomed. None. Noted. None. No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Historic Development</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>This policy is welcomed. None. Noted. None. No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Historic Development</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Criteria h and i are welcomed. None. Noted. None. No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Historic Development</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The policies are welcomed. None. Noted. None. No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Historic Development</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Criteria a is welcomed. None. Noted. None. No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Historic Development</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The Historically and Visually Important Local Green Space designations are welcomed. None. Noted. None. No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 Home Farm, Weston by Welland. 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" build and private equestrian facilities. Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are sufficiently protected due to their location in the open countryside. There was discussion of other plans with a view from an important point of view. The level of protection afforded to these two reservoirs will not diminish as a result.
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 presents 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 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 housing stock. 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 rural area is well behind schedule for the plan period. No further allocations should be permitted until the Town has absorbed the current volume of housing. At planning application stage, the criteria should be applied when allocating the green belt. It is not considered necessary for the Housing Assessment Officer to apply the criteria prior to planning. The site is constantly flooded during heavy rainfall and has been underwater since October 2019. We do not know 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 and 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 2019. 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 2019. Do not build any more houses in Mawsley. It is already over the original allocated numbers and it has made no reference to houses being environmentally sustainable, it does not comply with this motion. The late introduction of this designation is against paragraph 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework. No changes recommended. Yes 42 71 Thorpe Malsor Open Spaces 70 No No No No Yes 43 72 Local Manager Limited 5th Edition of the Open Space Heritage Framework Guide. It has been identified as an important community open space with the potential for recreational activities. The late introduction of this designation is against paragraph 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework. No changes recommended. Yes 44 74 Local Manager Limited 5th Edition of the Open Space Heritage Framework Guide. It has been identified as an important community open space with the potential for recreational activities. The late introduction of this designation is against paragraph 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework. No changes recommended. Yes
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 not mentioned in the Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS). The relevant JCS policies are referenced in Policy RS4 of the emerging SSP2 Publication Plan. The Councillor Table 17.1 can be moved from the previous local plan to this one without modification or use of resources. Retaining Policy 10 will continue to give confidence that this area is countryside. Therefore, although there is no specific policy in relation to both the Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs proposed in the Publication applications elsewhere in the Borough.

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

Ashley

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 a 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 ownership within the boundary of the site and the site layout should be designed to take these into account. This would not be the duty of the Borough Council. However, in the case of Anglian Water infrastructure, 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.

Mawsley

None.

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 a formal application to Anglian Water would be required.

MAW2

None.

It is therefore suggested that Policy NEH1 be amended as follows: ‘Have regard to the Flood Toolkit (DEFRA) in preparing proposals for sustainable drainage systems (SuDS).’ The supporting text in Policy NEH1 provides an opportunity for the formation of a new occupation (supporting text to be updated). See recommended change.

Wicksteed Park

None.

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 a formal application to Anglian Water would be required.

Factory adjacent to Cranford Road

None.

None.

None.

None.

None.
There are existing foul sewer and water main in consideration 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 transfer of assets is planned to be planned to ensure continuity of service. 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.

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 on-site and/or make off-site contributions to achieve a net gain of green infrastructure in accordance with the Aims and Objectives of the Local Plan. It remains unclear what form contributions would take particularly for developments that would not be expected to have a recreational impact. No changes recommended.

