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**Representation**

Please use a separate form for each representation.

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

Cranford Proposals Map HVI080

**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? Yes

**Duty to Cooperate**

Do you consider the Local Plan to be compliant with the Duty to Cooperate? Yes

**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.
1.1 On behalf of our client Cranford Management we object to the section of the publication Plan - Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan relating to the identification of land referenced HVI080 at Cranford which then comes under Policy NEH3 - Historically and Visually Important Local Green Space.

1.2 The policy seeks to preserve the openness of areas designated as Historically and Visually Important Local Green Space (HVI land) and specifically to prevent development on such designated land only in exceptional circumstances.

1.3 Our objection relates to part of the land under designation HVI080 which is notated on the Cranford Proposals map Figure 18.13.

1.4 Whilst we fully support and accept the principle of protecting green open space where this is important to the setting of historic buildings or where it is important to a Conservation Area character, we do strongly feel that this should not be a blanket approach where large swathes of land are given this designation when they do not make a specific local contribution in this regard.

1.5 The Planning Practice Guidance advises that, “If land is already protected by designation, then consideration should be given to whether any additional local benefit would be gained by designation as Local Green Space.” Cranford has a designated Conservation Area and an accompanying Conservation Area Character Statement. The village is set within open countryside to which restrictive policies are applied and the land is therefore already protected as necessary through policy designations and no further benefit would be gained by additional designations.

1.6 Paragraph 100 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) itself sets criteria for the designation of Local Green Space and advises that; “The Local Green Space designation should only be used where the green space is:a) in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves;b) demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquility or richness of its wildlife; andc) local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.

1.7 With regard to the criteria above whilst the land is ‘reasonably’ close to community the arable field has no recreational value, ecological value or any significant historic value. The arable field has no particular landscape beauty and is not covered by any landscaped designation. Its visual appearance is dominated by the backdrop of local authority housing which itself is out of character with the historic village. The arable field off Top Dyson has no public access.

1.8 Whilst it is understood that important views within the Conservation Area should be maintained as should the setting of listed buildings, the blanket designation of the arable field under reference HVI080 does not appear to fall within the guidelines for designation. There is limited public access to the land under HVI080. A footpath crosses the land south west to north east, to the south of the brook but the land to the north is entirely without public access. It is notable that the examples of green spaces appropriate for Local Green Space designation as given in the PPG are all types of open space to which public access is available. (PPG para 013 states “For example, green areas could include land where sports pavilions, boating lakes or structures such as war memorials are located, allotments, or urban spaces that provide a tranquil oasis”).

1.9 In addition paragraph 99 of the NPPF advises that the designation of land as Local Green Space should be consistent with the local planning of sustainable development and complement investment in sufficient homes. Our representations to the housing policies for Cranford question the deliverability of the two sites allocated to deliver the housing needs identified for Cranford village.

1.10 As regards the protective designation covering land labelled HVI080, whilst we would accept that the land to the south of the brook affords views towards the village and particularly the church from the footpath, the land to the north of the brook (the arable field) principally provides views across it from the public highway to the ribbon development of former local authority housing to the north which are not part of the historic settlement form. There are no views of the Listed Church or Hall from the arable field.

1.11 The justification for the designation of HVI080 in the Sites Specific Proposals Local Development Document - Historically and Visually Important Open Space Background Paper September 2015 accepts (at page 11) that the area for designation is ‘relatively large’. In terms of its particular significance locally the justification on page 11 comments that the land provides views of Cranford Hall Park land but as commented above this is only where there is public access to the south of the brook. The further summary on page 41 adds that the site provides views of the church (not previously mentioned on page 11) but again this is only from the southern part of the site. The page 41 summary refers to the
land as within the village but also refers to it as land outside the village boundaries which is an obvious contradiction.

1.12 There are other areas of open space within the Conservation Area boundary which are not proposed to be further covered by an HVI designation some of which have a greater historic significance such as ridge and furrow. The designation of HVI open space in respect of Cranford is not therefore consistent. The arable field which forms the northern part of HVI080 is a modern construct and historic maps indicate it was first enclosed in 1900 with the houses along Top Dyson shown as partially constructed on the 1958 O.S. map and completed on the 1970 O.S. map.

1.13 On 28 November 2019 a report was considered by Kettering Borough Council Planning Policy Committee Members setting out the responses to the Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan - Draft Plan consultation. The Members were asked to endorse the officer responses set out in the comments schedule to be taken in to account in the production of the Pre-submission Plan.

1.14 The assessment for Cranford village is set out in the report as follows: “2.14 Cranford (Appendix 1i and 2i)Five supporting comments were received and four neither objecting nor supporting. There was some support for the two proposed affordable housing allocations identified; however there was also some objection and two new sites were promoted for consideration. There was also support for the Historically and Visually Important Local Green Space identified but also an objection. Issues relating to the water recycling centre were raised.”

1.15 Appendix 1i referenced in the extract above comments in relation to the proposed alternative sites put forward by our client as follows:-

“The proposed allocations in Cranford have been assessed and it is considered that these are of a sufficient scale and represent an opportunity to deliver affordable housing in Cranford in accordance with the Housing Needs Survey.”

1.16 As set out above an in our separate representations we question the suitability and deliverability of the sites identified.1.17 The supporting Appendix 2i provides the following response to our client submissions:

“In relation to this designation of HVI080, both the Historically and Visually Important Open Space Background Paper (September 2015) and a subsequent update in June 2016 set out the Council's approach the designation of this site as Historically and Visually Important Open Space. This included recommendations put forward by a third party and the site has been subsequently identified in the SSP2.”

Response – the assessment of our objection to the inclusion of the norther part of HVI080 in the 2015 and 2016 documents are inadequate. In the 2015 assessment referred to above it is commented, “The site provides views to Cranford Hall parkland and is important to the setting of the village”. Any views are not public view and in any event these factors are covered by Conservation Area policies.

In the 2016 update at page 16 the officer justification for retaining the land as HVI is that it is “important to the context of the village” and “is a fundamental part of the village” but makes no further explanation why it is considered so and why this does not apply to every field or paddock around the village. It is further commented it creates a setting for the village structure, but this is not a reason for designation under HVI as is covered under Conservation Area policy.

It is acknowledged that this site is not publicly accessible. Public access is not a requirement of the HVI designation.

Response - agreed but under paragraph 100 of the NPPF for designation the land should be demonstrably special and hold local significance. In our view this has not been demonstrated in any of the Council's assessments.

Proposed Actions/Changes

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

1.18 We therefore object to the extent of HVI designation as it applies to the northern part of the Cranford site reference HVI080. Its inclusion within Policy NEH3 is insufficiently justified by the Council's assessments and should be excluded from this policy designation.
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.

In order to help and support the inquiry process in the full understanding of the issues under consideration.

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?