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INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY

Prepared by David O’Neil
Nortoft Partnerships Ltd

August 2005
INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY

1.1 Introduction

Kettering Borough Council appointed Nortoft Partnerships Limited (Nortoft) and Lambert Smith Hampton (LSH) to undertake the identification and assessment of future employment sites to feed into the strategic forward planning of the Borough and of the Joint Planning Unit of the North Northamptonshire Together Core Spatial Strategy.

1.2 Context

The current planning policy framework for the identification and approval of employment sites is the Kettering Borough Council Local Plan (adopted in January 1995). This plan is 10 years old and is to be revised as the Local Development Framework for Kettering.

However the need for an employment land review and identification of new sites is needed now, so that it can both better meet current economic development needs, more strategically respond to the needs of the market and feed into the emerging North Northamptonshire Together (NNT) Core Spatial Strategy.

Evidence of this need may be found in the fact that three major employment sites (Morrisons on Latimer Park, Prologis by Rothwell, and Weetabix) have needed to be approved as departures to the Local Plan.

The Core Spatial Strategy and the future economic development strategy of the Borough is being largely led by the approved Milton Keynes and South Midlands (MKSM) Growth Areas Agenda. Kettering is identified as needing to plan for some 16,200 new jobs up to 2021, so as to ensure that housing provision and employment are balanced supporting sustainable development.
1.3 Methodology

The core brief for the Kettering Employment Study was to:

- Identify potential sites for employment development; specifically B1, B2 and B8 use classes.

- Assess those potential sites for suitability of development; in terms of environmental, social, and commercial sustainability.

- Produce a list of options of sites with an appraisal of the pros and cons of each

- Provide an assessment of the viability and deliverability of the sites

- Provide a final selection of deliverable sites

In order to achieve the above Nortoft and LSH were to undertake:

- an employment market appraisal;

- an economic strategy and planning policy appraisal

- a sites assessment process

Kettering Borough had identified the supply-and demand needs for the Borough for the period up to 2021 and this study identifies sites that will help deliver these future employment land needs.

1.4 Types Of Employment Land

This requirement for this study is to focus on the identification of sustainable yet deliverable locations.
The policy base for the writing of employment land reviews is set out in the ODPM’s Employment Land Reviews Guidance Note. Here it is stated that: “Employment Land Reviews are a key component of the evidence base for policy and proposals in Local Development Frameworks (LDFs) and the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSSs and form part of the continuing ‘plan, monitor and manage’ approach to creating spatial strategies at the regional and local levels. The prioritisation of identified employment land in this employment study reflects the given split in employment types assessed on supply and demand by the Council having taken into account detailed regional, sub-regional and local research and policy”. The relevant stage in the ODPM identified process is “Stage 3: Identifying a ‘New’ Portfolio of Sites”.

The identification of locations has thus been informed by the relevant needs of different types of specified employment land use, specifically being B1, B2 and B8 uses. Kettering Borough Council has provided this information, adapting to current local needs the results from employment studies such as “COPELA”. It is to be noted that retail and other employment uses are not part of this study. The COPELA study is being revised, but initial findings of this revision have been assessed by the Council and as far as possible fed into this report.

As a result of this approach KBC has identified the following land needs up to 2021: B1:25 ha (62 acres); B2: 8 ha (20 acres); B8:19 ha (47 acres); being a total of 52ha (129 acres) of new employment land.

As this study is specifically to identify future employment needs it does not consider land that has already been allocated for employment development be that through the Local Plan process or through subsequent departures from the Local Plan. Thus excluded from the land totals the existing allocated Local Plan sites North of Kettering and North of Desborough sites, other sites in the towns allocated for employment (such as on the Kettering Venture Park which are still coming onto the market), and sites that have been given recent planning permission as a Departure from the Local Plan including: Morrisons at Latimer Park; the Weetabix factory extension and; the Prologis site south of the A14 at Rothwell.
The study has identified employment land totals based on the Council’s identified land needs, but it is recognised that totals may vary as evolving Local Development Framework and regional sub-regional policies move further forward.

The study also considers the identifying of some land with best potential for employment uses to in part cover the period between 2021 and 2031.

This study identifies the following types of employment land that are suitable for B1 and that are suitable for B2 and/or B8.

The relative Deliverability of sites was assessed and potential sites were split into five categories:

- High Deliverability land that is likely to be available in the very near future
- High Deliverability land that would become available with intervention (e.g. largely due to provision of major infrastructure)
- Other land that may or may not be of a higher Deliverability at a later stage (e.g. awaiting for the A14 route to be identified, or needing grants to mitigate abnormal costs, pollution etc)
- Land that is quantified but with location unidentified (being in the town centre and in rural areas).
- Land with a low or no reasonable likelihood of being suitable or available for employment.

1.5 Market appraisal and planning policy

A detailed market appraisal and an analysis of all relevant planning policy was undertaken.

These baseline studies were then used to help identify the above prioritisation of potential employment sites.
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ECONOMIC STRATEGY AND PLANNING POLICY DRIVERS

2.1 Introduction

This document provides a non-technical summary of the key planning documents that have been used to help determine the planning and locational context for the proposals for new employment land for Kettering.

Appendix A “Abstracts from Key Economic Strategies and Planning Policies” provides detailed abstracts for the strategies/policies referred to below.
2.2 Policies and Strategies

The economic strategy and planning policy drivers were taken from key background documents that included the following documents:

National Policies and Strategies
Planning Policy Statement on Sustainable Development (PPS1);
Planning Policy Guidance on Industrial and Commercial Development and Small Firms (PPG 4);
Planning Policy Guidance on Simplified Planning Zones (PPG 5)
Planning Policy Guidance on Transport (PPG 13)
Planning Policy Statement on Planning for Town Centres (PPS 6)
Guidance note: Planning, Employment Land Reviews (ODPM)

Regional Policies and Strategies:
Regional Spatial Strategy for the East Midlands (RSS 8) 2005
The Sub-Regional Spatial Strategy for Northamptonshire
The East Midlands Regional Economic Strategy (EMDA: Destination 2010)

Sub Regional Policies and Strategies
The draft Sub-Regional Economic Strategy for Northamptonshire (2005)
Quality of Employment Land Study : QUELS (2003)

Local Policies and Strategies:
The draft Economic Development Strategy of Kettering Borough Council (2005)
The current Local Plan for Kettering Borough
Issues Papers produced by Kettering Borough Council as part of the plan review process (2002).
Emerging and existing Kettering Community Plans (2005)
2.3 Policy and Strategy Drivers

The predominant policy driver in national, regional and local policies is for sustainable development. This primarily relates to climate change (reduction in transport impact), other environmental matters (e.g. loss of greenfield land) and social matters (access to employment, mixed development). Transport impact should as a result be minimised. This means that were possible energy efficient uses for moving goods, such as rail transport, should be considered, and; the encouragement of a reduction in use of motorised transport (e.g. locating sites where employees can travel by non-car means). Employment should be sequentially located thus favouring, in order: town centre and town brownfield sites; other urban and urban edge site (the latter particularly where they are part of mixed use sustainable urban extensions) and ; out-of-town sites.

(Ref: PPS 1; PPG 13; PPS 6)

This predominant driver is most important as the MKSM North Northamptonshire Growth area will result in an increase of 42,700 dwellings up to 2021, with some 13,100 in Kettering. Critically important is the linked provision of 43,800 jobs for the sub-region. A simplified analysis might suggest about 16,200 jobs needed to be created for Kettering up to 2021. Many of these jobs will be generated within existing premises, by intensification of existing locations, and in the service industries (including schools, health etc). Taking this into account and by looking into the supply and demand research, KBC has identified of 52ha of new employment land being needed up to 2021 (see below).

(Ref : RSS 8; Sub Regional Spatial Strategy for Northamptonshire)

The policies taken together also say that these primary drivers must be set in the context of supporting the delivery of regional and sub-regional economic goals and should take into account the specific needs of various types of employment. Deliverability of employment land in a timely manner is also a clearly stated policy theme that runs through the national, regional and local policies. For example:

- Distribution (B8) development is usually best located where traffic impact will be minimised and access to markets is optimised. This usually means on the edge of
urban areas close to transport hubs with good access to major roads, or in certain justified cases in out-of-town locations.

- Offices (B1) uses should be located in or near town centres where possible, but policies recognise that not enough of these sites may be available, or that such sites would not effectively compete with locations elsewhere. This may particularly be the case for some high-tec and/or research and development (R&D) functions.

(Ref: PPS1; PPG13; PPS 6; Guidance Note: Employment Land Reviews ; ODPM)

The draft “Economic Development Strategy for Kettering” (2005) is clear that:

- every opportunity shall be afforded to businesses within the Borough as well as those coming from outside, in order to maximise the potential for economic and social growth within Kettering.

- there is a need to ensure that there is enough employment development land for at least a period of 10 years, covering employment uses B1, B2 and B8.

- there will be a need to provide the right environment for a mixture of people in terms of migration to the Borough as a result of the MKSM growth and to allow, within acceptable parameters, continuing development of the rural areas of the Borough.

- in allocating particular sites, the quality of potential sites in terms of accessibility, attractiveness, ease of development, etc should be taken into account. This should be undertaken to ensure that development sites are not allocated that stand little chance of being developed without public intervention, as such sites might put a barrier in the way of economic development.

- the ownership, type and size of employment land also needs to be able to best match expected future employment land demand.
• Commercial development in rural areas should also be catered for if these areas are not to become living museums.

This Employment Study for Kettering seeks to meet the above drivers by prioritising land that can be sustainably developed. Thus town centre and urban brownfield land sites are identified as the prime sites for offices (B1) and some general industry (B2). Edge-of-town sites with good non-car transport for workers, close to major road junctions as the priority are considered first for distribution uses (B8).

However the study also recognises the need for some larger sites that due to their size that may not be fully available in the above Deliverability locations. The study also recognises that some high-tec office, headquarters and/or R&D sites may for competitiveness reasons need to be located on the urban fringe rather that in the town centre. These locations, where possible, are identified on brownfield/damaged land. (Such an approach is identified by for example the recent North Northamptonshire Together Options Report June 2005).

(Ref: PPS 6 ; Guidance Note: Employment Land Reviews ; ODPM)

Sustainability also means a balanced development where new jobs are created close to new housing. This is particularly relevant to the Milton Keynes and South Midlands Growth Areas (MKSM) where large numbers of new housing are to be developed. New employment locations should be present as part of sustainable urban extentions. In these cases the amount of employment and can be identified in part through using existing Structure Plan policies of providing 20 ha of employment per 1000 houses, together with information provided supply and demand analyses and by the relative strengths of other identified potential employment locations.

The MKSM development is to be a jobs-led development. The deliverability of any identified employment land is a critical factor in achieving this. Sufficient employment land therefore needs to be identified, that has a high likelihood of immediate or early delivery. However this has to be balanced by the bringing forward of those sites that are more sustainable, but difficult to deliver. Some of these more environmentally sustainable sites will take time to come forward because either the planning for large scale urban extentions takes time and in the case of Kettering even the locations have to
be fixed, or due to land assembly issues, or because some because public financial intervention is necessary before the sites can be made available. An example of the latter would be where grants for an improved or new crossing of the mainline railway is needed to release the development potential of some town centre and edge-of-town centre sites.

(Ref: Regional Spatial Strategy for the East Midlands - RSS 8)

Policy also identifies that economic development in the rural areas is important, and that sites in these areas may be able to particularly provide for some higher quality office accommodation. Such developments would need to be small and in keeping with the various policies that seek to protect the rural communities and the open countryside.

(Ref: Draft Economic Strategy for Kettering; Draft Sub-Regional Spatial Strategy Options Paper; Kettering Local Plan; Kettering Local Plan Review Issues Papers)

The emphasis identified by the Council for this study was the identification of larger more strategic sites, rather than a plethora of smaller of smaller sites. Some smaller sites have though been identified particularly where these are able to come forward in the near future in Kettering town. However it is recognised that other small sites may be identified in the future, for example where low intensity B2 use landowner may wish to seek a higher density B1 use. This study suggests how this might be considered.

This study recognises that the planning policy background for Kettering is in a state of flux with the new Local Development Framework, North Northamptonshire Options paper and other regional and sub-regional policies being in the process of being developed or reviewed. However it would not be in the interests of good planning, meeting economic needs or sustainable development to delay the process of identifying employment land. Indeed this study will be of considerable use in informing the direction of emerging policies in relation to future employment land location.
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SECTION 3.1
INTRODUCTION

The strategic employment site study was commissioned by Kettering Borough Council to form part of the options and evidence base for the forthcoming Local Development Documents (LDDs) for Kettering Borough. The basic aims of the project are to:-

* Identify potential sites within the Borough for employment development (employment development in this instance relates to B1, B2 and B8 Use Classes).
* Assess potential sites for suitability of development (in terms of environmental, social and commercial sustainability).
* Product a list of options of sites with an appraisal of the pros and cons of each.
* Provide an assessment of the viability of the sites, details of the likely costs of development and identify any potential impediments to the development of those sites (and the level of any "extra" costs that would faced in bringing the sites forward).

In undertaking the above, discussions have taken place with local commercial developers, land owners and land agents as necessary. As a background against which the potential sites and the appraisals thereof can be viewed, we set out in this report a General Market Overview.
SECTION 3.2
KETTERING – AN EMPLOYMENT LOCATION

The population of Northamptonshire in 2001 was 615,900 and the region generally has experienced significant growth in population and employment over the last 10 years. Economic activity rates have generally been high with low unemployment. The region has proved to be a popular location for new development and the regional planning guidance recently published has identified the general area of Milton Keynes and South Midlands (including Northamptonshire) as one of four potential major growth areas in the wider South East.

With the development of much of the employment land in Wellingborough, Kettering and Corby since the 1980's agents active in the market report that there has generally been a lack of supply over recent years of development sites available which has constrained the amount of new development activity. It is clear that when there have been new development opportunities; generally there has been considerable market interest. This has been borne out by the success of the recent developments such as Regent Business Park and Wendel Point on Park Farm South Estate in Wellingborough and Constellation Park at Kettering Venture Park and Vernon Court on the Telford Way Industrial Estate in Kettering for example.

Developers' estimated strength of the occupier market, and the general lack of supply sites, is such that they are often prepared to invest hundreds of thousands of pounds and considerable time in unlocking development problems in order to secure sites for development.

Historically Kettering and Wellingborough, along with the East Northamptonshire area generally, have been reliant on the manufacturing sector particularly on the footwear industry. The recognition of the need to diversify the commercial base, attracting inward investment and employment opportunities, was one of the main reasons associated with
the designation of part of the Park Farm Estate in Wellingborough and sections of the industrial areas of Corby as an Enterprise Zone in the early 1980's. Although this status expired 10 years later, it provided the stimulus for development and a number of companies were attracted to the region. Kettering had no Enterprise Zone designations, however employment in the town was affected by the closure of the steelworks in Corby and the decline in the footwear industry.

There have been substantial communication improvements, over the last 20 years or so, including the A45 dual carriageway and the opening of the A14. Kettering now has excellent communications with good access to the M1 and M6 to the west, and to the A1, M11, Cambridge and the East Coast ports. There is a population of 2,507,954 within a drive time of one hour (Northampton Partnership 2003).

It is the excellent communications both within the region and for Kettering that has focused much of the demand on the area. The regional and national based enquiries for the area have been largely warehouse related although it should be noted that a variety of industrial and office requirements continue to be received from companies based outside of the area.

There is still a significant manufacturing base in the town (employed 21.12% of the workforce in 2002). There are currently very positive labour market conditions for Northamptonshire, although there are reported to be a number of underlying structural weaknesses (Northamptonshire integrated local employment strategy). In terms of quality of work and productivity – key measures show Northamptonshire slightly ahead of GB levels but significantly lower than near competitor Milton Keynes which has more employment in knowledge intensive sectors than Northamptonshire.

Manufacturing has experienced ongoing employment contraction over many years and if this continues, and is not matched by increases in knowledge intensive sector activities, Northamptonshire performance figures will decline.
Kettering has generally experienced good industrial/warehouse conditions over the last 4/5 years with a number of completed transactions throughout all size ranges reported by agents. Whilst there has been a slowing down of the economy, and recession within the manufacturing sector, market conditions currently remain good.