Natural Capital

Natural Capital

The Plan also does not meet the requirements of the HRA and therefore of the National Planning Policy Framework which states that local planning authorities must have regard to the requirement for a net gain in green infrastructure. For the site allocations relating to the proposals within the Site Specific Part, the significant wildlife sites are those identified in Table 8.1 and SAGE site 48. These are Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs. However, the Plan also does not meet the requirements of the HRA and therefore of the National Planning Policy Framework which states that local planning authorities must have regard to the requirement for a net gain in green infrastructure. For the site allocations relating to the proposals within the Site Specific Part, the significant wildlife sites are those identified in Table 8.1 and SAGE site 48. These are Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs. The Plan also does not meet the requirements of the HRA and therefore of the National Planning Policy Framework which states that local planning authorities must have regard to the requirement for a net gain in green infrastructure. For the site allocations relating to the proposals within the Site Specific Part, the significant wildlife sites are those identified in Table 8.1 and SAGE site 48. These are Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs. The Plan also does not meet the requirements of the HRA and therefore of the National Planning Policy Framework which states that local planning authorities must have regard to the requirement for a net gain in green infrastructure. For the site allocations relating to the proposals within the Site Specific Part, the significant wildlife sites are those identified in Table 8.1 and SAGE site 48. These are Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs.
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.

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 daily needs is insufficient in this regard).

Sequential Test

Proposals for a

misinterpretation. The definition of ‘small-scale’ proposals must be defined. Concerns that neither the JCS or the SSP2 seek 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 daily needs is insufficient in this regard).

The site was recently put up for sale, and was marketed as having ‘Development Opportunities’ This unique and valuable asset to the Borough, appears to be inordinately sensitive to the proposed development. It is set within an extensive area of 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.

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. In my view, it should be protected for future generations to enjoy.

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 to the local community. These reservoirs deserve to remain protected, help us preserve them for future generations to enjoy.

The Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) to Cransley Reservoir (a Local Wildlife Site) and onto Thorpe Reservoir. Wetland birds (both migratory and British residents) are able to use this interconnecting

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 emerging SSP2 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.

The benefits of a Northamptonshire environment are both national and international in significance. The importance of maintaining and enhancing the area’s wildlife and ecological heritage is widely acknowledged. The preservation of existing habitats and the creation of new ones is an important aspect of the Council’s environmental policy. This policy is intended to protect the environment from development that would

The President of Conservative Councillors.

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 to the local community. These reservoirs deserve to remain protected, help us preserve them for future generations to enjoy.

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 to the local community. These reservoirs deserve to remain protected, help us preserve them for future generations to enjoy.

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 to the local community. These reservoirs deserve to remain protected, help us preserve them for future generations to enjoy.

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 to the local community. These reservoirs deserve to remain protected, help us preserve them for future generations to enjoy.

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 to the local community. These reservoirs deserve to remain protected, help us preserve them for future generations to enjoy.

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 to the local community. These reservoirs deserve to remain protected, help us preserve them for future generations to enjoy.

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 to the local community. These reservoirs deserve to remain protected, help us preserve them for future generations to enjoy.
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, will be achieved. Policy HOU4 sets out the approach to development in the open countryside. It is recognised that the level of demand, as determined by the register in March 2019, as the base date for the aforementioned background evidence presented in the Self and Custom Build Background Paper, 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 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 achieved. 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 affordable housing. The Council’s assumptions made in respect of the housing trajectory risks the deliverability of the SPP2. There is a significant shift in the Council’s position on all site specific parts. Site Specific Part in this regard.

The settlement boundaries have been drawn in accordance with a robust set of criteria. The Settlement Boundaries Background Papers (February 2015, 2016 and 2019) set out the rationale for the boundaries drawn. They also summarise the process undertaken to arrive at the boundaries. The process undertaken to arrive at the boundaries is set out in the Settlement Boundaries Background Papers. No changes recommended.

No changes recommended.

Gladman support the inclusion of the above policies, which recognise the importance of safeguarding and maintaining employment land uses at Desborough. Policy DES5 relates to a specific area of HVI with particular characteristics and visually Important Local Green Space Background Papers (2015, 2016 and 2019) and the location of the land. No changes recommended.

The evidence presented in the Self and Custom Build Background Paper does not support the inclusion of the above policies, which recognises the importance of safeguarding and maintaining employment land uses at Desborough. No changes recommended.

Policy HOU4 seeks to introduce a policy mechanism to see the delivery of this type of housing to the meet the demand not achieved. Policy RS4 sets out the approach to development in the open countryside. The Council’s assumptions made in respect of the housing trajectory risks the deliverability of the SPP2. There is a significant shift in the Council’s position on all site specific parts.

