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Introduction

Para 1 - This additional representation provides clarification to my consultation representation dated Feb 2020 and also considers the Inspector’s MIQs, especially Matter 7, and the KBC consultation response dated June 2020 to my original representation.

Para 2 - Additionally, I present new information that was not previously available. This includes a housing needs survey (HNS) for Great Cransley and planning application KET/2020/0278 objections for housing development on site RA/146, subsequently withdrawn. Also work on the draft Housing Needs Assessment (HNA) for the Great Cransley Neighbourhood Plan has provided a greater insight into the evolution of Policy GRC2.
Is there a need and justification for additional housing in Great Cransley?

Para 3 - The KBC consultation response dated June 2020 refers to the housing site allocation process. I believe it useful to review this site allocation process in light of the new information.

Para 4 - Consideration of the SSP2 housing policy started with the **Rural Master Planning Report, dated February 2012 (ref: RA3)**. Pages 108 to 120 cover the evaluation summary for Great Cransley.

Para 5 - Page 110, section 4 provides a summary of housing needs assessments; quote.

“There is an identified need for affordable housing in the rural areas of the Borough, though this has not recently been identified at the individual settlement level. The North Northamptonshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) identifies a shortfall in provision of affordable housing in the rural areas of the Borough of 148 units per annum. No settlement-specific assessment has been conducted for Great Cransley.”

Para 6 - Page 110, section 6 provides a summary of a Parish Council Meeting regarding housing needs, quote.

- “There is a need for affordable housing in the village. The Council needs to be assured that any housing would stay affordable.
- There are young people who want to stay in the village. The Parish Council would like control of who would have affordable housing so local people would not be overlooked.
- There should be put in place the possibility of house swapping of affordable housing as numbers of residents alter.”

Para 7 - The **Rural Master Planning report identifies a need for affordable housing in the rural areas and specifically for Great Cransley.**

Para 8 - This was followed by the **Site Specific Proposals LDD Option Paper, dated March 2012 (ref: PKB6)**. Section 13.11 covers Great Cransley.

Para 9 - Para 13.11.4 quotes; “**Consultation has highlighted a need for affordable housing within the village, despite this a Housing Needs Assessment will need to be prepared prior to production of the Proposed Submission Site Specific Proposals LDD. Provided a need for affordable housing is identified through the Housing Needs Assessment a site could be identified outside the existing village boundary solely for affordable housing, this would however require a willing landowner.**”

Para 10 - Para 13.11.5 quotes; “**The alternative option for Great Cransley is to allow some small scale development to help provide affordable housing to allow local people to continue to live in the village. Great Cransley is not a location where growth would normally be appropriate as it has limited services and facilities. All the housing sites identified in Great Cransley are currently located outside the village boundary. However, including one of these sites within the boundary, to include a mixture of market housing and affordable housing, would help meet local needs for affordable housing. Small scale growth may also help fund some small scale environmental improvements in the village.”**

Para 11 - At para 13.11.6 question 85 asked:

“**Do you think development in Great Cransley should be limited to no growth beyond the village boundary or do you think there should be some small scale growth as set out above?**
If you think there should be some small scale growth do you agree the site identified is the most appropriate?
If you think development should be limited to no growth do you think a site should be identified for solely affordable housing if a Housing Needs Assessment identifies a need? If so which site should be identified?”

Para 12 - Great Cransley Parish Council responded to this question (comment ID 1915 on 23 Apr 2012) quote;
“Q 85 Cransley Parish Council considers that there could be some growth for affordable housing only and be outside the village boundary.
The site identified as RA/ 146 is the most appropriate for this affordable only housing. This area should have coloured as for ‘proposed affordable housing option’.”

Para 13 - This paper also identifies the need for affordable housing and only affordable housing at Great Cransley. Additionally, KBC recognise the requirement for a housing needs assessment for Great Cransley.

Para 14 - The Housing Allocation Assessment of additional sites and update, dated October 2013 (ref: HOU8) followed with Section 15 covering Great Cransley. Now site RA/146 has been identified as a potential site for affordable housing providing an approximate yield of 6 to 8 dwellings. Para 15.4 also confirms, quote; “The preferred option is for ‘small scale’ growth in Great Cransley for affordable housing”.

Para 15 - This assessment repeats the requirement for affordable housing and a site has now been identified for approximately 6 to 8 affordable dwellings at Great Cransley.

Para 16 - This was followed by the Housing Allocations Background Paper, dated May 2018 (ref: HOU6). By this time the JCS had been adopted and Para 2.2 of the paper repeats JCS Policy 11. Section 3 of the paper describes the allocation methodology and Section 4 provides a summary of the assessment of individual sites. The assessment summary for Great Cransley, site RA/146 now indicates a site for up to 15 dwellings, so a doubling of the housing density, and mention of affordable housing is now conspicuously absent. Additionally, there is no evidence to indicate that a housing needs assessment had been prepared to justify the proposed housing development (shown as being required in the Site Specific Proposals LDD Option Paper, dated March 2012). The allocation decision is shown as having been made on 19 April 2017, so after the adoption of the JCS.

Para 17 - Para 4.7 shows that KBC have exceeded their JCS requirement for the rural area plus 10% buffer by approximately 22% to 28% with their draft housing allocations.

Para 18 - This paper indicates that affordable housing has now been effectively abandoned and is to be replaced by open market housing at Great Cransley without any evidence of a local need justification for such housing. Additionally, the housing yield has been doubled without explanation. This housing allocation therefore conflicts with the housing need identified during consultation with the Parish Council, and also conflicts with JCS Policy 11, parts 2a and 2c. It also conflicts with the NPPF Paragraphs 31 and 77.
Para 19 - This was followed by the Housing Land Supply Background Paper – dated October 2019 (ref: HOU1). Para 1.10 repeats the JCS Policy 11 part 2.

Para 20 - Para 1.11 clarifies the housing supply situation, quote; “This demonstrates that, taking into account all sources of supply, 12,976 dwellings would be delivered in the plan period. This is 25% above the housing requirement in the JCS. It is therefore clear that sufficient land has been identified to meet housing requirements without a further increase in the flexibility allowance identified.”

Para 21 - Para 2.21 States: “In the rural area, 11 sites will be allocated in the SSP2. This will deliver 149 dwellings, which along with windfall development will meet the requirements identified in the JCS. In addition to this, it is anticipated that Neighbourhood Plans, affordable housing delivered through JCS Policy 13, and self-build rural exceptions will provide additional sources of housing in the rural area.”

Para 22 - This paper provides confirmation that KBC will meet the SSP2 housing targets with a comfortable margin. Therefore, there can be no justification for open market housing allocations in unsustainable locations such as Great Cransley.

Para 23 - KBC in their Regulation 20 consultation response dated June 2020 to my original comments ID41 state; “Although a need for affordable housing was previously identified, without a Housing Needs Survey the need is unable to determined. Therefore, the site is not allocated specifically for affordable housing and is expected to deliver affordable housing in accordance with Policy 30 of the Joint Core Strategy.”

Para 24 - This late admission by KBC confirms that any pretence at providing affordable housing via a rural exception scheme has been abandoned. The Parish Council and residents have consequently been misled. JCS Policy 30 will only require affordable housing to be delivered for developments of 11 or more dwellings. As a consequence, we should expect a development on site RA/146 of 10 or fewer dwellings and that no affordable homes will be delivered.

Para 25 - Since the SSP2 consultation, a housing needs survey (HNS) was conducted for Great Cransley neighbourhood plan steering group by Midland Rural Housing (MRH). Survey questionnaires were sent out to all households in the parish during January 2020 and returned during February to MRH.

Para 26 - The HNS report dated March 2020 shows an indicative need for five 2-bedroom affordable dwellings and two 3-4-bedroom open market dwellings, see Appendix 1. This HNS was copied to KBC.

Para 27 - The HNS was followed by a housing needs assessment (HNA) prepared for the Great Cransley neighbourhood plan with a 1st draft dated 14 August 2020, see Appendix 3. At the time of writing, this 1st draft HNA has been passed to the NP Steering Group and Parish Council for their review. Although still at the draft stage, this HNA is being included with this additional representation since it demonstrates the HNA methodology and its findings are relevant to Policy GRC2. The conclusions from the HNA are: “After consideration of the local plan policies and demographic data, the housing needs survey and community consultation it is concluded there is an identified need for approximately five affordable 2-bedroom dwellings. It is therefore recommended that the GCNP investigate a rural exception housing development for approximately 5 dwellings. Whereas the identified housing need is for a mix of rent and buy, this aspect needs further investigation with regards to how this housing could best be delivered at Great Cransley.”
Para 28 - Additionally, consultation has identified several potential sites for rural exception housing and the next step for the neighbourhood plan steering group will be to conduct an assessment of sites, again in line with the government’s Locality guidance for neighbourhood plans. It is anticipated that site RA/146 will be included in this assessment.

Is site RA/146 a suitable location for new housing?

Para 29 - The KBC response dated June 2020 mentioned above refers to the housing site allocation process. Whereas site RA/146 is first identified in the Housing Allocation Assessment of additional sites and update, dated October 2013, it is the Housing Allocations Background Paper, dated May 2018 where the assessment of individual sites is provided.

Para 30 - Appendix 3 from that paper provides the assessment for site RA/146. It is argued here that the assessment methodology is inadequate. As a result, the assessment of site RA/146 is faulty and fails to identify some highly significant constraints. The site assessment would appear to have relied too much on information provided by the landowner or agent and has not been informed by an adequate site survey. The following criteria are clearly in error:

- Public transport – None available for several years. This should be a red assessment
- Flood risk – The flooding problem on Loddington Road adjacent to the site is well known. This should be a red assessment.
- Access to Highway – This is a significant constraint due to the site being on a blind bend and speeding is a long-term issue for the village. This should be a red assessment.
- The elevation difference between the site and Loddington Road has not been assessed or recognised. This should be a red assessment.
- The archaeological value of this site has been underestimated. This should be a red assessment.

Para 31 - Housing density is also a significant issue for this site. The initial proposed yield of 6 to 8 dwellings for the 0.43ha site relates to a housing density of 14 to 18 dph. The proposed yield now of 10 to 15 dwellings relates to a housing density of 23 to 34 dph. Such a high density may be appropriate for a town centre housing development but is inappropriate in a rural setting on a highly constrained site. It is considered impossible to achieve these high housing density levels and comply with Policy GRC1d and Policy GRC2a, b, c, d, and f.

Para 32 - The limitations and constraints of site RA/146 became fully evident following the submission of a planning application KET/2020/0278 on 23 April 2020. See link: https://www.kettering.gov.uk/planningApplication/129707

This application was for 9 dwellings, 7 detached and 2 semi-detached. Although the two 3 bedroom semi-detached are referred to as affordable in the application this was thought to have been a marketing tactic. There was no mention concerning a S106 planning agreement or that they would be affordable in the planning sense, or would actually be guaranteed to be delivered as affordable.

Para 33 - The application was subsequently withdrawn by the applicant on 4 June 2020, after the consultation closing date. Copies of the consultation responses and objections were obtained from KBC and are provided at Appendix 2. These consultation responses will help inform regarding the soundness of SSP2 Policy GRC2 and suitability of site RA/146.
Para 34 - Objections to the application were made by 19 residents plus the neighbourhood plan steering group, a significant number for such a small village. The objections covered a wide range of topics, not repeated here, but mostly covered in my Feb 2020 consultation representation.

Para 35 - What is quite obvious when reviewing this planning application is that attempting to fit in 9 dwellings onto this site results in a gross overdevelopment. See KET/2020/0278 document 6, Proposed Site Plan. Attempting to fit in the 10 to 15 dwellings as is being proposed by KBC in Policy GRC2 is totally unrealistic.

Para 36 - However, the objections from the statutory consultees will carry more weight in planning terms than objection from residents. Objections were received from Northamptonshire County Council (Archaeological), Great Cransley Parish Council and Northamptonshire Highways.

Para 37 - The Northamptonshire County Council (Archaeological) response highlighted the archaeological importance of this site. It is argued here that the field containing site RA/146 is one of the most important open spaces in the parish given its archaeological and landscape importance including the medieval ridge and furrow remains. It is argued that this field should be considered for protection, not development.

Para 38 - A significant constraint for site RA/146 is the elevation difference between Loddisington Road and the site and the implications this has on site access, layout of the development and road safety. These factors were clearly not appreciated when site RA/146 was first proposed by the Parish Council during 2012.

Para 39 - This elevation difference due to Loddisington Road passing through a cutting was conservatively estimated in my Feb 2020 representation at approximately 1.5m. Detailed mapping provided with the planning application shows this actual height difference to be over 2m for most of the site length. The response from Northamptonshire Highways indicates the consequences of this elevation difference and it was most likely this statutory consultee objection that caused the application to be withdrawn. The statutory consultee objections therefore support my Feb 2020 SSP2 objections with regard to the site constraints.
Summary

Para 40 - As detailed above, Policy GRC2 is considered to be unsound. In preparing the SSP2 for Great Cransley KBC have:

- Effectively ignored SSP2 consultation representation from the Parish Council.
- Failed to conduct a housing needs assessment for Great Cransley
- Have subsequently abandoned affordable housing delivery
- Have proposed open market housing not needed in Great Cransley
- Have proposed housing development that conflicts with the JCS, the NPPF and sustainable development principles
- Have failed to properly assess the proposed housing site RA/146
- Have proposed an unrealistic housing density

Para 42 - In order to make the SSP2 sound, Policy GRC2 should be deleted. The settlement boundary including site RA/146 should be reinstated to the pre-SSP2 position following alongside Loddington Road between house numbers 32 and 48.

Para 43 - It should now be left to the Neighbourhood Plan group supported by the Parish Council to bring forward the Rural Exception housing development that is needed at Great Cransley.
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Housing Needs Survey for Great Cransley – March 2020 (24 pages)
A DETAILED INVESTIGATION INTO THE HOUSING NEEDS OF GREAT CRANSLEY

ANALYSIS REPORT
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1. Introduction

Midlands Rural Housing (MRH) is a non-asset holding, profit for purpose organisation that works to promote and enable the provision of homes in rural settlements. We do this by working closely with local authorities, town and parish councils, registered providers and local communities in order to investigate the need for affordable housing. MRH is a well respected organisation, recognised for its expertise in this field. In addition to the work done locally within communities across rural England, MRH is also a key lobbyist and influencer at national and regionally.

MRH is the appointed Rural Housing Enabler Strategic Partner for six Leicestershire local authorities, the County Council and three partner Registered Providers. As part of the role as the Strategic Partner, MRH undertakes Rural Housing Needs Surveys across the participating local authority areas to evidence rural housing need is evidenced through a 5 year rolling survey timetable.

In addition to the above, MRH also undertakes work by commission, on behalf of land owners, private developers, planning consultants, Parish Council’s and Neighbourhood Plan groups.

The organisation follows established best practice methodology when undertaking survey work. On adoption of the findings, the results of these surveys are generally shared with the relevant Local Authority and Parish Council, who may then choose to release the information into the public domain.

MRH can be contacted at:
Whitwick Business Centre
Stenson Road
Leicestershire
LE67 4JP

Email: [REDACTED]
Web: www.midlandsrural.org.uk
2. Summary

In February 2020, on behalf of the Cransley Neighbourhood Plan Group, MRH carried out an independent housing needs survey in Great Cransley. The survey was carried out with the full support and understanding of Kettering Borough Council.

Questionnaires were delivered to all 127 households in the Parish by Royal Mail. Results showed that there is a requirement for 7 new homes, in order to enable local people to be suitably housed within their community. The property types required are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Type</th>
<th>Affordable Rent</th>
<th>Shared Ownership</th>
<th>Open Market Homes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 or 2 bed home</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bed home</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bed bungalow</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 bed bungalow</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bed house</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 bed house</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 bed house</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Housing need arising from the survey

These new homes could be developed on an infill site, or alternatively on a rural exception site (should any be brought forward), with the properties earmarked for people with a Local Connection to the Parish. Alternatively, they could be provided as part of a large scale development.

The Neighbourhood Plan Group, in partnership with Kettering Borough Council, will use the findings of this survey to ensure that any affordable homes provided on developments that are brought forward by the market, meet a local need.
The term affordable housing applies to housing for sale or rent, for those whose needs are not met by the market (including housing that provides a subsidised route to home ownership and/or is for essential local workers); and which complies with one or more of the following statements, as defined within the National Planning Policy Framework (Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, 2019).

a) Affordable housing for rent: meets all of the following conditions: (a) the rent is set in accordance with the Government’s rent policy for Social Rent or Affordable Rent, or is at least 20% below local market rents (including service charges where applicable); (b) the landlord is a registered provider, except where it is included as a Build to Rent scheme (in which case the landlord need not be a registered provider); and (c) it includes provisions to remain at an affordable price for future eligible households, or for the subsidy to be recycled for alternative affordable housing provision. For Build to Rent schemes affordable housing for rent is expected to be the normal form of affordable housing provision (and, in this context, is known as Affordable Private Rent)

b) Starter homes: is as specified in sections 2 and 3 of the Housing and Planning Act 2016 and any secondary legislation made under these sections. The definition of a starter home should reflect the meaning set out in statute and any such secondary legislation at the time of plan-preparation or decision-making. Where secondary legislation has the effect of limiting a household’s eligibility to purchase a starter home to those with a particular maximum level of household income, those restrictions should be used.

c) Discounted market sales housing: is that sold at a discount of at least 20% below market value. Eligibility is determined with regard to local incomes and local house prices. Provisions should be in place to ensure housing remains at a discount or future eligible households.

d) Other affordable routes to home ownership: is housing provided for sale that provides a route to ownership for those who could not achieve home ownership through the market. It includes shared ownership, relevant equity
loans, other low cost homes for sale (at a price equivalent to at least 20% below market value) and rent to buy (which includes a period of intermediate rent). Where public grant funding is provided, there should be provisions for the homes to remain at an affordable price for future eligible households, or for any receipts to be recycled for alternative affordable housing provision, or refunded to Government or the relevant authority specified in the funding agreement.

3. Affordability in Rural Communities

According to the latest annual Halifax Rural Housing Review (Halifax, 2017), homes in rural areas across Great Britain are 20% more expensive on average than in urban areas. In financial terms, this percentage equates to £44,454.

However, regionally, these figures increase or decrease dramatically depending on the locality. For example, figures for the East Midlands show a 38% increase in rural average house prices since 2012. This equates to a rural housing premium of £55,426, compared to urban locations. The local authority districts of Derbyshire Dales and South Northamptonshire have the lowest number of first time buyers in rural areas, with 29% and 30% respectively.

In the West Midlands, the average house price in rural areas is 47%, or £89,272 higher than the region’s urban areas, and in contrast, the East of England has an average rural housing premium of 9% or £27,765.

Data from the review shows that first time buyers have more or less found themselves priced out of rural areas. They account for 41% of all mortgaged products in rural areas, compared with 53% in urban areas. Affordability is the main reason for this.

Areas which are predominantly rural typically have higher house prices than urban locations, thus making them less affordable. In 2016, the average lower quartile house price was 8.3 times the average lower quartile earnings in rural areas, in comparison with 7 times in urban areas.
In 2018, the National Housing Federation stated that ‘the housing crisis in rural England is acute, with the most affordable rural homes costing 8.3 times wages in rural areas’ (National Housing Federation, 2018).

4. Great Cransley Parish Profile

Great Cransley is a small village within the Cransley Parish. It is situated 12 miles north of Northampton, with Kettering to the east and Mawsley to the West. At the time of the 2011 Census, Cransley had a population of 305 inhabitants.

As illustrated in Table 2, home ownership in Cransley Parish is high. The majority of those living in the Parish either own their own home, either outright or with a mortgage. A low number live in accommodation that is either rented from the Council or a Housing Association, with even fewer people living in privately rented housing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owned outright</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owned with a mortgage or loan</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Ownership</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented from the Council</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private landlord or letting agency</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other private rented</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living rent free</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>123</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Cransley Parish property ownership and rental statistics

(Office for National Statistics, 2020)
The property types that were recorded in Cransley Parish at the time of the 2011 Census are detailed within Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwelling Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whole house or bungalow: Detached</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole house or bungalow: Semi-detached</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole house or bungalow: Terraced (or end terraced)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat, maisonette or apartment: Purpose built block</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat, maisonette or apartment: Part of a converted or shared house</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat, maisonette or apartment: In a commercial building</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caravan or other mobile or temporary structure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a shared dwelling</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Dwellings, household spaces and accommodation type
(Office for National Statistics, 2020)

As can be seen at Table 4, the number of male residents compared to the number of females in Cransley Parish is fairly evenly split with 52.8% and 47.2% respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Usual Residents</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>52.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lives in a household</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lives in a communal establishment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Usual resident population (Office for National Statistics, 2020)
It should be noted that the data in Tables 2 - 4 was taken by the Office for National Statistics from the 2011 Census. Given the time that has elapsed since the Census took place, this data may not now be a wholly accurate representation of statistics relating to the Parish.