Levels of demand on a leasehold basis have undoubtedly been reduced over this period of time, although there has been a slight pick up over the last six months. Overall levels of demand have been supported by a strong freehold market, from both investors and owner-occupiers alike. This demand has been fuelled by low interest rates, the popularity of SIPP's and the poor performance of alternative investments. The supply of available properties has been dramatically reduced over the last year as widely reported by agents.

Compared with most surrounding centres, Kettering has low levels of built stock for industry and warehousing which is primarily located at Telford Way Industrial Estate, Kettering Business Park, Pytchley Lodge, Latimer Park, other areas in the town and small towns such as Rothwell and Desborough for example. Much of the manufacturing built stock was built before the mid 1980's and now is somewhat dated.

Warehouse buildings in the town have tended to be smaller than in surrounding centres, largely due to the age of the buildings and the lack of available land in the right locations which has frustrated new development.

Manufacturing is principally indigenous and satisfied within the existing stock of buildings. Rental values have not changed over recent years however freehold values have seen significant growth. Values are now broadly similar for Kettering and Wellingborough, and slightly lower in East Northants and Corby.

The potential for B1 and B2 can not be ignored, but in view of the strategic distribution location, the potential for B8 should not be discouraged. High quality B8 can provided the 'springboard' for wider use development. The effect of the Catalyst Corby regeneration
framework and WEAST is difficult to predict, but the increased focus on the area will be beneficial providing sufficient opportunities are available.

Within the Northampton Office of Lambert Smith Hampton there are 10 surveyors and cover the immediate area of Wellingborough, Kettering, Corby, Rushden, Northampton, Daventry, Rugby and surrounds. On average, over the last 4 years, they have been receiving approximately 40 enquiries per week for all market sectors. It would appear that approximately 75% of these instructions related to B1c, B2 and B8. Of these 30 or so enquiries, it would broadly be the case that approximately 15 would include Kettering within a specific area of search. They have always received steady levels of interest for industrial/warehousing purposes with Kettering, which is reflected by the success of the various developments within the town, and consistently high levels of occupation with the built estates.

The locally based enquiries tend to be for unit sizes of less than 1,400 sq m (15,000 sq ft) and they generally have the highest conversion rate between number of enquiries received and completed transactions. The regional enquiries received tend to be within the Milton Keynes, Leicester and Cambridge triangle or focused along the A14 corridor. Those enquiries received on a national basis tend to be for larger distribution units.

It is interesting to note that even through difficult market conditions, occupancy rates have tended to remain very good for unit sizes of less than 1,400 sq m (15,000 sq ft) within the town. When market conditions do become more difficult it is noticeable that it is unit sizes between 2,300 sq m - 4630 sqm (25,000 sq ft – 50,000 sq ft) that have been particularly difficult to let. This size range is too small for the majority of warehouse occupiers and tends to be for established manufacturing operators.

Whilst market conditions obviously change, it is apparent from reviewing the enquiries that the actual requirements of occupiers have also changed and it is clear that expectations are for increasingly better quality buildings and sites particularly from the
regional and national enquiries. In preparing the market overview, it was apparent that even in difficult market conditions, the best properties/sites in the best locations have continued to be attractive to the market.

We believe this trend from occupiers, owners and investors will continue and enquiries will continually be demanding the following:-

1. Excellent access. This is evidenced by the successful development of Kettering Venture Park. The completion of the A14 in the mid 1990's has lead to Kettering becoming the focus of many regional/national enquiries, perhaps more so that nearby Wellingborough which previously may have been seen as a better location in view of the A45.
2. Large site areas to provide for expansion, excellent servicing and car parking.
3. A good quality environment, well maintained and managed.
4. Not only good local accessibility but accessibility to the main road network, rail and air links. Many national/regional enquiries often refer to a 15 minute drive time from a main arterial route.
5. Good quality recreational and leisure facilities including public open space and good quality housing.
6. Occupiers like the benefits enjoyed by business park locations, accessibility and links to a town centre.

Whilst it would be fair to say that the majority of enquiries received, and likely to be received in the future, relate to existing buildings, it is apparent that there is an increasing proportion of enquiries seeking to purchase their own sites. The majority of sites within the region are now “tied up” with various developers offering design and build opportunities and there is increasing frustration amongst applicants that they are generally unable to purchase a site which they can then develop themselves without being tied to a particular developer. It is apparent that over recent months, premium values have been paid by applicants to secure sites that are not tied to developers.
There is also the well recognised trend towards ever larger distribution units and it is now the case that enquiries are increasingly above 18,500 sq m (200,000 sq ft) and often considerably higher than that. The B8 enquiries generally relate to a relatively wide area of search even occasionally nationally and as such, buildings and sites have to meet every requirement of the warehouse operators if they are to be successful. It is not just a case of the size of the property, but significantly access, in particular direct access onto the main regional transport links which is of fundamental importance.

In terms of offices, overall levels of demand have historically been relatively low in not only Kettering but Northamptonshire as a whole. It is predicted that there will be steady growth in the UK office market over the next 5 years although this will be significantly effected by the performance of the financial services sector and growth from the public sector. Developers are becoming more active in the more popular locations, but there are still gaps in the short term. Growth is predicted in regional centres such as Manchester, Liverpool, Newcastle, Birmingham and Leeds. Smaller UK cities are becoming good office locations for development although developers are still needing encouragement from agents.

With the exception of Northampton, the B1 office market is small and take-up correspondingly has been limited, but continuing demand from the indigenous sector for predominantly small up to 280 sq m (3,000 sq ft) offices, particularly in modern purpose built units available freehold and also for serviced office space, remains good. Excluding Northampton, Kettering has a high level of offices compared with surrounding East Northants, Wellingborough and Corby, most of which are within the town centre and new development at Kettering Venture Park. There have been successful office developments such as Montague Court and Swallow Court, mainly servicing local need, with professional and business services predominating.
SECTION 3.3

THE OFFICE & INDUSTRIAL MARKETS

Kettering, and indeed the surrounding centres of Wellingborough, Corby, Rushden and Northampton, are not considered to be premier office locations and there is a relatively limited market.

The letting market has been quite poor over the last 12 months and, although most rents are holding up, no growth has been evident and the amount of incentives that need to be offered and length of time to secure leases has risen. This contrasts greatly with the freehold market where the area generally has seen values rising by approximately 20% over the last two years.

Within Kettering there has been little rental growth over a number of years and generally town centre office premises would have a rental value between £86 per sq m (£8 per sq ft) and £108 per sq m (£10 per sq ft) in locations such as Station Road, Clarendon House and Chesham House. Freehold values have generally ranged between £1076 per sq m (£100 per sq ft) and £1097 per sq m (£120 per sq ft).

For those multi storey properties, or those located above the retail units without allocated car parking, occupier demand has been more limited. The various lettings achieved have generally been to local covenants generally taking short term leases.

In Kettering on the established Telford Way Industrial Estate the strength of the occupier market is shown by the successful development Vernon Court, comprising industrial units which have two storey offices. The successful marketing of the development confirms the viability in the current market of providing business units with flexibility in the design to meet exact occupier requirements. This development was speculatively developed providing a clear indication of the perceived strength of this market to developers.
Perhaps the most interesting development comprises of Kettering Venture Park which overlooks the A14 to the south of Kettering town centre. This mixed use business park originally had planning permission for 111,500 sq m (1.2 million sq ft) of mixed use space, together with substantial residential allocations.

There was an overall master plan incorporating offices, warehouse and manufacturing development in designated areas. The first development took place in the late 1980’s, since when there has been further extensive development within the business park with very few plots now remaining. To the main frontage to the site there is a Mercedes Benz car dealership, Kettering Park Hotel and family pub restaurant. Within the main development, various companies have set up their headquarters buildings including Winkhaus UK Limited and Balmoral Trading. There have been some large purpose build office premises constructed within the development, the most significant of which is occupied by R.C.I.

Adjacent to the building let to NCC, a further office unit of 330 sq m (3,530 sq ft) is under offer on a leasehold basis.

Within Kettering Venture Park the initial office development was Montague Court which was in two blocks providing two storey self contained office accommodation with allocated car parking. This proved reasonably attractive to the occupier market and there were a number of lettings at annual rentals in the region of £108 per sq m (£10 per sq ft). The office development known as Swallow Court was constructed approximately 2 years ago with self contained office units being available from 176 sq m (1,900 sq ft) to 376 sq m (4,056 sq ft). These units were all sold on a freehold basis at values up to £1400 per sq m (£130 per sq ft). The most recent transaction related to an office 377 sq m (4,056 sq ft) which was sold far in excess of £400,000 to Hydrosave.

Kettering Venture Park was successful in attracting not only large distribution occupiers such as Knights of Old and Headquarter locations for manufacturers, but has also proven
to be a successful office location. The main theme surrounding the successful marketing related to location and environment. This has been evidenced by the early take up of Montague and Swallow Courts and currently by Constellation Park.

There was considerable emphasis placed on high quality design standards, extensive services and utilities (including an on-site management team) and extensive landscaping. It was important for flexibility to be available to potential occupiers and it was of considerable advantage to the marketing to be able to offer buildings immediately available, design and built opportunities to enable occupiers to have units built to their own specification, and provide an opportunity for occupiers to buy their own site without being tied to a developer. The experience and resources available to developers can be essential in bringing forward sites for development, particularly those requiring significant upfront investment or having development problems. However, enquiries continue to be received by some occupiers wishing to develop their own sites and the availability of sites on this basis would be attractive to some potential market operators, most of which may be within the manufacturing sector for example, who may not necessarily maximise development potential and therefore profitability of a site.

Adjacent to the Kettering Park Hotel at Kettering Parkway, Balmoral House, was sold in 2004 which is a mixed office/industrial building with a gross internal floor area of approximately 1378 sq m (14,830 sq ft) to Grosvenor Contracts for a figure in excess of £900,000.

Levels of industrial activity at Kettering Venture Park have been equally strong. The letting has also been completed in 2004 of 2270 Kettering Park Way, comprising of 906 sq m (9,757 sq ft) of office and warehouse accommodation after a short marketing period. At the adjacent Kettering Business Park, Unit 1a Orion Way was also let in 2004. The building comprised 1068 sq m (11,500 sq ft) of warehouse and office accommodation and was let after a short marketing period to Dredging and Construction Company Limited.
Market activity within the larger size ranges has been equally strong. At Kettering Business Park at Orion Way there has also been a lease renewal of 3809 sq m (41,000 sq ft) occupied by Bantex at a rental reported to be £48.44 per sq m (£4.50 per sq ft). On the Telford Way Industrial Estate, Unit B Telford Point was let in September 2002 comprising 6968 sq m (75,000 sq ft) to Batley Pet Products Limited. The lease was for 10 years with a rent review after only 5 years on a full repairing and insuring lease. The rental reflected £45.74 per sq m (£4.25 per sq ft) and was guaranteed by Batley plc. The investment was sold at a reported net yield of 7.7%.

Within the last year, there have been completed two design and builds at Kettering Parkway. A unit has been developed for Grewcock's of 4084 sq m (43,970 sq ft) which was sold for £3 million. The unit had 1765 sq m (19,000 sq ft) of offices but there was a limited fit out undertaken by the developer. The price reflected £732 per sq m (£68.00 per sq ft). The second unit has been sold to Kingsway Shoes and extends to 2723 sq m (29,311 sq ft) incorporating 804 sq m (8,655 sq ft) of offices. The warehouse was heated, lit and air conditioning was installed throughout and the offices were finished to a good speciation. The price reflected £753.5 per sq m (£70.00 per sq ft).

Various new builds are nearing completion with quoting values for buildings of between 2322 sqm – 5574 sqm (25,000 sq ft – 60,000 sq ft) being in the region of £753-£807 per sqm (£70 - £75 psf). It remains to be seen whether owner occupiers will be prepared to pay these values. Quoting values for new builds have risen to in the region of £861 per sqm (£80 psf) for some projects.

The cost of design and build projects has increased significantly over the last year particularly in view of the substantial increase in build costs (steel prices have risen by 10%). Within the B1 & B2 market sectors this has lead to the following –

- It has contributed to the strong demand for existing properties fuelling price increases.
- It has contributed to the pick up in leasehold demand with some rentals now appearing competitive.
- Some land owners have preferred to secure premium values disposing of development sites rather than speculatively develop.

In view of the shortages of supply of development land there has been little transactional activity. At Orion Way, Kettering Business Park a two acre site known as Constellation Park was sold in early 2004 at £494,500 per hectare (£200,000 per acre). It is considered that for small parcels when strong owner occupier is received with parties bidding against one another values well in excess of £741,500 per hectare (£300,000) per acre are achievable. However for developers values above £556,000 per hectare (£225,000 per acre) can make new development projects marginal.
SECTION 3.4

THE WAREHOUSE B8 MARKET

GENERAL MARKET OVERVIEW – WAREHOUSING (B8)

The decline of the importance of the manufacturing sector in the UK economy has been clearly reflected in the industrial property market. The evidence is seen in the decline in the proportion of industrial floor space devoted to traditional uses. By contrast, an increasing proportion of industrial floor space is now devoted to warehousing and distribution.

Within the overall picture however there are significant regional variations. Unsurprisingly, London, the South East and East of England’s share of manufacturing output is below the national average. In these regions the dominance of service sector activities mean that a greater proportion of industrial floor space is devoted to distribution and warehousing. For those large sites requiring considerable upfront expenditure to enable development to commence the potential for developers to secure B8 lettings/sales may “unlock” the development potential of constrained sites. The returns available from B8 development are not huge and with increased build costs margins have only been maintained by a strong investment market.
NEW INDUSTRIAL LEGACY

With the market dominated by the strength of consumer demand and foreign trade, the commercial sector has undergone a rapid transformation. Key determinates increasing the influence in property decisions are -

* Stock turnover periods
* Just-in-time delivery, as manufacturers reduce inventory and stock levels.
* Distribution centres at major motorway junctions.
* Third-party logistics providers offering increasingly sophisticated solutions for Point-of-sale operators
* New shapes and formats for large distribution centre.
* Increased demand for smaller, satellite and trans-shipment depots – a trend which is likely to be intensified by the EU Working Time Directive (WTD). This will introduce a shorter working week for commercial vehicle drivers, limiting drivers to an average of 48 hours per week.

EMERGING HOT SPOTS

The choice of location is determined by a number of criteria, with occupiers looking for the combination which best suits their location needs. The criteria are –

* Access to major markets.
* Accessibility to major road networks.
* Existing distribution networks.
* Availability of suitable property/sites.
* Presence of skilled workforce/labour costs.
* Property costs.
* Sympathetic planning regime.
Over the medium term it is anticipated that a new generation of locations will emerge. The regions to benefit most from occupier interest and hence to watch over the next few years include –

* East Midlands.
* East of England
* South East
* West Midlands
* North West
* Yorkshire & Humberside
MARKET TRENDS

After a quite year in 2003, retailers have stormed back into action, signing large shed deals. Operators are seeking distribution centres at a size previously unheard off and they are prepared to go to locations which would scarcely have merited a second glance as little as 12 months ago.

New areas are opening up to the logistics activity in many of the UK regions. Newly established developers such as Gladman, Rosemound and Helio Slough are starting to challenge the dominance of Prologis, Gazeley and Astral. In the summer of 2004 Exel continued the trend towards consolidation in the logistics sector by swallowing Tibbett & Britten.

The macro-economy factors underlying the change are well documented. The manufacturing base at UK and western economies continues to leak away to more cost effective locations in Eastern Europe and Asia. Meanwhile, consumer spending grows in an apparently recession-proof manner and competition has intensified among retailers. They are seeking cost reduction through their supply chain so it can be passed on to customers.

It is apparent that the top 100 multinationals account for 90% of new investment and the developers are increasingly playing to their agendas. One by one, retailers are revamping their distribution networks and are pushing the boundaries of what constitutes a "big" shed
further each time. Tesco, Morrison's, B & Q, Dixon's, Sports World and others have made the headlines by taking buildings of up to 92,900 sqm (1 million sq ft).

In the East Midlands the focus has shifted from Northampton to Kettering, Corby and up to Nottinghamshire, in the West Midlands from Birmingham to Stoke on Trent, in Yorkshire from Wakefield to Doncaster and Sheffield and in the North West from Manchester to Merseyside.

