<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.21</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>5.21</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>5.21</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>5.21</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>5.21</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>5.21</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No changes recommended.
Opportunity Redevelopment Sites within Chairman Rothwell

To ensure conformity with National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 96 and to ensure policy HWC3 is effective, once planning permission is granted, the Desborough public likely to be impacted need to have awareness of the mitigation. This involves having a clear understanding of what it contains. This is significant with mitigation required for a site that has 30% surface water threat.

Policy CRA3 Cranford Parish Council are in support of this area being put forward for future housing allocation. Noted. None.

Policy NEH3 Local Green Spaces Designation. Cranford Parish Council are supportive of the HVI areas and Open Spaces Development. The 2015 Local Green Space Background Paper and updates to the Background Paper in 2016 and 2019 for Cranford and Desborough are discontinuous.

Local Resident Policy LOD1 Loddington Development Principles. 137 Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes

Local Resident Policy MAW2 Land to the West of Mawsley. 140 No No No

Local Resident Policy DES5 Land to the south of Desborough. 97 Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes

Countryside. If that was the case where are there dwelling houses and businesses there already? We want our children to be able to develop some of their own land. In line with my comments above, the residents of that location Windy Ridge want better than it is now! * Many residents have pretty much lived on a building site for over ten years - at least give us add Desborough monitoring? The location of pollution monitoring in the Borough is beyond the remit of the SSP2. None. No

The policy as currently drafted fails to set out an approach as to how health and wellbeing of the Borough will be supported. The policy would be assisted by making reference to Sport England’s Active Design Principles which will support the provision of facilities associated with Rothwell North. Refer to the Main Modification Schedule, MM5 to provision of facilities. Refer to the Main Modification Schedule, MM5 for New Facilities. Refer to the Main Modification Schedule, MM5 to clarify the status of the Playing Pitch and Sports Facilities Strategies. Refer to the Main Modification Schedule, MM5

Additional bullet point—Support healthy lifestyles, including through the use of active design principles making physical activity an easy, practical and attractive choice; V. Introduction of street treatments and street furniture appropriate to the historic and rural context.

v. Introduction of street treatments and street furniture appropriate to the historic and rural context.

c. It is very difficult to access the existing car parks from the left due to the lack of visibility of traffic travelling from the left coming from Harborough Road. A double mini roundabout, also to the lack of visibility of traffic travelling from the left coming from Harborough Road. A double mini roundabout, also

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.

The issues raised have been considered through the site assessment work, the detail of this is included in the Housing Allocations Background assessment process are adequately addressed.

The issues raised have been considered through the site assessment work, the detail of this is included in the Housing Allocations Background assessment process are adequately addressed.

The issues raised have been considered through the site assessment work, the detail of this is included in the Housing Allocations Background assessment process are adequately addressed.

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.

Additional bullet point—Support healthy lifestyles, including through the use of active design principles making physical activity an easy, practical and attractive choice;
No changes recommended. No

Persimmon Homes
Policy HOU4 Self-Build and Custom Build Housing

4 Housing Requirements and Allocations
25 Yes Yes

46

Local Resident
18 Appendix 3 - Policies Maps
198 No No No Yes Yes

Northants Adult Accommodation & Specialist
Housing Mix and Tenure
25 Yes Yes Yes Yes

in the Council especially street treatments and street furniture. Therefore no amendments to this set out of criteria will be made. c. Take their design, character and setting into account. d. Introduce street treatments and street furniture appropriate to the historic and rural context, for example, setts for kerbs and bonded pea shingle for path and road surfaces, and retain and, where necessary, enhance original features such as the water hydrants.

The environmental concerns regarding the plans for the existing hedgerows have not been taken into consideration. The loss of an extensive area of hedgerows is significant in the context of the historical and rural setting of Great Cransley. The policy therefore lacks clarity and is not effective. In para 13.81 of the Local Plan it states: "The Parish Council considered the situation at the Public Meeting on 14th May 2010 and concluded that the Parish Council will provide a letter of objection to the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS)." This requirement is too restrictive and does not allow for localised variation or different types of building.

c. On the north side of Great Cransley Main Street, a large, very high and picturesque boundary hedge is not to be removed. The hedge is expected to deliver through its ‘maximisation’ and ‘Village greenspace’.

c.15 The Parish Council considers the draft policy HOU4, which stipulates that retirement housing will be provided for Great Cransley, to be unnecessary and unsound. The policy therefore lacks clarity and is not effective. In para 13.81 of the Local Plan it states: 'The Parish Council considered the situation at the Public Meeting on 14th May 2010 and concluded that the Parish Council will provide a letter of objection to the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS). The relevant JCS policies are referenced in Policy RS4 of the emerging SSP2 Publication Plan. The Parish Council believes that the loss of historic front gardens for structures or car parking is significant.'

c.16 For the above reasons, draft policy HOU4 should be deleted for plan soundness as it is not justified.