4.1 House Prices and Rents Data

Buying a home on the open market in rural locations can be expensive and a prospect possibly out of reach for many.

Mortgage lenders base the amount a person can borrow on a multiple of their income, otherwise known as the loan to income ratio. In most circumstances, lenders will cap this at 4.5 times the annual salary. Additionally, they will look for a deposit of around 20%, although some will accept 10%.

Property prices in Great Cransley across all house types have, in the last 5 years, increased by 28.73%. According to Zoopla, there have been 13 property sales in that time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market activity</th>
<th>Last 5 years</th>
<th>Any property type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average price paid</td>
<td>£341,576</td>
<td>Sales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Value change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current average value</td>
<td>£490,826</td>
<td>£109,553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value change</td>
<td>▲ 28.73%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Market activity in the last 5 years (Zoopla, 2019)
Table 6 presents an account of property values, sale prices and number of sales for detached, semi-detached, terraced homes and flats for the period December 2019 – February 2020. It can be seen that despite the fact that no sales have been recorded, values have increased for all types.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Type</th>
<th>Current Average Value</th>
<th>Average Price Paid</th>
<th>Number of Sales</th>
<th>Value Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>£660,081</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>↑ £4,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-detached</td>
<td>£283,870</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>↑ £1,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terraced</td>
<td>£182,791</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>↑ £574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat</td>
<td>£130,788</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>↑ £146</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Actual property values and sales data, December 2019 – February 2020 (Zoopla, 2019)

Taking these values into account, and using the loan to income ratio method used by mortgage lenders, a house buyer would need a minimum deposit (10%) of £18,279, and an annual income of £47,000; or a maximum deposit of £36,558 (20%) and an annual income of £32,496 in order to afford a terraced property valued at £182,791.

As illustrated in Table 7, the private rented sector was not offering any properties for rent at all in Great Cransley at the time of the survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Type</th>
<th>1 bed</th>
<th>2 beds</th>
<th>3 beds</th>
<th>4 beds</th>
<th>5 beds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Houses</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flats</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Private rented property availability (Zoopla, 2019)
5. Survey Methodology and Purpose

The housing needs survey was conducted in order to obtain clear evidence of any local housing need across a range of tenures, for residents in the locality. The information gained from local surveys is invaluable, particularly to local authorities, parish council’s and neighbourhood planning activities. Such information can be acted on locally and taken on board in decision making processes around housing issues.

Whilst the study investigated the affordable and open market housing needs of the Parish, the primary purpose of the study was to identify the need for affordable housing. Given that housing needs surveys are completed every 5 years, the results of this study can be considered valid until February 2025.

In December 2019, an article to publicise and raise local awareness of the survey was placed in the Cransley Chronicle. Household addresses for all residential properties were provided by Kettering Borough Council, and in February 2020 a paper survey questionnaire was delivered to each of these via Royal Mail, with a return date of 24 February 2020. A pre-paid envelope was included with each survey, so that households could return their completed questionnaire direct to MRH. A total of 55 responses were received, giving an overall response rate for the survey of 43%, which is considered a good response for a survey of this size.

The survey questionnaire was divided into 2 parts:

- Part 1 – General Information
- Part 2 – Your Housing Requirements

Part 1 sought to discover general information about household members, their current housing situation and their connection to the Parish. It also explored people’s perceptions of what it is like to live in the locality, and gave an opportunity for them to make general comments. The evidence arising from Parts 1 is provided in Appendix 1.
Part 2 identified the future housing requirements of those household members who considered they have a housing need, either now or within the next 5 years. The analysis of this data is provided in Appendix 2.

The results of this survey have yet to be combined with data held by Kettering Borough Council’s Housing Register. Once this work has been completed, there may be a greater need for affordable housing. A revised report will be issued at the appropriate time.

**Conclusion**

MRH has conducted a detailed study into the current housing needs in Great Cransley. This study has not only investigated the actual affordable housing needs of the Parish, but also for open market and private rented housing. In addition, the survey ascertained resident’s views with regard to living in the Parish and support for new housing for local people to help sustain local communities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>There is an identified need for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 Affordable homes and a preference for 2 open market homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Great Cransley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For those with a local connection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 1a - Analysis of Part 1

Question 1 asked people how long they had lived in the Parish. 53 of the 55 respondents answered this question, with 41 of them having lived in Great Cransley for 10 years or more. Just 2 households have lived in the area for less than 2 years. This could indicate that Great Cransley has a settled and sustainable community, with a low turnover of residents.

Figure 1: Length of residency

Question 2 looked at the composition of households, i.e. couples, lone parent families and so on. 53 of the 55 respondents answered this question.

Couples and two parent families were the most represented groups, with 23 and 15 households respectively. 2 households defined their composition as fitting into the ‘other’ category. Their individual responses showed that these households were of different generations, for example, grandparents, children and grandchildren living in the same household.
Questions 4 and 5 asked about the tenure, size and type of home in which people live. 53 of the 55 respondents answered these questions.

In the owner occupier sector, 46 of the households responding to the survey either own their home outright, or with a mortgage. The number of households living in the affordable housing sector is extremely low, with just 5 households living in accommodation that is rented from the Council. Just 2 households live in the private rented sector.

The majority of households live in houses with 3 or 4 bedrooms. A small number of households reside in single storey accommodation.
Figure 3: Tenure type
Figure 4: Accommodation type and size

Question 6 asked people to indicate the house types they think Great Cransley needs. Respondents were invited to tick as many boxes across the different options as necessary.

The number of people with the opinion that different accommodation types are needed was far greater than the number of people who selected the option to say no further homes are needed, with 36 respondents in support, and 19 against. All 55 respondents answered this question.
What type of housing is needed in Parish?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No further homes needed</th>
<th>Family homes (2-3 beds)</th>
<th>Family homes (4+ beds)</th>
<th>Homes for single people (1-2 beds)</th>
<th>Homes for elderly people</th>
<th>Homes for people with disabilities</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Type of home needed in the Parish

Question 7 asked whether people would support a number of homes being built for local people, and 54 of the 55 respondents answered. There were more households in favour of new homes being built compared to that not in favour; 30 and 11 respectively. 13 respondents did not know whether they would support new development or not.

Questions 8 and 9 explored how many people were known to have left the Parish during the last 5 years, and their reasons for doing so.

53 of the 55 respondents answered this question, and 16 of those knew a total of 41 people who moved away. Moving away for employment was the most significant reason, and moving away due to a lack of facilities was the least significant. 5 people had moved away from the Parish due to a lack of affordable housing.

Question 10 asked people to mark on a map of the Parish; any location they thought could be suitable for the development of new homes. 30 of the 55 respondents marked a location, whilst 25 respondents did not give an opinion. The marked maps have been photocopied from the questionnaires, and can be found at Appendix 3.
Appendix 2 – Analysis of Part 2: Housing Need Assessment

In order to identify the actual housing need that exists in Great Cransley at the current time, respondents were asked to clarify their need in terms of property type and size, together with a preferred tenure type. In assessing the stated need, income levels and likely property prices are taken into account to ensure that any proposed future housing development will indeed meet the needs of those to be housed. Therefore, a ‘likely allocation/purchase’ is suggested to outline what any housing provision could realistically look like.

Under normal circumstances, this information would be presented as a table within the report; however, as Great Cransley is such a small Parish, it would not be possible to provide this level of detail with the risk of an individual’s identity being known to a third party. For this reason, the information has been withheld by MRH from the public domain, and a breakdown of the key information is provided as follows:

Out of the 55 responses received, 10 respondents classed themselves as being in housing need either now, or said they would be at some time during the next 5 years.

Respondents were asked to state whether they were registered with a number of agencies for rehousing. The responses are broken down as follows:

- Keyways (the Choice Based Lettings scheme used by councils and housing associations in the boroughs of Kettering, Corby and Wellingborough) - 1
- Housing Association Register - 0
- Private Lettings Agency – 0
- Did not answer – 0

1 respondent was discounted from the analysis as they did not provide enough information to allow an assessment of their need to take place. Had contact details been provided, these details could have been established.
1 respondent was deemed to be suitably housed at present, as their current accommodation appears to be an adequate size for the number of people in the household.

5 out of the 10 households with a perceived housing need were considered to have a need for affordable housing.

The need of these respondents can be summarised as follows:

Affordable Rent
- 1 x 2 bedroom house

Shared Ownership
- 1 x 2 bedroom bungalow
- 3 x 2 bedroom house

A further 2 respondents were assessed as having a preference for open market housing:
- 1 x 3 bedroom bungalow
- 1 x 4 bedroom house
Appendix 3 – Marked Maps

As part of the survey, households were provided with a map of the Parish, and were asked to mark upon it any locations they thought may be suitable for housing development.

25 surveys were returned with maps duly marked. The locations chosen have been amalgamated and presented on the map below. The individual maps have been retained by MRH, so as to protect the identity of the sender.
Works Cited


Appendix 2

Planning application KET/2020/0278 consultation responses – June 2020 (64 pages)
Dear Mr Bennett

Proposal: Full: 9no. dwellings

Location: Loddington Road (land to north of), Great Cransley

The site is located on the northern edge of Great Cransley. It was included in the LDD site assessments in 2012 at which time the NCC Archaeological Advice Service indicated that further information in the form of an evaluation would be required were an application to come forward. The county Historic Environment Record indicates that the site contains traces of ridge and furrow and is likely therefore to have been under cultivation in the medieval period, but this does not preclude the presence of earlier remains. An undated settlement has been identified from cropmarks to the west of the site and to the east a Roman settlement was partly investigated during works for a new water main.

The NPPF, in paragraphs 189 & 190, stresses the importance of pre application discussions in order to assess the significance of potential heritage assets. In light of the proximity of known significant archaeological remains, evaluation in the form of geophysical survey and targeted trial trenching needs to be undertaken in advance of determination, as recommended by the NPPF paragraph 189.

The evaluation could provide sufficient information to identify if any areas of national significance were present within the development area that would form a constraint on development. Current policy and guidelines indicate that this information should be provided as part of the planning application in order to allow the LPA to make a balanced and informed decision as to the archaeological potential of the area.

I therefore recommend that further information in the form of an archaeological field evaluation is provided by the applicant before the determination of this application. This will enable us to ascertain the existence and the state of preservation of any buried remains, in order to assess the importance of the site and the impact of the development as per the NPPF.

I will be happy to provide a brief for the evaluation.

Yours sincerely
Liz Mordue
Assistant Archaeological Advisor
Planning
The Councillors of Great Cransley Parish Council unanimously agreed that this application should be refused. The Parish Council endorses the arguments detailed below produced by the steering committee working on the Neighbourhood Plan for Great Cransley Parish Council

Planning Application KET/2020/0278 by applicant Mr Marcus Reeder
Loddington Road (Land to north of), Great Cransley, 9 no. dwellings

PLANNING POLICY
The application fails to conform to current planning policy regarding development in the open countryside as the development site lies outside the current settlement boundary for Great Cransley.

- 1995 saved policy 7 Protection of the open countryside. Quote: “Planning permission for development within the open countryside will not be granted except where otherwise provided for in this plan.”
- North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy Policy 11 – The Network of Urban and Rural Areas. Part 2. The rural Areas; paras a) “Development in the rural areas will be limited to that required to support a prosperous rural economy or to meet a locally arising need, which cannot be met more sustainably at a nearby larger settlement;”. Development in Great Cransley cannot be considered sustainable as the village lacks local facilities and services such as shops, schools or public transport.

- and c). “Other than small scale infilling or ‘rural exceptions’ schemes, development above these requirements will be resisted unless agreed through the Part 2 Local Plan or Neighbourhood Plans to meet a particular local need or opportunity;”

Emerging Site Specific Local Plan (SSP2) for Kettering Borough
The applicant indicates that KBC has advised them that the proposed policies for Great Cransley, GRC1 and GRC2 although not adopted will carry weight in the planning decision. Policy GRC2 specifically promotes this site RA/146 for development.

During the public consultation ending Feb 2020 a highly detailed objection was submitted (and is available on the KBC SSP2 consultation website), that challenges the legitimacy and legality of policy GRC2.

The emerging SSP2 therefore should not be given weight or consideration until adopted. The objections to policy GRC2 should be tested during the ‘Examination in public’ by the appointed Government planning inspector. The implications of this planning application for Great Cransley are too significant to justify overriding existing planning policies.
PLANNING APPLICATION

The application and proposal is flawed for the following planning reasons:-

Housing style and density
The overall style and appearance is out of keeping the character of the area.
Although appearance and style are subjective, the development density can be
quantified.

Note SSP2 Policy GRC2 para b) states: “Respect the existing character of the
village, especially that on Lodddington Road,…”

and para f): “Reflect the density of development of adjacent development on
Lodddington Road;”

The proposal for 9 dwellings as shown allows for only approximately 1.15m spacing
(scaled and measured) between houses although chimney breast extensions reduce
this clearance down to less than 1.0m. This will present access problems for the
disabled with wheelchairs, parents with child buggies and just simply moving large
objects such as furniture and waste bins.

The Supporting Visuals are totally misleading. They show a more spacious frontage
and parking area and a greater separation between houses than is shown on the
Proposed Site Plan, and show a level site instead of the elevated site. Also, the 4m
high hedge along Lodddington Road is shown at an estimated 1m height.

Elevation difference between the site and road
The application fails to consider the implications of the elevation difference between
Lodddington Road and the development site. Lodddington Road runs effectively
through a cutting as it passes the development site. The spot heights provided on
the Proposed Site Plan allow the elevation difference to be calculated. Taking 4
location points along Lodddington Road next to the development site compared to the
new shared access road just behind the hedge give elevation differences of 2.32m,
2.28m, 1.84m and 2.08m, so over 2m for most of the site length.

The crossovers for the two vehicle access points as shown in the application from
Lodddington Road will therefore have to ramp up the 2m height increase over an
estimated 5.7m between Lodddington Road and the new shared access road. This
results in a 35% slope gradient for each vehicle access creating access and safety
problems. It is understood that Highways guidance suggests such access roads
should have gradients of no more than 4%.

Road Safety

Each access road 35% gradient will cause most vehicles to ‘bottom out’ at the top
and bottom of the slope and may also prevent access for emergency vehicles,
particularly fire engines and regular service vehicles, particularly waste collection.
The steep slope will also present a safety issue when entering and leaving the
development, especially during winter conditions.

With no separate pedestrian access, pedestrians will also have to use these steep
vehicle access roads. There is no pavement on this (east) side of Lodddington Road
and no roadside verge to enable a pavement to be constructed. These gradients will
create a barrier to movement for people with limited mobility, wheelchair users and
child buggies and presents a road safety concern for pedestrians.

Vehicle access to the development as shown would create a significant traffic safety
issue on Lodddington Road, it being on a blind corner with well documented traffic
speeding at this location. The applicant has claimed there will be 45m visibility splays
but these are not shown on either the Proposed Block Plan or the Proposed Site
Plan, neither are any sight lines shown. In order to make this development safe there would need to be a traffic calming scheme installed and most likely significantly increased visibility splays. Increased visibility splays would further increase the loss of this old growth, species rich hedgerow. Note that SSP2 Policy GRC1 para b) i: insufficient space around each house for waste and recycling bins, the applicant has proposed these be stored in the garages. This effectively rules out using the requires, “Traffic calming along Loddington Road to create a more pedestrian friendly environment”.

**Parking**
The applicant has claimed 34 parking spaces will be provided for the 9 dwellings, that is 3 spaces in front of each house plus 7 houses with garages. Due to garages for car parking so the effective number of parking spaces is likely to be only 27. Additionally, there are no visitor parking spaces provided and no capacity to accommodate service or emergency vehicles. Vehicle turning will also be extremely tight. Excess vehicles will have to park on Loddington Road, exacerbating the existing parking problem, especially when events are held at the village hall.

**Blocked Views**
Note SSP2 Policy GRC1 para d) ii states: “Allow for the retention of views out to the open countryside to be retained”, and Policy GRC2 para b) states: “Be spaced to allow the retention of views out to the open countryside”.
Due to the density and height of the proposed development, views from the opposite side of Loddington Road, especially the public areas of the village hall and play area will be completely blocked. Currently these locations enjoy panoramic and distant views over the open countryside.

**Flood Risk**
Loddington Road at the location of the development site suffers from frequent flooding, a mix of surface runoff and groundwater seeps. The application has failed to address the flooding problem and has failed to demonstrate how removing sections of the roadside hedge will not aggravate the current flooding problem.

**Waste Bin Collection**
If as surmised above, waste collection vehicles will not be able to access the development, waste and recycling bins will have to be taken out to Loddington Road on collection days. There is no roadside verge on this (east) side of Loddington Road so no safe area to leave the bins.

**Old Growth Hedge**
The development site is bordered by an old growth hedgerow along Loddington Road for approximately 97m. The importance of this hedge has been understated in the applicant’s ecology report although the species rich nature of the hedge has been recognised. This section of hedge is an excellent example of a well-maintained species rich old growth hedge, significantly more than 100 years old and possibly several hundred years old. This hedge adds to the unique character and biodiversity of this part of the village opposite the village hall. This hedge will lose its statutory protection if it changes from an agricultural to a residential boundary. Note that SSP2 Policy GRC1 para c) ii states; “Not result in the loss of mature trees or hedgerows which are an important part of the character of this area.”
Additional Issues

- A Housing Needs Survey was conducted for the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group during Feb 2020. The survey report has since been received but has not yet been circulated due to the Coronavirus lockdown although KBC do have a copy. The findings of the survey indicate a need for up to 5 affordable homes (2 bedroom) and up to 2 open market homes (3/4 bedroom) by local people. There is no identified demand by local people for housing as is being proposed by this planning application. The Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group are at the early stages of preparing a neighbourhood plan for Great Cransley. They intend to address the housing development needs of the local community and the most suitable locations for such development in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan.

- No consideration has been given by the applicant to the likely archaeological potential for the site given the historical background to this field including the medieval settlement and early quarrying activities. Note that SSP2 Policy GRC2 para g) states “Be accompanied by an archaeological assessment;”

- No mention or consideration has been made of the extensive ridge and furrow in the agricultural field in which the development site is part. This is one of the best examples of ridge and furrow remaining in the locality and will date back to medieval times or earlier. Viewed from Northfield Road, the ridge and furrow runs almost the full east to west of the northern end of the field and extends up to the Loddington Road boundary. Development of the site will destroy a significant part of this ridge and furrow.

- There is no construction or traffic management plan provided for the development. Given the difficult access to this site on the blind corner, construction activities and traffic movements should have been considered as the potential for disruption within the village is considerable. Providing construction access and site parking from Bridle Way or Northfield Road would result in additional damage to the historic Ridge and furrow and other possible historic / archaeological assets.

- The applicant has not stated the type of heating systems to be installed, this being of relevance to planning especially given the limited space around the proposed houses. If oil or gas heating is to be proposed then each house will require a space to be designated for an oil or calor gas storage tank. Note that mains gas is not available at Great Cransley. Additionally, any fuel tank will need to be sited in accordance with the applicable safety regulation and be located within the standard ‘hose reach’ of fuel delivery tankers. Renewable systems such as heat pumps also require space allocation for the additional equipment on the outside as well as the inside of the house.

- The applicant has failed to provide his address details as is required.

- The application fails to identify the land owners (believed to be 4 people) as is required and whether they have all been notified and agree with the application.

- The applicant has claimed the site area is 4,536m2 whereas measuring as per the SSP2 site map and using the NCC interactive mapping software indicates an area of 4,211m2

- The Design and Access Statement, document 11 on the KBC website, sections ‘Scale’ and ‘Landscaping’ have text missing and text corrupted so meaningful review of these sections are not possible. This document should be re-submitted for comment.
Dear Sean

I refer to the above application and request the following conditions:

XCD2 Working hours for construction
XCD4 Construction Method Statement
XCL1 Contaminated Land Standard Condition
IEH1 Radon
IEH5 Acoustic Separation

Kind regards

Jeanette

Jeanette Reith
Environmental Protection Officer

Municipal Offices
Bowling Green Road
Kettering
NN15 7QX
Tel: 01536 851248 (direct line)
Email jeanettereith@kettering.gov.uk

Please find attached document.
## Recommendations:
Presently the LHA cannot accept the application and require further information to support the application.