Developers increasingly consider 14,000 sq m (150,000 sq ft) – 18,500 sq m (200,000 sq ft) to be their minimum size and there is increasing reluctance to build speculatively particularly in the smaller size ranges.

Giant sheds are all the rage at the present, however the developers and agents are beginning to consider how much demand there will continue to be in this market as there aren't that many operators that can afford to take units of 92,900 sqm (1 million sq ft). Much will depend on whether the retailers that have already super-sized show a return on their balance sheets for their investment in logistics.
EAST MIDLANDS MARKET

Investment in warehouses in the East Midlands is rising, and demand from retailers and logistics companies remains high.

Investors appetite for distribution property in the east midlands has reached feeding-frenzy proportions. A succession of large transactions has been fuelled by institutions with pots of cash to spend.

But with plummeting yields and the cost of borrowing swiftly increasing, some commentators are beginning to ask whether rising prices and saturated buyers will bring an end to the investment boom.

Two big purchases totalling £93 million were made at the end of 2004 at Daventry by UBS and Warner Estates Radial Distribution Fund. At the turn of the year, Standard Life purchased a £190 million portfolio, including units in Leicester and Coventry, from Prologis. On the development front in August 2004, US insurer Metlife formed a £200 million joint venture with Gazeley to develop distribution property in Magna Park in Leicestershire and in Hemel Hempstead.

Investors regard distribution property in the region as a relatively low-volatility sector. It is clear investors have been following occupational demand, the sector also attracts investment money, not only for its good performance in 2004 but because it provides the
opportunity to spend large chunks of available money quickly. Prime yields buildings let for 15 years or more to companies with good covenants have fallen from 6.75% at the beginning of 2004 to 6.5%.

Even yields for second hand properties have hardened significantly.

UBS paid £52 million to Frogmore for three buildings at Daventry including a 55,750 sqm (600,000 sq ft) 1960's unit let to Tesco with a yield of 7.5%.

It is widely recognised that the prices have now peaked and it is foreseen that the yields will not get keener. Some of the investors have begun to largely concentrate outside the prime areas in order to capture better returns rather than focus on established locations such as Magna Park and DIRFT. For example Standard Life have moved into more peripheral untried locations such as Corby where it forward funded Rosemound's 46,500 sq m (500,000 sq ft) speculative shed at Max Park. It has also been investing in the north of the region where it has entered into several deals with Wilson Bowden and expects greater rental growth.

The planning debate has also had a nasty impact on land prices, fuelling inflation. Land and labour prices are the biggest part of the equation for tenants and end users. Several developers have therefore built up substantial land banks (Prologis and has built up a 81 hectares (200 acre) land bank in Wellingborough, Kettering, Northampton & Daventry).
In connection with rail freight, whilst they have been provided into many schemes they have not yet proved to be popular with occupiers.

The final factor that has had a considerable effect on the market in 2004 has been the steel shortage that has added about 7.5% to build costs in the last 12 months. Generally speaking developers have been absorbing the extra costs with yields for investments more than matching increased steel costs.

The recent surge in tenant demand for big warehouses in the East Midlands has continued to gather pace, and developers have been scrambling to get warehouses up in time to capture requirements.

At Magna Park near Lutterworth, third-party Unipart Logistics has taken Frontier Estates 19,170 sq m (206,340 sq ft), Welcome Point Unit on a ten year lease at around £59.20 per sq m (£5.50 per sq ft). The investment interest was placed on the market for £14.3 million, reflecting a net initial yield of 7.4%.

At Prologis Park, Daventry, Excel have taken 16,250 sq m (175,000 sq ft) warehouse to service a contract to pub operator J D Weatherspoon. The building was completed in 50 days using ProLogis's pro-shed construction method. Asking rents at the Park are around £48.44 per sq m (£4.50 per sq ft).
Several developers have been responding to the demand for speculative developments. In Northampton, Astral Developments and Morley Fund Management plan to build a 28,000 sq m (300,000 sq ft) warehouse on their remaining land at Swan Valley. The building is scheduled for completion in summer 2005.

In Corby Rosemound sold a speculative unit at Max Park of 13,500 sq m (145,000 sq ft) at £485 per sq m (£45 per sq ft) in mid 2004. Also at Max Park a 46,450 sq m (500,000 sq ft) distribution centre unit due to be completed in spring 2005 has been let to Wincanton on a ten year lease (with a tenants break in the 7th year) at £48.4 per sq m (£4.50 per sq ft. The site will be operated by Wincanton to fulfil a contract with Argos and there will be 400 jobs created. The investment interest is currently available on the market at a quoting net initial yield of 6.75%.

Also in Corby, Bee Bee Developments submitted a joint planning application with Astral to build a 278,700 sq m (3 million sq ft) GBP 200ml rail freight centre at Stanion Lane Plantation.

In Kettering 2004 Prologis obtained detailed planning consent for a distribution unit of 77,570 sq m (835,000 sq ft). It is understood that this will be the single largest shed in the east midlands and will form part of a 204,500 sq m (2.2 million sq ft) Prologis Park, where B1, B2, and B8 consent has been granted for this “North Kettering Business Development
Area”. Prologis had announced that they were to speculatively build a unit of 37,160 sq m (400,000 sq ft.)

Morrison's recently purchased a site of circa 40.5 hectares (100 acres) at Birchlington Road on the Weldon North Industrial area of Corby. In addition they have started construction of an 79,000 sq m (850,000 sq ft) unit at Gazeley's Latimer Park, having won planning consent after reaching an agreement with the local authority, which rejected plans for the building earlier in 2004.

In July, Northampton Borough Council adopted English Partnership's Master Plan for the town's urban extension. The area includes Prologis 50 hectares (120 acres) Pineham site. An outline planning application was submitted in November with infrastructure scheduled to commence on site in spring 2005.

Bovis submitted a planning application for a 276 hectares (681 acres) Wellingborough East expansion, which would include 31 hectares (77 acres) of rail linked warehousing. In Wellingborough Prologis have received planning consent for 1.1 million sq ft of sheds. The plans for phase one of the 20.33 hectares (50 acre) Victoria Business Park, which it purchased from Whitworths, include a single shed of 72,500 sq m (780,000 sq ft). The developer is also reported to be considering starting a 3344 sqm (360,000 sq ft) speculative unit in spring 2005. The scheme which is close to the A45 for links to the east coast ports
and the M1 represents the first new employment area for 15 years in Wellingborough, a
town earmarked for growth.

Interest of Prologis in the town was driven by low land values give the values that will be
achievable from the operators.

The 13.4 hectares (33 acres) second phase of Severn Trent's property Daventry
International Rail Freight Terminal at junction 18 of the M1 is also set to go ahead when a
section 106 agreement is finalised. If all goes to plan sites will be available for
development from 2006.

Further to the north, Wilson Bowden is set to begin infrastructure works on the former
Castle Donnington Power Station site. A 44.5 hectare (110 acre) first phase of the East
Midlands Distribution Centre will be available to accommodate a unit of up to 116,000 sq
m (125 million sq ft) and will have rail freight access.
FUTURE TRENDS

Over the next five years we expect the UK distribution market to be driven principally by domestic demand given that 92% of all UK road freight is for domestic purposes. That said, London and the South East, Birmingham and the Midlands are already established locations within Europe offering the second highest and the fourth highest concentration of distribution centres in Europe, respectively. We expect these regions to dominate the UK distribution market in the medium term.

Over the medium term the industrial market is likely to be affected by a number of changes including –

• Further consolidation in the third party logistics provider market. The merger of Exel and Tibbett & Britten is one example.

• Continuing demand for larger distribution centres. A healthy consumer sector should continue to drive demand from both food and non food retailers for large units. Take-up levels for units over 23,250 sq m (250,000 sq ft) have increased significantly over the last 2 – 3 years.

• A gradual move towards fringe locations as site availability and costs became increasingly important.
• New occupiers demanding new solutions to their property requirements. New legislation, such as WTD is likely to increase the need for smaller trans-shipment depots.

• Greater emphasis on leasing rather than owner occupation as retail interest shifts towards minimising costs and freeing capital for new investments.

In a recent research publications produced by Lambert Smith Hampton over the next two years forecasts show –

• The industrial sector as a whole will out perform the market in 2005 & 2006 with total returns of 7.7% & 9.8% respectively.

• The distribution and warehousing sector out performing the market as a whole with total returns of 7.5% & 10.6% in 2005 & 2006 respectively.

• Performance will continue to be determined by Income return rather than rental growth.

• Speculative development returning in response to a recovery in demand.

• Rental growth for the industrial sector as a whole remaining relatively modest at 1.2% in 2005 and 1.5% in 2006.

• Marginally higher rates of rental growth for distribution and warehousing in 2005 & 2006 at 2.3% and 2.8% respectively.
SECTION 3.5

THE INVESTMENT MARKET

The UK commercial property investment market has seen exceptional levels of activity over the past four years, in contrast to the same period in the occupier market. The total amount of money invested in commercial property has nearly doubled rising from £22bn in 2001 to a record £42bn last year. Much of the demand for investment stock between 2001 and 2003 was equity driven as both domestic and international private investors turned their attention to the UK commercial property sector, seeing it as a safe haven in a period when global stock markets continued to lose value. The availability of relatively cheap finance and opportunities for active management further increased the appeal of property as an investment medium.

In 2004 the weight of money targeting property continued to increase, with the spread of investors more diverse than in the previous three years. Activity levels remained strong in all sectors of the market, with increasing competition among investors leading to yields sharpening and capital values rising.

The year saw a significant shift in investor behaviour. Institutional investors, largely absent during 2001-3 came back into the fray (as the performance of the occupier markets improved), joining debt-driven private investors who maintained their market presence. A significant proportion of the transactions in 2004 were undertaken in the last quarter of 2004. The year ended with the highest quarterly volume of transactions ever recorded, at £13.9bn, and a marketplace set to continue to attract both institutional and debt-backed investors.
The Regional Picture: Northamptonshire

Overall Activity Levels

In line with the national trend, investment activity in the East Midlands increased in 2004 by 17% to £787m. Distribution warehouse transactions accounted for almost two thirds of all industrial sector market activity in the region. Half of the distribution purchases were by institutional investors, reflecting their desire to buy into the sector.

Closer examination of the overall investment pattern shows Northamptonshire as the main focus of activity in 2004, attracting £247.6 m of investment during 2004 – 35% of the regional total. More than 80% of this total was invested in the second half of the year.

Spread of Activity

Around 77% of all transactions in 2004 comprised industrial properties- this is a significant increase over both 2003 (50.6%) and 2002 (65.7%).

The retail sector accounted for 14.3% of total investment in Northamptonshire, with offices attracting 7.6% of total activity.
Table 1

Total Investment in Northamptonshire 2002–4

Table 1
Total Investment in Northamptonshire 2002-2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>£m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Lambert Smith Hampton Research

Table 2
Investment Activity By Sector in Northamptonshire 2002–4

Table 2
Spread of Investment Activity 2002-4 - Northamptonshire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Retail</th>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Industrial</th>
<th>Leisure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Lambert Smith Hampton
Table 3 overleaf provides a list of all transactions in Northamptonshire in 2004, broken down by district, sector, price and purchaser (see Appendix 1 for transactions during 2002 and 2003).

DIRFT Logistics Park in Daventry accounted for £102.1m of investment including two of the largest transactions in the region: Triton Property Fund’s £50m purchase at an initial yield of 7.5% and Warner Holdings and Bank of Scotland’s £41m acquisition at a yield of 6.4%. Northampton comes second in terms of attracting investors in 2004, with a total of £78.5m in 11 transactions. This includes the acquisition of Brackmills for £39m by HSBC Amanah Global Fund at a yield of 6.4%.
## Table 3

**Total Investment Activity in Northamptonshire in 2004**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Price (£m)</th>
<th>Initial Yield (%)</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Purchaser</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northamptonshire</td>
<td>Wellingborough</td>
<td>London Road</td>
<td>RE</td>
<td>24.25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dec-04</td>
<td>Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northamptonshire</td>
<td>Northampton</td>
<td>19 Market Square</td>
<td>RE</td>
<td>0.385</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>Dec-04</td>
<td>Auction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northamptonshire</td>
<td>Rushden</td>
<td>34-36 High Street</td>
<td>RE</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Oct-04</td>
<td>Bedford Developments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northamptonshire</td>
<td>Kettering</td>
<td>10/11 Silver Street</td>
<td>RE</td>
<td>0.635</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>Oct-04</td>
<td>Auction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northamptonshire</td>
<td>Kettering</td>
<td>69-81 St Johns Road</td>
<td>RE</td>
<td>1.195</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Oct-04</td>
<td>Auction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northamptonshire</td>
<td>Kettering</td>
<td>Gold Street</td>
<td>RE</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Sep-04</td>
<td>Boulbee Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northamptonshire</td>
<td>Northampton</td>
<td>3 The Parade</td>
<td>RE</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>May-04</td>
<td>Auction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northamptonshire</td>
<td>Northampton</td>
<td>16 Bridge Street</td>
<td>RE</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>May-04</td>
<td>Auction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northamptonshire</td>
<td>Rushden</td>
<td>4 Abingdon Street</td>
<td>RE</td>
<td>1.215</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>Mar-04</td>
<td>Grafton Investments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northamptonshire</td>
<td>Kettering</td>
<td>72-74 High Street</td>
<td>RE</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>Feb-04</td>
<td>Auction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northamptonshire</td>
<td>Corby</td>
<td>165-167 Farmstead Road</td>
<td>RE</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>Feb-04</td>
<td>Auction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northamptonshire</td>
<td>Desborough</td>
<td>68&amp;6 Havelock Street</td>
<td>RE</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Feb-04</td>
<td>Auction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northamptonshire</td>
<td>Towcester</td>
<td>Porsche Centre</td>
<td>OF/RE</td>
<td>3.475</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>Jan-04</td>
<td>Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northamptonshire</td>
<td>Northampton</td>
<td>Brackmills</td>
<td>OF</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Jun-04</td>
<td>Private Irish Investor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northamptonshire</td>
<td>Northampton</td>
<td>Radstone Headquarters</td>
<td>OF</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>May-04</td>
<td>Radstone Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northamptonshire</td>
<td>Wellingborough</td>
<td>Poyntz Lane</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Mar-04</td>
<td>Auction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northamptonshire</td>
<td>Wellingborough</td>
<td>Park Farm Ind Estate</td>
<td>IN/RE</td>
<td>0.595</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Feb-04</td>
<td>Merrill Lynch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northamptonshire</td>
<td>Brixworth</td>
<td>Quarry Road</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>Dec-04</td>
<td>Private investor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northamptonshire</td>
<td>Northampton</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>7.77</td>
<td>Oct-04</td>
<td>Crofton Place Estates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northamptonshire</td>
<td>Northampton</td>
<td>Salt house Lane</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>Sep-04</td>
<td>CCLA Investment Man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northamptonshire</td>
<td>Daventry</td>
<td>Welling Park</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Sep-04</td>
<td>Eagle Star Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northamptonshire</td>
<td>Daventry</td>
<td>Drift Logistics Park</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>Sep-04</td>
<td>Sep-04 Push Property Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northamptonshire</td>
<td>Daventry</td>
<td>Dirft Logistics Park</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>41.125</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>Aug-04</td>
<td>Warner Estate Holdings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northamptonshire</td>
<td>Lutterworth</td>
<td>Magna Park</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Jul-04</td>
<td>Private investor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northamptonshire</td>
<td>Northampton</td>
<td>Brackmills</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>Jul-04</td>
<td>HSBC Amanah Global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northamptonshire</td>
<td>Corby</td>
<td>Eismann Way</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>7.135</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>Jul-04</td>
<td>Lothian Pension Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northamptonshire</td>
<td>Kettering</td>
<td>Telford Way Ind Estate</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>6.275</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>Jun-04</td>
<td>Charities Property Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northamptonshire</td>
<td>Northampton</td>
<td>Bedford Road</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>6.872</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>May-04</td>
<td>Close High Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northamptonshire</td>
<td>Kettering</td>
<td>Units A&amp;B Henson Way</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>Mar-04</td>
<td>Mayfair Capital</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Retail    |                    |                        |        | 34.72       |                  |              |                                          |
| Total Office    |                    |                        |        | 18.4        |                  |              |                                          |
| Total Industrial|                    |                        |        | 187.79      |                  |              |                                          |

**Total Northamptonshire** 247.6

*Source: Property Data*
Investment Activity By Type Of Investor

Following the general market trend, institutions were the most active group, accounting for 67% of total investment in Northamptonshire. Overseas investors were also active taking a 19% share.