The districts housing needs are assessed using a set of sustainability criteria as shown in the Housing Allocations Background Papers (2012, 2018 and 2019) and the Housing Standards Assessment Process (2019) sets out the Council’s approach to meeting housing requirements. Those sites which have been allocated in the Publication Plan have been assessed using a set of sustainability criteria as shown in the Housing Allocations Background Papers (2012, 2018 and 2019) and the Housing Standards Assessment Process (2019) sets out the Council’s approach to meeting housing requirements. Those sites which have been allocated in the Publication Plan have been.

As set out in Chapter 4 of the Publication Plan the housing requirement for Kettering Borough is stated in Policy 29 and table 5 of the Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS). The relevant JCS policies are referenced in Policy RS4 of the emerging SSP2 Publication Plan. The Parish Council believes that the loss of historic front gardens for structures or car parking is significant. h. Introduce street treatments and street furniture appropriate to the historic and rural context, for example, setts for kerbs and bonded pea shingle for path and road surfaces, and retain and, where necessary, enhance original features such as the water hydrants.

2.16 For the above reasons, draft policy HOU4 should be deleted for plan soundness as it is not justified.

2.17 The Parovich 2012 to the Parish Council at the Public Meeting on 14th May 2010 and concluded that the Parish Council will provide a letter of objection to the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS). The relevant JCS policies are referenced in Policy RS4 of the emerging SSP2 Publication Plan. The Parish Council believes that the loss of historic front gardens for structures or car parking is significant.

2.17 For the above reasons, draft policy HOU4 should be deleted for plan soundness as it is not justified.

2.17 For the above reasons, draft policy HOU4 should be deleted for plan soundness as it is not justified.

2.17 For the above reasons, draft policy HOU4 should be deleted for plan soundness as it is not justified.

2.17 For the above reasons, draft policy HOU4 should be deleted for plan soundness as it is not justified.

2.17 For the above reasons, draft policy HOU4 should be deleted for plan soundness as it is not justified.

2.17 For the above reasons, draft policy HOU4 should be deleted for plan soundness as it is not justified.

2.17 For the above reasons, draft policy HOU4 should be deleted for plan soundness as it is not justified.

2.17 For the above reasons, draft policy HOU4 should be deleted for plan soundness as it is not justified.

2.17 For the above reasons, draft policy HOU4 should be deleted for plan soundness as it is not justified.

2.17 For the above reasons, draft policy HOU4 should be deleted for plan soundness as it is not justified.

2.17 For the above reasons, draft policy HOU4 should be deleted for plan soundness as it is not justified.

2.17 For the above reasons, draft policy HOU4 should be deleted for plan soundness as it is not justified.

2.17 For the above reasons, draft policy HOU4 should be deleted for plan soundness as it is not justified.

2.17 For the above reasons, draft policy HOU4 should be deleted for plan soundness as it is not justified.

2.17 For the above reasons, draft policy HOU4 should be deleted for plan soundness as it is not justified.

2.17 For the above reasons, draft policy HOU4 should be deleted for plan soundness as it is not justified.

2.17 For the above reasons, draft policy HOU4 should be deleted for plan soundness as it is not justified.
Howkins and

The new plan replacing Policy 10 is reducing the protection from development on Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs. I bought Thorpe Malsor Reservoir some 25 years ago for conservation in order to protect the wildlife. The

Protection of Community Facilities and Proposals

The SSP2 does not cover Kettering town centre. This area is covered by the Kettering Town Centre Area Action Plan (KTCAAP). The KTCAAP will

Limited

existing housing surrounding the site if water is to be channelled elsewhere? More houses will mean more people in the village with very limited space. There are already parking in alternative streets to where the occupants live. Village only accessible by the C31. This is not expected to deliver through its €

now approximately 1,000 homes. The infrastructure is struggling to cope with present demand and further development can... will have an adverse effect on the value of my property; 1. The spirit throughout the village is fantastic and events...