### Observations:

1. From the Proposed Site Plan ((00)04):
   a. The LHA seek clarification as to whether both access roads are proposed to be 4.8m-wide shared private drives as they do not meet the dimensional requirements of adoptable layouts i.e. a standard 5.5m carriageway with 2m footways either side, or an adoptable shared surface consisting of a 4.8m carriageway with x2 1.5m service strips.
   
   b. A 'shared private drive' is a private vehicular (or shared vehicular/pedestrian) access to 2-5 number dwellings which joins a road laid out and constructed to adopted highway standards (or is existing public highway) via a vehicle access crossing, not a kerbed radii junction.
   
   c. Shared private drives require a multiple-dwelling bin and recyclable bin presentation point for collection. It must be within the curtilage of the development in a location that does not obstruct the highway (including footway and verge), visibility splays, the effective width of the private drive or pedestrian access. This is not detailed.
   
   d. Shared private drives require turning for vehicles to be provided and maintained in perpetuity for vehicles, including the largest likely to use the site.
   
   e. All driveways must meet the highway boundary at right angles. The two accesses onto Loddington road must do so for a minimum of 5.5m (or the length of the largest vehicle likely to use the access) beyond the highway boundary.
   
   f. All private vehicular accesses should have a hard bound surface for a minimum of the initial 5.0m from the highway boundary.
   
   g. The gradient of a vehicular access should not exceed 1 in 15 for a minimum of the first 5.0m from the highway boundary.
   
   h. Legally, surface water from a private drive or private land must not discharge onto the highway. Measures to prevent such discharge are required where vehicular accesses fall towards the highway. The outfall for such drainage should fall within the curtilage of the private property and may not be connected to existing highway/surface water drainage system within the highway. Such facilities should be in place and operational before the vehicular access is brought into use.
   
   i. Utility covers and carriageway gullies must not be located within vehicle crossovers.
   
   j. Vehicle visibility splays are not detailed at either of the accesses onto Loddington Road. Vehicular visibility splays of 2.0m from the carriageway edge along the centre of the vehicular access by a distance of 43m measured from the centre of the vehicular access along the carriageway edge. Splays shall thereafter be permanently retained and kept free of all obstacles to visibility over 0.9m in height above carriageway level.
   
   k. Pedestrian visibility splays of at least 2.0m x 2.0m shall be provided on each side of the vehicular access. These measurements are taken from and along the highway boundary. The splays shall thereafter be permanently retained and kept free of all obstacles to visibility over 0.6m in height above access/footway level. The land should be contained entirely within land in the control of the developer.
   
   l. Visitor parking is not detailed.
   
   m. Trees:
      i. No private trees are permitted within 2.5m of the public highway.
      ii. Highway trees require a minimum verge width of 2m (wider dependant on species).
iii. No trees are permitted within visibility splays (unless species with narrow trunk when fully mature, and not in a line as to obscure visibility).

2. From House Type 1 Floor Plans ((00)101);
   a. House type 1 is a 5-bedroom dwelling. It requires 3 residential car parking spaces.
   b. Visitor parking is required at 1 space/dwelling.
   c. Cycle parking is required at 1 space per bedroom and should be covered, secure, overlooked and easy to use. No lifting of cycles should be required.
   d. A single garage can be counted as a single parking space as long as additional ancillary external storage is provided, such as a shed (This would only apply to the third space on 4 bed units and above). Also, an additional 0.25 on-street provision will be required.
   e. Garage internal dimensions, clear of piers and openings, are 6m deep by 3.3m wide for singles.
   f. The positioning of the two car parking bays in-front of the garage would make it difficult for a vehicle to access/egress the garage, if either are occupied. The LPA may wish to take a view on this.
   g. Car parking spaces should be a minimum of 2.5m wide, widened to 3.3m where a solid side boundary exists, such as hedgerows or boundary fences, or they are also the sole means of pedestrian access to the dwelling.

3. From House Type 2 Floor Plans ((00)102);
   a. House type 2 is a 4-bedroom dwelling. It requires 3 residential car parking spaces.
   b. Points 2b – g from above apply.

4. From House Type 3 Floor Plans ((00)103);
   a. House type 3 is a 3-bedroom dwelling. It requires 2 residential car parking spaces. However, the Application Form states all 9 dwellings are 4+ bedroom dwellings.
   b. Points 2b, c & g from above apply.

5. The application is requested to be conditioned with a CTMP if it progresses.
The application site is not affected by a Public Right of Way.

Planning Permission does not give or imply permission for adoption of new highway or to implement any works within the highway and / or a Public Right of Way.

Shivang Patel MEng (Hons) GMICE
Graduate Engineer, Kettering Borough
For Assistant Director of Environment, Planning, and Transport
One Angel Square, Angel Street
Northampton, NN1 1ED
Web www.kierwsp.co.uk
Email highwaysdcKettering@kierwsp.co.uk
Hi Sean,

Please see email below. It’s a response from Lead Local Flood Authority regarding KET/2020/0278.

Regards,

From: Surface Water Drainage Assessment Team
Sent: 04 May 2020 11:02
To: [redacted]
Subject: RE: Kettering BC: Full Consultation

Dear Sean
Thank you for consulting us on the above application. Please note that in its role as a statutory consultee to the planning application process, Northamptonshire County Council (as the Lead Local Flood Authority) only has a legal responsibility to provide advice on surface water drainage matters for major development as defined by Section 62A(2) of the 1990 Town and County Planning Act. This application is not deemed to be a major application i.e. 10 dwellings or more, additional internal floor space of 1000sqm or more or a site of 1ha. Therefore, please refer to our Standing Advice which can be found within our Local Planning Authority Consultation Guidance, hosted on the Planners section of our online Flood Toolkit https://www.floodtoolkit.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/LPA-Consultation-Guidance_v2_March2016.pdf for further advice and guidance.

Kind regards

Malcolm Ball
Drainage Engineer

Surface Water Drainage Assessment Team

Phone: 01604 367805
Email: swdrainage@northamptonshire.gov.uk
Web: www.floodtoolkit.com
From: [redacted]
Sent: 01 May 2020 13:46
To: Surface Water Drainage Assessment Team <swdrainage@northamptonshire.gov.uk>
Subject: Kettering BC: Full Consultation

Please find attached document.

The contents of this email, including any attachments, may contain information which is confidential or privileged, and which is solely for the recipient named above. If you are not the intended recipient, please send the email back to us, and immediately and permanently delete it. Any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of this email and any attachments is strictly prohibited.

This email and any replies to it may be subject to disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, the Environmental Information Regulations 2004 or Data Protection legislation, and its confidentiality cannot be guaranteed.

Kettering Borough Council has taken reasonable steps to ensure no viruses are present in this email. The Council cannot accept liability for any loss or damage arising from the use of this email or any attachments.

This email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or organisation to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error, please notify customerservices@northamptonshire.gov.uk

The information contained in this email and in your reply may be subject to disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 or other legislation and its confidentiality cannot be guaranteed.

This email has been checked for the presence of computer viruses.
Hi

Please see comments.

Thanks,

Technical Support Officer
Development Services
Kettering Borough Council
Municipal Offices
Bowling Green Road
NN15 7QX
01536 534316
www.kettering.gov.uk

From: Heather Webb
Sent: 21 May 2020 10:58
To: Planning
Subject: KET/2020/0278 Loddington Road Great Cransley

Dear Sean:

I’m writing in response to your consultation on the above application for nine dwellings on land at Loddington Road Great Cransley. Having read the ecological survey report I’m satisfied that biodiversity impacts should be minimal. Once the gardens of the new dwellings mature they should offer better opportunities for pollinators and nesting birds than occur on site at present. To protect and enhance biodiversity on site I would suggest a few measures:

- The existing hedgerows will need to be protected during construction; the specifications for fencing etc should be included in the site Construction Management Plan.
- Close board fences between the gardens should have small ‘hedgehog holes’ to maintain habitat connectivity for hedgehogs.
- A species rich hedgerow could be planted along the northeast boundary (i.e. at the rear of the properties). I note that a post and rail fence is currently proposed; a hedgerow would provide better screening but could be planted with the fence to improve screening.
- There are no suitable trees on site so a suite of integral nest boxes would provide additional nesting opportunities without requiring ongoing maintenance. There are swifts in the area, and the species is declining in part from the loss of nesting sites. One brick/box per dwelling (e.g. ‘Cambridge’ type available from Vivarapro, or the ‘S’ type available from Swift Conservation, both of which are appropriate for rendered walls) could be mounted under the eaves on the north or west side of the dwellings.

Thanks very much; please don’t hesitate to get in touch with any questions.

Regards,
Heather
Heather Webb MSc MCIEEM
Principal Project Officer
Planning Services
Northamptonshire County Council
One Angel Square
4 Angel Street
Northampton
NN1 1ED

Tel: 01604 361210

-------------------------------------------------

This email and any files transmitted with it are intended solely for the use of the individual or organisation to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error, please notify customerservices@northamptonshire.gov.uk

The information contained in this email and in your reply may be subject to disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 or other legislation and its confidentiality cannot be guaranteed.

This email has been checked for the presence of computer viruses.

-------------------------------------------------
Application ref:  KET/2020/0278
Our ref:  316087

Natural England has no comments to make on this application.

Natural England has not assessed this application for impacts on protected species. Natural England has published Standing Advice which you can use to assess impacts on protected species or you may wish to consult your own ecology services for advice.

Natural England and the Forestry Commission have also published standing advice on ancient woodland and veteran trees which you can use to assess any impacts on ancient woodland.

The lack of comment from Natural England does not imply that there are no impacts on the natural environment, but only that the application is not likely to result in significant impacts on statutory designated nature conservation sites or landscapes. It is for the local planning authority to determine whether or not this application is consistent with national and local policies on the natural environment. Other bodies and individuals may be able to provide information and advice on the environmental value of this site and the impacts of the proposal to assist the decision making process. We advise LPAs to obtain specialist ecological or other environmental advice when determining the environmental impacts of development.

We recommend referring to our SSSI Impact Risk Zones (available on Magic and as a downloadable dataset) prior to consultation with Natural England. Further guidance on when to consult Natural England on planning and development proposals is available on gov.uk at https://www.gov.uk/guidance/local-planning-authorities-get-environmental-advice

Yours faithfully

Dawn Kinrade
Natural England
Operations Delivery
Consultations Team
Hornbeam House
Crewe Business Park
Electra Way
Crewe
Cheshire, CW1 6GJ

Tel: 0208 0268349
Email: consultations@naturalengland.org.uk

www.gov.uk/natural-england
During the current coronavirus situation, Natural England staff are working remotely to provide our services and support our customers and stakeholders. All offices and our Mail Hub are closed, so please send any documents by email or contact us by phone or email to let us know how we can help you. See the latest news on the coronavirus at http://www.gov.uk/coronavirus and Natural England’s regularly updated operational update at https://www.gov.uk/government/news/operational-update-covid-19. Stay at home, protect the NHS, save lives

From: [Redacted]
Sent: 01 May 2020 13:46
To: SM-NE-Consultations (NE) <consultations@naturalengland.org.uk>
Subject: Kettering BC: Full Consultation

Please find attached document.

The contents of this email, including any attachments, may contain information which is confidential or privileged, and which is solely for the recipient named above. If you are not the intended recipient, please send the email back to us, and immediately and permanently delete it. Any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of this email and any attachments is strictly prohibited. This email and any replies to it may be subject to disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, the Environmental Information Regulations 2004 or Data Protection legislation, and its confidentiality cannot be guaranteed. Kettering Borough Council has taken reasonable steps to ensure no viruses are present in this email. The Council cannot accept liability for any loss or damage arising from the use of this email or any attachments. This message has been sent using TLS 1.2 This email and any attachments is intended for the named recipient only. If you have received it in error you have no authority to use, disclose, store or copy any of its contents and you should destroy it and inform the sender. Whilst this email and associated attachments will have been checked for known viruses whilst within the Natural England systems, we can accept no responsibility once it has left our systems. Communications on Natural England systems may be monitored and/or recorded to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes.
Objection letter for Planning Application KET/2020/0278

Head of Development Services
Kettering Borough Council
Municipal Offices
Bowling Green Road
Kettering
NN15 7QX

Great Cransley
Northants
NN14 1PY

16 May 2020

Dear Sir

Planning Application KET/2020/0278
Loddington Road (Land to north of), Great Cransley
9 no. dwellings

I have read the applicant’s planning application and write to object to the above planning application for the site identified as RA/146 for the following reasons.

Planning Policy
The application fails to conform to current planning policy regarding development in the open countryside as the development site lies outside the current settlement boundary for Great Cransley.

- 1995 saved policy 7 Protection of the open countryside. Quote: “Planning permission for development within the open countryside will not be granted except where otherwise provided for in this plan.”

- North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy Policy 11 – The Network of Urban and Rural Areas. Part 2. The rural Areas; paras a) “Development in the rural areas will be limited to that required to support a prosperous rural economy or to meet a locally arising need, which cannot be met more sustainably at a nearby larger settlement;”. Development in Great Cransley cannot be considered sustainable as the village lacks local facilities and services such as shops, schools or public transport.

- and c). “Other than small scale infilling or ‘rural exceptions’ schemes, development above these requirements will be resisted unless agreed through the Part 2 Local Plan or Neighbourhood Plans to meet a particular local need or opportunity;”

Emerging Site Specific Local Plan (SSP2) for Kettering Borough
The applicant indicates that KBC has advised them that the proposed policies for Great Cransley, GRC1 and GRC2 although not adopted will carry weight in the planning decision. Policy GRC2 specifically promotes this site RA/146 for development.
During the public consultation ending Feb 2020 a highly detailed objection was submitted (and is available on the KBC SSP2 consultation website), that challenges the legitimacy and legality of policy GRC2.

The emerging SSP2 therefore should not be given weight or consideration until adopted. The objections to policy GRC2 should be tested during the ‘Examination in public’ by the appointed Government planning inspector. The implications of this planning application for Great Cransley are too significant to justify overriding existing planning policies.

**Planning Application**

The application and proposal is flawed for the following planning reasons.

**Housing style and density**

The overall style and appearance is out of keeping the character of the area. Although appearance and style are subjective, the development density can be quantified.

Note SSP2 Policy GRC2 para b) states: “Respect the existing character of the village, especially that on Loddington Road,…”

and para f): “Reflect the density of development of adjacent development on Loddington Road;”

The proposal for 9 dwellings as shown allows for only approximately 1.15m spacing (scaled and measured) between houses although chimney breast extensions reduce this clearance down to less than 1.0m. This will present access problems for the disabled with wheelchairs, parents with child buggies and just simply moving large objects such as furniture and waste bins.

The Supporting Visuals are totally misleading. They show a more spacious frontage and parking area and a greater separation between houses than is shown on the Proposed Site Plan, and show a level site instead of the elevated site. Also, the 4m high hedge along Loddington Road is shown at an estimated 1m height.

**Elevation difference between the site and road**

The application fails to consider the implications of the elevation difference between Loddington Road and the development site. Loddington Road runs effectively through a cutting as it passes the development site. The spot heights provided on the Proposed Site Plan allow the elevation difference to be calculated. Taking 4 location points along Loddington Road next to the development site compared to the new shared access road just behind the hedge give elevation differences of 2.32m, 2.28m, 1.84m and 2.08m, so over 2m for most of the site length.

The crossovers for the two vehicle access points as shown in the application from Loddington Road will therefore have to ramp up the 2m height increase over an estimated 5.7m between Lodgington Road and the new shared access road. This results in a 35% slope gradient for each vehicle access creating access and safety...
problems. It is understood that Highways guidance suggests such access roads should have gradients of no more than 4%.

Road Safety
Each access road 35% gradient will cause most vehicles to ‘bottom out’ at the top and bottom of the slope and may also prevent access for emergency vehicles, particularly fire engines and regular service vehicles, particularly waste collection. The steep slope will also present a safety issue when entering and leaving the development, especially during winter conditions.

With no separate pedestrian access, pedestrians will also have to use these steep vehicle access roads. There is no pavement on this (east) side of Loddington Road and no roadside verge to enable a pavement to be constructed. These gradients will create a barrier to movement for people with limited mobility, wheelchair users and child buggies and presents a road safety concern for pedestrians.

Vehicle access to the development as shown would create a significant traffic safety issue on Loddington Road, it being on a blind corner with well documented traffic speeding at this location. The applicant has claimed there will be 45m visibility splays but these are not shown on either the Proposed Block Plan or the Proposed Site Plan, neither are any sight lines shown. In order to make this development safe there would need to be a traffic calming scheme installed and most likely significantly increased visibility splays. Increased visibility splays would further increase the loss of this old growth, species rich hedgerow. Note that SSP2 Policy GRC1 para b) i: requires, “Traffic calming along Loddington Road to create a more pedestrian friendly environment”.

Parking
The applicant has claimed 34 parking spaces will be provided for the 9 dwellings, that is 3 spaces in front of each house plus 7 houses with garages. Due to insufficient space around each house for waste and recycling bins, the applicant has proposed these be stored in the garages. This effectively rules out using the garages for car parking so the effective number of parking spaces is likely to be only 27. Additionally, there are no visitor parking spaces provided and no capacity to accommodate service or emergency vehicles. Vehicle turning will also be extremely tight. Excess vehicles will have to park on Loddington Road, exacerbating the existing parking problem, especially when events are held at the village hall.

Blocked Views
Note SSP2 Policy GRC1 para d) ii states:” Allow for the retention of views out to the open countryside to be retained” and;

Policy GRC2 para b) states: “Be spaced to allow the retention of views out to the open countryside”.

Due to the density and height of the proposed development, views from the opposite side of Loddington Road, especially the public areas of the village hall and play area will be completely blocked. Currently these locations enjoy panoramic and distant views over the open countryside.
Flood Risk
Loddington Road at the location of the development site suffers from frequent flooding, a mix of surface runoff and groundwater seeps. The application has failed to address the flooding problem and has failed to demonstrate how removing sections of the roadside hedge will not aggravate the current flooding problem.

Waste Bin Collection
If as surmised above, waste collection vehicles will not be able to access the development, waste and recycling bins will have to be taken out to Loddington Road on collection days. There is no roadside verge on this (east) side of Loddington Road so no safe area to leave the bins.

Old Growth Hedge
The development site is bordered by an old growth hedgerow along Loddington Road for approximately 97m. The importance of this hedge has been understated in the applicant’s ecology report although the species rich nature of the hedge has been recognised. This section of hedge is an excellent example of a well-maintained species rich old growth hedge, significantly more than 100 years old and possibly several hundred years old. This hedge adds to the unique character and biodiversity of this part of the village opposite the village hall. This hedge will lose its statutory protection if it changes from an agricultural to a residential boundary. Note that SSP2 Policy GRC1 para c) ii states; “Not result in the loss of mature trees or hedgerows which are an important part of the character of this area.”

Additional Issues

- A Housing Needs Survey was conducted for the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group during Feb 2020. The survey report has since been received but has not yet been circulated due to the Coronavirus lockdown although KBC do have a copy. The findings of the survey indicate a need for up to 5 affordable homes (2 bedroom) and up to 2 open market homes (3/4 bedroom) by local people. There is no identified demand by local people for housing as is being proposed by this planning application. The Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group are at the early stages of preparing a neighbourhood plan for Great Cranseley. They intend to address the housing development needs of the local community and the most suitable locations for such development in the emerging Neighbourhood Plan.

- No consideration has been given by the applicant to the likely archaeological potential for the site given the historical background to this field including the medieval settlement and early quarrying activities. Note that SSP2 Policy GRC2 para g) states “Be accompanied by an archaeological assessment;”

- No mention or consideration has been made of the extensive ridge and furrow in the agricultural field in which the development site is part. This is one of the best examples of ridge and furrow remaining in the locality and will date back to medieval times or earlier. Viewed from Northfield Road, the ridge and furrow runs almost the full east to west of the northern end of the field and
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extends up to the Loddington Road boundary. Development of the site will destroy a significant part of this ridge and furrow.

- There is no construction or traffic management plan provided for the development. Given the difficult access to this site on the blind corner, construction activities and traffic movements should have been considered as the potential for disruption within the village is considerable. Providing construction access and site parking from Bridle Way or Northfield Road would result in additional damage to the historic Ridge and furrow and other possible historic / archaeological assets.

- The applicant has not stated the type of heating systems to be installed, this being of relevance to planning especially given the limited space around the proposed houses. If oil or gas heating is to be proposed then each house will require a space to be designated for an oil or calor gas storage tank. Note that mains gas is not available at Great Cransley. Additionally, any fuel tank will need to be sited in accordance with the applicable safety regulation and be located within the standard ‘hose reach’ of fuel delivery tankers. Renewable systems such as heat pumps also require space allocation for the additional equipment on the outside as well as the inside of the house.

- The applicant has failed to provide his address details as is required.