Table 4

2004 Investment Activity By Investor Type - Northamptonshire

Intense competition for stock and the weight of money chasing property over the past three years has pushed down yield levels in both the office and industrial markets. In Northamptonshire, the IPD (Investment Property Databank) figures show a fall in office average initial yields from 8.5% in 2000 to 7.2% in 2004. Industrial yields have declined from 7.6% to 6.5% over the same period.

The fall in yield has been the key factor in boosting capital values and enhancing the return achievable on property as an investment medium. The higher returns achievable on property in relation to other investment assets such as equities and gilts have in turn been a major draw in attracting investors and in perpetuating this trend. The transaction tables show the yield on each individual deal during the period 2002-4.
Comparison with Other Counties in The East Midlands Region

A breakdown of investment activity by County shows Nottinghamshire and Leicestershire following Northamptonshire with 25% and 20% of the regional share of total investment in the region respectively.

Table 5
Total Investment By County 2002-4

![Total Investment Activity By County 2002-2004](image)

Source: Lambert Smith Hampton Property Data
As with the national trend, competition for investment stock has led to property yields falling significantly in all sectors in all counties in the East Midlands during 2004. The table below shows average initial yields for office and industrial properties by location from 2002 to 2004.

### Table 7
**Office and Industrial Initial Yields By Location In East Midlands**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Office Initial Yields (%)</th>
<th>Industrial Initial Yields (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northampton</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicester</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derby</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Investment Property Databank (IPD) – No data available for offices for Lincoln and Derby*
**Spread of Activity**

Analysis by sector shows the strength of the retail market in attracting investors in 2004. The combination of stable or rising rental growth and falling yields, meant that retail was the best performing sector of the property market during 2004. It is therefore not surprising that investors have been keen to take advantage of the higher returns generated by retail properties. While the consumer sector has slowed and the prospects for the sector may not be as strong over the next 2-3 years as they have been in the past 2-3 years, the retail sector as a whole is expected to continue to maintain it’s a healthy performance.

A detailed examination of last year’s investment transactions illustrates the following:

- In Nottinghamshire, Nottingham was the main focus of investment activity, attracting £112 m in funds. Around 85% of the acquisitions in the County as a whole were in the retail sector. The office market comes second with 10%, reflecting the larger size of the office market in Nottingham and its position in the office hierarchy.

- The largest deals by value in the retail sector in Nottinghamshire during 2004 were the purchase of St Marks Place, Nottingham for £18.7 m at a yield of 7% and the purchase of Briddlesmith Gate, Nottingham for £7.46m at a yield of 5.15%. In the industrial sector, Long Eaton which was bought for £17.46m at a yield of 7.2% was the largest by value.

- In Lincolnshire, 96% of all transactions were retail properties. Pescod Square in Boston was purchased for £29m and 65 Victoria Street, Grimsby for £21.5m.

- In Leicestershire, retail accounted for 83% of the investment in the County. The largest deals were the Haymarket Centre, Leicester where ING Britannica paid £77m at a yield of 5.51%; Abbeygate Shopping Centre in Nuneaton which was bought for £16.8m at a yield of 6.5% and St Mary’s Place, Market Harborough which was bought
for £15m at a yield of 5.25%. The industrial sector was second in terms of attracting funds with 8.4% of all transactions by value, while offices attracted 6.2% of the total share.

- In Derbyshire £72.7m was invested in the property market. 69% of this total was in retail, with industrial drawing 15% of the funds.

**Table 8**

**Investment Activity By Sector in Nottinghamshire**

Comparison With Milton Keynes

Comparison of investment activity with the neighbouring Milton Keynes shows significant variation in both the volume and the pattern of investment activity. Our analysis highlights the following key points:

- Total investment activity in Milton Keynes over the period 2002-2004 totalled £538.5m. This compares with £356.3 for Northamptonshire as a whole.
• The year on year investment levels show a more even spread of activity over the three year period in Northamptonshire. In Milton Keynes the majority of transactions by value were in 2003. 2004 saw lower transaction levels, although significantly higher than 2002.

• In terms of sector spread, investment activity in Milton Keynes has been more focused on the retail market than Northamptonshire. Investor interest turned towards the retail market in 2002 and 2003. Retail investment accounted for more than half of all transactions by value in 2002 and more than two thirds in 2003.

Table 9
Total Investment Activity in Milton Keynes 2002-4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Investment (£m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: LSH Research/Property Data

• In 2004, the anticipated slowdown in consumer spending following successive interest rates increases and the anticipated slowdown in the retail market were the key factors in diverting investment away from retail and into the industrial sector in Milton Keynes.
Table 10
Investment Activity By Sector in Milton Keynes

- The share of all industrial transactions by value in Milton Keynes increased to over 50% in 2004, while that of retail declined to 23%. Although significant in absolute terms, the amount of money invested in the industrial sector was much lower than in Northamptonshire.

- As an investment medium, the performance of office and industrial properties has varied between Milton Keynes and Northamptonshire. Office properties in Northampton have produced lower returns than those in Milton Keynes over a three, five and ten year period and this partly explains the lower level of interest in this sector by investors, particularly in the last three years. Not surprisingly, the performance of industrial properties has been stronger in Northamptonshire over the same period.
Table 11
Total Returns – Northamptonshire and Milton Keynes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Milton Keynes</th>
<th>Northamptonshire</th>
<th>Milton Keynes</th>
<th>Northamptonshire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-year</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-year</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-year</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-year</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Investment Property Databank (IPD)

Summary

The past three years have seen exceptional levels of activity in the commercial investment market. East Midlands along with other regions has benefited from this higher level of investor interest. The region attracted over £700m in 2004. Northamptonshire and Nottinghamshire have been the two counties benefiting most.

The prominence of the distribution sector in Northamptonshire’s local economy is reflected in the pattern of investment activity, with the industrial sector accounting for £188m or 77% of all transactions by value in 2004. The largest deals took place at DIRFT, totalling £102m. Northampton came second with £78m worth of transactions. The majority of deals in the retail and office sector were small in terms of value.

Nottinghamshire has also benefited from a steady rise in investment in the industrial sector as the availability of land and labour has increased its attractiveness in recent years as a distribution location. Industrial properties have been cheaper to purchase in Nottingham at a yield of 7.2% compared with 6.5% in Northampton and 5.7% in Leicester.
SECTION 3.6

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES.

The objectives of the MKSM and Sustainable Communities Plan is not just to create more housing, but to integrate housing with infrastructure, investment and economic growth. As such the objectives are to create the necessary environment and quality of life that would allow existing businesses to expand and help attract new investment.

An increasingly global and competitive business climate is forcing many companies to take a closer look at minimising costs and maximising shareholder value. Competitive pressures and new technological advances also mean that companies are becoming more footloose and more focused on finding the right accommodation that serves their needs as a business.

For many companies, particularly larger national and international companies, property is becoming increasingly a strategic choice. Choosing the right premises influences the effectiveness of both operational management and corporate finance and helps to create a competitive advantage.

For all companies, however large or small, ensuring a suitable property arrangement takes forward planning and vision. Several key factors play a key part in the decision making process. These include: property costs, flexibility, connectivity, accessibility/transport, sustainability, availability of high quality premises, availability of skilled labour and a high quality of life.

For companies, depending on priorities, there is some element of trade-off with respect to the above criteria. The demands of a high-tech company will be very different from that of a call centre or indeed a company choosing a location as its headquarters. It may be logical to assume that the most attractive locations are those that have the lowest property
costs. But, what is equally important is whether the type of space required by the occupier can be found.

Many of the first tier regional centres such as Manchester, Birmingham and Glasgow are more successful at attracting new companies because they have a mature, established office market that offers a wide range of modern, high specification premises. The majority of second and third tier regional centres can only attract smaller, local occupiers because high quality space of 930 sq m (10,000 sq ft or above is not usually available for immediate occupation. More significantly, there is very little in the development pipeline which could be developed speculatively or on a design and build basis. With the exception of Northampton, the office markets in the other districts in the County of Northamptonshire are relatively small. With demand for larger units relatively thin, developers are reluctant to build space speculatively. This lack of high quality accommodation is the key constraint in attracting inward investment. Breaking away from this pattern requires substantial investment in new property development, regeneration and provision of retail and leisure facilities as well as good connectivity and transport access.

The County’s future success as a business location should be seen within the context of its strength and weaknesses. Northamptonshire has clearly a number of advantages:

- **Population growth**: Northamptonshire has been a growth area in terms of population and will continue to see an increase in population and number of households over the next 30 years as a direct result of the MKSM plan to increase housing. This increase in population in turn will create a significant boost to the spend power within the County and help faster company/business formation and higher employment levels. The increase in population will have to go hand in hand with the improvements in infrastructure and amenities and this in turn will help improve the quality of life and increase the attractiveness of the area as a business location.
• **Competitive labour costs:** Unemployment is low and labour costs are the most competitive in the UK. Wage costs are lower than the national average. Recent trends show an increase in the number of companies relocating their operations to Asia or Central and Eastern Europe in order to take advantage of low cost of labour. In an increasingly competitive business climate this discount will continue to be an advantage.

• **Competitive property costs:** Office rental values in the region are relatively low compared to the South East. Prime office rents in Northampton are £161.46 per sq m (£15 per sq ft) compared with £296 per sq m (£27.50 per sq ft) in Birmingham, £215.57 per sq m (£20 per sq ft) in Oxford, £247.57 per sq m (£23 per sq ft) in Reading, £269.1 per sq m (£25 per sq ft) in Heathrow and £322.8 per sq m (£30 per sq ft) in Hammersmith. In terms of total occupancy costs (rents, rates, FM costs), Northampton is expected to continue to offer a competitive deal to occupiers over the next five years, with total costs at £376.75 per sq m (£35 per sq ft) not only below Nottingham £430.57 per sq m (£40 per sq ft) and Leicester £409 per sq m (£38 psf), but significantly below Birmingham £678.14 per sq m (£63 per sq ft) and Manchester £624.32 per sq m (£58 per sq ft).
Table 12
Total Occupancy Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>£ per sq ft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>£0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>£10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liverpool</td>
<td>£20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>£30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiff</td>
<td>£40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>£50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>£60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth</td>
<td>£70.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The Data takes account of 2005 rating revaluation, rental growth and the associated rise in FM costs as a proportion of these.

- **Central location/good access**: As a strategic location at the heart of the UK, with good access to the M1 and A1, Northamptonshire is ideally placed to take advantage of new business relocations, especially from companies who need to remain close to the South East and London. However, the completion of Heathrow Terminal 5 will continue to be a major draw to companies keen to be close to an airport. A lot of effort will be needed to persuade companies to choose Northamptonshire over the traditional markets in and around Heathrow.

- **The O2C Arc**: At the centre of the O2C Arc, Northamptonshire is best placed to accommodate companies who wish to be close to the centres of excellence at Oxford and Cambridge, but wish to take advantage of the quality of life, housing, lower property costs and lower labour costs offered by Northamptonshire. The County is effectively a convenient area for businesses needing to operate within the Arc. This is particularly an advantage for the County in terms of attracting high tech and R&D companies who need to be close to the Oxford and Cambridge Universities and should help encourage the development of business clusters in Northamptonshire.
• **Strong Logistics/distribution market:**

Northampton, Daventry and Wellingborough have become synonymous with Distribution. The distribution market is by far the largest market in the area. Availability of land and good communications and access have been the key elements attracting large national occupiers to the region.

Despite these positive factors, there are a number of areas where a more positive and direct action is needed if Northamptonshire is to compete successfully with some of the other first tier regional centres in attracting office and high tech occupiers. Tackling these is important if the County is to avoid losing inward investment opportunities and new jobs to other regions in the UK. The areas which need particular attention are:

• **Infrastructure and connections:** The County’s telecommunications and connectivity infrastructure need improving.

• **Skills base:** The proportion of the workforce with A level or higher level qualifications is below the national average and while the gap is narrowing, more effort needs to be made to ensure that the right skills are available, particularly if the County is to succeed in attracting high tech and financial and business companies.

• **Branding & image:** Unlike the other UK regions, the East Midlands region has no well defined capital city. Moreover, Northamptonshire suffers from a lack of identity. Branding and image are increasingly important if Northamptonshire is to compete successfully with other areas within the East Midlands region and across the UK. More effort therefore is needed on brand development in general and in improving Northampton’s image as an office location. A large, well defined office market is essential in creating that identity.

• **Finance & support networks:** Attracting new investment in R&D and high tech sectors will have to be supported by a network of agencies and support groups. This means the presence of a full range of finance options, including venture capitalists, intellectual
property lawyers, organised industry groups and academic links, as well as the full spectrum of industry, from large corporates to spin outs.

• **Right quality of premises**: The MKSM advocates the creation of 81,000 new jobs in Northamptonshire, the majority of these in the Financial & Business Services sector. For leading companies in this sector and those considering a new location for their HQ operations costs are much less of a factor than image. The tendency so far has been for such companies to opt out for the first tier centres such as Birmingham, Manchester and Cardiff, where there is a greater supply of high quality accommodation. The number of high quality office developments in Northamptonshire that can at present compete and attract large occupiers in the financial sector or with requirements for HQ premises is limited. Neither are there adequate provisions for high tech companies wishing to locate on a science park, incubation centre or a business park

• **Rising land and labour costs**: The rising cost of land and labour could pose a threat to the distribution market by pushing occupiers looking for mega sheds to other locations around the UK. Availability of land for ownership enhances the appeal of competing centres such as Nottingham, Stoke and Peterborough.
SECTION 3.7
Summary and SWOT

In summary, the following SWOT analysis captures the advantages, disadvantages and opportunities facing Northamptonshire as a whole and Kettering in particular at present.

**SWOT Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Competitive labour costs</td>
<td>• Lack of identity or brand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Competitive property costs</td>
<td>• Skills gap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Central location</td>
<td>• Lack of high quality office accommodation, particularly in town centres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Relatively good transport links</td>
<td>• Lack of accommodation for high tech and R&amp;D companies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• At centre of O2C Arc</td>
<td>• Small office markets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Strong logistics market</td>
<td>• Need for connectivity improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Strong investor interest in the industrial sector</td>
<td>• Some towns/districts not well connected by road or rail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Population growth due to MKSM</td>
<td>• Strong competition from Milton Keynes and Peterborough following their designation as Growth Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Employment growth due to MKSM</td>
<td>• Lack of office accommodation to meet the additional new employment in FBS sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Higher office demand due to growth in financial &amp; business services</td>
<td>• Heathrow Terminal 5 attracting inward investing occupiers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Growth in high tech &amp; R&amp;D clusters</td>
<td>• Lack of cohesive marketing and branding strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rising demand due to proximity to Oxford &amp; Cambridge Universities</td>
<td>• The status of the County as a second tier regional centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 900 ha of land available for office and industrial development in the region</td>
<td>• Lack of skilled labour particularly in R&amp;D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Continuing strength of the logistics market</td>
<td>• Competition from other distribution locations offering cheaper land and labour costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lack of sites and property available for immediate development and occupation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SITE IDENTIFICATION AND ASSESSMENT

4.1 Introduction

The brief for this study included the following basic aims:

- Identify potential sites within the Borough for employment development; employment development in this instance relates to the B1, B2 and B8 use classes.

- Assess those potential sites for suitability of development (in terms of environmental, social, and commercial sustainability)

- Produce a list of options of sites with an appraisal of the pros and cons of each

- Provide an assessment of the viability of the sites, details of the likely costs of development and identify any potential impediments to the development of those sites (and the level of any ‘extra’ costs that would be faced in bringing the sites forward).

- In undertaking this assessment of sites, it will be especially important to take on board the advice within the employment land reviews guidance note recently published by the ODPM as well as the relevant national, regional, sub-regional and local planning policies

The project outcome should provide a list of sites capable of accommodating the envisaged future quantity of land for employment development. These sites will have been assessed for their suitability both in terms of their likely environmental and social impact as well as their commercial viability. These sites may be of a strategic nature (e.g. one site that accommodates all the envisaged requirement) or a mixture of smaller sites. The key is to provide an assessment of the costs and benefits of the sites to produce a portfolio of sites that meet the local and strategic planning objectives while serving the requirements of businesses and developers.
Recommendations as to the order of preference of such sites (in terms of those that best meet the planning and commercial objectives) should be made.