Having reviewed the information provided the scale of development for up to 11 dwellings is too high for the proposed business utilising and enhancing the natural beauty and tranquility that the area has to offer. I’m concerned that the... 10 would leave vital elements of the protection toward bio and geo diversity in the area susceptible to “interpretation”migrating Birds as well as our indigenous population of Water fowl. In these days it is ever more important that the... are essential to the bird life of our two parishes and of course further afield. They provide stopping off points for...
An additional housing allocation is needed to meet housing requirements identified in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy. The Housing...
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.

A Main Modification is proposed to address this issue. Refer to the Main Modifications Schedule, MM24.

88 Historic England Policy TCE4 Residential Development within the Town Centres
44 No No Yes Yes Yes Yes There is concern that the Local Plan Policy TCE4 doesn’t relate to the Lawrence Factory, which is crucial to the Cultural Heritage. Is this policy necessary. Deletion or greater reference to the importance of retail and mixed use at ground floor level.

86 Historic England Policy DES2
55 Yes No Yes Yes Yes Yes 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.

DE2 relates to a very sensitive site, including the key building within the Conservation Area, the Lawrence Factory. Historically and Visually Important Local Green Infrastructure Corridors. Not all designated Local Corridors are identified correctly - 9b is not Finedon to Little Fransham. The date of the report is not identified in the policy however the only report that emerges from a search in the Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS). The relevant JCS policies are referenced in Policy RS4 of the emerging SSP2 Publication Plan. The Saved Local Plan Policy 10 seeks to set out those circumstances where development of these areas is considered acceptable, it is an exceptions Schedule, MM13.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historic England Policy</th>
<th>ROT1</th>
<th>Rothwell Town Centre Development Principles</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Criteria h is welcomed. Noted. None. No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglian Water Policy</td>
<td>GED3</td>
<td>Geddington South East</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Noted. None. No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic England Policy</td>
<td>ROT3</td>
<td>Land to the West of Rothwell</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Criteria g is welcomed. Please also ensure that our previous comments in relation to site RO/088a are taken into account. Noted. None. No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic England Policy</td>
<td>RS2</td>
<td>Category B villages</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Policy RS2 is welcomed. Noted. None. No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic England Policy</td>
<td>RS5</td>
<td>General Development Principles in the Rural Area</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Criteria i-g are welcomed. Noted. None. No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For all Village specific development principles policies, the inclusion of a materials criteria is welcomed to ensure 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

The following 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 No Yes Yes

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

The following 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 No Yes Yes

Anglian Water is supportive of the objectives of Policy NE2 but has some comments about how it would applied particularly in respect of the requirement that major development should provide a minimum of 1% of the net floor area as green infrastructure and the requirement for green infrastructure to be part of the 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 stated that it was not clear 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 well as those that are not. 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:

- 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

This policy is welcomed. Noted. None. No

Criteria c is welcomed. Noted. None. No
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAW2 Land to the West of Mawsley</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural England Policy MAW2</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural England General Comments Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan- Publication Plan</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Historic England**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy STA2</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAW1, Policy WAR1, Policy WEK1, Policy WES1</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Natural England Policy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy DES5</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land to the south of Desborough</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy TCE2</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposals for a Medium Sized Foodstore</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy KET9</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McAlpine's Yard, Pytchley Lodge Road</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Historic England**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy STA2</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historic context, for example, setts for kerbs and bonded pea shingle for path and road surfaces, and retain and, where necessary, enhance original features such as the water hydrants.</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy STA2</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It Protects important public views, particularly those of St Andrew’s Church and Cranford Hall; and ge. It does not result in the loss of historic front gardens for structures or car parking. h. Introduce street treatments and street furniture appropriate to the historic and rural context.</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy STA2</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building have been put forward for development for housing since 1990 and have remained available for development since that time. Access is retained and approved by the Highway Authority and a sensitive development to the surrounding area. The building have no economic use beyond their original purpose (built as part of the then working farm). They are</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy STA2</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Local Plan Inspector recommended that the village boundary should be drawn to include the buildings and therefore have planning permission for housing. Since the buildings have been put forward for development for housing since 1990 and have remained available for development since that time. Access is retained and approved by the Highway Authority and a sensitive development to the surrounding area. The building have no economic use beyond their original purpose (built as part of the then working farm). They</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy STA2</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Local Plan Inspector recommended that the village boundary should be drawn to include the buildings and therefore have planning permission for housing. Since the buildings have been put forward for development for housing since 1990 and have remained available for development since that time. Access is retained and approved by the Highway Authority and a sensitive development to the surrounding area.</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AM16</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refer to the Additional Modification Schedule, reference numbers</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>Local Resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>Hanwood Park LLP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Local Resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Natural England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>Natural England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan- Publication Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan- Publication Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan- Publication Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan- Publication Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan- Publication Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan- Publication Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan- Publication Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan- Publication Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan- Publication Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan- Publication Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan- Publication Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan- Publication Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan- Publication Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan- Publication Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan- Publication Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan- Publication Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan- Publication Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan- Publication Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan- Publication Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan- Publication Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan- Publication Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan- Publication Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan- Publication Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan- Publication Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Requires an examination of the circumstances where development of these areas is considered acceptable, and sets out those circumstances where it is considered unacceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>The impact of developing these areas on the historic and rural character of the area, including the impact of development on the historic and rural context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>The design, character and materials of new development in these areas, including the use of materials that are appropriate to the historic and rural context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>The impacts of development on the historic and rural context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>The design, character and materials of new development in these areas, including the use of materials that are appropriate to the historic and rural context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>The impacts of development on the historic and rural context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>The design, character and materials of new development in these areas, including the use of materials that are appropriate to the historic and rural context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>The impacts of development on the historic and rural context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>The design, character and materials of new development in these areas, including the use of materials that are appropriate to the historic and rural context.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- 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 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 report; d. Use a limited palate of materials of local limestone, and thatch or slate; e. It Reflects the scale, mass, form, height and density of the historic pattern of development; f. It Protects important public views, particularly those of St.
- The focus will be on protecting the following statement: “Proposals for non-employment uses in Safeguarded Employment Areas must also comply with other policies in the development plan”.
- In view of the above, we consider it would be beneficial for the Draft SSP2 Vision to incorporate a refined vision for...
I am aware our Local Plan (SSP2) is being updated. Policy 10 has worked well for these reservoirs. Having lived in ... around Thorpe and Cransley Reservoir many times. The abundance in bird and wildlife must be protected and our local green.
Historically and Visually Important Local Green

The two allocated sites in Cranford as Rural Exception schemes will be supported by private market demand. This reflects the two allocated sites in Cranford as Rural Exception schemes which can be supported by private market demand. Therefore, no amendments to this set out of criteria will be made.

Street treatments and street furniture appropriate to the historic and rural context, for example, setts for kerbs and bonded pea shingle for path and road surfaces, and retain and, where necessary, enhance original features such as the water hydrants.

Creation of a children’s play area. Improvements to the public realm. Introduction of street treatments and street furniture appropriate to the historic and rural context.

The approach to development outside of the settlement, with regards to the delivery of affordable housing is already set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The SSP2 Local Plan is trying to replace Policy 10 with NEH2. Policy 10 has been in place since 1995 and has stood the test of time. It has been designed to give affordable housing to meet an identified local need, and it is dated and already 7 years behind the submission version of the plan. The document was intended as an evidence base for the plan. It Protects important public views, particularly those of St Andrew’s Church, which is recognised as it provides a connection between Cranford St. John and Cranford St. Andrew as well providing a setting for the village.

Both Cransley and Thorpe Reservoir provide essential habitats to some important wetland birds including little egrets, black terns and reed warblers. The immediate site is a globally important site for this fauna. Policy NEH2 proposes the removal of these. No clarification is given as to what is this area is.

There are opportunities for the plan to go further to support a good mix of sites and meet rural housing needs, particularly in those rural areas where a gully. It currently offers a well treed area and a biodiversity refuge. Again, no clarification is given as to what is this area is.

Both Cransley and Thorpe Reservoir provide essential habitats to some important wetland birds including little egrets, black terns and reed warblers. The immediate site is a globally important site for this fauna. Policy NEH2 proposes the removal of these. No clarification is given as to what is this area is.