- The application fails to identify the land owners (believed to be 4 people) as is required and whether they have all been notified and agree with the application.

- The applicant has claimed the site area is 4,536m² whereas measuring as per the SSP2 site map and using the NCC interactive mapping software indicates an area of 4,211m².

- The Design and Access Statement, document 11 on the KBC website, sections ‘Scale’ and ‘Landscaping’ have text missing and text corrupted so meaningful review of these sections are not possible. This document should be re-submitted for comment.

I trust you will consider the above points when making your decision for this planning application.

Yours sincerely
From: jadu-www@rsvm237.servers.jadu.net On Behalf Of forms@kettering.gov.uk
Sent: 21 May 2020 17:08
To: Planning
Subject: Form completion: Commenting On A Planning Application

FORM DETAILS

Web Reference No: 183639
Form Title: Comment on a planning application
Date Started: 21/05/2020
Time Started: 17:01:31
Date Completed: 21/05/2020
Time Completed: 17:08:08
Status: Pending

USER DETAILS

Site user email:

USER INPUTS
Confirm you understand how Kettering Borough Council processes your information and you are happy to proceed:

I confirm

Title:

Your address details: 1 Church Lane
Great Cransley

Postcode: NN14 1PX

email:

Our application reference: KET/2020/0278

Application address: Land to the North of Loddington Road, Great Cransley

Do you wish to support, object, raise no objection to, comment on the proposed application?:

I/We wish to object to the proposed application

Your Ref: KET/2020/0278 Sean Bennett

Sean Bennett Esq
Planning Case Officer
Kettering Borough Council
Municipal Offices
Bowling Green Road
Kettering
NN15 7QX

Ragsdale
1 Church Lane
Great Cransley
Kettering NN14 1PX

21st May 2020

Dear Mr Bennett,

RE: Loddington Road, (Land to the North of) Great Cransley 9 no Dwellings
KET/2020/0278
I write to object to this proposal. The application has been submitted without a Heritage Assessment and there is no clear indication of the impact of the proposed development on heritage assets whether below ground or part of the built historic environment. There are listed buildings within visual range of the proposed development and earthworks within the site area. The latter indicate the possible presence of below ground, probably medieval, archaeology which predates the 1st edition OS on which the developer has relied. There is no Heritage Assessment and this is contrary to para 189 NPPF which requires that:

"Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation."

In the absence of such an assessment the application should be refused.

Yours sincerely
Hi

Please see comments

Thanks

Technical Support Officer
Development Services
Kettering Borough Council
Municipal Offices
Bowling Green Road
Nn15 7QX

01536 534316

www.kettering.gov.uk

---

From: jadu-www@rsvm237.servers.jadu.net On Behalf Of forms@kettering.gov.uk
Sent: 22 May 2020 18:58
To: Planning
Subject: Form completion: Commenting On A Planning Application

FORM DETAILS

Web Reference No: 183759
Form Title: Comment on a planning application
Date Started: 22/05/2020
Time Started: 18:36:31
Date Completed: 22/05/2020
Time Completed: 18:58:07
Status: Pending

USER DETAILS

Site user email:

USER INPUTS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confirm you understand how Kettering Borough Council processes your information and you are happy to proceed:</td>
<td>I confirm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your address details: 2 Church Lane</td>
<td>Great Cransley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcode: NN14 1PX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>email:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our application reference: KET/2020/0278</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application address: Loddington Road</td>
<td>Great Cransley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you wish to support, object, raise no objection to, comment on the proposed application?:</td>
<td>I/We wish to object to the proposed application</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| I/We wish to make comments on the proposed application:                | I object to this proposal for the following reasons:-
The style of development is not in keeping with the surrounding house styles.
There are 34 parking spaces for 9 properties plus garages on most of the designs, the access in and out of the area as this location is on a bend so vision is restricted. Giving more concern for road safety. This would also be a concern for refuse collection and or deliveries. Another concern would be people parking along the road giving additional concern to entry and exit, along with drivers not having a good visual if driving through the village.
On doing the recent housing needs survey the types of properties proposed are not what the parish have said they would like.
I believe that the land was agreed by the parish councillors that they would be in favour of additional housing, but they preference was for social housing and or affordable housing.
The style of properties are aimed at larger families, but lack the detail on access for buggies etc.
The author of the design is an ex resident of the village so they should already have had so idea of the needs which is disappointing.
It is also disappointing that they haven’t considered approaching the neighbourhood plan committee as this committee.
Dear sirs

I refer to above Planning application at Loddington Road (Land at North of) Great Cransley, Kettering. Northants.

We have lived at our address, 33 Loddington Road, Cransley, Kettering. Northants. NN14 1PY for almost 60 years, initially as Council tenants then private owners.

My wife and I are coming into our 82nd and 80th year respectively. Never having any objections to developments in the past such as when the childrens play area was built next to us, when Mawsley village was developed, when houses were built to the side or the land purchased as paddock directly adjoining the rear of our garden. But we now have concerns that the enjoyment of our family home may be affected by the future development application KET/2020/0278 which will be directly opposite. We are set back in an elevated position from the road, always having had views of open countryside. We would be at eye-level to proposed site for 9 dwellings. We have concerns regarding extra traffic, safety of the entrance/exit because of the bend in the road. We and neighbours currently have gravel verge for off-road car parking - will this be affected? Over the years the trees to the front of our home have grown to such a height providing screening and a good amount of privacy which in fact could provide a certain amount of sheilding from the proposed development. These trees have given us both an amount of security over the last 5 years particularly as we were victims of an extremely disturbing aggravated burglary. Is there an opportunity to have these trees protected so as to not have them removed in the near future as it is so important to us feeling safe and secure with privacy?
To conclude, from our observations we are concerned about this having a significant negative impact.

Thank you for considering our observations and comments. Please contact us via email - or by post:-

33 Loddington Road
Cransley
Kettering
NN14 1PY

Yours faithfully
Hi

Please see comments.

Thanks,

Technical Support Officer
Development Services
Kettering Borough Council
Municipal Offices
Bowling Green Road
NN15 7QX

01536 534316

www.kettering.gov.uk

From: jadu-www@rsvm237.servers.jadu.net On Behalf Of forms@kettering.gov.uk
Sent: 23 May 2020 10:07
To: Planning
Subject: Form completion: Commenting On A Planning Application

FORM DETAILS

Web Reference No: 183783
Form Title: Comment on a planning application
Date Started: 23/05/2020
Time Started: 09:50:30
Date Completed: 23/05/2020
Time Completed: 10:07:12
Status: Pending

USER DETAILS

Site user email:

USER INPUTS
Confirm you understand how Kettering Borough Council processes your information and you are happy to proceed: I confirm

Title:

Your address details: 49 Loddington Rd
Cransley
Northants

Postcode: NN14 1PY

email:

Our application reference: 129707

Application address: Loddington rd (land north of) Cransley

Do you wish to support, object, raise no objection to, comment on the proposed application?: I/We wish to object to the proposed application

Objection to planning.

Although I don’t object to houses being built on the suggested plots I strongly believe that traffic calming measures need to be undertaken not only for when the houses are built but also for the construction traffic. Cars and lorries constantly speed 60mph plus up and down that stretch of the road with vehicles turning out from behind the hedge it is simply an accident waiting to happen . Recently a traffic survey was carried out but the data box was put in the wrong place and therefore the data is useless. Therefore if no traffic calming measures can be enforced on the developer, on health and safety grounds for which Kettering Borough Council has a huge responsibility for, I will have to object to the planning application
From: jadu-www@rsvm237.servers.jadu.net On Behalf Of forms@kettering.gov.uk
Sent: 25 May 2020 16:01
To: Planning
Subject: Form completion: Commenting On A Planning Application

FORM DETAILS

Web Reference No: 183917
Form Title: Comment on a planning application
Date Started: 25/05/2020
Time Started: 15:52:19
Date Completed: 25/05/2020
Time Completed: 16:01:15
Status: Pending

USER DETAILS

Site user email:

USER INPUTS
Confirm you understand how Kettering Borough Council processes your information and you are happy to proceed:

I confirm

Title:

Your address details:

55 Loddington Road
Cransley
Kettering
Northants

Postcode:

NN14 1PY

email:

Our application reference:

KET/2020/0278

Application address:

Loddington Road (Land to north of), Great Cransley

Do you wish to support, object, raise no objection to, comment on the proposed application?:

I/We wish to object to the proposed application

I would like to register my opposition to the proposed development for the following reasons:

1. The location of the site makes safe access very difficult as it is on the inside of a bend in the road which severely limits visibility.

2. The design of the houses is not at all in keeping with the surrounding area.

3. No consideration has been taken of the need for affordable housing.

4. The number of houses proposed means that any buildings will be densely packed together, giving no thought to access for maintenance or emergency vehicles to the rear of the properties. There is no gas main in Cransley so a significant number of householders may choose to have an oil or gas tank installed which would require regular arrivals of HGVs to the site which would further exacerbate point 1. regarding access.

5. Pedestrian access would have to be from the pavement on the opposite (South West) side of Loddington Rd. This would be safe for people
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>entering the development area but people exiting would have limited visibility and be at risk from traffic. The steepness of the entrance driveways is such that a child would be likely to find it irresistible to speed down it and out onto the road on a cycle/skateboard or similar and this will lead to a very high accident risk.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GCNP Objection letter for Planning Application KET/2020/0278

Head of Development Services                      39 Loddington Road
Kettering Borough Council                         Great Cransley
Municipal Offices                                 Northamptonshire
Bowling Green Road                                NN14 1PY
Kettering
NN15 7QX

21 May 2020

Dear Sir

Planning Application KET/2020/0278
Loddington Road (Land to north of), Great Cransley
9 no. dwellings

I write on behalf of the Great Cransley Neighbourhood Plan (GCNP) Steering Group. We believe it is appropriate that the Steering Group should comment on planning application KET/2020/0278 where it stands to conflict with the aims and intentions of the emerging GCNP.

We have read the applicant’s planning application and write to object to the above planning application for the site identified as RA/146 for the following reasons.

Great Cransley Neighbourhood Plan
The GCNP Steering Group was formed during March 2019 and has made good progress over the last year, particularly with regards to community consultation and the gathering of evidence to support the Plan. This includes a Housing Needs Survey (HNS) carried out by Midlands Rural Housing during February 2020.

The HNS report has since been received and KBC Planning Department have been given a copy. The findings of the HNS indicate a need for up to 5 affordable homes (2 bedroom) and a preference for up to 2 open market homes (3/4 bedroom) for local people over the next 5 years. Unfortunately, further distribution of the HNS report has been delayed by the Corona virus emergency such that Parishioners have not yet had an opportunity to consider the report and how it may conflict with planning application KET/2020/0278.

Other community consultation has indicated a general willingness to accommodate small scale development for affordable or social housing but resistance against large scale open market housing development.

Further progress with developing policies and writing the neighbourhood plan for Great Cransley has been delayed since early March due to the Corona virus emergency but is now resuming within the constraints of social distancing requirements.

It is the intention of the Steering Group that the identified housing needs and wishes of the community will be addressed through the GCNP policies and if applicable through a Neighbourhood Development Order. Given the apparent number of local...
resident objections to planning application KET/2020/0278 on site RA/146, the Steering Group will also be considering other site options for housing development.

Planning Policy
The application fails to conform to current planning policy regarding development in the open countryside as the development site lies outside the current settlement boundary for Great Cransley.

- **1995 saved policy 7** Protection of the open countryside. Quote: "Planning permission for development within the open countryside will not be granted except where otherwise provided for in this plan."

- **North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy Policy 11** - The Network of Urban and Rural Areas. Part 2. The rural Areas; paras a) Quote; "Development in the rural areas will be limited to that required to support a prosperous rural economy or to meet a locally arising need, which cannot be met more sustainably at a nearby larger settlement". Development in Great Cransley cannot be considered sustainable as the village lacks local facilities and services such as shops, schools or public transport.

- and c). Quote; "Other than small scale infilling or 'rural exceptions' schemes, development above these requirements will be resisted unless agreed through the Part 2 Local Plan or Neighbourhood Plans to meet a particular local need or opportunity."

Emerging Site Specific Local Plan (SSP2) for Kettering Borough is expected to be submitted shortly for the independent 'Examination in public'. The planning application applicant indicates that KBC has advised them that the proposed SSP2 policies for Great Cransley, GRC1 and GRC2 although not adopted will carry weight in the planning decision. Policy GRC2 specifically promotes this site RA/146 for development.

During the SSP2 public consultation ending Feb 2020 a detailed objection was submitted that challenges the legitimacy and legality of policy GRC2. We therefore believe the emerging SSP2 should not be given weight or consideration until adopted and that current planning policy should continue to be followed. The objections to policy GRC2 should be tested during the 'Examination in Public' by the appointed Government planning inspector.

**KBC Housing Land Supply 2011 to 2031**
Based on the KBC Housing Land Supply Background Paper dated Oct 2019, KBC have achieved the required housing land supply as required by the JCS plus a margin of 25%. Additionally, there is no specific JCS strategic housing target for Great Cransley. As a result, there can be no justification based on housing targets to bring forward development for Great Cransley in advance of the SSP2 or the GCNP.

Granting planning permission for KET/2020/0278 under the pretence of the emerging SSP2 now would undermine the emerging GCNP and would conflict with the aims and spirit of the **Localism Act 2011 (page 12):**
Quote: “Instead of local people being told what to do, the Government thinks that local communities should have genuine opportunities to influence the future of the places where they live. The Act introduces a new right for communities to draw up a neighbourhood plan.

Neighbourhood planning will allow communities, both residents, employees and business, to come together through a local parish council or neighbourhood forum and say where they think new houses, businesses and shops should go – and what they should look like.

These plans can be very simple and concise, or go into considerable detail where people want. Local communities will be able to use neighbourhood planning to grant full or outline planning permission in areas where they most want to see new homes and businesses, making it easier and quicker for development to go ahead."

and the NPPF 2019 (Para 29)
Quote: “Neighbourhood planning gives communities the power to develop a shared vision for their area. Neighbourhood plans can shape, direct and help to deliver sustainable development, by influencing local planning decisions as part of the statutory development plan. Neighbourhood plans should not promote less development than set out in the strategic policies for the area, or undermine those strategic policies”.

The implications of this planning application for Great Cransley and the GCNP are too significant to justify overriding current planning policies.

We trust you will consider the above points when making your decision for this planning application.

Chair of the Great Cransley
Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group
Dear Sir/Madam

Re: Planning Application KET/2020/0278 – LODDINGTON ROAD (land to north of), GREAT CRANSLEY – 9 dwellings.

We wish to object to the above application for the following reasons:

1. The houses are sited with insufficient space between them. We understand this to be just over a metre. With social distancing of a minimum of 2 metres required due to coronavirus, the placement of these homes puts at risk healthy living for residents, their visitors and the Village as a whole. Additionally, wheelchair/pushchair access would be problematic.

2. The Development’s vehicle access would cause Road Safety issues especially on Loddington Road due to the blind corner. It is well known that traffic often exceeds speed limits in this area.

3. To our knowledge there is no demand by local people for the proposed housing type. A housing survey which was carried in Great Cransley recently overwhelmingly requested that, if additional houses were to be built in the Village, they should be of the smaller ‘affordable’ type.
Dear Sir/Madam

re: Planning Application KET/2020/0278 Loddington Rd
Great Cranseley 9 dwellings

We have read the applicants planning application and wish to object strongly to the above planning application for the site RA/1146.

We have lived in the village at Cranseley for 33 years plus and our main concern is the road safety. Traffic speeding through our village is a normal occurrence but we feel this position of the development on a blind corner would be very dangerous. Especially on average each house would have two cars so that is a lot of daily comings and goings. However, we understand there will be insufficient parking spaces so if the residents have to park on the road it really will cause problems for everybody, including the residents living opposite and either side of the proposed development. From past experience and knowledge cars parced outside the three Cranes don’t manage to slow vehicles down and I have witnessed many near misses.

We also feel that the overall style and
appearance is out of character for the area and very importantly we feel the supporting visuals are totally misleading which is so wrong to present false images.

We love our village of Cranley and are very proud of it, if we thought this development was needed and to be an asset we would support it. However, we don't.

Please consider the above when making your decisions for this planning application.
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Dear Sirs,

As a resident of Great Cransley living at The Old Brewery, 17 Church Lane, Cransley, NN14 1PX., I wish to object to the above planning application for various reasons which are set out below:

1. The general style and appearance of the proposed housing is crowded and not in keeping with the style of the existing properties on either Loddington Road or anywhere else in the village. There is not enough space between what are supposed to be detached houses for everyday movement of residents with prams, wheelchairs, lawnmowers etc.

2. The visuals provided do not give a true impression of the site as it does not show the elevated position that the buildings would be on. They show two driveways onto the main road as if they are level with the main road. They show the existing hedge as it is now, without any footpath, which means that vehicles exiting the two driveways would be coming out blind onto this curved bend, totally unsighted and thereby causing a danger to traffic on the main road. The visual does not indicate the steep slope that would in fact be in place.

3. Such a row of 9 families is likely to generate approx. 18 vehicles owned by those residents, apart from the coming and going of service vehicles, deliveries, rubbish collections, postmen, visitors. Without a footpath, it would only be a matter of time before accidents occur. Visitors would be likely to park on this dangerous part of the road. The high elevation of the land and the height of the buildings would block our any view across towards Kettering.

4. Apart from the above we feel that here are serious concerns regarding access for emergency services.

5. The visuals give the impression of a wide, spacious Loddington Road as though there is no housing on the opposite Village Hall side. In reality, at that section of the road main road there is the playground, a parking area and on
regular occasions considerable vehicular traffic caused by Village Hall activity.

6. The recent village plan survey published this application showed that resident preferred any development to be further out of the village past Northfield Road. It also emphasized that residents do not wish to lose any existing countryside views. This proposal flies in the face of the wishes of those who replied to the survey.

Please consider all the above points when deciding on whether to grant this planning application.

Yours sincerely,
18th May 2020

Dear Sir/Madam

Ref Planning Application KET/2020/0278 – Loddington Road Great Cransley 9 new dwellings

I am writing to object to the above planning application ref the site RA/146. The reasons for my objection I will detail as follows.

My first objection to this application is the location of the houses on a very accident prone sharp bend, the bend has always been a blind spot. This bend would need to be taken out which would mean the 100 years plus old Hedgerow would be destroyed.

My next objection is that I have lived on Loddington Road for 38 years, since the last 2 houses were built on land off Loddington Road known as 35a amd 35b, the Loddington Road has had problems with continuous flooding throughout the winter months. This will only exasperate the already existing problem.

Also Cransley, Thorpe Malsor and Loddington are 3 unspoilt villages on the boundaries of Kettering, with over a thousand houses being built in the new village of Mawsley and thousands of houses being built on Northampton Road coming out of Kettering all featuring starter homes in easy walking distance to Great Cransley is Cransley in need of a new development I suggest not.

Finally, we have now also got a new travellers site between Cransley and Loddington which contains numerous caravans without planning permission, which has also caused an increase in traffic through the village.

I trust you will consider my objection to the development when making your decision.

Yours sincerely
22nd May 2020

Dear Sir / Madam

Further to the recent planning application above please note I OBJECT to the Planning, and a list of my reasons for objecting regarding the proposed development adjacent to my property:

1) The number of houses proposed for this development does not give sufficient spacing between the houses for residents on the opposite side of Loddington road to maintain any view to the open countryside as is the case with all previous developments over the years. This will also have a detrimental effect on the view from Cransley play park and village hall grounds which is currently enjoyed by both locals, passers-by, and visitors to functions at the village hall. Residents worked tirelessly in 2010 to raise £43,000 to replace the play equipment for this park to which KBC contributed and maintains for the village to date.

2) The elevation from the road to site level is up to 2 meters deep and will require significant removal of the very thin layer of soil and then blue clay to get to any where near height required to even start development. What are the proposals to deal with the amount of runoff water and rainwater from this density of housing in such a small parcel of land with blue clay only just under the surface?

3) The sewage system on the east side of Loddington road from 32 Loddington is insufficient in size to take any additional waste with regular documented blockages at no 18 and 20. The sewage system on the west side of Loddington also experiences regular blockages at the juncture of 35 Loddington road and the more recent 2 dwellings which were built in the back garden. This area around the village hall also suffers with rainwater runoff onto the road which has never been resolved .This was never a problem before the developers removed the large lime trees which were doing a great job of soaking up natural spring ground water.