The other primary outcome of the study should be an estimate of the costs of bringing the sites into use and identification of any potential impediments to or excessive costs likely to be incurred in their development.

The Borough Council would provide the amounts of new employment land required and the split between B1, B2 and B8. Key existing research, such as the COPELA study would be used as a baseline for this work by the Council.

Given that some 50 to 60 ha (122 – 148 acres) of land were to be identified, with higher levels that this on a long-list, KBC indicated that the study should concentrate on the larger [say >10 ha (25 acres)] and medium sized sites [say 2 -10ha (5 – 25 acres)] rather than small sites [say < 2ha (5 acres)].

### 4.2 Principles for Site identification

**Principles**

The main search areas were identified by addressing the relevant local, regional and national planning and economic policy background. The detailed policy considerations have been summarised in the Key Economic and Planning Policies chapter of this report.

Key drivers from this policy analysis identified certain key criteria that included:

- Employment should be located so as to minimise transport impact and so be close to where people live.

- In particular sites that are in and immediately around the towns of Kettering, Burton Latimer, Desborough and Rothwell should be prioritised.
• Where not appropriate to the town centres, employment should preferably be located in sustainable locations.

• Where specific justifiable employment needs means that suitable sites cannot be identified in the above locations, other locations may be considered, but the principles of sustainability and commercial deliverability needs to be balanced as far as is possible.

• Timely deliverability is a high priority as the provision of jobs in the Borough is essentially to the economic and social well-being of the community.

• Sites that have already been identified in the existing Local Plan are not considered in this study.

• Sites that are not in the Local Plan but have been given planning permission as a departure from the Local Plan, are not considered in this study (specifically Morrisons on Latimer Park, the Weetabix factory extension site and the Prologis site south of the A14 at Rothwell).

• Within the wider locational criteria site location have then also been refined by other factors notably environmental sensitivities (e.g. high visibility to the surrounding countryside and nearness to environmentally sensitive areas) and deliverability factors (e.g. the willingness of the landowner/developer to release the land).

**Sustainable Urban Extentions**

Another policy driver, as highlighted in the NNT Options paper, stresses that employment land should be considered to be part of “sustainable urban extentions”. At the time of writing this strategy the *Local Development Framework* was not sufficiently advanced to identify where such sites will be. For example there is an expectation that significant housing land may be located as part of an SDA for Rothwell and Desborough, also to the
East of Kettering, however there is no certainty, as to exactly where, how many houses, nor how much employment land will be needed.

This is a key unknown variable and so a balance has to be struck between identifying land that has a certainty of delivery, identifying land for those employment uses that are site specific and/or may not best be located in the places the sustainable urban extentions will eventually be, and identifying land to be allocated within sustainable urban extentions when these do come on line.

**Future of the A14**

Another key unknown variable is the whereabouts of the proposed re-alignment of the A14. This employment study has identified purely theoretical alignments to test the locational priorities that might result from an alignment to the north of Kettering and to the South of Kettering (or indeed a widening on the current alignment). Any new road scheme eventually decided upon is unlikely to actually built and open until 2017 or even later.

**The Three Growth Towns**

Finally there is an issue of the relationships within the North Northamptonshire Growth Area as a whole. The 3 towns (Corby, Kettering and Wellingborough) are discrete units, and coalescence between the three towns is not an objective of the growth plans. However there may be advantages of closer economic links.

It is better for the sustainability, vitality and viability of the three main towns if local interaction between them is strengthened. For example the enhancing the scale and choice of employment offered by the three towns to its combined workforce, means travel to work and business-to-business activities would be kept local. This is better than, by default, encouraging travel to say Leicester, Birmingham, Peterborough, Milton Keynes or London.

The implication here is that sites that lie along the main north-south links between the three sites should be given more weight. The North of Kettering Business Park are extended to include Weekley Woods East is an example, as are the sites that lie to the south of the town alongside the Junction 9 (A509 / A14), and to a lesser extent along Junction 8 (A43/A14).
Sites around Junction 10 at Burton Latimer (A6 / A14) would be given a further boost should road improvements south to Wellingborough and the A45 be improved, in particular so as to bypass Finedon town.

**Deliverability**

The thrust of this study has been to focus earlier delivery on sites that have a high likelihood of delivery in the period up to 2016/21. Some other sites such as those associated with sustainable urban extensions, may be able to be brought forward in advance of 2016/2021, or be considered later in the development period (2021-2031).

**Rolling Review**

The issues and uncertainties highlighted above, combined with recent Government advice on good practice means that the Employment Study should best be reviewed on a rolling basis both as the planning process moves forward, and as market supply and demand factors change. Once this study has fed into the emerging KBC Local Development Framework (LDF), a first review should perhaps then take place 18 months to 2 years on (in 2007/08). This will allow for the adoption of the Core Strategy/Local Development Framework and other MKSN related planning and policy work to have progressed. A second major review might then be appropriate in 2010/11.

**4.3 Identifying Specific Locations**

**Kettering Locations**

The identification of town centre sites, particularly for B1 and B2 uses, is a priority. Essentially all town centre/close to town centre sites already have a use, so the emphasis is on regeneration, intensification and change of use.

Kettering town centre has several sites/areas that can offer significant opportunities for employment, however, apart from smaller sites, they are largely not deliverable at this time due to major infrastructure impediments that will require intervention funding and/or require detailed area Masterplanning.
These sites specifically include the: the town centre core; the station area and; the Northfield Avenue area (from Lower Street up to Rockingham Road).

The Station area requires major investment in a new and/or widened crossing of the railway line (and KBC have indicated that they are seeking early funding for a widening of the Northampton Road under the railway is needed). KBC have also identified The Northfield Avenue area needs the rail crossing below the hospital on the Rothwell Road. A significant improvement to the junction of the Northfield Rd and Northampton Road is also needed to facilitate access in this area, including to and from the station.

Development in the station area would require major investment due to access restrictions. Consideration also needs to be given to taking the next stage in town centre Masterplanning started by the Atkins Town Centre Masterplan work (2004) to cover the station area and the Northfield Avenue area. Without and until these studies are complete it will not be possible to identify the amount, exact location and type of employment land that should be identified.

Some sites within these yet to be masterplanned areas are available in theory for development. Active marketing by agents for some sites is also underway. Serious consideration should be given to adopt a development moratorium on these sites as it would be premature to accept application until the planning work has been completed. It would be a strong argument that the longer-term sustainability, vitality and viability of the town centre as whole should not be compromised by short-term development pressure. However it would be incumbent upon the Council to use all reasonable endeavours to resolve the works need to allow for these sites to come forward.

Some other sites are able to be developed without the railway widening constraints, but have different constraints of their own. A key example of this would be the McAlpine/Pytchley Road Industrial Estate.

This large area of existing employment land is underdeveloped, yet lies close to the A14, is within the town, and not too far from the town centre. Multiple ownerships, the need to relocate some current users, major access enhancements, some contamination and some
flood prevention issues would need to be addressed first. New employment uses for the site should primarily be aimed at higher quality B1 with some related B2. The viability of the development would need these higher land value uses. Some minor leisure and/or housing may assist as enabling development. Grant aid for example from the Fit for Market Fund or similar may help clear any final viability gap. Funding for major strategic access works may be sought via NNT from ODPM. The opportunities afforded by the identification of the area as a formal Special Planning Zone (SPZ) might be considered. Such a designation would help market confidence by shifting the likelihood of planning permission, and better allow for some grant aid to be allocated to the site. Despite this site on the face of it being a difficult site to bring forward, it is the strong sustainable development drivers, supported by clear sub-regional, regional and national guidance, that identifies the priority of this site and others like it as suitable to be included in this study. The site is not identified as a first rank deliverable site only because it will take time and major intervention funding, significant planning resource input from KBC and NNT/JPU and the co-operation of landowners/developers to move the site towards realistic delivery.

Consideration is being given to dealing with all 3 of these major strategic town centre sites (Northfield Avenue area, station area and Pytchley Lodge Industrial Estate) within the context of a wider strategic approach.

Some within-town sites (for example the site between the A14 at Junction 7 and the Crematorium/Evening Telegraph offices, south of Warren Hill) lie within the town boundary, with good transport links to markets and to the town centre, with few environmental constraints, and offer a good opportunity for early deliverability.

Other sites identified around the edge of Kettering town are dealt below under Peripheral Kettering and Burton Latimer Sites

Burton Latimer

Sites lying within the wider Burton Latimer town area are dealt with below under Peripheral Kettering and Burton Latimer sites. Whilst the two settlements are clearly distinct from each other, the common factor of the peripheral sites is their immediate adjacency to the A14, A43 and the A6 on the periphery of the built up areas. In the case of
Burton Latimer the sites lie within what the current Local Plan identifies as open/landscape space as part of the wider town.

**Peripheral Kettering and Burton Latimer Town Sites**

These sites lie on the town edge adjacent to the three major roads that encircle the town (A14, A6 and A43). These sites have the attributes that they can be relative large and thus help deliver the scale of new employment land needed. They are close to high quality transport routes and thus are commercially attractive, particularly to those uses that need access to wider markets (e.g. B8 and some B2). There are also environmental benefits for locating HGV movements away from residential areas.

They sites also include a few sites where the commercial reality is that companies wanting to locate to research and design (R&D) high-tec offices, a KBC employment strategy priority, will want sites that have a high quality environment, and usually a parkland type environment (as also recognised in the emerging North Northamptonshire NNT Options Core Strategy Options paper).

A good example of this would be the Weekley Woods East site (KN3), which despite being north of the main town boundary is: adjacent to the major road network and to a complimentary land use (the existing Weekly Woods/North Kettering Business Development Area); is a clearly defined site enclosed by significant mature woodland; would undoubtedly be attractive to employers; helps meet the high priority targets in the regional, sub-regional and local high-priority economic strategies (research and development, hi-tec and headquarter offices); and is reasonably accessible to the town centre and to residential areas.

Other such sites are in the longer term likely to be found as part of sustainable urban extentions in suitably attractive settings.

Because such sites are on the town edge and at junctions that lead towards the town centre, there reasonable accessibility to and from the services and populations that the town centre offers.
The sites though are not as sustainable in environmental terms as town centre sites, and have been identified only because of the overall locational needs listed above, coupled with the wider sustainability need to ensure jobs can be located through sites that will be developed in the short to medium term, be competitive with other towns’ sites, and so help support a locally available jobs-led growth.

Thus a balance is being struck between environmental protection and economic development, which is the basis of holistic sustainability in the context of the wider MKSM Growth area polices, and to support the thrust of the current Local Plan and current Council employment allocations.

A regional policy priority is to locate new major employment sites within sustainable urban extentions.

At the time of the writing of this report the location and amounts of housing and employment were not yet known. The current uncertainty makes it difficult to allocate this potential land in the Deliverability figures, however the land has been identified in the “next most likely employment land to be delivered” allocation.

Site analysis identified that the south-east corner of the overall KE1/2 site as a potential location for significant employment, as long as good access to the A14 was provided.

Rothwell and Desborough

The search area for the two towns has been directly informed by the identified search area of the SDA’s. It has also been informed by the various submissions by those landowners/developers that have made proposals as requested for the development SDA areas.

Whilst one site in particular has been identified that could be developed regardless of the choice of the SDA’s (the DN4/5 site lies adjacent to the A6 Rothwell/Desborough bypass roundabout at its junction with the Braybrooke Road), two other potentially key sites have a less high Deliverability given to them because they may be commercially more dependant upon the area being chosen as a housing SDA and on the need for a new junction with the A6.
There is also an issue of market deliverability in the Rothwell Area should too many sites come forward in that area, particularly when other more attractive sites closer to the core roads network, and/or employee market are also identified.

It is noted for example that the north of Desborough (at the time of writing) has an existing large employment site identified in the Local Plan (Site 6 named in this study as DN1) that despite considerable reported interest, at the time of writing the report had not yet come forward, and that Rothwell has the Prologis site (at A14 Junction 3) with relatively recent planning permission that has yet to developed and sold. It is felt that one more large site in the area would be appropriate for early delivery. Indeed the proposed site (DN4/5) is a better location than the existing Local Plan site (DN1) in relation to access to the road network due to opening of the new A6 Rothwell bypass. It may be useful to assess the deliverability of DN1 as and if site DN4/5, and other better located sites, come forward to market.

**Rural**

Whilst larger scale sites in and around urban areas have been identified, Borough economic priorities identify the need to provide employment opportunities for rural communities as well. Particularly with new technology, employment in villages can help deliver high quality, higher skilled and thus high priority jobs through small B1 office locations, and in some exceptional instances by related and appropriate B2 use.

Recent market experience and future market predictions strongly favour small rural office developments as might be typically be found in the conversion of a set of traditional farm buildings, as long as the market is not swamped by too many such developments in one area or at one time.

The village and rural environment is very sensitive to the type, scale and location of such development, and there are clear policies regarding inappropriate development in open countryside. This needs to be balanced against the deliverability of high priority economic targets, and the need to provide employment in rural areas.
It is therefore felt that with sufficient planning protection and with a clear policy on amount, scale, location, phasing, quality and type of employment that a set amount of rural office development should be positively encouraged.

**Small urban sites**

Whilst larger urban brownfield sites have been identified in this study, the development opportunities for small/very small urban sites should also be encouraged. These sites would typically have existing employment use, that could be intensified or “upgraded”, for example from some poor quality B2 uses, to high quality, more intensive B1 uses.

Such redevelopment would need to be able to be achieved in a sustainable manner. As it not that practical to make a conclusive study of where such sites may be located or when they might come onto the market, and the fact that such sites will generally not make a major impact on the overall scale of provision needed, it is suggested that these be considered as potential windfall sites, but not counted in the totals for this study.

It is recognised that a few such B1 sites have already been identified by the Atkins Town Centre Masterplanning study and these sites should generally be pursued as the masterplan evolves.

It is noted that few sites identified in the Local Plan are in the process of coming forward (e.g. KS3 and KS9), but since they are already allocated they are not counted in the totals for this study.

**Other sites**

Some other sites not fitting into the above categories were considered, specifically a site within the Borough, but located on Corby’s urban fringe (Site C1). Whilst the site may have some advantages in terms of sustainable accessibility, its downside included the issue of coalescence between Corby and Kettering.

Interestingly this same coalescence argument, though also considered for the Weekly Woods East site, has less relevance there because: the site is no nearer Corby than the
allocated North Kettering Employment Area; is better connected to the town centre; does not narrow the gap between the towns and; has other higher economic priority B1 delivery benefits.

Sites not considered

Sites not covered by the above categories that are: outside of the towns’ boundaries; on the outside/open-country side a potential new A14 alignment; or outside of the SDA search areas, have not been identified, for the purposes of this study, as suitable for new employment locations, on the basis of not being sustainable locations, in line with local, regional and national planning and economic policies.

4.4 Identifying Likely Sites

Kettering Borough Council undertook a supply-and-demand based analysis that also considered issues such as the vitality and viability of the town centres. Existing research was considered, particularly the Northamptonshire COPELA study. An indication of the amount of B1, B2 and B8 land required to be identified was then passed to the consultants. This was a minimum of 25 ha (62 acres) of B1 and 27 ha (67 acres) of B2/B8.

Nortoft and LSH identified broad search areas as discussed in the paragraphs above. Extensive research was also undertaken with all key landowners, agents and developers to help identify potential sites and further search areas. Nortoft and LSH further undertook both specific enquiries in relation to sites that best fitted the planning and policy drivers.

Once sites with potential had been identified, further detailed discussions were held with: landowners, agents and developers; KBC planning and economic development officers; NNT Joint Planning Unit; the County Council; Invest Northamptonshire and others. These discussion allowed for a second opinion on the consultants’ initial choice of sites as well as the opportunity to ensure key sites had not been missed.
4.5 Initial Assessment of Sites

Once the refined search area and initial discussions with planners, landowners and agents had been undertaken a detailed list of factors was then taken into account for each site, broadly split into commercial/economic factors and sustainable/environmental/social factors. Sites that best met a combination of the commercial and sustainable were identified as having the higher priority.