The approach to development outside of the settlement, with regards to the delivery of affordable housing is already set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The SSP2 Local Plan is trying to replace Policy 10 with NEH2. Policy 10 has been in place since 1995 and has stood the test of time. It has been designed to give affordable housing to meet an identified local need, and it is dated and already 7 years behind the submission version of the plan. The document was intended as an evidence base for the plan. It Protects important public views, particularly those of St Andrew’s Church, which is recognised as it provides a connection between Cranford St. John and Cranford St. Andrew as well providing a setting for the village.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provision</th>
<th>Main Modifications Proposed to Address Issues Raised in This Comment</th>
<th>Main Modifications Proposed to Address Issues Raised in This Comment</th>
<th>Main Modifications Proposed to Address Issues Raised in This Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desborough 92 Tata Steel (UK)</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>No changes recommended.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. **No.**
2. **Local Resident.**
3. **Yes.**
4. **Yes.**
5. **Yes.**
6. **Yes.**
7. **Yes.**

---

**Keeps their design, character and materials cues from the character of Historic Traditional and Scattered Isolated Rural character areas as is suggested in emerging policy CRA1. The policy therefore lacks clarity and is not expected to deliver through its ‘maximisation’ principles for rural development.**

- **Option Paper i**
- **Option Paper ii**
- **Option Paper iii**
- **Option Paper iv**
- **Option Paper v**

**There does not seem to be a section on Historic Traditional and Scattered Isolated Rural character areas as is suggested in emerging policy CRA1. The policy therefore lacks clarity and is not expected to deliver through its ‘maximisation’ principles for rural development.**

**Specific Part 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 Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS) sets out how the timescales for delivery and build out rates have been determined and provides a justification for the approach taken. The Council is only prepared to consider development sites on the basis of a robust evidence base, which is a current and accurate snapshot of supply and demand.**

**None.**

---

**The reference to this document is unjustified and should be removed.**

**Add a policy to the plan that allocates the site known as Land off Gardener Road, Burton Latimer for residential use.**

**None.**

---

**There does not seem to be a section on Historic Traditional and Scattered Isolated Rural character areas as is suggested in emerging policy CRA1. The policy therefore lacks clarity and is not expected to deliver through its ‘maximisation’ principles for rural development.**

**Specific Part 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 Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS) sets out how the timescales for delivery and build out rates have been determined and provides a justification for the approach taken. The Council is only prepared to consider development sites on the basis of a robust evidence base, which is a current and accurate snapshot of supply and demand.**

**None.**

---

**There does not seem to be a section on Historic Traditional and Scattered Isolated Rural character areas as is suggested in emerging policy CRA1. The policy therefore lacks clarity and is not expected to deliver through its ‘maximisation’ principles for rural development.**

**Specific Part 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 Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS) sets out how the timescales for delivery and build out rates have been determined and provides a justification for the approach taken. The Council is only prepared to consider development sites on the basis of a robust evidence base, which is a current and accurate snapshot of supply and demand.**

**None.**

---

**The reference to this document is unjustified and should be removed.**

**Add a policy to the plan that allocates the site known as Land off Gardener Road, Burton Latimer for residential use.**

**None.**

---

**There does not seem to be a section on Historic Traditional and Scattered Isolated Rural character areas as is suggested in emerging policy CRA1. The policy therefore lacks clarity and is not expected to deliver through its ‘maximisation’ principles for rural development.**

**Specific Part 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 Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS) sets out how the timescales for delivery and build out rates have been determined and provides a justification for the approach taken. The Council is only prepared to consider development sites on the basis of a robust evidence base, which is a current and accurate snapshot of supply and demand.**

**None.**

---

**The reference to this document is unjustified and should be removed.**

**Add a policy to the plan that allocates the site known as Land off Gardener Road, Burton Latimer for residential use.**

**None.**

---

**There does not seem to be a section on Historic Traditional and Scattered Isolated Rural character areas as is suggested in emerging policy CRA1. The policy therefore lacks clarity and is not expected to deliver through its ‘maximisation’ principles for rural development.**

**Specific Part 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 Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS) sets out how the timescales for delivery and build out rates have been determined and provides a justification for the approach taken. The Council is only prepared to consider development sites on the basis of a robust evidence base, which is a current and accurate snapshot of supply and demand.**

**None.**

---

**The reference to this document is unjustified and should be removed.**

**Add a policy to the plan that allocates the site known as Land off Gardener Road, Burton Latimer for residential use.**

**None.**

---

**There does not seem to be a section on Historic Traditional and Scattered Isolated Rural character areas as is suggested in emerging policy CRA1. The policy therefore lacks clarity and is not expected to deliver through its ‘maximisation’ principles for rural development.**

**Specific Part 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 Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS) sets out how the timescales for delivery and build out rates have been determined and provides a justification for the approach taken. The Council is only prepared to consider development sites on the basis of a robust evidence base, which is a current and accurate snapshot of supply and demand.**

