WRITTEN STATEMENT IN RESPECT OF THE KETTERING SITE SPECIFIC PART 2 LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

MATTER 7- HOUSING ALLOCATIONS IN RURAL AREAS

On Behalf of The Boughton Estate
1. **INTRODUCTION**

1.1 This Written Statement is made on behalf of our client, The Boughton Estate (the Estate), in respect of the forthcoming examination (EIP) of the Kettering Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan.

2. **MATTER 7- HOUSING ALLOCATIONS IN RURAL AREAS**

Issue: Whether the following housing allocations are soundly based.

- BRA2 Top Orchard Braybrook (3)
- CRA2 South of New Stone House, Duck End Cranford (5/6)
- CRA3 Land east of the corner of Duck End and Thrapston Road Cranford (8/10)
- GED2 Geddington Saw Mill, Grafton Road, Geddington (10)
- GED3 Geddington South East (11)
- GED4 Old Nursery Site, Grafton Road (10)
- GRC2 Land to north of Lodddington Road, Great Cransley (10/15)
- MAW2 Land west of Mawsley (50) (see below)
- PYT2 Two fields on the outskirts of Pytchley (8)
- STA2 land to the south of Harborough Road Stoke Albany (16)
- WES2 Home Farm Weston by Welland (10)

Questions

The Council is requested to address the following questions for each of the proposed housing allocations. For those sites where reps have been made, the Council should respond to the particular issue(s) raised. In doing this any updated information regarding the planning and development status of the sites should be included.

1. Are the housing allocations appropriate and justified in light of the
potential constraints, infrastructure requirements and adverse impacts?

2.1 In respect of GED2 and GED3, yes, the allocations are appropriate and justified.

2. Are there any significant factors that indicate that any sites/parts of sites should not have been allocated?

2.2 In respect of GED2 and GED3, there is are no significant factors.

3. Are the sites viable and deliverable? Is there any risk that site conditions and constraints might prevent development or adversely affect viability and delivery?

2.3 Geddington Sawmill (GED2) is owned by the Estate and we can confirm that there are no known technical issues and that the site is viable and deliverable immediately. There is a desire to bring development forward quickly which will assist the Council’s housing land supply within the next 5 years.

2.4 Geddington South East (GED3), which is also owned by the Estate, is available and there are no constraints which would prevent development or affect delivery. The Estate has the desire to bring development forward quickly which will assist the Council's housing land supply within the next 5 years.

4. How were the site capacities determined? What assumptions have been made? Are these justified?

2.5 In relation to GED2, the policy wording is explicit in identifying the allocation for ‘up to’ 10 dwellings. Whilst the Estate are comfortable with this quantum of development we are mindful of the need for flexibility and it is not commonplace in this respect to see planning policies which set maxima. We consider the policy should be modified with wording such as ‘approximately’ or ‘around’ to enable a design process to be undertaken which arrives at a sensible amount of development having regard to housing need and the size of units desired as well as design
requirements.

2.6 In relation to GED3, as with our comments in respect of GED2, we consider the policy wording to be unnecessarily restrictive by limiting development to ‘up to’ 11 dwellings. We consider the policy should be modified with wording such as ‘approximately’ or ‘around’ to enable a design process to be undertaken which arrives at a sensible amount of development having regard to housing need and the size of units desired as well as design requirements.

5. What is the current planning status of the site?

2.7 Both GED2 and GED3 are available and can come forward for development in the short term once the Plan has been adopted. The Estate is fully committed to both GED2 and GED3, therefore both sites should be taken forward and adopted as housing allocations in SSP2.

6. What benefits would the proposed development bring?

2.8 Both GED2 and GED3 will contribute housing that meets local needs, and will be designed and developed in a way that adds positively to the character of the village.

7. What are the potential adverse impacts of developing the site and how might they be mitigated?

2.9 In respect of GED2, some non-mature trees along the western frontage of the site are likely to require removal to enable development to front on to the street and this will be mitigated through planting within the site. However, trees along the southern boundary can be retained. A tree survey which will assess the quality of the existing trees will be submitted as part of any planning application, and the policy (criteria g.) should provide for the possibility of tree removal being necessary along the site frontage in order to accommodate an appropriate layout.

2.10 In relation to GED3, the Estate would like to confirm that a suitable scheme has been designed to accommodate an easement required by
Anglian Water and that there are no adverse odour impacts.

8. Would the Modifications proposed by the Council address any shortcomings?

2.11 We recognise the proposed change to policy GED2 which will now state that ‘Land at Geddington Sawmill, as shown on the policies map, is allocated for housing development’. It is agreed that this will make clear the geographical application of the policy is illustrated on the policies map.

2.12 As above, we recognise the proposed change to policy GED3 which will now state that ‘Land at Geddington South East, as shown on the policies map, is allocated for housing development’. It is agreed that this will make clear the geographical application of the policy is illustrated on the policies map.

2.13 However, these changes do not address the other shortcomings raised in the representations. Policies GED2 and GED3 should be modified to refer to a quantum of development of ‘approximately’ or ‘around’ 10 and 11 homes respectively. Policies GED2 and GED3 should also be modified to cross reference the requirement for site-specific master planning in GED1 or to introduce balancing clauses (i.e. where appropriate, where viable etc.) and employ flexible wording.

9. What is the expected timescale and rate of development and is it realistic?

2.14 As stated above, both GED2 and GED3 are deliverable within 5 years.

10. Is the boundary of the site appropriate? Is there any justification for amending the boundary?

2.15 In relation to GED3, the Estate considers that the settlement boundary of Geddington (and therefore allocation boundary) does not follow any defensible features. In our view, this arbitrary line should be repositioned
commensurate with the rear garden boundaries at Steele Way to the north east of the allocation, and to run south to the existing south east corner of the allocation (as shown on Appendix A within our representation to the Draft Plan).

2.16 This would result in a very slightly larger site and would provide for a built form and development character which is in-keeping with the current urban fabric and will maintain the relationship between the built village and the surrounding countryside.

11. Are the detailed policy requirements for each site, effective, justified and consistent with national policy? Are they needed when some of the sites already have planning permission?

2.17 The detailed policy requirements in Policy GED2 are considered too prescriptive, and lack the necessary flexibility to be applied at the Development Management stage. Amendments were suggested in the detailed representations to cross refer to the requirements of GED1 and to introduce flexibility by stating ‘where possible’ within criteria b. and g.