The appraisal of the sustainable/environmental/social factors was based on:

- environmental and traffic impact;
- use of brownfield land;
- sequential test;
- topography,
- impact of landscape,
- amenity impact on neighbouring uses;
- flooding impact,
- potential contamination / stability / site clearance issues;
- access to site;
- accessibility for workforce by car and by non-car transport;
- access to facilities for the workforce,
- availability of other jobs locally;
- potential to reduce local deprivation areas;
- potential for intervention funding;
- alternative uses if not allocated for employment;
- quality of agricultural land if lost;
- and other factors.

The appraisal of the commercial/economic factors included:

- potential viability based on costs of land/rents;
- development and mitigation;
- site availability; sites constraints;
• complexity of land assembly;
• workforce availability;
• access issues;
• 3 hr HGV catchment;
• market conditions;
• existing land use;
• attractiveness of the surrounding areas to business;
• proximity to similar uses;
• existing planning permissions;
• supply and demand for proposed land use;
• recent relevant market activity;
• likely availability of the site;
• market demand without the need for intervention;
• ease of land assembly;
• and other factors.

4.6 Refinement of sites

Putting sites into categories

The sites assessments were based on a qualitative judgement taking into account all the above factors and expressing them as a numerical summary, so as to be able to plot the relative position of the sites in relation to a combined assessment of the commercial and sustainable factors. Equal weighting was given to each factor, scored essentially on a low/medium/high basis. This was a useful aid from which site assessments were further checked and refined on planning and deliverability grounds.

Overall, timely deliverability was considered in the assessment of both the sustainability and commercial factors. For example sites may initially seem attractive, but on closer examination be difficult to deliver because they were found to have: complex land assembly needs; requirement for new major infrastructure, were reliant upon the new A14; dependant upon further strategic planning to identify where major housing growth would be located; or landowners that were likely to be reluctant to proceed with employment land.
The relative deliverability priority of sites was assessed on a qualitative basis supported by using a graph (see sites assessment chapter) summarising commercial and sustainability benefits, and potential sites were split into five categories:

- Sites that are most deliverable, that are likely to be available in the near future or would be available given likely intervention funding to mitigate abnormal costs, typically major infrastructure provision. These sites are coloured dark green (level 1) and light green (level 2) in the Sites Assessment Table (Chapter 5 - Figure 5.2) and coloured solid green and hatched green on the site plans.

- Land that may be of a higher deliverability at a later stage, but is dependant on the location of the improved A14 route, or determination of major housing allocations as part of a sustainable urban extension. These sites are coloured dark orange (level 3) and light orange (level 4) in the Sites Assessment Table (Chapter 5 - Figure 5.2) and coloured solid orange and hatched orange on the site plans.

- Land that is allocated but doesn’t have a specific location identified, ie small rural area sites and small town centre sites. This latter sites were not added to the totals but is expected to come forward as windfall sites.

- Land with a low or no reasonable likelihood of being suitable or available for employment. These sites were coloured red or left blank on the site assessment plans.

The assessment plans also show some sites with a grey colour. These are for information only and depict developments that have been given planning permission as a departure from the Local Plan (e.g. Morrisons, Weetabix, Prologis at Rothwell) as well as a few sites that are in the Local Plan and are just coming to market (e.g. site next to the Little Chef by the A14).

Sites in the first category (green sites) were the pool from which the final top deliverable sites would be chosen. Although sites in the second categories (orange sites) were not seen as current priorities, there would be some exceptions if major limitations / uncertainties were overcome. Chief amongst these were: the future route of the A14; the rail crossing
infrastructure and; the confirmation of the location and number of major new housing sites up to 2021.

It is to be expected that the proposed on-going review of this Employment Study would identify when sites in the second category (orange sites) might be more clearly identified and increase in deliverability, and so be considered for employment designation.

Given that the MKSM growth policy clearly identifies future major growth beyond 2021 and up to 2031, it will be appropriate to have these potential sites in reserve for consideration for future allocation.

Site Allocation by Land Use

Sites were prioritised that would best meet the identified land requirements identified by the Council for B1, B2 and B8.

“Logistics Plus” may well be needed to be supported by suitable employment land allocation. Advocated by Invest Northamptonshire based on wider external research, and agreed by KBC, logistic plus would essentially provide more jobs per hectare including higher quality jobs than could be delivered by traditional B8 distribution sites. This is achieved by co-locating a firm’s distribution B8 with its related B2 (e.g. product assembly) and related B1 (e.g. headquarter management). This would have the added advantage of reducing transport waste between assembly and delivery functions.

COPELA identified a current surplus of B2 uses, however more detailed analysis by KBC identified that there is a need to provide for B2 including those associated with distribution, as above, and also those associated with hi-tec industries and priority clusters (e.g. environmental technologies). It was therefore determined by KBC that for the purposes of this study the B2 and B8 allocations were merged.

A final detailed analysis of deliverable sites was undertaken and this confirmed those sites that would best:
- benefit balanced sustainability and commercial needs;
- meet local, national and regional planning policy and economic development drivers;
- deliver the specific amount of B1, B2/B8 land requirement;
- be best likely to be delivered in time to support a jobs led growth.

4.7 Conclusions

The Council identified a need up to 2021 for total of 25 ha (62 acres) of B1; 8 ha (20 acres) of B2, 19 ha (47 acres) of B8 [combined 27 ha (67 acres) of B2/B8], and thus a total of 52 ha (129 acres) of new unallocated employment land.

This Employment Study has identified 27 ha (67 acres) of B1 and 28 ha (69 acres) of B2/B8, as suitable for delivery up to 2021, and potentially deliverable up to 2016 should the future strategic and planning drivers and the market demand require it. The location of these sites is identified in the sites analyses section of this report.

A further 48 ha (143 acres) of potential employment land was identified as “next most likely to be deliverable”. This total was made up from two sources namely: Cohen’s Yard (8 ha; 19.7 acres) and possible undefined other major urban development as part of new MKSM growth, which has had to be given a theoretical estimate at around 40 ha (99 acres), based on the Structure Plan employment to housing ratios and a conservative number of houses to be built up to 2021. A rolling review of this employment study will need to refine this figure in due course.

Given the high level of market interest for sites in Kettering along the A14, evidenced by the recent Morrisons and Weetabix sites and to a lesser extent by the Prologis A14 Rothwell site, it will be helpful to have larger strategic sites available, in excess of local identified need. This additional allocation also provides some flexibility should it not be possible to deliver one or more of the sites identified within the main priorities on time.
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5.1 Analysis of Sites: Relative Commercial and Sustainable Viability

Sites nearer the top right of the graph will have the higher commercial and sustainability ratings. Sites nearest the bottom left will be the least commercially and sustainably desirable of the sites on the graph. Green sites are of a higher deliverability than orange sites. Green sites include both solid and hatched green sites, as identified in the site assessment sheets and maps. Of all the orange sites in the analyses, only solid orange sites are shown in this graph, having the a higher deliverability of the orange sites.

Grey arrows indicate how possible intervention funding could increase the priority and deliverability of some key sites. Grey sites are reference sites of three employment areas identified in the Local Plan and presently coming to market (KS2: nr Little Chef; KS3: near Velux; and DN1: Desborough North), and also shown in grey are a further three sites coming to market as a departure from the Local Plan (BL6: Weetabix; BL7: Morrisons and RS1: Prologis at Rothwell).

A list of commercial and sustainability factors used to generate the sites positions in this graph may be found in the section 4.5 of Chapter 4 “Sites Identification and Assessment”.
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### 5.2 KETTERING EMPLOYMENT STUDY: SITES INFORMATION AND PRIORITISATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Site No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Site Information</th>
<th>Deliverability Analysis</th>
<th>Deliverability level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gross ha</td>
<td>Estimated gross developable size ha</td>
<td>Size ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desborough North</td>
<td>DN1</td>
<td>Local Plan D6 site</td>
<td>16.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desborough North</td>
<td>DN2</td>
<td>Dobbs Hall Farm west of Stoke Rd</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desborough North</td>
<td>DN3</td>
<td>Dobbs Hall Farm east of Stoke Rd</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desborough North</td>
<td>DN4</td>
<td>South of Braybrooke Rd</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desborough North</td>
<td>DN5</td>
<td>South of Braybrooke Rd Extension</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desborough North</td>
<td>DN6</td>
<td>South West of D6 Grange</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desborough North</td>
<td>DN7</td>
<td>North East of Byway</td>
<td>6.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desborough North</td>
<td>DN8</td>
<td>North of Braybrooke Rd</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desborough North</td>
<td>DN9</td>
<td>North of Braybrooke Rd</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desborough North</td>
<td>DN10</td>
<td>North of Braybrooke Rd</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desborough West</td>
<td>DW1</td>
<td>Manor Farm North</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desborough West</td>
<td>DW2</td>
<td>Manor Farm South</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desborough West</td>
<td>DW3</td>
<td>Manor Farm West</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desborough West</td>
<td>DW4</td>
<td>Manor Farm East /Astride Harrington Rd</td>
<td>25.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rothwell West</td>
<td>RW1</td>
<td>Rothwell West</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rothwell West</td>
<td>RW2</td>
<td>Rothwell West extension to south</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rothwell West</td>
<td>RW3</td>
<td>Rothwell West other</td>
<td>19.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rothwell South</td>
<td>RS1</td>
<td>SE of A14, J3, Prologis Site</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corby South</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>East of Shorefield Woods/A6003</td>
<td>22.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering Central</td>
<td>KC1/KC2</td>
<td>Station West</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering Central</td>
<td>KC3</td>
<td>Station East - North</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering Central</td>
<td>KC4</td>
<td>Station East - Central</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering Central</td>
<td>KC5</td>
<td>Station East - South</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering Central</td>
<td>KC6</td>
<td>Civic offices/pool</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering Central</td>
<td>KC7</td>
<td>Northfield Ave north</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering Central</td>
<td>KC8</td>
<td>Lower St</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering Central</td>
<td>KC9</td>
<td>Northfield Ave undefined</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering Central</td>
<td>KC10</td>
<td>Town Football Ground</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Site No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>New sites most deliverable</td>
<td>Of which B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering South</td>
<td>KS1</td>
<td>McAlpine area</td>
<td>20.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering South</td>
<td>KS2</td>
<td>South of Little Chef</td>
<td>31.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering South</td>
<td>KS3</td>
<td>Parkway</td>
<td>33.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering South</td>
<td>KS4</td>
<td>south of A14, JE of J9 opposite RCI</td>
<td>29.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering South</td>
<td>KS5</td>
<td>south of A14 Pytchley Lodge Barn, S of J9</td>
<td>57.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering South</td>
<td>KS6</td>
<td>South of A14 golf driving range, W of J9</td>
<td>58.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering South</td>
<td>KS7</td>
<td>south of A14 Marshes Barn/Clarke's Lodge</td>
<td>58.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering North</td>
<td>KN1</td>
<td>Glendon Employment Park</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering West</td>
<td>KW1</td>
<td>Scapyard by junction 8</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering West</td>
<td>KW2</td>
<td>south of A14 btw junctions 7 and 8</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering West</td>
<td>KW3</td>
<td>south of A14 A43 Junction 7</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering West</td>
<td>KW4</td>
<td>North of Gypsy Lane at Junction 7</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering West</td>
<td>KW5</td>
<td>East of A14 btw junction 7 and 8</td>
<td>31.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering North</td>
<td>KN2</td>
<td>Weekly Woods</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering North</td>
<td>KN3</td>
<td>Weekly Woods East</td>
<td>15.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering North</td>
<td>KN4</td>
<td>Weekly Woods Far East</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering East</td>
<td>KE1/KE2</td>
<td>Employment location undefined.</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burton Latimer</td>
<td>BL1</td>
<td>S of A14, Adjacent and E of J10,</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burton Latimer</td>
<td>BL2</td>
<td>Blackridge Farm East</td>
<td>13.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burton Latimer</td>
<td>BL3</td>
<td>A14, S of J10, S of A6, East of Kettering Rd</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burton Latimer</td>
<td>BL4</td>
<td>W of A6, SE from J10</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burton Latimer</td>
<td>BL5</td>
<td>W of A6, White Lodge Farm</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burton Latimer</td>
<td>BL6</td>
<td>Weetabix North</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burton Latimer</td>
<td>BL7</td>
<td>Morrisons Latimer Park</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>RUR1</td>
<td>No specific location (each site less than 0.5 ha)</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Smaller town centre sites that may come forward have not been identified and could be treated as windfall sites. It is not possible to identify the area of these sites, but with loss of other typically poor quality older existing employment sites (for example converted when to housing) it is assumed there will be no net change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Most Deliverable</th>
<th>Most Deliverable</th>
<th>Most Deliverable</th>
<th>Most Deliverable</th>
<th>Next most likely deliverable</th>
<th>Column Totals (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>63.00</td>
<td>149.72</td>
<td>319.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>649.30</td>
<td>Overall total area (ha) considered:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KBC current identified needs 25ha 27 ha
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WIDER SPATIAL PLANNING CONCLUSIONS

6.1 Introduction

The on-going strategic spatial planning of the North Northamptonshire growth area being undertaken by the North Northamptonshire Together (NNT) JPU is to be informed by this Employment Study. At present NNT “Options Study” is out to consultation. There are also significant inputs into this process from some major developers.

6.2 Key Outcomes

The key relevant outcomes from this Employment Study that will help inform the NNT Options study are:

- The critical high priority of providing substantial early financial public investment and early master-planning to release the potential of the Kettering Station, Northfield Avenue and Pytchley Road Industrial Estate areas.

- A priority for the expansion of the existing North Kettering Employment Area to provide early support high level office based headquarter and hi-tec employment sites and to strengthen the north-south economic linkage with Corby, without coalescence.

- The urgent need to resolve the new A14 alignment and/or relief road as there will otherwise be no certainty until construction is finished in 2017 or later. Until this uncertainty is resolved, enough deliverable sites need to be identified to cover future employment needs for Kettering.

- There is a need to support economic vitality along the Wellingborough to Kettering to Corby transport corridor notably around Junction 9 (and although not part of this study also around northern arc of Wellingborough adjacent to the urban area, as this will indirectly benefit Kettering).
• A decision regarding whether the SDA Growth areas for Desborough and Rothwell will progress as planned, or will be reduced to concentrate growth around Kettering, or will grow to take more housing up to 2021 and beyond. This will help identify related employment needs, both in Rothwell and Desborough as well as in Kettering town.

• A related decision to identify the extent of any growth in sustainable urban extentions, and the implications for strategic roads (for example if any housing came forward to the East of Kettering the impact of any potential eastern relief road and any new or changed junctions on the A14 would need to be considered.

• A comprehensive and conclusive river catchment study needs to be undertaken as a high priority by the JPU and Environment Agency working jointly, that clearly identifies both constraints and proactively identifies acceptable and practical mitigation wherever possible. For example the hydrology of the Slade Brook is an essential and complex project within this. Opportunities to resolve Kettering town flood constraints by providing significant river management upstream needs to be considered – eg an upstream strategic flood storage reservoir.

• Finally there is a need for the findings from this Employment Study to feed into a wider NNT employment study to better integrate and support a balanced growth-area-wide employment delivery.
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ECONOMIC STRATEGIES AND PLANNING POLICIES ABSTRACTS

The following abstracts have been identified for their relevance to this study. The words are mostly direct quotes from the policy papers. In a few case for the sake of readability minor syntax changes have been made, and some phrases left out. All texts cab seen in full on the ODPM website.

Planning Policy Statement on Sustainable Development (PPS 1)

Sustainable economic development
The Government is committed to promoting a strong, stable, and productive economy that aims to bring jobs and prosperity for all. Planning authorities should:

(i) Recognise that economic development can deliver environmental and social benefits;

(ii) Recognise the wider sub-regional, regional or national benefits of economic development and consider these alongside any adverse local impacts;

(iii) Ensure that suitable locations are available for industrial, commercial, retail, public sector (e.g. health and education) tourism and leisure developments, so that the economy can prosper;

(iv) Provide for improved productivity, choice and competition, particularly when technological and other requirements of modern business are changing rapidly;

(v) Recognise that all local economies are subject to change; planning authorities should be sensitive to these changes and the implications for development and growth;

(vi) Actively promote and facilitate good quality development, which is sustainable and consistent with their plans;

(vii) Ensure the provision of sufficient, good quality, new homes (including an appropriate mix of housing and adequate levels of affordable housing) in suitable
locations, whether through new development or the conversion of existing buildings. The aim should be to ensure that everyone has the opportunity of a decent home, in locations that reduce the need to travel;

(viii) Ensure that infrastructure and services are provided to support new and existing economic development and housing;

(ix) Ensure that development plans take account of the regional economic strategies of Regional Development Agencies, regional housing strategies, local authority community strategies and local economic strategies; and,

(x) Identify opportunities for future investment to deliver economic objectives.