4) I am concerned about the elevation of the proposed dwelling next to 32 Loddington road in terms of proximity (1meter) overshadowing and disruption to existing upper bedroom vistas and privacy. The steep access required by vehicles to the shared driveway will cause a high density of traffic to an area already a very busy main road, use of village hall, no 35, 35A and 35B and the school bus stop which picks up school kids during rush hours. How can the 1 in 15-degree minimum slope (?) be achieved for emergency vehicles, delivery vans, where no turning point is provided for them to turn around resulting in vehicles reversing onto the highway.

5) With no pavement on the highway adjacent to the proposed development, there is no practical access for pedestrians, wheelchairs, buggies etc.

6) This will also create a problem for waste collection with the potential for 9 properties a total of 27 wheelie bins to be congregated at any one time in a small area prior to collection.

7) Removal of the existing hedgerow would be a travesty and do little to improve the chances of soaking up rainwater on this side of the road.

Thank you for taking the time to read my comments before considering this application.

Resident at 32 Loddington Road
Dear Sir / Madam,

Planning Application KET/2020/0278 – Loddington Road (Land to north of), Great Cransley – 9 no. dwellings.

We are writing to object to the above planning application following review of the planning application for the site designated RA/146. We cite the following reasons:

Road Safety / Vehicular access to Loddington Road

One of the proposed access points to the development is opposite the driveway of number 35 Loddington Road, a shared driveway serving 2 properties behind 35 Loddington Road and the bus stop used by school bus services. The visibility from the proposed access to the north along Loddington Road is severely limited given the curvature of the hedge line. Additionally, the proposed access does not consider the proximity to the existing access for the Village Hall and adjacent children’s play area. When in use, the insufficient parking at the hall causes cars to be parked along Loddington Road opposite to the proposed access.

Loddington Road has a documented issue with traffic speed, the increase in cars and limited visibility for access will create a traffic safety issue at a pinch point of existing access points for residents and visitors.

Access to the development will be a steep incline due to the elevation differences, vehicular access particularly for municipal and Emergency services could be limited particularly in wintery weather but also create additional access issues due to visibility.

Pedestrian Safety

There is no pavement to the east side of Loddington Road and no verge to allow the creation of safe pedestrian walkways. The steep proposed access will present further problems for those with disabilities, limited mobility, wheelchair users and children’s buggies.

Elevation of the site

Loddington Road becomes a cutting as it passes the development site meaning the land on which the development is proposed is 2 m higher than the road. This is not considered within the planning proposal and will lead to steep gradient access roads and the feeling of dominance from the buildings proposed.
House style and number of dwellings

The proposal details 9 dwellings on the development land which would limit any space between properties to approximately 1 meter. This is not represented in the visuals, nor are the elevation differences illustrated. The overall style and appearance of the proposed properties, coupled with the high density, is out of keeping with the character of the area.

There are insufficient parking spaces attached to the proposed properties, with no provision for visitor parking, which will only increase the road safety risk detailed above.

Views

The elevated site position and the high density of the dwellings, with little space between, would block the view from our property, the communal spaces of the Village Hall and play area and those of our direct neighbours. Our property enjoys views of the countryside from both ground and first floor elevations and is not overlooked, the proposed development with the increased elevation from the road would completely destroy this. This situation is further exacerbated by the limited gap between dwellings given the density, no view would even be offered in this instance.

Local Biodiversity / Agricultural architecture

The development, whilst retaining some of the hedgerow, would cause damage to a natural structure which has been in place for over a century and adds to the biodiversity of both plant and animal species in the area.

Likewise, the development land would cause untold damage to the ridge and furrow features of the agricultural land, a feature dating back to the medieval period.

Thankyou for taking these points into consideration whilst reviewing the application.

Owner & resident 35 Loddington Road, Cransley, Kettering NN14 1PY.
Dear Sir

PLANNING APPLICATION KET/2020/0278
LODDINGTON ROAD (LAND NORTH OF) GREAT CRANSLEY

I have studied the planning application and write to object plan for the site for the following reasons.

PROPOSED HOUSING TYPE

The planned houses would not be in keeping with the aesthetics of this area of the village, some too large and all too close together which would create difficulties with access for many things for example, disability aids (Wheel chairs, buggies), Emergency services which would have to park in the road as turning on to the site outside the proposed houses would be difficult if not impossible.

SAFETY ISSUES

This being an elevated site and as such would have safety issues both entering and exiting the site. Lodddington road at the site, is quite narrow and has a blind bend. There is no pavement on this side of the road in front of the development site, which would mean pedestrians would have to compete with traffic for exit and access. Speeding is a daily on-going problem through this village especially dangerous at this point due to vision being limited because of the bend past this site.

FLOOD RISK

Lodddington road already has flooding problems caused by buildings, large trees and hedge removals, in the recent past, on ground with natural springs. To remove a further hedge could make flooding worse. It would also be an environmental issue, eg: nesting birds, wild life, if the ancient hedging now on site was to be damaged or removed during the development of the site.

I trust you will consider these points when making your decision for this planning application.
Dear Sir

9 Dwellings - Loddington Road (Land to north of), Great Cransley

Planning application KET/2020/0278

I write to object to the above planning application for the following reasons:

The proposed development site is currently designated outside of the Settlement Boundary for Great Cransley. As such there is a presumption that permission should not be granted for any development that is outside the village boundary.

As part of the consultation process in drafting the Site Specific Proposals Local Development Document (LDD) stakeholders and members of the public were consulted on a range of option for development within the village of Great Cransley.

Question 85 of the LDD asked:

Do you think development in Great Cransley should be limited to no growth beyond the village boundary or do you think there should be some small scale growth as set out above?

If you think there should be some small scale growth do you agree the site identified is the most appropriate?

If you think development should be limited to no growth do you think a site should be identified for solely affordable housing if a Housing Needs Assessment identifies a need? If so which site should be identified?

Great Cransley Parish Council was steadfast in its response by stating

Cransley Parish Council considers that there could be some growth for affordable housing only and be outside the village boundary.
The site identified as RA/146 is the most appropriate for this affordable only housing. This area should have coloured as for ‘proposed affordable housing option’.

This site therefore was only put forward on the basis that it would be used for affordable housing. It was never the desire of the Parish Council or the village of Great Cransley to recommend this site for a high density luxurious speculative development such as that currently proposed.
On this basis alone, the proposed development should be refused as it was never within the contemplation of local villagers that this site should be allocated for a scheme such as that being put forward.

I now focus on the detailed points of my objection.

**Validation of the Application**

It is noted that the application was validated on the very same day that it was submitted. This is surprising given the number of inconsistences and error contained therein. For example:

**Section 10** It has not been made clear in the application whether or not the planners required a tree survey to be carried out. Given the historical importance of the hedging along Loddington Road it would be very surprising if a survey was not required to be submitted as part of the application.

**Section 13** It is stated that the dwellings would be connected to the foul sewer in Loddington Road. Given the significant difference in level between the dwellings and Loddington Road it is difficult to understand how this could be achieved without some form of pumping.

**Section 16** The proposed density of housing has been incorrectly stated!

**Section 23** It is stated that pre-application advice has been sought although the name of the officer has not been identified. More importantly it is stated that the advice given was:

> Advice while promoting site RA-146 into the site specific local plan. we were advised to make an application early 2019 as the draft plan will carry significant weight prior to adoption in 2020.

This statement contradicts the statement that the applicant makes at page 3 of the Design and Access Statement where it states:

> Though the Local Plan may not be adopted for 12 months April 2020 (sic) we have been advised this draft plan should carry no weight with the planning department.

The applicant has created a nonsensical position for itself given that on the one hand it states that the draft plan will carry significant weight with the planners prior to its adoption and yet on the other hand the draft plan will carry no weight with the planners.
Section 25  The owners have not been identified. Also the applicant has been listed as Joby Simson although this person is also named as the Agent. Who actually served the notice on the owners should have been a question raised prior to the validation of this application.

Design and Access Statement

Description of site and proposal introduction

The village is centred on the intersection between Broughton Hill, Loddington Road, Church Lane and Bridle Way. Most of the older buildings in the village are located at this central crossroads and the western end of Church Lane. The predominant characteristic of these buildings is their material, stone, as well as a variety in roofing materials. The Great Cransley Conservation Area Appraisal was adopted in May 1984.

The above statement has absolutely nothing to do with the site in question. The site is situated some distance from the area described. Hence it is totally irrelevant.

Consultation identified a need for affordable housing within Great Cransley; to date a Housing Needs Survey has not been undertaken for the village. However, through consultation at the Options stage a need for affordable housing in the village was raised.

As previously noted this site was offered on the basis of affordable housing only. The site is outside the settlement boundary and should not be considered for high density luxury housing of the type being proposed.

The applicant is incorrect with his assertions. A housing needs survey was carried out in 2020. The results have not yet been published to the local community but have been made available to the committee of the Neighbourhood Plan team. The results clearly indicate that there is no demand for housing schemes of this nature in Great Cransley.

The options for growth section of the DAS states:

Options for Growth Two different options for growth in Great Cransley were previously identified and consulted upon at the Option Stage of the plan. The first was for no growth beyond the settlement boundary. The second option for Great Cransley is to allow some small scale growth outside the settlement boundary and site RA/146 was identified. It was also identified that there was a need for affordable housing within the village, although to
date a Housing Needs Survey is yet to be undertaken. Through further consultation in the Housing Allocations - Assessment of Additional Sites and Update, site RA/146 remained as a potential allocation. It was subsequently agreed that site RA/146 be designated as a draft housing allocation.

a. Great Cransley has very distinct character areas and new development should be designed in the context of the character area to which it relates and should seek to enhance or improve the character of the area.

b. Where possible proposed development should reflect the positive character of the historic core; and contribute towards the following identified improvements to the village:
   i. any approval could include Traffic calming along Loddington Road to create a more pedestrian friendly environment

c. Development proposals within or closely related to the historic core should.
   i. Front directly onto the street or where buildings are set back stone walls should be used to continue the built form creating a good sense of enclosure.
   ii. Not result in the loss of mature trees or hedgerows which are an important part of the character of this area.
   iii. Maintain the informal nature of streets.

d. Development proposals along Loddington Road should:
   i. Front on to Loddington Road but be set back in a similar style to adjacent properties.
   ii. Allow for the retention of views out to the open countryside to be retained

Firstly it has to be made clear that the above statements as lifted from the Local Plan proposal relate only to this site being adopted for affordable housing. Notwithstanding, the criteria that has been set out within the un-adopted Local Plan clearly has not been met by the designer of this development. The proposed design clearly does not:

Reflect the character area to which it relates,

Respect the linear character of the adjacent dwellings most of which are ex local authority housing,

Allow for the retention of views across the open countryside. The dwellings have been sites barely 1m apart thus affording no views of the countryside for the residents living opposite,

Reflect the density of development along Loddington Road.

Contrary to the statement made in the DAS, the proposed development clearly does represent an over development of this site.
The village Parish council carried out a survey in 2019 ant (sic) the application site was identified as a popular chose for development. The house types designed on the site are a direct response to the survey carried out by the village, so the presumption is in favour of development.

This statement is incorrect. A survey was not in fact carried out in 2019. The survey to which I think the applicant is referring to was carried out in 2017. This survey was instigated by the Parish Council and was completed by only 35 households. With members of certain households answering the same survey the total number of responses was 47. The results of the survey were skewed due to the fact that residents ticked more than the one option that was available to the question being asked. This led to a misrepresentation of the data received and hence the results of the survey were not formally published. The Neighbourhood Planning committee was quick to action the shortfalls of the 2017 survey and initiated a Housing Needs Survey in early 2020. The applicant relies heavily on the views contained within the 2017 survey which has been attached as an appendix to the planning application. The nonsensical results of the survey can best be demonstrated by reference to the following extract:

Q6 - If development should be planned for Great Cransley what type of housing do you think it should include?

The above graphic clearly shows that the results have been skewed by residents ticking more than one box to the question. Although there were only 47 responses received from 35 households (difference created by the receipt of more than one response per household) a total of 120 viewpoints have been recorded. This therefore makes a mockery of the survey and for this reason it has been widely accepted that the results cannot be relied upon in any authoritative form.
It is difficult to contemplate therefore, how the applicant can conclude from this survey that there is a “presumption in favour for the development” of this site.

**Amount**

The proposal is to provide 9 number residential dwellings for the market 2 of which will be affordable. The dwellings will comprise of 3 house types of a rural character. The dwellings will be two storey and provide three four and five bedrooms and comfortable family living to the ground floor, the dwellings will be of a medium size of ranging from 1120 to 1646 sqf matching the sizes of the neighbouring dwellings. The proposals closely match the surrounding dwellings in height and scale.

It is incorrect to suggest that the size of the proposed dwellings matches the size of neighbouring dwellings. The neighbouring dwellings are by and large ex local authority housing stock and will be dwarfed by the size and density of the proposed scheme. Furthermore there can be no comparison drawn between the height and scale of the proposed dwellings to that of the neighbouring dwellings.

**Layout**

The siting also allows for the provision of 4 car parking to each dwelling and each car to leave the site in a forward manor (sic).

The allocated car park spaces offer little room between parked cars. Also the layout does not make for easy manoeuvring in and out of spaces. Cars will have to be moved in order to allow other cars to freely move out of its allotted parking space. The car parking allocation includes 7 garage parking spaces. Garages are rarely used for the parking of cars and given the restricted spacing this will result in vehicles being parked along Loddington Road. There are no visitor parking spaces which again will lead to excessive parking along Loddington Road. The site is positioned on a dangerous blind bend which will make egressing and exiting the site extremely dangerous. Parked cars close to the planned entrances will only exacerbate this hazard.

Given the significant difference in ground levels between Loddington Road and the dwellings households will be exiting the site on an uphill gradient thus making any manoeuvre onto Loddington Road extremely precarious.
Landscaping
Large parts of this statement are un-intelligible when uploaded from the KBC website.

Access and Approach

The dwellings will be accessed off of Loddington road (sic) through 2 new opening (sic) in the existing hedge and via a new drop kerb. The access will allow for 45m vehicular visibility splays as well as a 2.5x2.5 pedestrian visibility splay. New permeable surfacing will be laid to the entrance to the site to the Local Authority Approval. All vehicles will be able to leave the site in a forward motion.

There is insufficient evidence adduced to demonstrate that the 45m visibility splays are achievable as drawn. Given the sweeping blind bend on Loddington Road, egress and exiting this site will be extremely hazardous for all road users. This will be exacerbated by the number of parked cars that this development is bound to attract.

Generally
The applicant has given little thought to the significant difference in ground levels between Loddington Road and the proposed siting of the dwellings. The ground falls away sharply from West to East. Conveniently, and no doubt for the purpose of misrepresenting the extent of the gradient, the elevations do not take this difference in ground levels into account. The elevations and in particular, the side elevations depict the land as being flat and level. Hence the heights of these dwellings in comparison with the levels of Loddington Road and adjacent properties have not been correctly portrayed on the elevations. The elevations are clearly unrepresentative of how the dwellings will be sited in reality!!!

There is no provision made for oil or LPG tanks and it is difficult to see how they could be accommodated into the scheme.

My final point relates to the funding of the 2 affordable houses. What arrangements have been made with the planners in the form of S106 agreements and/or other planning obligations to fund these dwellings? Surprisingly, there is no mention of this in the application!!
Conclusion

In conclusion and for the aforementioned reasons, this application should be refused. Not least, it would be wholly undemocratic to force this development upon the village when there is clearly no desire for a scheme of this type on land that has only been allocated for the needs of the village in the way of affordable housing. The scheme has been proposed on land that falls outside the settlement boundary and as such there is a presumption in favour of this application being refused.

Yours sincerely
Dear Sirs,

I wish to record my objections to this application for the following reasons.

1. Proposed plan is a grossly over development of the site.

2. The proposed houses are totally out of keeping with the surrounding properties

3. This development is an attempt by the developers to pre-empt the Neighborhood Plan at present being produced and about to be published shortly.

4. The site is an elevated site with seven large houses cheek by jowl that will not fit in with the village profile.

5. The houses shown do not supply what is asked for in the recent, (2020), housing survey. Where seven houses are said to be required just two for open market purchase the other five are for affordable housing, or shared ownership. I do not consider a 4bed semi to be affordable in what we understand that to mean.

6. Such a development will increase the traffic problems on this difficult bend, causing a danger to themselves and to other road users.
21st May 2020

Head of Developmental Services
Kettering Borough Council
Municipal Offices
Bowling Green Road
Kettering
NN15 7QX

Dear Sir,

With ref to Application KET/2020/0278 | Gt Cransley

I have tried to understand the plans as presented so I hope I have done well but I have to object for the following reasons
The site under consideration is between No32 and No48 Loddington Road. Space for 7 houses. This numbering is the long term plan for this village. The site is earmarked for low density affordable homes. This application is for 9 dwellings, so obviously too many to be in keeping with our long term vision of the village of Gt Cransley.

The application is between semi-detached houses and a bungalow, so a line of detached houses is not in keeping with the character of the village. The visuals make them look like large town houses. They are 4+ bedroom properties so they are large. They are opposite three bungalows which emphasises their dominating appearance especially as the site is on high ground.

The roofline shown appears to be even higher than the roof of No32 which is already high. The roof material is to be of slate, which is not in keeping with Loddington Road houses. The only slate roof is a stable conversion next to the pub. The nearest slate roofs are 1 and 2 The Limes which is a driveway next to the village hall. Despite the TPO on the lime trees they were destroyed during the building of the houses and so the houses became 35A and 35B Loddington Road.

The back garden fencing proposed is close boarded 2m high. This is not typical of a village. Wildlife is appreciated in a village so habitat and access are made available when defining boundaries between properties. This style of fencing does not fulfil this role.

Access to the house appears to be up a steep incline rather than being terraced. Gaining access will require care by the driver not to hit the bottom of their vehicle whilst accessing the site. The sight line is over a 0.6m hedge, whose responsibility would it be to maintain that height?

These are 4+ bedroomed properties so parking allocations appear inadequate for the number of residents and their visitors. I have not read any proposals to safeguard
pedestrians and users of the recreation ground or village hall, which is opposite this site, when any overspill parking from the houses is in Loddington Road and on the pavements.

It is stated that there large open areas to the side of the property. However, it is suggested that the rubbish bins are to be stored in the garage indicating that access to the rear garden is limited. The visuals make the properties look very close together and there is no indication of solar panels or other green energy sources. The drainage on this site is via soakaways. Loddington Road is quite often awash with water running off the fields. Once the hedge is removed won’t more water run into the road?

The application quotes from the 2017 housing needs survey and the majority (29) wanted Semi-detached / terraced private houses (1, 2 or 3 bedrooms). The next largest group (22) wanted Detached private houses (3, 4 or more bedrooms). The Midland Rural Housing report for the 2020 Neighbourhood Housing Survey is more specific. The villagers who responded to the survey wanted 2-3 bedroom properties (24) or 1-2 bedroom properties (22). Properties suitable for the elderly or disabled was 29. This application is mostly for 4+ bedroom properties and this application doesn’t satisfy the identified need of this community.

Yours faithfully
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Date Started: 20/05/2020
Time Started: 16:27:50
Date Completed: 20/05/2020
Time Completed: 16:49:45
Status: Pending

USER DETAILS

Site user email:

USER INPUTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confirm you understand how Kettering Borough Council processes your information and you are happy to proceed:</td>
<td>I confirm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Your address details:
- Bellmere
- Lodddington Road
- Great Cransley
- NN14 1PY

Postcode: NN14 1PY

email: KET/2020/0278

Application: 9 New Houses
- Lodddington Road
I/We wish to make comments on the proposed application:

I object to this planning application for the following reasons:
A Neighbourhood planning team has been set up for the village of Great Cransley and has been working extremely hard as a group to set out the needs of Great Cransley particularly in regard to housing.
The site in question was put forward by Great Parish Council as a potential site for affordable housing if and when that need should ever arise.
The site is outside of the village boundary and should not be developed for any other purpose than the intended use for which it was originally proposed.
The Neighbourhood Plan will identify the criteria for developing this site, if at all, and it would be wrong for Kettering Borough Council to force upon the village a development that does not represent the views and wishes of the villagers of Great Cransley. It seems to me that this application has been rushed through in an attempt to thwart the efforts of the Neighbourhood Plan team and as such it should not be allowed to succeed.
Head of Development Services  
Kettering Borough Council  
Bowling Green Rd  
Kettering  
NN15 7QX

20.05.20

Planning Application KET/2020/0278 by Mr Marcus Reeder for 9 dwellings on Loddington Rd (land to north of), Great Cransley

Dear Sir

I wish to object strongly to this application for the following reasons.

1. The proposed houses are very close together and would make life difficult for anyone wishing to go back to front of their house with a wheel barrow, wheelchair or similar.

2. The visibility for cars wishing to go on to Loddington Rd would be very difficult as the site is on a bend and the gradient is very high at that point.