HOU4. It is recognised that the level of demand, as determined by the register in March 2019, as the base date for the aforementioned background evidence presented in the Self and Custom Build Background Paper, 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 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 achieved.

4.4.3 Despite the need for older persons accommodation, there are challenges to those in this development sector and the economics of achieving planned levels of housing provision are challenging for developers. This is evidenced by the 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 achieved.

Policy HOU4 has not resulted in a marked increase in the delivered number of older persons accommodation, to the extent that it was hoped that it would. Policy HOU4 sets out the approach to development in the open countryside. It is recognised that the level of demand, as determined by the register in March 2019, as the base date for the aforementioned background evidence presented in the Self and Custom Build Background Paper, 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 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 achieved.

Policy HOU4 has not resulted in a marked increase in the delivered number of older persons accommodation, to the extent that it was hoped that it would. Policy HOU4 sets out the approach to development in the open countryside. It is recognised that the level of demand, as determined by the register in March 2019, as the base date for the aforementioned background evidence presented in the Self and Custom Build Background Paper, 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 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 achieved.
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 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 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 representation.

The Housing Allocations Background Paper sets out the Council’s approach to the allocation of housing sites in the Borough. The two proposed allocations at Desborough are 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. The Council has failed to set out how the proposed sites have been justified and the rationale for their locations. The Plan is not evidence-based, and the evidence provided lacks robustness. The Plan is not adequate for the external examination and does not meet the planning guidance set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. The Plan is not an effective representation of the Council’s approach to housing allocations.

The SSP2 includes this site within the settlement boundary as the site has planning permission. Site DE/063 was discounted as a potential housing site. The Council’s approach does not demonstrate an evidence-based approach to housing site identification and assessment. The Council has failed to demonstrate how the site was justified and the potential for development was assessed. The Council has not provided the necessary evidence to support the site’s inclusion in the SSP2. The Plan is not an effective representation of the Council’s approach to housing site identification and assessment.

The HVI directive needs removing from the smaller field. This site has no recreational value, ecological value or any significant historic value, or landscape beauty. Given the absence of any form of significance, the Site is therefore not deliverable, and therefore the Plan is not positively prepared. The Plan is also not effective as there is uncertainty regarding the deliverability of the sites. The Council has failed to set out how the proposed sites have been justified and the rationale for their locations. The Plan is not evidence-based, and the evidence provided lacks robustness. The Plan is not adequate for the external examination and does not meet the planning guidance set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. The Plan is not an effective representation of the Council’s approach to housing allocations.

The proposed designation HVI057a was put forward for inclusion as an area of HVI through the consultation on the Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan – Draft Plan consultation. The proposed designation is based on the presence of a huge number of plants and birds, and the Council’s decision to designate the site is therefore not evidence-based. The Council has failed to demonstrate how the site was justified and the potential for development was assessed. The Council has not provided the necessary evidence to support the site’s inclusion in the SSP2. The Plan is not an effective representation of the Council’s approach to housing site identification and assessment.

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 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 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 the local plan, and the level of protection afforded to these two reservoirs will not diminish as a result.
Objection to the Settlement Boundary at Weston by Welland. Do not agree that the area highlighted orange accord with the principles. The boundary should be

The Settlement Boundary Background Paper (Update April 2018) sets out the defining principles which have been used to define the proposed

Bletsoe on considered as being in open countryside. As a result, these areas are afforded a level of protection through existing policy in the North

84 208 Local Environment and

55 None.

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

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.

To reduce the reliance on rural windfall development we propose that additional housing allocations

In summary, the Plan is a strategic approach to deliver the housing requirements set out in the North

The Site Assessment Framework provides further information on the assessment of the site’s suitability and performance against the site assessment criteria. This is set out in Appendix 4 of the Local Plan,

No changes recommended. Yes

None.