**Planning Policy Guidance on Industrial and Commercial Development and Small Firms (PPG 4)**

Para 1. One of the Government's key aims is to encourage continued economic development in a way which is compatible with its stated environmental objectives.

Para 10.
The locational demands of businesses are therefore a key input to the preparation of development plans. Development plan policies must take account of these needs and at the same time seek to achieve wider objectives in the public interest (see paragraph 11). Development plans offer the opportunity to:

- encourage new development in locations which minimise the length and number of trips, especially by motor vehicles;
- encourage new development in locations that can be served by more energy efficient modes of transport (this is particularly important in the case of offices, light industrial development, and campus style developments such as science and business parks likely to have large numbers of employees);
- discourage new development where it would be likely to add unacceptably to congestion;
locate development requiring access mainly to local roads away from trunk roads, to avoid unnecessary congestion on roads designed for longer distance movement.

More generally, the preparation of development plans is now the main mechanism by which major new development proposals can be assessed alongside the transport improvements needed to serve them; and by which transport proposals can be linked to the development opportunities they create.

Policies should provide for choice, flexibility and competition. In allocating land for industry and commerce, planning authorities should be realistic in their assessment of the needs of business. They should aim to ensure that there is sufficient land available which is readily capable of development and well served by infrastructure. They should also ensure that there is a variety of sites available to meet differing needs. A choice of suitable sites will facilitate competition between developers; this will benefit end-users and stimulate economic activity.

Para 11.
The Government's policy, set out in "This Common Inheritance" and subsequent White Papers, is to seek to control the emissions of greenhouse gases which lead to global warming. Locational policies in development plans can help to achieve that objective through reducing the need to travel, and encouraging development in areas that can be served by more energy efficient modes of transport - such as rail or water. Local planning authorities should consult the British Railways Property Board to help identify potential development sites such as old goods yards and depots or other land adjacent to track.

Where land for such development opportunities is scarce, planning authorities may indicate that they will give preference to proposals from industrial and commercial users who would benefit from efficient rail or water services rather than for retail or housing proposals which could be located elsewhere. Such policies need to be approached with flexibility and care. Their purpose is to maximise the potential use of transport infrastructure other than roads. But such an objective would not justify protecting such sites from alternative development if there was no realistic prospect of redevelopment for industrial or commercial purposes in the foreseeable future.
Para 12.
Some types of modern distribution facility have a low density of employment, and are served by a very large number of lorries. Retail distributors, for example, depend on efficient distribution systems and require strategic locations capable of serving regional, national and European markets. Extensive, well-planned out-of-town distribution parks can offer economies of scale and consequent benefits to consumers or businesses supplied. Sites for such developments are best located away from urban areas, where the nature of the traffic is likely to cause congestion, and wherever possible should be capable of access by rail and water transport. Such sites should be reserved for those warehousing uses which require them, and not released for other uses unless there is a clear surplus of suitable sites in the area, and no realistic prospect of development for that purpose in the foreseeable future. Separate guidance on the location of retail development is provided in PPG6.

Para 21.
Many urban areas contain large amounts of land, once used for industrial purposes but now under-used or vacant. Getting this land back into beneficial use is important to the regeneration of towns and cities. Optimum use should be made of potential sites and existing premises in inner cities and other urban areas, taking into account such factors as accessibility by public transport, particularly in the case of labour-intensive uses. Local planning authorities should identify such areas and indicate their appropriate alternative uses, including industrial and commercial uses, in their development plans, keep up-to-date details on available sites, and provide information about them to potential developers.

Para 22.
The establishment of a Simplified Planning Zone (SPZ), which grants planning permission for specified development or types of development, may be an appropriate approach in areas where there is a particular need to promote regeneration and to encourage economic activity. Advice on SPZs is given in PPG5.
Planning Policy Guidance on Simplified Planning Zones (PPG5 - SPZ)

Para 5:
Both the size and character of SPZ schemes can be varied to suit different objectives and prevailing local circumstances. The following examples illustrate the versatility of SPZs and how they can be used in conjunction with other measures as part of a wider marketing strategy:

(a) Large old industrial areas or estates
Many towns and cities have such areas. In some cases they were purpose-built industrial estates or large establishments in single ownership. Some of the buildings are now obsolete and need to be replaced, whilst others can be refitted and reused. Some plots of land may be vacant.

(e) Large single ownership sites
Single ownership is likely to be advantageous to progressing an SPZ scheme rapidly. (Sites) - perhaps close to the town centre - will have been in beneficial use, but are now redundant or underused. The reuse of such sites can play an important part in reducing the pressure for peripheral expansion, as well as improving the local environment and economy. Often these areas may be suitable for one predominant use - such as housing with local shops and community amenities or large tourist complexes. Or they may be appropriate for mixed commercial development - perhaps light industry and offices, depending on the surrounding area.

(f) Redevelopment sites
Large vacant or underused sites represent a considerable land resource, much of which has development potential. The successful disposal and subsequent development of these sites for beneficial uses often depends on positive marketing. The planning status of sites is an important aspect of their promotion. An SPZ scheme can offer, from the outset, a clear and reliable statement of what development would be appropriate, coupled with the permission to develop. This can greatly enhance any other form of publicity to stimulate interest in the sites.
**Regional Spatial Strategy for the East Midlands (RSS8)**

The East Midlands Regional Plan (officially known as the 'Regional Spatial Strategy') was published on 17 March 2005 and provides a long term development strategy for the Region up to 2021. It covers the scale and distribution of new housing, priorities for the environment, transport, infrastructure, economic development, agriculture, minerals extraction, waste treatment and disposal. It replaces the Regional Planning Guidance for the region that was published in January 2002.

A sequential approach to the selection of land for development should be adopted in development plans in accordance with the following priority order:

a) suitable previously developed sites and buildings within urban areas that are or will be well served by public transport;

b) other suitable locations within urban areas not identified as land to be protected for amenity purposes;

c) suitable sites in locations adjoining urban areas, which are or will be well served by public transport, particularly where this involves the use of previously developed land; and

d) suitable sites in locations outside of (that is not adjoining) urban areas, which are or will be well served by public transport, particularly where this involves the use of previously developed land.

In order to assess the suitability of land for development, in accordance with policy 1 above, the nature of the development and its locational requirements will need to be taken into account along with all of the following criteria:

a) the availability and location of previously developed land and vacant or under-used buildings;
b) the accessibility of development sites by non-car modes and the potential to improve such accessibility to town centres, employment, shops and services;

c) the capacity of existing infrastructure, including the highway network, public transport, utilities and social infrastructure (such as schools and hospitals) to absorb further development;

d) physical constraints on the development of land, including, for example, the level of contamination, stability and flood risk;

e) the impact that the development of sites will have on the region’s natural resources, environmental and cultural assets and the health of local people;

f) the likelihood that the site can be viably developed, taking into account the availability of resources (both public and private); and

g) the suitability of sites for mixed use development and the contribution that development might make to strengthening local communities.

Development plans should ensure that provision for employment uses will be considered first on previously developed land in urban areas and on previously developed sites in other sustainable locations. Development plans and other policy and programme measures should ensure that an appropriate range of sites, in terms of quality, size and location, are readily available as part of a rolling programme to meet employment needs and the requirements of indigenous and inward investing businesses.

Development plans should allocate (B8) sites away from urban areas where there is good access to transport, to the national road network and where practicable, to a rail freight or water freight facility. Development should not cause unacceptable environmental problems. Where existing sites elsewhere can meet these criteria, expansion will be a sustainable solution to the region’s needs. Local authorities should consider the need to allocate in development plans additional smaller scale storage and distribution facilities to serve local markets.
Provision should be made in development plans for Strategic High Quality Employment Sites where supply is inadequate or shown to be inadequate to meet demand by the proposed study of employment land. In identifying suitable sites, local authorities should have regard to:

- accessibility by public transport;
- accessibility for freight purposes by rail;
- the sequential approach and criteria set out in policies 1 and 2;
- the opportunity to enhance regional and sub-regional competitiveness;
- the opportunity to regenerate areas of greatest need as set out in policy 3 and other areas of high unemployment;
- local landscape and environmental factors; and
- the attractiveness of sites to investors and market demand in the area.

Development plans should make appropriate provision for sites for high technology businesses and science parks, giving priority to urban areas and previously developed land in sustainable locations. Such sites should be identified where they can promote cluster related development, preferably close to higher education establishments and allowing the possibility of mixed uses in existing centres. Cluster-related development should be accommodated on existing development plan allocations where possible.

SHQES.

Development plans should sustain and enhance the role of city, town, district and local centres. Mixed-use developments and new retail and leisure floorspace, including extensions, of regional or sub-regional importance, should, where a demonstrable need exists, be located in city or town centres as a first preference and have regard to policies 1 and 2 and PPG6. Locations on the edge of city or town centres will be the second preference where the vitality and viability of other nearby centres is not undermined.

Development plans should ensure that major office development and other travel intensive uses should be directed to town centres or in the vicinity of public transport interchanges within main urban areas. Only if central sites are unavailable should other urban areas or areas having particularly good public transport accessibility, be considered.
Development plans and other strategies or policies of local authorities and economic development agencies should promote the continued diversification and further development of the rural economy, where this is consistent with sustainable development considerations and environmentally sound management of the countryside. Locations in the open countryside for major new development should be avoided. Employment developments including offices appropriate to the size of the town, should be concentrated in market towns.

Local Authorities and Sub-Regional Strategic Partnerships should work together to:

• ensure that, by the allocation and de-allocation of employment land (B1, B2, B8) through the development plan and spatial planning process and through selective public investment, there is an adequate supply of good quality land for office and industrial uses available for development in sustainable locations;

• bring forward good quality allocated employment sites to meet the specific requirements of potential investors;

• review employment land allocations in their areas to ensure that they are relevant to current and likely future requirements, and that surplus employment land is considered for beneficial alternative use; and

• monitor gains and losses in the overall supply of good quality office and industrial sites and assess the floorspace capacity of allocated sites.

Local planning authorities should take into account the findings of QUELS and RELPS when drawing up policies for their development plans and local development frameworks. In addition they need to consider whether sites which may currently be allocated for employment uses are likely to become surplus to current requirements. In such cases planning authorities should consider what other uses might be appropriate on such sites. The QUELS and RELPS highlighted some significant sub-area variations, some of which are outlined below.
The Southern Sub-area: In recent years the availability of both offices and industrial sites in and around Northampton has been limited but elsewhere in the sub-area supplies have been adequate due to limited demand. There has also been evidence that pressure for storage and distribution sites has begun to restrict other uses. In the areas identified for growth, particularly Northampton, Corby, Kettering and Wellingborough, there will be a need to ensure that there are adequate employment sites to match the needs arising from increased levels of population.

**Regional Economic Strategy : EMDA Destination 2010**

**In the Southern Sub-area,** the needs are: the regeneration of Corby; to capitalise on the established distribution sector; industrial land that is attractive to a wider range of employment uses; and to capitalise on South East overspill, particularly in relation to office supply in Northampton.

Provide quality employment sites, on previously developed land, where appropriate, in areas of need through restructuring of local plans.

**ODPM Employment Land Reviews Guidance Note**

Employment Land Reviews are a key component of the evidence base for policy and proposals in Local Development Frameworks (LDFs) and the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSSs) and form part of the continuing ‘plan, monitor and manage’ approach to creating spatial strategies at the regional and local levels.

Para 2.14
Up-to-date and relevant plans are essential if the development needs of commerce and industry are to be met. Development Plan Documents should contain clear land use policies for different types of industrial and commercial development. It has been common practice, in existing local plans, to: identify sites for particular types of employment uses (eg B1/B2/B8); identify sufficient sites to provide businesses with a choice of sites and to provide for the expansion of key local employers; seek to protect key or strategic sites currently in or designated for employment use and; carry forward
undevolved allocated employment sites from the previous plan period without appraising their current ‘fitness for purpose’.

Stage 1 Taking Stock of the Existing Situation
Stage 2 Creating a Picture of Future Requirements
Stage 3 Identifying a ‘New’ Portfolio of Sites

All linked to Policy Development, Monitoring and Review.

Paras 2.33-35
The three stage methodology is, in essence, the preliminary or ‘brief ’ stage, followed by the assessment of demand or need, followed by the detailed appraisal of the stock of sites and premises available. In Stage 1, LDF authorities are recommended to undertake a preliminary review of their employment site portfolio, identifying any which are clearly no longer ‘fit for purpose’ and, if they wish, identifying those ‘high quality’ or ‘strategic’ sites which must continue to be safeguarded for employment development. The benefits of undertaking the Stage 1 appraisal of sites will vary from authority to authority but are likely to include: an improved understanding of the priorities for the remainder of the review and; providing early evidence, albeit incomplete, that can be used to inform development control decisions or used at appeal.

Figure 2.2: The Steps Involved in the Three Stages of Employment Land Reviews

Stage 1: Taking stock of the existing situation
Step 1: Devise brief for Stage 1
Step 2: Collate data on land stock and revealed demand
Step 3: Devise and apply site appraisal criteria
Step 4: Undertake preliminary site appraisal
Step 5: Confirming the brief for Stages 2 and 3

Stage 2: Creating a picture of future requirements
Step 6: Understand market areas and segments
Step 7: Select and apply suitable forecast model/demand analysis
Step 8: Quantify employment land supply
Step 9: Translate employment forecasts to land requirements
Step 10: Scenario testing

Stage 3: Identifying a ‘New’ Portfolio of Sites
Step 11: Devise qualitative site appraisal criteria
Step 12: Confirm existing sites to be retained or released and define gaps in portfolio
Step 13: Identify additional sites to be brought forward
Step 14: Complete and present the employment land review

The evidence base is critical to the preparation of local development documents. Local planning authorities should ensure that the delivery of housing and other strategic and regional requirements is not compromised by unrealistic expectations about the future availability of infrastructure, transportation and resources

**Kettering Community Partnership Community Plan**

The relevant Key Priorities for 2005 – 2008 is: “Active engagement in the Milton Keynes South Midlands Growth Area and promote Kettering as a business location”

**Invest Northamptonshire: DTZ market positioning 2005**

Market Recommendations: Of the sectors, clusters and functions assessed our recommended markets for Invest Northamptonshire are set out below. Given that market selection results from a combination of data and perspectives, these represent groupings of opportunities, rather than absolute rankings of the individual markets.

Core Markets -Good Growth & Mid-Strong Offering (High Performance Engineering, Food & Drink, Print & Publishing, Construction, Logistics).

Active Cross Sector/Cluster Markets -Strong/Changing Markets which support other Sectors/Clusters: (Professional Services, Shared Service Centres, Contact Centre, Public Services).
Niche Markets - Smaller Scale Opportunities: (Entrepreneurial, Environmental Technologies, Leather).

Watching Brief & Strategic Investor Development Activity: (Healthcare, Financial Services, ICT).

Property can be an early filter as well as determining factor between final options late in the location selection process. The COPELA work clearly identified the need for Northamptonshire to ‘rise substantially in the office hierarchy’ but there is also a need to ensure a good supply ‘industrial’ space with expansion capabilities and in good environments. Further, whilst existing work focuses on the amount of land available for development, a key issue for inward investors is quality and range of existing stock.

There is a clear need for Northamptonshire to develop high quality business space (office and industrial) for prospective as well as expanding existing investors. This needs to deliver a range of options to potential investors (as this offers flexibility in negotiation as well as demonstrating that there is investment in the county) as a secondary route there needs to be serviced land available with a range of developers able to deliver fast-track design and build solutions that would be available on a lease or freehold basis.

A common feature of most location/regions attempts to attract inward investment is the pro-active provision of properties in a high quality/business park environment. However, in many cases the lack of demand-supply issue has been addressed through public sector intervention e.g. EP, WDA. The potential for the forthcoming LDV/URC to provide a similar role in Northamptonshire should be explored with a focus on providing properties with flexible configuration to maximise take-up opportunities.