3. Pedestrians wishing to leave the site would have to walk straight into the road as there is no footpath/pavement along this stretch of road. Children particularly would be in great danger with oncoming traffic, if wishing for instance to play in the park opposite.

4. The village needs small starter homes that young people could afford when adult children wish to remain in the village but not live with family residents. No-one has asked for 4 bedroom properties.

5. Parking for visitors would also be a problem as they would have to stay in Loddington Rd which is fairly restricted.

Please take these reasons into consideration when making decisions on this application.

RECEIVED  
20 MAY 2020
Dear Sir,

I have now fully read this planning application and wish to object to the application for the following reasons:

To start with I should point out that we are the lowest of the properties on the opposite side of the road to the proposed development and this causes us two direct issues with the proposal.

Firstly, the elevation difference between the road and the site is completely misleading in the “Site Elevation” and “Supporting Visuals” where it looks to be on a level with the road. As you should be aware, this is not the case and should the proposed houses be put on the site they will tower above us and block out a large proportion of our light. As they are also less than one metre apart this will exacerbate the issue.

Secondly, I read on the “Application Form” that surface water would be disposed of via a soakaway. This will greatly increase the flood risk to our property. The ground is clay and we know from experience that water does not “soakaway”. The road outside our property regularly floods as there are natural springs behind our property and this water passes through ours and our neighbours’ grounds to the road (video available). We have standing water outside our property in the road and on our drive, with drains unable to cope. If you then build on the field opposite and rely on soakaway, that water is likely to join up with the existing problem and increase the flood risk to our property.

Turning now to my more general points:

Vehicle parking. The application states thirty four proposed parking spaces. It then states that the bins will be stored in the garage. Therefore, straight away a reduction of seven parking spaces. On two of the houses (HT3) the proposed parking spaces show the cars block each other in, meaning less likelihood that that they would be used. There are also no visitor parking spaces. Therefore, the statement on parking spaces must be seen as inaccurate and not enough parking is being offered. Add to this the site is opposite a very busy village hall where cars regularly park all the way along Loddington road opposite the site (photos available) and parking will become an issue.

This will also impact the access points. The access points are both on a blind corner where we have had a traffic survey completed and over 45% of vehicles were travelling over the 30mph speed limit.
If cars were to park opposite as well this would create a very dangerous scenario. There is also a lack of pedestrian access to the site.

Trees and Hedges. A full tree survey is warranted with this application due to the ancient hedge, but this is missing.

Heating. There is no gas in the village so unless there is an alternative renewable supply being proposed, consideration must be given to oil or gas tank installation. Once again this will either reduce parking or space around the properties.

On the design and access statement it points out that a “need for affordable housing” was identified during consultation. It also states that no Housing Needs Survey has been undertaken. This is incorrect. Kettering Borough Council now have a copy of the HNS and it is specific in looking for “affordable housing for residents of Cransley”. The development does not meet the criteria.

There are also strict guidelines on how site RA/146 should be developed. The development “should not result in the loss of mature trees or hedgerows”. In the proposed plan hedgerows will be lost.

A development should “allow for the retention of views out to the open countryside”. Views to the open countryside from the south side of Loddington road will be completely blocked due to the density of the development.

“Should match surrounding dwellings in height and scale”. The houses adjacent are semi-detached ex local authority three-bedroom properties. This proposal does not in any way match the surrounding properties in height and scale.

The design and access statement also states: “The village Parish Council carried out a survey in 2019 and the application site was identified as a popular choice for development. This is also inaccurate. The survey was done in 2017. The document presented as the survey is actually an analysis by one individual of the results of the survey to open up a discussion. Since then the survey has been discounted and an HNS has been done.

It is also worth pointing out that RA/146 is outside of the village boundary and therefore should not be developed.

I trust you will take into consideration these points when you make your decision on this planning application.

Yours sincerely
Appendix 3

Great Cransley neighbourhood plan housing needs assessment – 1st draft Aug 2020 (35 pages)
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Introduction

Neighbourhood plan policies revolve around the use of land. Consequently, the focus for the Great Cransley Neighbourhood Plan (GCNP) is with regards to housing development. This will require consideration of the following:

- The housing needs of the community
- The wishes of the community as evidenced in the various community consultation activities
- Government guidance and policies on neighbourhood planning.
- Local plan strategic policies
- Availability of sites for development

Neighbourhood planning policy and guidance is provided by central government with the following being the relevant documents:

- The Localism Act 2011
- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
- Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)

Additional practical guidance on neighbourhood planning is provided on the Government’s ‘Locality’ website. The following documents being relevant to housing policy development.

- Neighbourhood Plans Roadmap
- Housing Needs Assessment at Neighbourhood Plan Level
- How to assess and allocate sites for development

This housing needs assessment (HNA) for Great Cransley therefore follows the process outlined in the ‘Housing Needs Assessment at Neighbourhood Plan Level’ (HNA toolkit) guidance document. The HNA should be proportionate and robust for the purposes of neighbourhood planning, sufficient to meet the Basic Conditions.

Quote from the HNA toolkit page 4:

“**A housing needs assessment is just one part of the neighbourhood plan’s evidence base. As such, it is not itself a policy document – only the neighbourhood plan itself sets housing policy. The evidence in the HNA will need to be balanced with other evidence, in particular on the viability of different policy objectives, to develop policies in your Neighbourhood Plan which are achievable and realistic. However, as a part of the evidence base, it is in your interest to ensure that any HNA you carry out or commission is clear, consistent, defensible, and has been carried out in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the PPG. This will help ensure that your housing policies informed by the HNA are considered robust by the independent examiner at the neighbourhood plan examination, thus enabling the plan to proceed to referendum.”**

Also:

“**It is important to state upfront that the process of determining housing need, as demonstrated by this toolkit, is relatively complex; delivering a robust, defensible HNA requires detailed, technical work.”**
Housing Needs Assessment Process
(With reference to the ‘Housing Needs Assessment at Neighbourhood Plan Level’ toolkit)

Do you need a housing needs assessment? – page 5
Housing has been identified as an important issue for the NP to address for Great Cransley. We should therefore assume that an HNA is needed and so it should be undertaken.

Do we need to know how many homes, and/or what type of homes, to plan for? – page 5
Housing targets are given in the local plan, but no targets are set for the individual rural villages including Great Cransley. Neither has, housing type, tenure or size been given in the local plan. Therefore, an HNA is needed. The benefits of an HNA are given at page 6 of the HNA toolkit.

Quote: page 6
“The HNA shows the demand for new housing, whereas Site Assessment shows the supply of available land. It is important to keep the demand and supply analysis completely separate, i.e. through a two-stage process, so neither is constrained by the other.”

Carrying out a neighbourhood housing needs assessment – page 7
This HNA will first draw upon existing freely available data and will supplement this with primary research data.

Summary of process – page 8
Figure 1: Process diagram of HNA at neighbourhood plan level
Data Gathering

Gathering, presenting, and interpreting data about the local housing market will provide the evidence needed to underpin the neighbourhood plan’s housing policies. As such, up-to-date, objective, and relevant data is at the heart of any robust HNA. See HNA toolkit pages 9 to 19.

Existing (Formal) Data

This will include the local plan strategic policies for North Northamptonshire and the Kettering Borough site specific plan plus supporting evidence relating to housing needs. The GCNP will attempt to align with the local plan.

Strategic Local Plan - North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy – (JCS) adopted July 2016

The JCS covers the period 2011 to 2031. Spatial policies and supporting guidance relevant to housing needs include:

Page 75/76 – The Rural Areas, paras 5.12 to 5.15 and 5.17 and 5.18 are relevant.

Page 77 – Table 1: Spatial Roles categories ‘Villages’ and ‘Open Countryside’ are relevant.

Page 78 - Part 2 of policy 11 will be relevant to any anticipated development in Great Cransley.

Policy 11 – The Network of Urban and Rural Areas

Development will be distributed to strengthen the network of settlements in accordance with the roles in Table 1 and to support delivery of the place-shaping principles set out in Table 2. The special mixed urban/rural character of North Northamptonshire with its distinctive and separate settlements will be maintained through the avoidance of coalescence.

2. The Rural Areas
   a. Development in the rural areas will be limited to that required to support a prosperous rural economy or to meet a locally arising need, which cannot be met more sustainably at a nearby larger settlement;
   b. Small scale infill development will be permitted on suitable sites within Villages where this would not materially harm the character of the settlement and residential amenity or exceed the capacity of local infrastructure and services. Part 2 Local Plans and/or Neighbourhood Plans may identify sites within or adjoining Villages to help meet locally identified needs or may designate sensitive areas where infill development will be resisted or subject to special control;
   c. Local and Neighbourhood Plans will identify sites within or adjoining the villages to meet the rural housing requirements identified in Table 5. Other than small scale infilling or ‘rural exceptions’ schemes, development above these requirements will be resisted unless agreed through the Part 2 Local Plan or Neighbourhood Plans to meet a particular local need or opportunity;
   d. Rural diversification and the appropriate re-use of rural buildings will be supported in accordance with Policy 25. Renewable energy developments will be considered under Policy 26. Other forms of development will be resisted in the open countryside unless there are special circumstances as set out in Policy 13 or national policy;
   e. The strategic opportunity for an exemplar sustainable new village community at Deenethorpe Airfield will be explored in accordance with Policy 14.
Policy 13 – Rural Exceptions

As an exception to the spatial strategy set out in Policy 11, new development may be permitted in the rural area as set out below:

1. Development adjoining established settlements, beyond their existing built up area or defined boundary, where the proposal satisfies all of the following criteria:
   a. The form and scale of the development should be clearly justified by evidence that it meets an identified need arising within a village or network of villages through a local needs survey;
   b. Sites should be well-related to a settlement that offers services and employment to meet the day to day needs of occupants of the development;
   c. Development should enable access to local services and facilities by foot, cycle or public transport;
   d. The scale and nature of the development will not exceed identified needs and must be appropriate to the surroundings, minimise impacts on the environment and be supported by existing or new infrastructure. Rural Exception Housing schemes should be purely affordable housing unless an element of market housing is essential to enable the delivery of the development. In such cases, the scale of market housing will be the minimum necessary to make the scheme viable and should be tailored to meeting specific locally identified housing needs;
   e. Occupation of affordable units within the development will be controlled through a legal agreement or conditions to ensure that it remains available and affordable in perpetuity to meet local needs.

2. In open countryside, away from established settlements, permission will not normally be granted for new built residential development, with the exception of:
   a. Individual dwellings of exceptional quality or innovative design as set out in paragraphs 5.42 and 5.43; and
   b. Dwellings for rural workers at or near their place of work in the countryside, provided that:
      i. The dwelling is required to enable someone who is in full time employment in agricultural, forestry or similar rural businesses to meet the essential need of the enterprise concerned; and
      ii. It can be demonstrated the functional, financial and viability tests in paragraph 5.41 have been met.
Page 132 – **Policy 28 – Housing requirements.** For the plan period of 2011 to 2031, the housing target for Kettering Borough is 10,400 dwellings, an annual average of 520 dwellings.

**POLICY 28 – HOUSING REQUIREMENTS**

The local planning authorities will each maintain a rolling supply of deliverable sites to provide 5 years’ worth of housing (plus a buffer as required by national policy) and will identify developable sites or broad locations of growth for the rest of the plan period, against the requirements set out below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Annual Average Dwellings 2011-31</th>
<th>Total 2011-2031</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corby Borough*</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>9,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Opportunity</td>
<td>(710)</td>
<td>(14,200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Northamptonshire District</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>8,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering Borough</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>10,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough of Wellingborough</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Northamptonshire</td>
<td>1,750 (2,000)</td>
<td>35,000 (40,000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The figures for Corby include 700 dwellings from the Priors Hall Sustainable Urban Extension that extends into East Northamptonshire District


Page 136 – The final paragraph of policy 29 is relevant, especially the need for the phasing of individual housing sites.

**Policy 29 – Distribution of new homes**

*New housing will be accommodated in line with the Spatial Strategy with a strong focus at the Growth Towns as the most sustainable locations for development, followed by the Market Towns. Provision will be made for new housing as set out in Table 5.*

*The re-use of suitable previously developed land and buildings in the Growth Towns and the Market Towns will be encouraged. Further development requirements will be focused on the delivery of the Sustainable Urban Extensions and other strategic housing sites identified on the Key Diagram.*

*The local planning authorities will work proactively with landowners, developers and other partners to ensure the timely delivery of the Sustainable Urban Extensions and other strategic housing sites shown on the Key Diagram. Progress will be monitored in the North Northamptonshire Authorities’ Monitoring Report. Where necessary to maintain a deliverable 5 year supply of housing sites for a district/borough, the relevant local planning authority will identify additional sources of housing at the Growth Town, followed if necessary and relevant by the Market Towns within that district/borough.*
The Strategic Opportunity identified in Policy 28 for an additional 5,000 dwellings at Corby will only be delivered through the successful implementation of the Sustainable Urban Extensions at that town. It is not transferable to other settlements.

Other than small scale infilling (Policy 11) or rural exceptions schemes (Policy 13), levels of housing development in excess of the identified requirements for the named Villages and Rural Areas will only be permitted where tested and supported through Part 2 Local Plans or Neighbourhood Plans. These plans should also identify the phasing of individual housing sites in the rural areas to ensure that development opportunities are not exhausted early in the plan period.

Page 137 – Table 5: Housing delivery in named settlements, identifies a rural housing target for Kettering Borough of 480 dwellings. No targets are given for individual rural settlements.

Page 138 – Housing mix and tenure, paras 9.23 to 9.31 are relevant.

Page 140 – Tenure, paras 9.32 to 9.40 and Table 6 are relevant, providing guidance on affordable housing. Paras 9.38 and 9.40 are especially relevant with regards to consideration for affordable housing at Great Cransley.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 6 – REQUIRED TENURE AS PERCENTAGE OF NEW HOUSING 2011-31</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TENURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and affordable rent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate tenures – shared ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private rent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner occupation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Page 144 – Parasons a), d), and f) of policy 30 will be relevant to development at Great Cransley.

Policy 30 – Housing Mix and Tenure

Housing development should provide a mix of dwelling sizes and tenures to cater for current and forecast accommodation needs and to assist in the creation of sustainable mixed and inclusive communities. In particular:

a. The mix of house types within a development should reflect:
   i. The need to accommodate smaller households with an emphasis on the provision of small and medium sized dwellings (1-3 bedrooms) including, where appropriate, dwellings designed for older people;
   ii. The existing housing stock within the settlement or neighbourhood/ward in order to address any gaps in provision and to avoid an over-concentration of a single type of housing where this would adversely affect the character or infrastructure of the area.
b. The internal floor area of new dwellings must meet the National Space Standards as a minimum in order to provide residents with adequate space for basic furnishings, storage and activities. In both affordable and market sectors, adaptable housing designs will be encouraged in order to provide flexible internal layouts and to allow for cost-effective alterations (including extensions) as demands and lifestyles change;

c. New dwellings must meet Category 2 of the proposed National Accessibility Standards as a minimum and the local planning authority will negotiate for a proportion of Category 3 (wheel-chair accessible) housing based on evidence of local needs;

d. On private sector developments of 15 or more dwellings (net) or where the combined GFA of dwellings will exceed 1,500sqm in the Growth Towns and Market Towns and 11 or more dwellings (net) or where the combined GFA of dwellings will exceed 1,000sqm elsewhere, the local planning authority will seek the provision of affordable housing in line with the following targets:
   ▪ Sustainable Urban Extensions 20% of total dwellings in phases to be developed by March 2026, with provision to be made for a review of the viable level of affordable housing in later phases.
   ▪ Growth Towns and Market Towns excluding Oundle 30% of total dwellings
   ▪ Rural areas including all villages plus Oundle 40% of total dwellings
The precise proportion and tenure mix of affordable housing will take into account the need identified in the SHMA toolkit (or more up to date local assessment agreed with the local planning authority) and the viability of the development;

e. Affordable housing will be provided on site unless the developer can demonstrate exceptional circumstances which necessitate provision on another site, or the local planning authority is satisfied that off-site delivery or an equivalent financial contribution for affordable housing will support urban regeneration and/or the creation of sustainable mixed and inclusive communities;

f. Proposals will be encouraged for market and affordable housing provision to meet the specialised housing requirements of older households including designated, sheltered and extra care accommodation and other attractive housing options to enable older households to down-size to smaller accommodation. SUEs and other strategic developments should make specific provision towards meeting these needs;

g. Proposals for individual and community Custom-Build developments that are in line with the spatial strategy will be supported. SUEs and other strategic developments should make available serviced building plots to facilitate this sector of the market.

NNJPU Strategic Housing Market Assessment Update (SHMA) – January 2015

The purpose of this report is to update the 2012 SHMA for the North Northamptonshire Joint Planning Unit (NNJPU) and its constituent authorities including Kettering Borough Council (KBC). This report serves as the evidence base for the JCS (adopted July 2016), including Policy 30 (housing mix and tenure).

Section 9.8, Table 9.3 gives the projected housing requirements for Kettering Borough, showing a total requirement for 10,400 dwellings.
The main changes in the Net Housing Requirements for Kettering Borough from the 2012 data, are for 1-beds which have decreased from 11,837 units to 5,906. And for 3-beds, which have changed from a surplus of 201 to a requirement of 2,812.

### Kettering Borough Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan (SSP2) - submission plan May 2020

The SSP2 draft plan for consultation was released during June 2018. This was followed by the Publication Consultation version during January 2019. The submission version was released during May 2020. The SSP2 has been submitted for the ‘Examination in Public’ and is scheduled for adoption early 2021 subject to the plan passing the formal Examination in Public process.

Para 1.3 at the introduction to the SSP2 quotes; “The SSP2 will allocate non-strategic sites to meet requirements in the JCS and will provide detailed local policies for Kettering Borough. The SSP2 will not replicate policies included in the JCS but will provide more local detail specific to Kettering Borough.”

Para 1.4 quotes; “The SSP2 will cover the period 2011-2031. The SSP2 covers the whole of Kettering Borough, however it will not address issues covered in the JCS, the Kettering Town Centre Area Action Plan, or the Broughton Neighbourhood Plan.”

Para 3.4 covers the Scale of development. This repeats the JCS housing targets for Kettering Borough.

Policy LOC1 – Settlement Boundaries is relevant to Great Cransley along with the supporting guidance at paras 3.4 to 3.8.

**Policy LOC1 – Settlement Boundaries**

The settlement boundaries, shown on the policies maps, will be used to interpret whether proposals are within or adjoining settlements for the purpose of Policies 11 and 13 of the Joint Core Strategy (or superseding policies) and Policies RS1 and RS2 of this plan. Land located outside settlement boundaries will be considered open countryside.

Paras 4.1 to 4.7 cover, Housing Requirements and Allocations’. Para 4.6 quotes; “Table 4.3 demonstrates that the SSP2 allocates enough land in the urban areas to provide dwellings in excess of the JCS housing requirement plus a 10% flexibility allowance. In addition to this windfall development will provide an additional source of supply.”

Para 4.8 refers to the Housing Land Supply Background Paper, dated October 2019.
Policy HOU1 – Windfall and Infill Development is relevant to Great Cransley

Policy HOU1 – Windfall and Infill Development: Principles of Delivery
Windfall and infill development within settlement boundaries, including the complete or partial redevelopment of residential garden land, will generally be accepted in principle providing:

a. there is no erosion to the character and appearance of the area and no detrimental effects to the environmental quality, amenity and privacy enjoyed by existing residents
b. They meet the requirements of policy set out in the JCS and are in conformity with policy contained within this Plan and/or a Neighbourhood Plan where relevant
c. Infilling through the division of a curtilage or garden development in the following areas will be resisted to protect the distinctive townscape character, retain the range of family dwellings in a town centre location and avoid a negative impact on local residential amenity in the following locations:
   i. Gipsy Lane / Northampton Road
   ii. Warkton Lane / Poplars Farm Road
   iii. Headlands South of Glebe Avenue


Section 13 covers the Rural Area. Para 13.8 confirms the JCS housing requirement, quote; “The JCS housing requirement within Kettering Borough’s Rural Area is 480 dwellings within the plan period of 2011 and 2031. There are no specific housing requirements in the JCS for individual settlements within the Rural Area of Kettering Borough. The housing requirements in Table 5 of the JCS will be accommodated through this Part 2 Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plans through allocating land in the most sustainable locations available and provision of a windfall allowance. Table 13.1 below provides detail of completions, commitments, windfall allowance and rural housing allocations in the rural area.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Completions 2011-19</th>
<th>Commitments (1st April 2019)</th>
<th>Windfall Allowance</th>
<th>SSP2 Allocations</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural Area</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13.9 Policies allocating the sites identified in table 13.1 are set out in the chapters for individual settlements.