**None.**

---

**There does not seem to be a section on Historic Traditional and Scattered Isolated Rural character areas as is suggested in emerging policy CRA1. The policy therefore lacks clarity and is not expected to deliver through its ‘maximisation’ principles for rural development.**

**Specific Part 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 Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS) sets out how the timescales for delivery and build out rates have been determined and provides a justification for the approach taken. The Council is only prepared to consider development sites on the basis of a robust evidence base, which is a current and accurate snapshot of supply and demand.**

**None.**

---

**There does not seem to be a section on Historic Traditional and Scattered Isolated Rural character areas as is suggested in emerging policy CRA1. The policy therefore lacks clarity and is not expected to deliver through its ‘maximisation’ principles for rural development.**

**Specific Part 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 Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS) sets out how the timescales for delivery and build out rates have been determined and provides a justification for the approach taken. The Council is only prepared to consider development sites on the basis of a robust evidence base, which is a current and accurate snapshot of supply and demand.**

**None.**

---

**There does not seem to be a section on Historic Traditional and Scattered Isolated Rural character areas as is suggested in emerging policy CRA1. The policy therefore lacks clarity and is not expected to deliver through its ‘maximisation’ principles for rural development.**

**Specific Part 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 Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS) sets out how the timescales for delivery and build out rates have been determined and provides a justification for the approach taken. The Council is only prepared to consider development sites on the basis of a robust evidence base, which is a current and accurate snapshot of supply and demand.**

**None.**

---

**There does not seem to be a section on Historic Traditional and Scattered Isolated Rural character areas as is suggested in emerging policy CRA1. The policy therefore lacks clarity and is not expected to deliver through its ‘maximisation’ principles for rural development.**

**Specific Part 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 Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS) sets out how the timescales for delivery and build out rates have been determined and provides a justification for the approach taken. The Council is only prepared to consider development sites on the basis of a robust evidence base, which is a current and accurate snapshot of supply and demand.**

**None.**

---

**There does not seem to be a section on Historic Traditional and Scattered Isolated Rural character areas as is suggested in emerging policy CRA1. The policy therefore lacks clarity and is not expected to deliver through its ‘maximisation’ principles for rural development.**

**Specific Part 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 Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS) sets out how the timescales for delivery and build out rates have been determined and provides a justification for the approach taken. The Council is only prepared to consider development sites on the basis of a robust evidence base, which is a current and accurate snapshot of supply and demand.**

**None.**

---

**There does not seem to be a section on Historic Traditional and Scattered Isolated Rural character areas as is suggested in emerging policy CRA1. The policy therefore lacks clarity and is not expected to deliver through its ‘maximisation’ principles for rural development.**

**Specific Part 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 Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS) sets out how the timescales for delivery and build out rates have been determined and provides a justification for the approach taken. The Council is only prepared to consider development sites on the basis of a robust evidence base, which is a current and accurate snapshot of supply and demand.**

**None.**
As residents of Thorpe Malsor for the last 32 years, my wife and I would like to register our disapproval of the proposed development. The reservoirs are areas of outstanding natural beauty and as committed conservationalists, we consider the destruction of these areas to be a retrograde step.

Yes

Policy NEH4 Open Spaces 70 No No No Yes Yes

Mather Jamie Policy ROT3 Land to the West of Rothwell 104 No No No No Yes Yes

in the Council’s web pages is dated 2012. This is an evidence base document divided into countryside that is located in and around these areas. Both Cransley & Thorpe Reservoirs have been protected up until now since 1995. The reservoirs are an important wildlife resource in our area, they are beauty spots, close to Kettering and provide a lovely walk along its public footpath all year round. I live in Broughton and regularly walk this footpath.

Yes

Yes

None.

None.

No changes recommended.

A Main Modification is proposed to policy NEH 4 and its supporting text to clarify the status of Natural Environment and Heritage 55 I would like to retain policy 10 as both Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs are sufficiently protected due to their location in the 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 Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS) is also relevant to Site 211 Mather Jamie Policy ROT3 Land to the West of Rothwell.

