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Representation

Please use a separate form for each representation.

Which part of the Publication Plan does your representation relate to?
Mawsley R174

Tests of Soundness

Do you consider the Local Plan is sound in terms of being:

- Justified . No
- Effective . No
- Positively prepared . No
- Consistent with National Policy . No

Legal and Procedural requirements

Do you consider the Local Plan has been prepared in line with legal procedural requirements? No

Duty to Cooperate

Do you consider the Local Plan to be compliant with the Duty to Cooperate? No

Reasons
Please give the reason(s) why you consider the Local Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the statutory Duty to Cooperate.

The environmental concerns regarding the plans for the existing hedgerows have not been taken into consideration. Modest hedgerows can have an outsized influence on the environment and biodiversity, providing habitats for insects, birds, small mammals that help combat soil erosion and improve water quality. They also act to sequester carbon dioxide up to an estimated 500,000 tons a year. Hedgerows should be maintained and not removed.

- Loss of countryside view around which the layout of the village was designed, to build in this location takes away an amenity that all villagers share with view over open country. Taking away this amenity is no different to taking away the laying fields or pond.
- Irrevocable loss of wildlife habitat and negative impact on the populations of local birds and animals eg yellow hammer, red kites, field fayres, Waxwings, owls, woodpeckers, reed buntings, linnets and reed buntings, foxes, badgers, deer, bats, monk jack deers
- Detriment to residential amenity
- Revision to the Core Spatial Strategy, due to be adopted shortly by Kettering Council will show they have a 5 year land bank
- Policy 15 of North Northants Core Spatial Policy states that to meet local housing needs 30-40% more houses are needed to Kettering. Mawsley was originally 700 homes, this has been increased already by 300 homes to 1000 an increase of 42%. This proposal would mean a total of 1357 homes which is a total increase of 51% - far in excess of the Core Spatial Policy. It was categorically stated from the beginning of the building of the village that the village would consist of 700 homes. We have taken our fair share of increased development for Kettering Borough Council
- The need to avoid town cramming and over development
- The infill expansion on the site undermines the characteristic layout of Mawsley and goes against the original ethos of the village and extends the village beyond the boundary lines unnecessarily
- One of the unique design features of Mawsley is the design layout and this should be safeguarded. Mawsley was supposed to emulate the development of a typical Northamptonshire village with nooks and crannies, as such constraints on building design, replacement windows and doors, car parking provision to keep cars hidden and off the street support this. If this proposal goes ahead Mawsley will become another suburb of Kettering and become a housing estate rather than a village
- There is a possibility of developmental creep and urban crawl, the hatched area of the plan was also originally part of the new housing proposal, whilst this has been dropped for now it is not hard to see how a precedent will be set for future infilling
- New houses increase the strain on police, hospitals, fire and ambulance services
- Increased flood risk to Malaslea and Birch Spinney, water pools in these fields in the winter and after heavy rain and once this is tarmacked over risk of flooding will be a major concern
- Little regard appears to have been paid to either the letter or the spirit of the Government’s National Planning Policy Framework, and we would like to draw the Council’s attention to the aims behind those paragraphs most relevant to Mawsley, Core Planning Principles.

Paragraph 17
- planning should empower local people to shape their surroundings, finding ways to enhance and improve the places in which they live their lives. Comments already registered suggest that building on this site would be entirely at odds with the wishes of local residents.
- the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside should be recognised. To allow further housing to be built on the site would degrade it both visually and as a wildlife corridor. Does the Council not recognise this?
- planning should contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment, planning to build 57 houses on this site would be contrary to this

Promoting Healthy Communities

Paragraph 74
- existing open space... should not be built on, unless …the land is surplus to requirements. With an already increasing population, the land is agricultural and cannot be considered to be surplus to requirements

Paragraph 76
- Local communities should be able to identify for special protection green areas of particular importance to them. The objections have made it abundantly clear that this site is treasured.
In conclusion, we believe the area under consideration must be rejected on the grounds that it does not accord with the way in which the National Planning Policy Framework is expected to be applied. If additional housing is required in Northamptonshire it would be far preferable to build another new village designed like Mawsley or consider the brown field sites around Kettering. For all the above reasons we wish to register and you to acknowledge our very strong objection to RA/174. Mawsley was designed to be a village not an urban sprawl. The village has already been extended beyond the original scope and further houses would be counter-productive. The North Northamptonshire Development Company and the Daily Telegraph Best Village Aware cite the design layout of Mawsley as part of its unique creation as a Village rather than a housing estate. It is a village and has not become a rat run for commuters. There is no merit to the proposal and the existing facilities are over stretched. It is a wonderful village with a fabulous community spirit and we feel very strongly it must remain a village and not destroyed with more unwanted housing.