Policy RS1 - Category A villages, is relevant to Great Cransley.

Development in these villages will need to:

a. Be in accordance with Policy 11 of the JCS;
b. Take into account the level of existing infrastructure and services in the individual villages, as well as the proximity of these to larger settlements;
c. Be within the defined settlement boundary and classed an infill development, unless it can be demonstrated that it can meet the criteria under Policy 13 (Rural Exceptions) or Policy 25
(Rural Economic Development and Diversification) of the Joint Core Strategy or unless allocated in this Plan or a Neighbourhood Plan;

d. Show consideration and be sympathetic to the existing size, form, character and setting in the village; and

e. Be compatible with other relevant policies in both the Parts 1 and 2 Local Plans or Neighbourhood Plans.

Policy RS4 – Development in the Open Countryside, is relevant to Great Cransley

**Policy RS4 – Development in the Open Countryside**

*Development in the open countryside will be resisted, unless;*

a. It meets the requirement of Policy 13, 25 or 26 of the JCS; or

b. It involves the replacement of an existing dwelling; and

   i. the proposal is similar in size and scale to the existing dwelling;

   ii. is sited on or close to the position of the original dwelling; and

   iii. does not detract from the open and undeveloped character of the countryside

c. The development would involve the re-use of redundant or disused buildings and would enhance the immediate setting of the redundant or disused buildings; and

   i. the building is physically suitable for conversion or retention;

   ii. the building is suitable for the proposed use without extensive alteration, rebuilding, or extension;

   iii. the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the character of the building or surrounding area;

   iv. Proposed alterations are in keeping with the design and character of the building and seek to retain original features

d. It involves small scale private equestrian facilities where a need can be demonstrated.

Policy RSS – General Development Principles in the Rural Area, is relevant to Great Cransley.

**Policy RSS – General Development Principles in the Rural Area**

*Development in the Rural Area will:*

a. Reflect the height, scale and mass of neighbouring properties.

b. Involve the protection and enhancement of the character of all settlements, especially those with designated Conservation Areas.

c. Link to the centre of the village in several places and not result in a series of cul-de-sacs in any potential moderate village expansion.

d. Allow greater permeability with the open countryside through the inclusion of spaces in between properties to allow views and accessibility for development on the edge of settlements.

e. Allow connections to be made for further development in the future for development on the edge of settlements.

f. Be well-spaced to retain the villages open and rural character, and views to the open countryside should be maintained through the use of low or soft boundary treatment on new development on the edge of the settlement. The use of high close-boarded fencing and brick walls should be avoided.

Redevelopment of historic farm buildings will:
g. Involve the retention of the historic fabric of the buildings themselves, where this is not possible or where there are no historic buildings left the plan form and arrangement of buildings should remain to retain the historic reference to farmsteads in the village.

h. Include an element of employment to retain this important function within the village, where redevelopment is possible.

i. Consider non-residential uses prior to using these historic buildings, given that this is most damaging.

Materials to be used will:

j. Reflect the limited pallet of materials used in the historic core of the village. The only exception to this should be where the exceptional quality and innovative nature of design merit an exception to this approach. These exceptions should demonstrate contemporary design and should show how the development will impact positively on the character of the village.

Parking and Highways:

k. Parking should be designed to ensure the car does not become the focus of the street scene and, should be applied sensitively to ensure roads reflect the existing network of streets in the village.

Paras 13.80 to 13.85 and policies cover Great Cransley. When the Great Cransley Neighbourhood Plan is formally ‘made’, it will replace this part of the SSP2.

The SSP2 policies from the emerging SSP2 that directly affect Great Cransley are:

**Policy GRC1 – Great Cransley Development Principles**

Development in Great Cransley will:

a. Be designed in the context of the character of the character area to which it relates and should seek to enhance or improve the character of the area.

b. Where appropriate, reflect the positive character of the historic core; and contribute towards the following identified improvements to the village:
   
i. Traffic calming along Loddington Road to create a more pedestrian friendly environment
   
c. Development proposals within or closely related to the historic core should:
      
i. Front directly onto the street or where buildings are set back, stone walls should be used to continue the built form, creating a good sense of enclosure
      
   
   ii. Not result in the loss of mature trees or hedgerows which are an important part of the character of this area.
      
   
   iii. Maintain the informal nature of streets
   
   
d. Development proposals along Loddington Road should:
      
i. Front onto Loddington Road, but be set back in a similar style to adjacent properties
      
   
   ii. Allow for the retention of views out to the open countryside to be retained

**Policy GRC2 – Land to the north of Loddington Road, Great Cransley**

Land to the north of Loddington Road is allocated for housing development. The site will provide between 10 and 15 dwellings. Development proposals for the site will:

a. Provide for on-site turning for any dwellings which would have a direct frontage access onto Loddington Road;

b. Respect the existing character of the village, especially that on Loddington Road, adjacent to the site, which is linear in nature;

   c. Provide a linear scheme along Loddington Road, although if not viable due to a higher density proposal, it should not detract from the existing density of the built environment in Great Cransley;
d. Be spaced to allow the retention of views out to the open countryside;

e. Include boundary treatments to the rear of the properties which allow good visual links to the open countryside and planting should be used to create a soft edge to the village. The use of high close-boarded fences or walls to provide a boundary to the open countryside, should be avoided;

f. Reflect the density of development of adjacent development on Loddington Road;

g. Be accompanied by an archaeological assessment; and

h.Provide 40% of dwellings as affordable housing in accordance with Policy 30 of the JCS.

i. 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.

Section 15 Monitoring and review provides for reviewing the Plan to allow and necessary amendments to be made to ensure the Plan is flexible and adaptable in changing circumstances.

At para 15.3, Table 15.1 is a schedule of monitoring targets, indicators, and actions for each policy in the plan. The policies relevant for Great Cransley are: LOC1, HOU1, RS1, RS4, RS5, GRC1 & GRC2.

Section 18 Appendix 3 – Policies Maps

Figure 18.16 is the Great Cransley Proposals Map showing the proposed settlement boundary.

Rural Master Planning Report – February 2012

Pages 4 and 5 provide the background and purpose of this report. Although the primary purpose of this study and report was as preparation for the site specific local plan it, quote; “forms a significant and detailed evidence base for the Borough’s villages and this paper should also be used to inform Design and Access Statements for future development in rural areas.”

This report provides a detailed analysis of the rural area and includes a detailed assessment of all the villages in the Borough. This assessment will enable future development proposals to be considered in the context of each individual village’s characteristics and needs.

Pages 108 to 120 cover the evaluation summary for Great Cransley. The evaluation matrix is based on 2001 Census information that at that time included Mawsley. This data can now be compared with the 2011 Census data and more recent knowledge of the village.

Page 110, section 4 provides a summary of housing needs assessments; quote.

“There is an identified need for affordable housing in the rural areas of the Borough, though this has not recently been identified at the individual settlement level. The North Northamptonshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) identifies a shortfall in provision of affordable housing in the rural areas of the Borough of 148 units per annum. No settlement-specific assessment has been conducted for Great Cransley.”

Page 110, section 6 provides a summary of a Parish Council Meeting regarding housing needs, quote.

- “There is a need for affordable housing in the village. The Council needs to be assured that any housing would stay affordable.

- There are young people who want to stay in the village. The Parish Council would like control of who would have affordable housing so local people would not be overlooked.

- There should be put in place the possibility of house swapping of affordable housing as numbers of residents alter.”

Page 13 of 35
**Site Specific Proposals LDD Option Paper – March 2012**

This document was released for comment during March 2012. The purpose of this consultation document was to consult stakeholders and members of the public on a range of options to be addressed by the Site Specific Proposals Local Development Document (LDD). The Rural Master Planning report dated February 2012 is one of the background papers supporting this Options Paper.

Section 4.1 discusses affordable housing thresholds and options. Para 4.1.8 and question 7 considers reducing the threshold for affordable housing to 3 in the rural area to significantly increase the delivery of affordable homes.

Section 4.2 discusses affordable housing tenure. Para 4.2.1 suggests that the entire affordable housing need in Kettering is for social rented housing. Para 4.2.2 indicates: “Rural parts of the Borough: 100% rented affordable housing/ 0% intermediate housing or based on local Parish Housing Needs Surveys.”

Section 13.1 discusses the rural strategy. Para 13.1.4 quotes; “The Rural Masterplanning Report has looked at the needs, aspirations, opportunities for improvements, and their capacity for future development in each village and these have been used to identify opportunities for future development. For each village two options have been identified, these options are set out below.”

Option 72 – “To allow no growth beyond the village boundary.”

Option 73 – “To allow small scale growth to meet local needs and to provide enhancements to the existing village.”

Paras 13.1.12 to 13.1.14 discusses rural exception housing.

Section 13.11 covers Great Cranley.
Para 13.11.4 quotes; “Consultation has highlighted a need for affordable housing within the village, despite this a Housing Needs Assessment will need to be prepared prior to production of the Proposed Submission Site Specific Proposals LDD. Provided a need for affordable housing is identified through the Housing Needs Assessment a site could be identified outside the existing village boundary solely for affordable housing, this would however require a willing landowner.”

Para 13.11.5 quotes; “The alternative option for Great Cranley is to allow some small scale development to help provide affordable housing to allow local people to continue to live in the village. Great Cranley is not a location where growth would normally be appropriate as it has limited services and facilities. All the housing sites identified in Great Cranley are currently located outside the village boundary. However, including one of these sites within the boundary, to include a mixture of market housing and affordable housing, would help meet local needs for affordable housing. Small scale growth may also help fund some small scale environmental improvements in the village.”

At para 13.11.6 question 85 asked:
“Do you think development in Great Cranley should be limited to no growth beyond the village boundary or do you think there should be some small scale growth as set out above?
If you think there should be some small scale growth do you agree the site identified is the most appropriate?
If you think development should be limited to no growth do you thing a site should be identified for solely affordable housing if a Housing Needs Assessment identifies a need? If so which site should be identified?”
Great Cransley Parish Council responded to this question (comment ID 1915 on 23 Apr 2012) quote; “Q 85 Cransley Parish Council considers that there could be some growth for affordable housing only and be outside the village boundary. The site identified as RA/ 146 is the most appropriate for this affordable only housing. This area should have coloured as for ‘proposed affordable housing option’.”

Housing Allocation Assessment of additional sites and update – October 2013

Para 1.1 provides a description of this document, quote; “The purpose of this document is to provide an assessment of additional potential housing sites submitted following the publication of the Site Specific Proposals LDD - Options Paper (KBC, March 2012) and to provide an update to the assessment of sites based on additional evidence submitted during the consultation”.

Section 15 covers Great Cransley and site RA/146 has been identified as a potential site for affordable housing providing an approximate yield of 6 to 8 dwellings.

Para 15.4 also confirms, quote; “The preferred option is for ‘small scale’ growth in Great Cransley for affordable housing”.

Housing Land Supply Background Paper – dated October 2019

This paper is in support of the Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan (SSP2)

Para 1.1 states; “The purpose of this background paper is to provide detail on the Council’s approach to delivering the housing requirements set out in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy and to provide justification for the 10% flexibility allowance proposed, windfall delivery rates used and to demonstrate the Council’s five year land supply position with the Plan. In addition to this, the paper sets out how the plan meets the NPPF requirement to identify, through the development plan and brownfield registers, land to accommodate at least 10% of the housing requirement on sites no larger than 1 hectare.”

Para 1.7 repeats the requirements of JCS policies 28 and 29 and the rural area target for 480 dwellings over the period.

Para 1.10 repeats the JCS Policy 11 part 2 “with development in rural areas limited to that required to support a prosperous rural economy or to meet a locally arising need, which cannot be met more sustainably at a nearby larger settlement. Therefore, it is appropriate to focus any additional land requirements to ensure housing requirements are met in the urban area rather than the rural area.”

Para 1.11 clarifies the housing supply situation, quote; “This demonstrates that, taking into account all sources of supply, 12,976 dwellings would be delivered in the plan period. This is 25% above the housing requirement in the JCS. It is therefore clear that sufficient land has been identified to meet housing requirements without a further increase in the flexibility allowance identified.”

Para 2.2 repeats the NPPF definitions of ‘deliverable’ and ‘developable sites.”
Para 2.9 – Table 5 shows the residual housing requirement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>NNJCS Requirement</th>
<th>Completions 2011-2019</th>
<th>Total Commitments</th>
<th>Residual Requirement</th>
<th>Residual Requirement with 10% flexibility allowance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kettering (Including Barton Seagrave)</td>
<td>6190</td>
<td>1,902</td>
<td>5,464</td>
<td>-1,176</td>
<td>-557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burton Latimer</td>
<td>1,180</td>
<td>1,110</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>-99</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desborough</td>
<td>1,360</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>1,061</td>
<td>-74</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rothwell</td>
<td>1,190</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10,400</td>
<td>3,878</td>
<td>7,477</td>
<td>-955</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This shows the JCS requirement of 480, completions 2011 – 2019 of 173 and commitments of 50 dwellings, giving a residual requirement for the rural area of 257 dwellings.

Para 2.14 States that in the rural area the windfall allowance is for 108 dwellings during the plan period.

Para 2.21 States: “In the rural area, 11 sites will be allocated in the SSP2. This will deliver 149 dwellings, which along with windfall development will meet the requirements identified in the JCS. In addition to this, it is anticipated that Neighbourhood Plans, affordable housing delivered through JCS Policy 13, and self-build rural exceptions will provide additional sources of housing in the rural area.”
2011 Census Data

While data taken from the last census conducted on 27 March 2011 may be dated, it is still relevant as the housing stock and population of Great Cransley has changed very little during the intervening period. The 2011 Census local area report for Cransley Parish states:

- There were 305 usual residents as at Census day 2011.
- The average (mean) age of residents was 44.5 years.
- In total there were 124 household spaces.

The following ONS data tables from the 2011 Census will be relevant to this HNA. (Source: ONS Crown Copyright Reserved)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Usual Resident Population - persons</th>
<th>Cransley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All usual residents</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lives in a household</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lives in a communal establishment</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoolchild or full-time student aged 4 and over at their non term-time address</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area (Hectares)</td>
<td>660.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density (number of persons per hectare)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure - Households</th>
<th>Cransley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All households</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owned</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owned outright</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owned with a mortgage or loan</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared ownership (part owned, and part rented)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social rented</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rented from council (Local Authority)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private rented</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private landlord or letting agency</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living rent free</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Age Structure – persons (2001 compared to 2011 Census data)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geography</th>
<th>Cransley 2011 Census</th>
<th>Cransley 2001 Census</th>
<th>Change from 2001 to 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measures</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All usual residents</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 0 to 4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 5 to 7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 8 to 9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 10 to 14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 16 to 17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 18 to 19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 20 to 24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 25 to 29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 30 to 44</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 45 to 59</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 60 to 64</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 65 to 74</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 75 to 84</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 85 to 89</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 90 and over</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Age</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>42.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Age</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>42.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Age Structure – persons (Cransley compared to Kettering Borough)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geography</th>
<th>Cransley 2011 Census</th>
<th>Kettering 2011 Census</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measures</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All usual residents</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>93,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 0 to 4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>6,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 5 to 7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 8 to 9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 10 to 14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>5,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 16 to 17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 18 to 19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 20 to 24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 25 to 29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 30 to 44</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>20,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 45 to 59</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>18,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 60 to 64</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 65 to 74</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 75 to 84</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>4,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 85 to 89</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 90 and over</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Age</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Age</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Median is determined by ranking the data from largest to smallest, and then identifying the middle so that there are an equal number of data values larger and smaller than it is. Under these circumstances, median gives a better representation of central tendency than average.
2. The Mean of a data set is also known as the average value.
3. The median may be a better indicator of the most typical value if a set of scores has an outlier. An outlier is an extreme value that differs greatly from other values. However, when the sample size is large and does not include outliers, the mean score usually provides a better measure of central tendency.

Dwellings and No Bedrooms – Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geography</th>
<th>Cransley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedrooms</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All categories: Number of bedrooms</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No bedrooms</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 bedroom</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bedrooms</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 bedrooms</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 bedrooms</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more bedrooms</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dwellings, household spaces and accommodation type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geography</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Cransley Value</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dwellings</td>
<td>All categories: Dwelling type</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unshared dwelling</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shared dwelling: Two household spaces</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shared dwelling: Three or more household spaces</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All categories: Household spaces</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Household spaces with at least one usual resident</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>99.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Household spaces with no usual resident</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whole house or bungalow: Detached</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whole house or bungalow: Semi-detached</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whole house or bungalow: Terraced (including end-terrace)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flat, maisonette or apartment: Purpose-built block of flats or tenement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flat, maisonette or apartment: Part of a converted or shared house</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(including bed-sits)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flat, maisonette or apartment: In a commercial building</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caravan or other mobile or temporary structure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Census data evaluation
Over the period 2001 to 2011 the population of Great Cransley has increased by 24 (8.5%) from 281 to 305 residents. Over the same period the average (mean) age has increased from 42.1yrs to 44.5yrs. For comparison, the average (mean) age of Kettering borough is lower at 39.5yrs.

The 2011 Census data shows there were 124 households in Great Cransley parish. Of these 98 (79.7%) were owner occupier and 29 (23.5%) were rented. Of the rented households, 19 (15.4%) are classified as social housing rented from the local council.
Planning Commitments

When assessing the housing needs of the parish, it is important to consider the planning history and forward-looking planning commitments.

New dwellings (new build or conversions) delivered since 2011 (Local plan covers the period 2011 to 2031) are as follows:

- KET/2018/0890 – Pytchley Estates Ltd
  The Three Cranes, 1 Loddington Road – approved 13 Feb 2019
  Conversion of outbuilding to dwelling (2 bed detached)

- KET/2013/0766 – Mr P Stein
  The Old Filter House, Cranstey Eco Park, Eagle Lane – approved 6 June 2014
  Conversion of Water Company filter house to 1 no dwelling (3 bed detached bungalow)

- KET/2013/0306 – Miss J Claypole & Squires Lodge Farm
  The Camp, Church Lane – approved 23 July 2013
  1 no dwelling (4 bed detached house)

Housing commitments for Great Cranley currently (as of August 2020) in the KBC planning system are as follows:

- KET/2019/0790 – Mr P Knight (resubmission of KET/2016/0630 - lapsed)
  1 No dwelling (3 bed detached house) and double garage with associated access

  Conversion of agricultural building to single dwelling (3 bed detached bungalow) with associated garage, workshop, and car parking.

- KET/2015/0672 – Mr D Knight (also KET/2015/0675)
  Whitehill Farm (land at), Loddington Road – approved 19 Nov 2015 (now lapsed)
  Conversion of traditional buildings to 3 no. dwellings, construction of 2 no. dwellings with associated works and demolition of modern buildings
  (This permission has lapsed and requires a resubmission and new approval if it is to proceed)

The total yield if all are eventually delivered is 7 new dwellings.
**Supplementary (local Data)**
This includes formal and informal survey data of parish resident’s views.

**Great Cransley Parish Survey – August 2017**

This survey was conducted by Great Cransley parish council during August 2017. However, the completed survey questionnaires were not fully analysed, and a report produced until August 2019. Responses were provided by 47 residents although not all respondents answered all the questions.

Questions and responses relating to residents’ views regarding housing included:

Q5.1 – Village issues and facilities – Variety of housing; 10 residents indicated a ‘need to improve’ and 29 residents indicated ‘Do not need to improve’, as shown below.

Q5.6 - Have you any other comments re village issues / facilities. The only consistent response was 5 residents stating: ‘leave village as it is’.
Q6 – If development should be planned for Great Cransley what type of housing do you think it should include? Response as shown below.

In summary, the 2017 survey shows that the residents responding to the survey indicated a majority view against further new housing. However, if housing should be planned then the preferred mix of new housing is biased towards affordable, housing for the elderly and for family homes.
**Winter Warmer Event – January 2020**

The winter warmer communication event was held at Great Cransley village hall on 19 January 2020. This event provided the opportunity to update the community on progress with the neighbourhood plan and to obtain views of residents on the issues that concerned them. Although an imprecise survey methodology it did enable resident views to be better understood. The individual resident comments relative to housing are transcribed below:

- No large estates
- No housing dev
- No houses
- No houses needed
- No further development needed keep our village as a village
- Affordable housing needed
- Make any new houses self-build, and insist on renewable heating systems on all new buildings
- See no evidence of housing needs
- No development outside the boundary.
- I’m pro-development – but with that would like to see improvements to roads / shops / services
- If they have to have new houses it should be within the village boundaries
- Let’s have the chicken battery farm within the village boundary
- How will traffic turn in and out of proposed new build off Loddington Rd?
- New build houses need soundproofing on the inside
- Leave the village as it is, its perfect!

