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**Representation**

Please use a separate form for each representation.

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

Policy CRA2 and Policy CRA3

**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 Cranford Housing Site Policies covering paragraphs 13.47 to 13.55 and Policies CRA2 and CRA3.

1.2 Paragraph 13.47 of section on Cranford Housing Site Policies refers to the two allocated sites in Cranford as Rural Exception schemes which can be supported by private market housing to ensure deliverability and viability. We support this approach as in real terms this is likely to be the only way affordable housing is to be provided to the village to support its identified housing needs.

1.3 However, we disagree that the two sites allocated are either appropriate or viable and therefore not deliverable. As such the plan is not positively prepared as it fails to provide a strategy which, as a minimum, seeks to meet the area’s assessed needs. The Plan is also not effective as we question the deliverability of the sites identified. The key points we would raise with the Inspector in this regard are as follows:

  • The site identified under Policy CRA2 - South of New Stone House, Duck End, Cranford (RA/170) is allocated for 5 or 6 dwellings. It is not clarified in the Policy if the 5 or 6 dwellings will be supported by additional private market housing or whether the estimated capacity includes any supporting market housing. As a site at 0.17 ha with surface water flooding issues the extent of which are as yet undetermined the site capacity is limited, the viability of providing affordable housing on such a small site is questionable.

  • Proposed Policy CRA2 in our view demonstrates that the proposed allocation is far from constraint free and is insufficiently evidence-based to achieve an allocation. The proposed Policy requires a Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the site as well as a sequential approach to design options. The site is at high risk of surface water flooding due to its valley bottom location close to the brook. This may render the quantum of development on the site unachievable and unviable to provide affordable housing.

  • Both policy CRA2 and CRA3 require the built development to be in local limestone stone and thatch or slate. Again we question the viability of very this restrictive pallet of materials in the context of the small schemes whether there are other constraints to be addressed. It is known that RSLs will not accept thatch.

  • Both of the sites under Policy CRA2 and CRA3 have been proposed for allocation since circa 2010 and a decade later no further supporting information appears to have been prepared to demonstrate that these sites are in fact achievable and deliverable. Our concern is that the two sites have no realistic commitment to be delivered and hence the housing need identified by the Parish Council will not be met. The allocation of sites that have no impetus to be delivered block the opportunity for other deliverable sites to meet the identified need.

1.4 We also disagree that in so far as the allocations proposed for Cranford are concerned we consider these not to be justified in the context of an appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives and therefore not consistent with national policy to enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the NPPF for the following reasons.

  • Our representation to the Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan - Draft Plan (consulted on in Summer 2018) set out our objection to the allocation of the housing sites now proposed for Cranford. This case was set out in full and is attached herewith as Appendix 1.

  • In previous consultations in respect of the draft version of the plan on behalf of our clients we have proposed two alternative sites for development to deliver housing including land at Top Dyson and land at Duck End.

  • Kettering Borough Rural Masterplanning Report 2012 is intended to under-pin the plan as an evidence base document. However, neither the site at Top Dyson nor our client’s land at Duck End were considered in this evidence base document which has not been updated. The Kettering Borough Rural Masterplanning Report predates the Options plan consultation of 2012 (to which our clients responded), the Housing Allocations Plan consultation of 2013 (to which our clients responded).

  • The Housing Allocations Assessment of Additional Sites and Update report of 2013 seeks to analyse the two sites now proposed for allocation sites RA/170 (Duck End) and RA/173 (Thrapston Road)
together with our clients proposed allocation at Top Dyson then identified as RA/205. In our view the assessment is highly flawed. Please refer to our review of this at Appendix 2.

1.5 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.

1.6 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.”

1.7 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.”

1.8 The supporting Appendix 2i provides the following response to our client submissions:

“Both of the sites that have been promoted have yet to be considered for allocation at any stage during work on the SSP2.”

**Our response** – this is evidentially untrue as the Top Dyson site was assessed by the Council in 2013 as set out above and the alternative Duck End site was submitted at the draft plan stage.

“The sites that have been included as draft housing allocations have been included to address the identified need for affordable housing in the village and are supported by the Parish Council.”