We have previously considered the Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs as part of the Strategic Plan. The Southern Reservoirs are proposed within the proposed settlements boundaries and are therefore

In summary, the Plan is a strategic approach to deliver the housing requirements set out in the North

The Site Assessment Framework provides further information on the assessment of the site’s suitability and performance against the site assessment criteria. This is set out in Appendix 4 of the Local Plan,

No changes recommended. Yes

None.

The Site Assessment Framework provides further information on the assessment of the site’s suitability and performance against the site assessment criteria. This is set out in Appendix 4 of the Local Plan,

No changes recommended. Yes

Yes

Yes

None.

None.

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 Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS). The relevant JCS policies are referenced in Policy RS4 of the emerging SSP2 Publication Plan. The Policy RS4 aims to ensure that development in the open countryside is balanced with the need to protect the natural environment and support local amenity. The JCS provides additional criteria to that set out in the NPPF, in relation to replacement dwellings and the re-use of redundant or disused buildings. The updated Housing Land Supply Background Paper (October 2019) provides evidence for the housing trajectories provided for these sites. The updated Strategic Housing Assessment (SHA) provides a robust basis for the emerging Strategic Plan. The Plan must therefore have regard to the JCS for this purpose. Link to full comments.

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 and much needed policy. The Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are a haven for wildlife and an area of natural beauty. They are an integral part of the countryside and a unique resource. The community is in full support of these reservoirs and have worked hard to preserve them. The council should not be looking to replace such an important policy with another one.

We would like to make Policy 10 of the Local Plan permanent and not 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 to reflect the site conditions and not to have them deleted. The allocation of the site to meet housing needs within Stoke Albany. The allocation will also be in accordance with the updated JCS and will benefit the community. The proposals for the site and the adjacent ex-council land at Burton Latimer Figure 18.25 is acceptable. The Council should not be looking to replace such an important policy with another one.

The NPPF aims to ensure that development in the open countryside is balanced with the need to protect the natural environment and support local amenity. The NPPF provides additional criteria to that set out in the JCS, in relation to replacement dwellings and the re-use of redundant or disused buildings. The updated Housing Land Supply Background Paper (October 2019) provides evidence for the housing trajectories provided for these sites. The updated Strategic Housing Assessment (SHA) provides a robust basis for the emerging Strategic Plan. The Plan must therefore have regard to the JCS for this purpose. Link to full comments.

The Council should not be looking to replace such an important policy with another one. The community is in full support of these reservoirs and have worked hard to preserve them. The policy should not 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 to reflect the site conditions and not to have them deleted. The allocation of the site to meet housing needs within Stoke Albany. The allocation will also be in accordance with the updated JCS and will benefit the community. The proposals for the site and the adjacent ex-council land at Burton Latimer Figure 18.25 is acceptable. The Council should not be looking to replace such an important policy with another one.

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 and much needed policy. The Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are a haven for wildlife and an area of natural beauty. They are an integral part of the countryside and a unique resource. The community is in full support of these reservoirs and have worked hard to preserve them. The council should not be looking to replace such an important policy with another one.

We would like to make Policy 10 of the Local Plan permanent and not 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 to reflect the site conditions and not to have them deleted. The allocation of the site to meet housing needs within Stoke Albany. The allocation will also be in accordance with the updated JCS and will benefit the community. The proposals for the site and the adjacent ex-council land at Burton Latimer Figure 18.25 is acceptable. The Council should not be looking to replace such an important policy with another one.

The NPPF aims to ensure that development in the open countryside is balanced with the need to protect the natural environment and support local amenity. The NPPF provides additional criteria to that set out in the JCS, in relation to replacement dwellings and the re-use of redundant or disused buildings. The updated Housing Land Supply Background Paper (October 2019) provides evidence for the housing trajectories provided for these sites. The updated Strategic Housing Assessment (SHA) provides a robust basis for the emerging Strategic Plan. The Plan must therefore have regard to the JCS for this purpose. Link to full comments.