A selection of resident’s comments obtained during the Winter Warmer event

Of those residents that posted comments, 8 would appear to be against development while possibly 3 would appear to be pro-development. One comment mentions a need for affordable housing.
Housing Needs Survey – March 2020

A housing needs survey (HNS) was conducted for Great Cransley by Midland Rural Housing (MRH). Survey questionnaires were sent out to all households in the parish during January 2020 and returned by residents during February for analysis by MRH.

A draft report, V2 was prepared and reviewed by the Steering Group. A member of the Steering Group objected to the inclusion of Table 9 – ‘Assessment of housing need’ in the published version as it presented a potential breach of confidentiality with a risk for individuals being identified from the details given, even though the survey questionnaires responses were anonymous. This table was subsequently removed from the HNS final version.

However, Table 9 contains the information upon which the HNS claims are based so needs to be examined as part of this HNA. MRH indicate a need within the next 5 years for 7 new homes as per the HNS report Table 1 shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Type</th>
<th>Affordable Rent</th>
<th>Shared Ownership</th>
<th>Open Market Homes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 or 2 bed home</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bed home</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bed bungalow</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 bed bungalow</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bed house</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 bed house</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 bed house</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Housing need arising from the survey

Analysis of the HNS Table 9 shows general agreement with the MRH numbers of affordable rent housing (1) and shared ownership / affordable purchase / rent housing (4). The numbers of residents looking for open market housing in the parish are open to interpretation so the 2 indicated by MRH is considered a fair interpretation of the survey responses but may not be truly representative of the actual demand.

The check analysis of the HNS Table 9 is shown below. It should be noted that the personal financial situations of these residents have not been qualified to check whether they could realistically afford to purchase the affordable houses being suggested. The survey questionnaires were submitted to MRH on an anonymous basis to protect confidentiality. Additionally, a request by the NP Steering Group for greater transparency regarding the survey analysis was refused by MRH.

Therefore, the results of the HNS should be considered as indicative only as to the likely housing need over the next 5 years and not an absolute housing need for Great Cransley.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resident</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>New Housing Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Could possibly qualify for affordable housing (buy, rent or shared ownership) with preference for a 2-bedroom bungalow.</td>
<td>Affordable / shared ownership / rent 2 bed bungalow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Likely home extension or open market as currently own their own home outright.</td>
<td>None / open market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Open market as currently own their own home outright.</td>
<td>None / open market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Open market but could possibly qualify for affordable housing (buy or shared ownership) with preference for a 2-bedroom house.</td>
<td>Affordable / shared ownership 2 bed house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Could possibly qualify for affordable housing (buy or shared ownership) with preference for a 2-bedroom house.</td>
<td>Affordable / shared ownership 2 bed house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Homeowner wishing to downsize. Open market as unlikely to qualify for affordable housing.</td>
<td>None / open market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Could possibly qualify for affordable housing (rental) with preference for a 2-bedroom house.</td>
<td>Affordable rent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Could possibly qualify for affordable housing (buy, rent or shared ownership) with preference for a 2-bedroom house.</td>
<td>Affordable / shared ownership/ rent 2 bed house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Insufficient details given for MRH to make an assessment.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Open market as currently own their own home outright and wish to downsize. Unlikely to qualify for affordable housing.</td>
<td>None / open market</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Check analysis of HNS Table 9
Great Cransley Housing Market

To gauge the turnover and price levels of housing at Great Cransley, the housing market over the last 5 years has been documented below. Over the 5-year period from 2015 to 2019 there have been 19 houses sold, an average of 3.8 sales per year. The most frequently sold house type has been the three-bedroom semi-detached of which 8 have been sold during the period. Three-bedroom semi-detached former council houses have recently been selling for up to £350,000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>House Type</th>
<th>Selling price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27 Feb 2015</td>
<td>24 Loddington Road</td>
<td>3 bed Semi-detached</td>
<td>£210,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2015</td>
<td>Cranthorpe House, Northfield Road</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>£307,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 April 2015</td>
<td>35 Loddington Road</td>
<td>4 bed detached</td>
<td>£362,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept 2015</td>
<td>7 Holly Lane</td>
<td>3 bed Semi-detached</td>
<td>£398,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 October 2015</td>
<td>67 Loddington Road</td>
<td>6 bed detached</td>
<td>£470,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Dec 2015</td>
<td>26 Loddington Road</td>
<td>3 bed semi-detached</td>
<td>£257,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2016</td>
<td>1 Holly Lane</td>
<td>3 bed semi-detached</td>
<td>£373,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 July 2016</td>
<td>39 Loddington Road</td>
<td>2 bed detached bungalow</td>
<td>£300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2016</td>
<td>The Old Village School, Church Lane</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>£660,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 August 2017</td>
<td>49 Loddington Road</td>
<td>5 bed detached</td>
<td>£380,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Dec 2017</td>
<td>2 Loddington Road</td>
<td>Detached ???</td>
<td>£200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Feb 2018</td>
<td>35b Loddington Road</td>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>£855,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 November 2018</td>
<td>29 Loddington Road</td>
<td>3 bed semi-detached</td>
<td>£253,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 November 2018</td>
<td>1 Loddington Road</td>
<td>Three Cranes Public house</td>
<td>£300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Nov 2018</td>
<td>13 Loddington Road</td>
<td>3 bed Semi-detached</td>
<td>£218,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Feb 2019</td>
<td>5 Bridle Way</td>
<td>2 bed terrace</td>
<td>£185,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Feb 2019</td>
<td>9 Bridle Way</td>
<td>3 bed semi-detached</td>
<td>£350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 April 2019</td>
<td>5 Loddington Road</td>
<td>3 bed semi-detached</td>
<td>£320,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 2019</td>
<td>Holly Tree Cottage, Holly Lane</td>
<td>4 bed detached</td>
<td>£440,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Great Cransley housing market: 2015 to 2019

Credits: Zoopla, Rightmove, On the Market
Data Evaluation and Discussion

In order to determine the quantity and mix of housing type needed for Great Cransley it is necessary to analyse the data gathered relevant to housing need. At this point in the assessment process, the housing needs of the parish should be unconstrained from the considerations of available housing sites and funding. The main considerations are:

- Local plan policies and housing requirement
- The identified housing needs of the parish
- The wishes of the community as evidenced in the various community consultation activities
- Government guidance and policies for neighbourhood planning

Local plan policies and housing requirement

In accordance with NPPF paragraph 65, the JCS adopted July 2016 sets out the strategic policy and housing requirement for north Northamptonshire including Kettering Borough in part 1 of the local plan. The GCNP will need to conform with these JCS policies, the following will be relevant:

JCS Policy 11, especially part 2a ‘Development in the rural areas will be limited to that required to support a prosperous rural economy or to meet a locally arising need, which cannot be met more sustainably at a nearby larger settlement’. Policy 11 will act as constraint on housing development, essentially preventing new large-scale market housing in the rural areas.

JCS Policy 13 provides for an exception to the spatial strategy set out in Policy 11, for rural exception housing, especially at part 1d, ‘The scale and nature of the development will not exceed identified needs and must be appropriate to the surroundings, minimise impacts on the environment and be supported by existing or new infrastructure. Rural Exception Housing schemes should be purely affordable housing unless an element of market housing is essential to enable the delivery of the development. In such cases, the scale of market housing will be the minimum necessary to make the scheme viable and should be tailored to meeting specific locally identified housing needs’.

and part 1e, ‘Occupation of affordable units within the development will be controlled through a legal agreement or conditions to ensure that it remains available and affordable in perpetuity to meet local needs.

JCS Policy 29 covers the distribution of new homes, the first paragraph, ‘New housing will be accommodated in line with the Spatial Strategy with a strong focus at the Growth Towns as the most sustainable locations for development, followed by the Market Towns. Provision will be made for new housing as set out in Table 5.’

and final paragraph are both especially relevant, ‘Other than small scale infilling (Policy 11) or rural exceptions schemes (Policy 13), levels of housing development in excess of the identified requirements for the named Villages and Rural Areas will only be permitted where tested and supported through Part 2 Local Plans or Neighbourhood Plans. These plans should also identify the phasing of individual housing sites in the rural areas to ensure that development opportunities are not exhausted early in the plan period.’

Table 5 provides a breakdown of housing targets with 480 out of the 10,400 dwellings required for the Kettering Borough rural areas during the period 2011 - 2031.
JCS Policy 30 covering housing mix and tenure is relevant especially part a, ‘The mix of house types within a development should reflect:

i. The need to accommodate smaller households with an emphasis on the provision of small and medium sized dwellings (1-3 bedrooms) including, where appropriate, dwellings designed for older people;

ii. The existing housing stock within the settlement or neighbourhood/ward in order to address any gaps in provision and to avoid an over-concentration of a single type of housing where this would adversely affect the character or infrastructure of the area.’

and part d,

‘On private sector developments of 15 or more dwellings (net) or where the combined GFA of dwellings will exceed 1,500sqm in the Growth Towns and Market Towns and 11 or more dwellings (net) or where the combined GFA of dwellings will exceed 1,000sqm elsewhere, the local planning authority will seek the provision of affordable housing in line with the following targets:

- Sustainable Urban Extensions 20% of total dwellings in phases to be developed by March 2026, with provision to be made for a review of the viable level of affordable housing in later phases.
- Growth Towns and Market Towns excluding Oundle 30% of total dwellings
- Rural areas including all villages plus Oundle 40% of total dwellings

The precise proportion and tenure mix of affordable housing will take into account the need identified in the SHMA toolkit (or more up to date local assessment agreed with the local planning authority) and the viability of the development;

Policy 30 therefore provides a strong financial encouragement for housing development in the Sustainable Urban Extensions followed by the Growth towns and Market Towns. The 40% affordable housing requirement for developments of 11 or more dwellings provides a strong financial discouragement for large housing developments in the rural areas.

In summary, the JCS local plan part 1 strategic policies allow for only small-scale infill and rural exceptions schemes in the rural area to meet a particular local need. Additionally, while an overall housing target for the rural area has been provided, there are no strategic targets for individual villages.

The Site-Specific Part 2 of the local plan for Kettering Borough (SSP2) builds on the local plan part 1, the JCS strategic policies. The SSP2 covers the whole of Kettering Borough but does not address issues included in the JCS, the Kettering Town Centre Area Action Plan or any ‘Made’ neighbourhood plan. Currently only the Broughton Neighbourhood Plan has been ‘Made’.

Para 1.3 at the introduction to the SSP2 states, quote; “The SSP2 will allocate non-strategic sites to meet requirements in the JCS and will provide detailed local policies for Kettering Borough. The SSP2 will not replicate policies included in the JCS but will provide more local detail specific to Kettering Borough.”

SSP2 Para 13.8 confirms the JCS housing requirement, quote; “The JCS housing requirement within Kettering Borough’s Rural Area is 480 dwellings within the plan period of 2011 and 2031. There are no specific housing requirements in the JCS for individual settlements within the Rural Area of Kettering Borough. The housing requirements in Table 5 of the JCS will be accommodated through this Part 2 Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plans through allocating land in the most sustainable locations available and provision of a windfall allowance. Table 13.1 below provides detail of completions, commitments, windfall allowance and rural housing allocations in the rural area.”
The evidence base supporting the SSP2 housing allocations for the Kettering Borough rural area have been developed during a consultation process starting in 2012.

The first stage was the Rural Master Planning Report – dated February 2012. Page 110, section 6 of the Rural Master Planning Report provides a summary of a meeting with Great Cransley Parish Council regarding housing needs, quote.

- "There is a need for affordable housing in the village. The Council needs to be assured that any housing would stay affordable.
- There are young people who want to stay in the village. The Parish Council would like control of who would have affordable housing so local people would not be overlooked.
- There should be put in place the possibility of house swapping of affordable housing as numbers of residents alter."

The Rural Master Planning Report was followed by the Site Specific Proposals Local Development Document Options Paper (LDD Options paper) during March 2012. Section 4.2 discusses affordable housing tenure and Para 4.2.1 suggests that the entire affordable housing need in Kettering is for social rented housing. Para 4.2.2 quotes: “Rural parts of the Borough: 100% rented affordable housing/ 0% intermediate housing or based on local Parish Housing Needs Surveys.”

Section 13.1 discusses the rural strategy and Para 13.1.4 quotes; “... For each village two options have been identified, these options are set out below.”

Option 72 – “To allow no growth beyond the village boundary.”

Option 73 – “To allow small scale growth to meet local needs and to provide enhancements to the existing village.”

Section 13.11 covers Great Cransley and Para 13.11.4 quotes; “Consultation has highlighted a need for affordable housing within the village, despite this a Housing Needs Assessment will need to be prepared prior to production of the Proposed Submission Site Specific Proposals LDD. Provided a need for affordable housing is identified through the Housing Needs Assessment a site could be identified outside the existing village boundary solely for affordable housing, this would however require a willing landowner.”

Para 13.11.5 quotes; “The alternative option for Great Cransley is to allow some small scale development to help provide affordable housing to allow local people to continue to live in the village. Great Cransley is not a location where growth would normally be appropriate as it has limited services and facilities. ……

At para 13.11.6 question 85 asked:

“Do you think development in Great Cransley should be limited to no growth beyond the village boundary or do you think there should be some small scale growth as set out above?

If you think there should be some small scale growth do you agree the site identified is the most appropriate?

If you think development should be limited to no growth do you thing a site should be identified for solely affordable housing if a Housing Needs Assessment identifies a need? If so which site should be identified?”

Great Cransley Parish Council responded to this question (comment ID 1915 on 23 Apr 2012) quote; “Q 85 Cransley Parish Council considers that there could be some growth for affordable housing only and be outside the village boundary....
At this point there was a need identified for affordable housing only and that this growth could be outside the current village boundary. Also, a recognition that a housing needs assessment was required before this proposal could be taken forward.

The LDD Options paper was followed by the Housing Allocation Assessment of additional sites and update – dated October 2013. Section 15 covers Great Cransley and site RA/146 was identified as a potential site for affordable housing providing an approximate yield of 6 to 8 dwellings. However, there is no evidence of a housing needs assessment to determine quantity and type of affordable housing needed to support this number.

Para 15.4 also confirms, quote; “The preferred option is for 'small scale' growth in Great Cransley for affordable housing”.

The draft version of the SSP2 was released for consultation during June 2018. Section 12.7 concerns Great Cransley and Policy GRC02 allocates site RA/146 for housing, only this time the yield has been increased from 6 – 8 dwellings to 10-15 dwellings. This yield increase is not discussed or justified. Also, Policy GRC02 line e states; “Provide affordable housing in accordance with Policy of the Joint Core Strategy.”

JCS Policy 30 requires that developments of 11 or more dwellings allocate 40% of dwellings as affordable. For developments of 10 or less dwellings then there is no requirement to provide any affordable houses.

Policy GRC02 has then continued essentially unchanged through to the Submission version of the SSP2 dated May 2020 with the same housing yield of 10-15 houses and the same JCS Policy 30 affordable housing requirement.

In summary, there has not been a housing need assessment or other evidence to support the housing allocation in the SSP2 for Great Cransley. As a result, Policy GRC02 is in conflict with the requirements of NPPF Paragraph 31. The housing numbers given of 10 – 15 dwellings would appear to have been determined from the predicted yield of the nominated site and not based on housing need regarding either numbers of dwellings, type or tenure.

Any development of 10 or fewer houses would not be required to include any affordable houses so conflicts with the original housing requirements stated by the Parish Council. This housing site is likely to attract a development of 10 or fewer open market houses so will conflict with JCS Policy 11. As such, the SSP2 and evidence base fails to provide an evidence-based housing needs requirement for use when preparing the GCNP.

During October 2019 the Housing Land Supply Paper was released by KBC. Para 1.11 clarifies the housing supply situation in Kettering Borough, quote; “This demonstrates that, taking into account all sources of supply, 12,976 dwellings would be delivered in the plan period. This is 25% above the housing requirement in the JCS. It is therefore clear that sufficient land has been identified to meet housing requirements without a further increase in the flexibility allowance identified.” This paper confirms that KBC have demonstrated they will meet the JCS housing requirement plus a 25% margin so taking pressure off the need to allocate additional housing sites.
Identified housing needs of the parish

The housing needs survey conducted during February 2020 provides a useful starting point in determining the housing needs of local residents for the next 5 years. Analysis of the HNS indicates a requirement for 1 affordable rent, 4 shared ownerhip / affordable purchase / rent and 2 open market purchase houses. With regard to tenure, the HNS identified the greatest need is for 2-bedroom dwellings. Due to the anonymous nature of the HNS these figures should be considered as indicative only.

The SHMA dated 2015 Table 9.3 (see above) provides the housing requirements by tenure for Kettering Borough. This shows the ratio of affordable rent to shared ownership for 2-bedroom dwellings as 50:75. The HNS findings would appear to indicate a similar housing mix requirement of 2-bedroom dwellings for Great Cransley.

Consideration of the demographics is also required to better understand the future housing needs for Great Cransley. The 2011 Census data shows the Mean (average) age of Great Cransley residents at 44.5yrs is 5.0yrs greater than Kettering Borough. Additionally, when comparing 2001 to 2011 Census data, the Mean age of Great Cransley residents increased by 2.4yrs. The above average age compared to the Borough combined with the aging population will present a growing need for homes suitable for older residents, especially those wishing to downszie.

The 2011 Census data also shows only 18 two-bedroom dwellings out of the total of 123 dwellings in the parish. This contrasts with the 65 three-bedroom dwellings. There are 19 social rented households and 10 private rented households. The identified need for additional 2-bedroom houses or bungalows is to support young residents establishing their first home as adults and older residents downsizing as identified in the HNS.

A review of the Great Cransley housing market over the last 5 years shows there were 19 house sales, all open market housing with a range of house types being exchanged. This data supports the availability of open market housing as identified in the HNS without the need to build new houses of these types. If a resident is not able to find a suitable house for sale in Great Cransley then the surrounding villages of Broughton, Loddington and Thorpe Malsor, all located within two miles of Great Cransley may well provide the housing required without going further afield.

When considering any new development at Great Cransley, consideration should be given to the existing planning commitments and the numbers of dwellings that have been delivered since 2011, the start date for the local plan. As shown in the above data, 3 new dwellings have been delivered since 2011. Additionally, existing planning commitments (planning permissions) are for a further 7 dwellings if all are eventually delivered. All of these dwellings are for open market housing.

The local plan strategic policy restricts housing development in the villages, especially with regard to sustainability. Great Cransley has extremely limited local facilities lacking public transport, school, shops or medical facilities, so is not a sustainable location for development. JCS Policy 11 Para 2a) states; “Development in the rural areas will be limited to that required to support a prosperous rural economy or to meet a locally arising need, which cannot be met more sustainably at a nearby larger settlement”.

Whereas JCS Policy 11 restricts development to rural exception housing, JCS Policy 13 sets out strategy and conditions for rural exception housing. Para d), quotes; “The scale and nature of the development will not exceed identified needs and must be appropriate to the surroundings, minimise impacts on the environment and be supported by existing or new infrastructure. Rural Exception
Housing schemes should be purely affordable housing unless an element of market housing is essential to enable the delivery of the development. In such cases, the scale of market housing will be the minimum necessary to make the scheme viable and should be tailored to meeting specific locally identified housing needs.

Wishes of the community

The wishes of the community are a key factor in determining housing development policy. The GCNP will only become Made if voted for by parish residents during a formal referendum. Community consultation has therefore been at the heart of the GCNP process.

The village survey conducted by the parish council during 2017 provides a good starting point in gauging the views of residents. In summary, the survey shows that the residents responding indicated a majority view against further new housing, especially large developments. However, if housing should be planned then the preferred mix of new housing is biased towards affordable, housing for the elderly and for family homes.

During the Winter Warmer communication event held during January 2020, residents attending were asked to write their comments on post-it notes on the various displays in the village hall. Of those residents that posted development related comments, 8 would appear to be against development while possibly 3 would appear to be pro-development. One comment mentions a need for affordable housing.

There is a consensus within the GCNP Steering Group based on the various community consultation activities that the consistent majority view of the community is for no large-scale housing development. However, some small-scale development (such as rural exception housing) for local people if suitably located and designed would be supported.

Conclusions

After consideration of the local plan policies and demographic data, the housing needs survey and community consultation it is concluded there is an identified need for approximately five affordable 2-bedroom dwellings. It is therefore recommended that the GCNP investigate a rural exception housing development for approximately 5 dwellings. Whereas the identified housing need is for a mix of rent and buy, this aspect needs further investigation with regards to how this housing could best be delivered at Great Cransley.
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