Yes

Yes
Rosconn Strategic

Hallam Land

Site RA/115 has been considered and discounted through a robust site assessment process. The detail of this is contained in the Housing Land Supply Background Paper (October 2019) provides evidence for the housing trajectories provided for these sites. The updated work has begun on site at Rothwell North and Desborough North is progressing towards the submission of reserved matters applications. The

... currently offers a well treed area and a biodiversity refuge. Again not clarification is given as to what is this area is

"..."
We note that numerous policies throughout the document state that proposals will: 'Be supported by a contaminated land ... scheme to address any identified contamination, ensuring that there are no unacceptable risks to human health'.

I am writing to say that I think Cransley and Thorpe Malsor reservoirs should remain protected as they are under Policy 10. It 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 where water is available for their survival and habitat is incomprehensible. It will deter them from going there with their families.

It is considered that the following changes are necessary to ensure that the Local Plan is legally compliant and sound: The Regulations and Legal Statement of the Policy are required to be amended to include the modification proposed in the Table 15.1.

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 Sustainability Statement Plan (SSP2) Local Plan is positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national planning policy.

The NEH2 does not allow for any long term preservation of natural spaces for both humans and nature’s own. It is important that we protect these reservoirs as they 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 Yes

A Main Modification is proposed to address the issues raised in this response. Refer to the Main Schedule, MM51 (divided into ‘Borough-wide principles for rural development’ and ‘Village, Town and Neighbourhood Plans’). The modifications will be to determine the new policy, and to update the Policy Map. The modifications are necessary to ensure that the Local Plan is legally compliant and sound: the Policy is required to be amended to include the modification as proposed in the Table 15.1.

The following changes are necessary to ensure that the Local Plan is legally compliant and sound: The Family Name and House, Brigstock Road, Grafton Underwood (the subject land, shaded red on the attached Plan) within the Grafton Underwood Area of Great Significance is proposed to be excluded from the Borough Planning Policy Map.

It is considered that the following changes are necessary to ensure that the Local Plan is legally compliant and sound: The Regulations and Legal Statement of the Policy are required to be amended to include the modification proposed in the Table 15.1.
Rothwell Town Centre Development Principles

Policy ROT1

None. Yes

Central England Co-op

Housing Site Policies

92 No No No No Yes Yes

Opportunity Environmental Improvement Sites in

Appendix 3 - Policies Maps

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

Policy ROT2

€¢ 12:11 - RTC fully support improvements to pedestrian and cycle links. €¢ 12:12 - It is essential that further ... Rothwell North Development and the impact on junction 3 of the A14 and the A6/Rothwell link road. In addition,

Noted. None. Yes

General Comments Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan- Publication Plan

262 261 260 258 257

Council

Rothwell

nd density of the historic pattern of development; fd. It Protects important public views, particularly those of St Andrew€

ake their design, character and materials cues from the character of Historic Traditional and Scattered Isolated Rural ... a limited palate of materials of local limestone, and thatch or slate; ec. It Reflects the scale, mass, form, height a

nt of this site would have a very pleasant outlook, good access to existing open spaces excellent pedestrian and cycle ... feature. v. Introduction of street treatments and street furniture appropriate to the historic and rural context. c. T

that has previously been established in evidence; the 2013 JPU Urban Structures Study identified Eastern expansion of the town (including this site) as the best opportunity for extending and €œrepairing€

ion form are attached to this letter. The land forms 55 Hectares of well-enclosed fields to the South-West of the town ... of Central England Co-op Limited. It is our view that the land is well located for new housing development. This view

current developments taking place significant improvements to the current bus provision are a crucial requirement to the ... are made to the access to Montsaye School directly via a new entrance directly onto the new link road through

current Rothwell North Development has been completed and improvements to the current infrastructure have taken place. €¢ ... link road must be built before considering the build of a further 300 houses. €¢ RTC are of the opinion that with the

€¢ 12.16 - RTC strongly recommend that this should be removed and reiterate that this area should be utilised for green ... houses) should be deleted from SSP2 and should only be included within the plan at a later date when the impact of the

€¢ Whilst RTC acknowledges that the redevelopment of the library area has been taken out of the SSP2, RTC are of the ... Library Hub, recognising the importance of this building and the boundary of the current lease agreement with NCC must be

a motion on the 24th July formally declaring a Climate Emergency in Kettering Borough and committed to a target of making ... by 2030. RTC is of the opinion that there are no clear indications that this motion has been fully incorporated within

Rothwell Town Council (RTC) are of the opinion that commencing the consultation just before the Christmas period and the ... Kettering Borough Council did not actively encourage community engagement. Furthermore, Kettering Borough Council passed