**Our response** – the alternative sites are proposed for the same function. The Local Plan is intended to be an evidence-based plan allocating the most appropriate and deliverable site. The Parish has the opportunity through the Neighbourhood Plan to allocate sites it may prefer.

“Site assessments of the sites have been undertaken and it has been agreed by Members of Planning Policy Committee that these sites should be allocated. It is acknowledged that both sites are somewhat disconnected from the village, although this was outweighed by the provision of affordable housing. As a result the two sites included in the Draft Plan will continue to be progressed and both of the promoted sites on Duck End and Top Dysons will not be considered any further.”

**Our response** – this is not a true assessment of why the sites should be discounted if they are locationally preferable with fewer constraints than those that are proposed or allocation.

“The two sites identified in the Plan provide sufficient housing to meet the affordable need and no further allocations are required in the village”.

**Our response** – the alternative sites were proposed as substitutes not as additional sites and we question whether there is a real intent to deliver the sites proposed for allocation.

“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.”

Our response to the identification of HVIOS in relation to HVI080 is under a separate representation.

1.9 The report is not a full assessment of the alternative sites as reasonable alternatives. It is merely dismissive of the suggested alternatives in favour of those that have already been assessed and are proposed for allocation. In this respect the plan is not justified as an appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives and based on proportionate evidence. The reason(s) for rejecting the site at Duck End is not even mentioned.

1.10 The Top Dyson site by comparison to those proposed for allocation has been subject a highway study to consider access arrangement and suggested layouts have been drafted. The site can also
deliver one of the ‘shopping list’ items of draft policy CRA1, a play space for children, as well as a car park for the village hall to alleviate dangerous roadside parking along Grafton Road.

1.11 The Duck End site proposed by our client is better connected to the village than the Duck End site as a proposed allocation. It abuts the settlement boundary and can be linked by a roadside footway, unlike the proposed site.

1.12 The proposed allocation at Duck End is in a location beyond the pavement running alongside Duck End and the access to the site is beyond a narrow bridge over the brook yet there is no requirement in the policy for a highway assessment nor a requirement to support connectivity when the site has already been accepted by the Council to lack connectivity to the village. In this regard the proposed allocation is not consistent with national policy and does not enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the NPPF.

1.13 The site at Thrapston Road is equally disconnected from the settlement. Its vehicular access can only be on to High Street at which point there is no footpath alongside this busy road out of the village. The 8 to 10 houses proposed will be physically disconnected from the village and its residents are less likely to be fully integrated to the village community as a result.

Proposed Actions/Changes

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

We support the following changes to make the plan compliant: Deletion of policies CRA2 and CRA3 and their replacement with the following policies:-

**Policy CRA2 Land at Duck End, Cranford**

Land at Duck End is allocated for housing development and will provide between 8 to 10 dwellings. Development proposals for the site will:

a. seek to deliver affordable housing to meet identified need and be supported by private market housing;
b. be supported by a heritage impact assessment to demonstrate how the design of the proposal will preserve the setting of nearby heritage assets and the character of the conservation area; and

c. include a traditional palate of materials and will respond to the local vernacular.

d. Provide a Surface Water Drainage Assessment to demonstrate that SuDS are being used to ensure that the development is safe and does not increase flood risk to any adjacent land.

**Policy CRA3 Land at Top Dyson, Cranford**

Land at Top Dyson is allocated for housing development and will provide between 10 and 12 dwellings. Development proposals for the site will:

a. seek to deliver affordable housing to meet identified need and be supported by private market housing;
b. Ensure the site is connected to the village through improvements to the highway, including footways and traffic calming in accordance with the requirements set out by NCC Highways;
c. Include attractive design which could be considered as a gateway to the village with appropriate consideration for the character of Cranford and its Conservation Area;
d. include a traditional palate of materials and will respond to the local vernacular.

e. Proved a soft landscaped car park for use the village and village hall and small play area.
f. Provide a Surface Water Drainage Assessment to demonstrate that SuDS are being used to ensure that the development is safe and does not increase flood risk to any adjacent land.

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?