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 and much needed policy. The Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are a haven for wildlife and an area of natural beauty. They are an integral part of the countryside and a unique resource. The community is in full support of these reservoirs and have worked hard to preserve them. The council should not be looking to replace such an important policy with another one.

We would like to make Policy 10 of the Local Plan permanent and not 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 to reflect the site conditions and not to have them deleted. The allocation of the site to meet housing needs within Stoke Albany. The allocation will also be in accordance with the updated JCS and will benefit the community. The proposals for the site and the adjacent ex-council land at Burton Latimer Figure 18.25 is acceptable. The Council should not be looking to replace such an important policy with another one.

The NPPF aims to ensure that development in the open countryside is balanced with the need to protect the natural environment and support local amenity. The NPPF provides additional criteria to that set out in the JCS, in relation to replacement dwellings and the re-use of redundant or disused buildings. The updated Housing Land Supply Background Paper (October 2019) provides evidence for the housing trajectories provided for these sites. The updated Strategic Housing Assessment (SHA) provides a robust basis for the emerging Strategic Plan. The Plan must therefore have regard to the JCS for this purpose. Link to full comments.

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 and much needed policy. The Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are a haven for wildlife and an area of natural beauty. They are an integral part of the countryside and a unique resource. The community is in full support of these reservoirs and have worked hard to preserve them. The council should not be looking to replace such an important policy with another one.

We would like to make Policy 10 of the Local Plan permanent and not 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 to reflect the site conditions and not to have them deleted. The allocation of the site to meet housing needs within Stoke Albany. The allocation will also be in accordance with the updated JCS and will benefit the community. The proposals for the site and the adjacent ex-council land at Burton Latimer Figure 18.25 is acceptable. The Council should not be looking to replace such an important policy with another one.
1. **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 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 must be met for development in the open countryside to be considered acceptable. Policy RS4 of the Local 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. The Council should consider the allocation of land in the open countryside, protected by the proposed development control area, as an exception to the principle that land in the open countryside must not be developed unless justified by a clear and compelling case. The level of protection afforded to these two reservoirs will not diminish as a result. The Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS) provides the evidence base and justification for the settlement boundaries shown on the policies maps. No changes recommended.

2. **Para 55** of the PPS8 (Planning Practice Guide) 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.

3. **Para 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.

4. **Para 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.

5. **Para 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.

6. **Para 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.

7. **Para 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.

8. **Para 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.

9. **Para 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.

10. **Para 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.

11. **Para 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.

12. **Para 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.

13. **Para 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.

14. **Para 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.

15. **Para 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.

16. **Para 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.

17. **Para 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.

18. **Para 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.

19. **Para 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.

20. **Para 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.
None. See recommended change.

None. The settlement boundaries have been drawn in accordance with a robust set of criteria. The Settlement Boundaries Background Papers (February

None. Northampton

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

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

shire Joint Policy HWC1 Health and Wellbeing and planning

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

Table 15.1 159

'Additional floorspace for health infrastructure.' This is a very narrow view of health and wellbeing and is a poor measure of

None. Noted. None.

53

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

None. Noted. None.

121 254

Planning Unit

Activity

Health and Wellbeing Community Facilities

Site Specific Part

2030. RTC is of the opinion that there are no clear indications that this motion has been fully incorporated within SSP2.

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

Rothwell 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

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.

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

of Rothwell 104

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

RTC welcome the references to health and wellbeing in the vision for Kettering Borough. The wording, revised from earlier versions, reflect the

Health and Wellbeing and planning

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

'Additional floorspace for health infrastructure.' This is a very narrow view of health and wellbeing and is a poor measure of

None. Noted. None.

'Additional floorspace for health infrastructure.' This is a very narrow view of health and wellbeing and is a poor measure of

None. Noted. None. Yes

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.

Sites in Rothwell

Braybrooke

Principles

Support the principles created in the policy for BRA02.

None. Northampton
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