**Proposed Actions/Changes**

**Please explain what changes or actions are needed to make the Local Plan legally compliant.**

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

**Attendance at the examinations hearings**

If you are seeking to change the Plan, would you like to attend the examination hearings? Yes

**If Yes, please outline the reason(s) why, below.**

- to ensure that the environmental damage is limited and important hedgerows are maintained. Hedgerows are an important feature of the countryside both for their wildlife value and the landscape and historical importance.
  - Loss of countryside view around which the layout of the village was designed, to build in this location takes away an amenity that all villagers share with view over open country. Taking away this amenity is no different to taking away the laying fields or pond
  - Irrevocable loss of wildlife habitat and negative impact on the populations of local birds and animals eg yellow hammer, red kites, field fayres, Waxwings, owls, woodpeckers, reed buntings, linnets and reed buntings, foxes, badgers, deer, bats, monk jack deers
  - Detriment to residential amenity
  - Revision to the **Core Spatial Strategy**, due to be adopted shortly by Kettering Council will show they have a 5 year land bank
  - Policy 15 of North Northants Core Spatial Policy states that to meet local housing needs 30-40% more houses are needed to Kettering. Mawsley was originally 700 homes, this has been increased already by 300 homes to 1000 an increase of 42%. This proposal would mean a total of 1357 homes which is a total increase of 51% - far in excess of the Core Spatial Policy. It was categorically stated from the beginning of the building of the village that the village would consist of 700 homes. We have taken our fair share of increased development for Kettering Borough Council
  - The need to avoid town cramming and over development
    - The infill expansion on the site undermines the characteristic layout of Mawsley and goes against the original ethos of the village and extends the village beyond the boundary lines unnecessarily
    - One of the unique design features of Mawsley is the design layout and this should be safeguarded. Mawsley was supposed to emulate the development of a typical Northamptonshire village with nooks and crannies, as such constraints on building design, replacement windows and doors, car parking provision to keep cars hidden and off the street support this. If this proposal goes ahead Mawsley will become another suburb of Kettering and become a housing estate rather than a village
There is a possibility of developmental creep and urban crawl, the hatched area of the plan was also originally part of the new housing proposal, whilst this has been dropped for now it is not hard to see how a precedent will be set for future infilling.

- New houses increase the strain on police, hospitals, fire and ambulance services.
- Increased flood risk to Malaslea and Birch Spinney, water pools in these fields in the winter and after heavy rain and once this is tarmacked over risk of flooding will be a major concern.
- Little regard appears to have been paid to either the letter or the spirit of the Government's National Planning Policy Framework, and we would like to draw the Council's attention to the aims behind those paragraphs most relevant to Mawsley, Core Planning Principles.

**Paragraph 17**
- planning should empower local people to shape their surroundings, finding ways to enhance and improve the places in which they live their lives. Comments already registered suggest that building on this site would be entirely at odds with the wishes of local residents.
- the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside should be recognised. To allow further housing to be built on the site would degrade it both visually and as a wildlife corridor. Does the Council not recognise this?
- planning should contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment, planning to build 57 houses on this site would be contrary to this.

**Promoting Healthy Communities**

**Paragraph 74**
- existing open space... should not be built on, unless ...the land is surplus to requirements. With an already increasing population, the land is agricultural and cannot be considered to be surplus to requirements.

**Paragraph 76**
- Local communities should be able to identify for special protection green areas of particular importance to them. The objections have made it abundantly clear that this site is treasured.
- In conclusion, we believe the area under consideration must be rejected on the grounds that it does not accord with the way in which the National Planning Policy Framework is expected to be applied. If additional housing is required in Northamptonshire it would be far preferable to build another new village designed like Mawsley or consider the brown field sites around Kettering.

For all the above reasons we wish to register and you to acknowledge our very strong objection to RA/174. Mawsley was designed to be a village not an urban sprawl. The village has already been extended beyond the original scope and further houses would be counter-productive. The North Northamptonshire Development Company and the Daily Telegraph Best Village Aware cite the design layout of Mawsley as part of its unique creation as a Village rather than a housing estate. It is a village and has not become a rat run for commuters. There is no merit to the proposal and the existing facilities are over stretched. It is a wonderful village with a fabulous community spirit and we feel very strongly it must remain a village and not destroyed with more unwanted housing.

**Notifications**

**Do you wish to be notified?**
- When the Plan is submitted for independent examination?
- When the Inspector's Report is published?
- When the document is adopted?