The timescale for planning permission has been identified by the business community (including the CBI) as a major impediment to business development. Many of Northamptonshire’s local planning authorities have performance standards below the GB average.
North Northamptonshire Together : Options For North Northamptonshire
(June 2005)

Chapter 3. Growth and Jobs

Sustainable communities need economic growth to ensure that they are active and thriving. As with shopping and leisure, this will mean trying to keep people in North Northamptonshire for employment, to reduce the numbers travelling outside the area to work. New and better jobs must be created in step with new housing to give people the choice to live and work locally.

Existing studies are telling us that overall there is more land with planning permission for employment, or identified in existing Local Plans, than will be needed in North Northamptonshire up until 2021. This would seem to suggest that no new sites need to be identified. However, the situation is not this simple as much of the land presently identified is for general industrial uses whilst future development needs are likely to be for office based and warehouse and distribution activities. In this light, and taking the commercial attractiveness of sites on board, there will need to be some new sites identified and some of the existing sites will either not be developed or will go to other types of uses.

The target for new jobs set out in the regional strategy, plus the need to expand the range and type of jobs that must be created, is likely to mean that planning for employment related development will have to balance the needs of the environment with the commercial needs of business and the long-term needs of the economy.

Planning policy at the national and regional level is aimed at encouraging office development within town centres, rather than elsewhere. If the economy of North Northamptonshire is to diversify, there will be a need to attract more office jobs to the area. At the moment, none of the town centres have much, if any, good quality office space. Recent work on master planning for the town centres of Kettering, Wellingborough and Rushden has shown that there is potential land for new office uses there. However it may not be enough to meet all the demand for new offices that is expected over the next 15 years or so and intervention from the local delivery partnership may be needed in terms of buying land and making sites attractive to investors.
It is also a commercial reality that many higher-value added activities like research and development, will seek the spacious environment provided by edge of town commercial areas. As part of any approach aimed at diversifying the local economy, some key sites may need to be provided as a focus for new inward investment in research and development. These can best be provided as part of sustainable urban extensions.

There will then be a delicate balance to be struck between encouraging development within town centres and encouraging development that is attractive to potential new start-up companies and inward investors. In other words, the challenge will be to create sustainable development within North Northamptonshire that at the same time allows the area to be competitive and generate economic development.

Achieving such economic growth will also require a concerted effort by all to improve the skills of the labour force within North Northamptonshire. Putting the North Northamptonshire Plan into practice will require those involved in economic development, training and skills provision to work with the planning system to bring about the growth and direction in the local economy that is desired. Underpinning the approach to planning for the future economy of North Northamptonshire will be a requirement to ensure better access to further and higher education provision in the area. Also, in conjunction with skills training and education, there will be a need for the provision of incubator space and support mechanisms to enable small business to flourish.

The main options in planning for future jobs and skills training seem to be:

a) Diversify jobs in the area into higher value added activities, such as offices and research and development – this will mean identifying land as part of urban extensions in order to provide the right types of sites for this investment and providing training in the right skills to make the local workforce attractive to new employers

b) Build on the area’s existing strengths – this may well mean accepting more warehousing and transportation developments, which will need large edge of town sites near road junctions

c) Plan to do both of the above by developing complementary roles for individual towns and the rural areas as part of an overall bigger picture.
In the (B1) Office market the current trends identify the following implications for town centres:

- Decreasing space requirements through new technology;
- Globalisation of markets providing flexibility of location;
- Increasing number of relocations overseas (call centres, etc.);
- Lease structures increasingly flexible to cater for growing SME market.

North Northants centres not prime office locations;
But do have important local office functions;
Focus on facilitating future office opportunities as part of remodelling centres linked to transport accessibility.

In Northamptonshire the Sub-Regional Policy Drivers include the key sub-regional driver for change, being the Draft MKSM Sub-Regional Strategy (July 2003) which, in relation to the study area proposes: an increase of 40,000 dwellings focused on Principal Urban Areas of Corby, Kettering an Wellingborough to 2021. Sub-regional centres/urban hubs are identified at: Burton Latimer, Desborough, Higham Ferrers, Irthlingborough, Rothwell and Rushden; the role of these centres is to complement the central areas in the Principal Urban Areas (five rural service centres identified, including Oundle and Thrapston) where the priority is to maintain retail and community service provision.

Also in the framework for future development the driver are for Kettering to focus on maintaining existing role through promotion and protection of existing provision, development of regionally important niche retail offer and of cultural attractions.

Given the prominence of the distribution (B8) industry to Kettering and the County the concept of Value Added Logistics is particularly important. Essentially this is designed to combine logistics (B8) and industrial activities (B2) together with related office functions (B1) all together on a key site. This has the advantage of providing for an overall higher quality and density of employment type, overcoming some of the employment shortfalls associated with traditional B8.
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Explanation of site analysis sheets
The table on this page explains the meanings of the sites analysis sheets inputs and acts a key for the following sheets. Only green category sites (likely to be most deliverable) and a few orange sites (potentially needing early assessment) are considered here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>THIS SHEET IS A KEY FOR THE FOLLOWING SITE ANALYSIS SHEETS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Number</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Name</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gross ha</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gross Developable ha</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notes</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Commercial Viability</strong></th>
<th>3.0</th>
<th>A qualitative number summarising all commercial factors (see main report for list of these matters). The scoring system is only used as a broad qualitative method to make relative comparisons between sites sustainability and its commercial attractiveness, rather than accurately define a site.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>++</td>
<td>Commercially attractive now</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Likely to be commercially attractive/borderline</td>
<td>More detailed studies may be needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Likely to require some intervention</td>
<td>Up to around £500k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>Likely to require significant intervention</td>
<td>Around £500k up to around 5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>Likely to require very significant intervention</td>
<td>Over £5m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Cannot be assessed at this time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Sustainability Summary** | 3.0 | A qualitative number summarising all sustainability factors (see main report for list of these matters). The scoring system is only used as a broad qualitative method to make relative comparisons between sites sustainability and its commercial attractiveness, rather than accurately define a site. |

| **Site Deliverability** | | A function of the commercial and sustainable assessments, giving a summary view on deliverability. Green sites are sites with highest Deliverability; Hatched green sites have second Deliverability; Orange sites have potential but with moderate to significant uncertainty; Hatched orange are sites with even less potential and more uncertainty; Grey are sites already allocated in the Local Plan, or with planning permission as a departure from the Local Plan and so do not count towards total new employment land to be identified. |
### Site Number
DN4/5

### Site Name
South of Braybrooke Rd

### Site Location
Desborough North

### Gross ha
12.2 ha (30 acres)

### Gross Developable ha
Net site area 9.7ha (24 acres). 38,553 sq m (415,000 sq ft). Employment in 2 phases. Suitable for B1, B2 & B8. Owner proposes B2 & B8

### Notes
6.3 ha RSM promoting (Rosemound); Diamond Estates on Henry Frost land. Also ID by Abcott Developments. New A6 bypass and particularly roundabout makes this attractive. Would need to be combined with and follow DN5 development (same promoter). - restrict to 2 storey B2. Possibly some limited B1 associated with the B2.

### Sustainability Summary
2.85 Clearly defined site adjacent to new A6 roundabout with Braybrooke Road. Within the Council’s SDA search area. Part of site close to existing housing. No environmental designations on site, but close to special landscape area. Is on relative high exposed land so some concerns over visual impact of high of development. Hedgerows could be retained. Grade 3 agricultural land. Solutions for storm water and sewage drainage not yet confirmed. There is a low to moderate risk of landslip subsidence mainly associated with the lias clay. There is no indication of serious pollution. The southeast corner of the site lies within an area previously a registered landfill site. Fill types included sub soil, topsoil and clay, there is a very limited / low potential for contamination. Should new SDA housing also be developed on site, employee accessibility will be good. Avoidance of increased town traffic by use of A6. Proposals for the site incorporate good levels of access by bus, cycle, and pedestrian. Promoters detailed sustainability appraisal and TA available.

### Commercial Summary
3.1 Limited immediate supply. Good demand. Direct access off A6 bypass important to marketing. No marketing undertaken. B1c values £53.82 sq m - £69.96 sq m (£5.00 - £6.50 psf). B8 £48.43 sq m - £53.82 sq m (£4.50 psf - £5.00 psf). Yields 6.75% - 7.5%. B1 offices £150.69 sq m (£14 psf). Freehold £1,883.75 sq m (£175 psf). Subject to planning and access to A6. Good occupier demand. Employment in 2 phases. Suitable for B1, B2 & B8. Owner proposes B2 & B8. Margins tight, will be effected by timing and extent of B8.

### Site Deliverability
High Deliverability site with early deliverability, visual impact considerations may limit some B8. Could progress with or without SDA housing, but this is subject to owners/promoters commercial view and the outcome of the SDA location choice for the area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Site Number</strong></th>
<th>DN8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Name</strong></td>
<td>North of Braybrooke Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>Desborough North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gross ha</strong></td>
<td>3 ha (7.38 acres)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notes</strong></td>
<td>New A6 bypass and particularly roundabout makes this attractive. Would need to be combined with and follow DN4/5 development. - restrict to 2 storey B2. Possibly some limited B1 associated with the B2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Sustainability Summary</strong></th>
<th>2.68</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Close to new A6 roundabout with Braybrooke Road. Within the Council’s SDA search area. Part of site has existing housing. No environmental designations on site, but close to special landscape area. Is on high exposed land so so significant concern over visual impact of high of development. Hedgerows could be retained. Grade 3 agricultural land. There is a low to moderate risk of landslip subsidence mainly associated with the lias clay. There is no indication of serious pollution. The site lies close to an area previously a registered landfill site. Fill types included sub soil, topsoil and clay, there is a very limited / low potential for contamination. Should new SDA housing also be developed on site, employee accessibility will be good. Avoidance of increased town traffic by use of A6.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Commercial Summary</strong></th>
<th>2.75</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<p>| <strong>Site Deliverability</strong> | Only moderate deliverability of site. On-site residential significant limitation with difficulty of mitigation. Visual impact considerations will limit B2. B8 not appropriate. Could progress with or without SDA housing, but this is subject to owners/promoters commercial view and the outcome of the SDA location choice for the area. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>DW2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Manor Farm South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Desborough West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross ha</td>
<td>7.50 ha (18.45 acres)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Developable ha</td>
<td>Net site area 6ha (14.76 acres). 23,225 sq m (256,000 sq ft).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sustainability Summary

2.8 Edge of town site would part infill land up to the new A6. Requires new roundabout to A6 trunk road close to existing new roundabout. Currently agricultural with Grade 3 soil. Within the Council’s SDA search area. Two rights of way cross the land Hedgerows could be retained. Due to former quarry workings adjacent to site, on-site stability survey would be needed. Access to the town centre and for employees is average, and would improve if the SDA housing was agreed for the site.

### Commercial Summary

2.1 Persimmon promoting this site for employment. Limited immediate supply. Good demand. Direct access off A6 bypass important to marketing. No marketing undertaken. B1 values £53.82 sq m – £69.96 sq m (£5.00 - £6.50 psf). B8 £48.43 sq m - £53.82 sq m (£4.50 - £5.00 psf). B1(c) Freehold £914.96 sq m (£85 psf). Subject to planning and access to A6. Good occupier demand. Margin likely to be tight / unviable (due to high development cost).

### Site Deliverability

Uncertainty over the location of an SDA, and potential competition from other emerging sites more commercially attractive locations (eg adjacent to A14). Need for A6 new access may make site marginal unless site area chosen as SDA. May depend upon A6 new access costs and acceptability to Highways Authority and Agency.
## Site Number
RW1

## Site Name
Rothwell West

## Site Location

### Gross ha
6.50 ha (15.99 acres)

### Gross Developable ha
Net site area 6.5 ha for B1 (12.79 acres). 20,438 sq m (220,000 sq ft)

## Notes

### Sustainability Summary
2.7 Edge of town site, infilling to new A6. Requires new roundabout to A6 trunk road close to existing A14 junction - a possible issue for Highways Agency. Good quality (Grade 2) agricultural land. Relative high land and visible across valley from large parts of Desborough.

### Commercial Summary
2.1 Limited immediate supply. Good demand. Direct access off A6 bypass critical to marketing. Promoted for residential. No marketing undertaken. B8 £48.43 sq m - £53.82 sq m (£4.50 - £5 psf). Yield 6.75% - 7.5% B1c £53.82 sq m - £69.96 sq m (£5.00 - £6.50 psf) Freehold £914.96 sq m (£85 psf). Good demand. Margins remain tight even if B8 design & build only with costs increased with need for A6 roundabout.

### Site Deliverability
Deliverability may well rely upon whether the site is part of a chosen SDA and upon A6 new access costs and acceptability to Highways Authority and Agency.
## Site Number
KW1

## Site Name
Cohen’s Yard

## Site Location
Kettering West, A14 Junction 8

## Gross ha
10 ha (24.6 acres)

## Gross Developable ha
Net site area 7.96 hectares (19.68 acres). 37,160 sq m (400,000 sq ft) in various phases

### Sustainability Summary

2.9  The current use is a Brownfield eyesore site, with a mix of sheds and mediocre quality buildings and a poor gateway to the town. Bridleway across site that is identified in the Local Plan as a strategic footpath/cycleway. Contaminated land. Some land instability possible due to prior use. High visibility from A14, but not from wider countryside. Site is isolated from the town with poor employee access except by car. Unknown drainage and flooding issues. Brook runs at edge of site. Conservation site adjacent. Possible candidate for intervention funding

### Commercial Summary

3.1  There is current developer interest in this Brownfield site. Owner reported to be entering into a partnership arrangement with a developer. Although the access to the A14 via junction 8 is potentially excellent, there are expensive technical difficulties in achieving this. A decision needs to be made as to whether all or part of this site is developed in advance of any A14 improvements. Masterplan being prepared for submission of planning application likely to include leisure, hotel, offices and industrial/warehousing.

### Site Deliverability

It is unlikely the site would come forward without intervention funding, and although not a site that is best for some sustainability aspects, this more than balanced by pollution reduction, brownfield land restoration and the improvement of the site as a gateway to Kettering.
### Site Number
KW4

### Site Name
A14/ J7 opposite cemetery.

### Site Location
Kettering West, East of A14 btw junction 7 and 8

### Gross ha
4.13 ha (10.16 acres)

### Gross Developable ha
Net 2.83 ha (7 acres). Potential 5,574 sq m (60,000 sq ft) together with 1.21 ha (3 acre) site. B1 offices together with site for hotel, leisure, retail

### Notes
Privately owned. Opposite Crematorium estimated land. Prominent position with excellent access to A14 junction 7. Complimentary surrounding land uses (employment and crematorium). Could become available almost immediately. Some indication as desired future use as Crematorium burials extension, but given the site's very high appeal and value for B1, could an alternative be found for the Crematorium extension (eg just south of Northfield Rd?). Good quality (Grade 2) agricultural land. Developable land estimate.

### Sustainability Summary
3.3
A14 Junction 7 site with B1 employment, church and cemetery opposite. Some housing to SE. Surrounded by mature hedgerows. Overlooks but raised over A14. Sight of wider countryside. Directly accessible for Kettering. Town centre within walking distance (1.5k). Nearby to small existing office, church and food retail. 1/4 mile to junction 7 of the A14 and entrance to Telford Way Industrial Estate. Access to wider trunk network, to the site (via Gypsy Lane/Northfield Road). Grade 2 (good) agricultural land. Most of site only slightly sloping. Is one of two good alternative sites for crematorium expansion (other is adjacent just south of Northfield Rd).

### Commercial Summary
2.92
B1 offices together with site for hotel, leisure, retail. Limited immediate supply. Demand good. Site has not been marketed. B1 offices rentals £150.96 sq m (£14 psf) p.a. Capital values £1,883.75 sq m (£175 psf). Hotel site £988,435 per hectare (£400,000 per acre). Dependant on planning, access and services. Could be available almost immediately. Good levels of anticipated demand. Potentially viable on speculative development of phase 1 only remainder on design build basis. Margins likely to be tight.

### Site Deliverability
A high deliverability site allowing for early delivery.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>KS1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>McAlpine / Pytchley Industrial Estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Kettering West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross ha</td>
<td>20.6 ha (51 acres)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Developable ha</td>
<td>Variable dependant on how much regenerated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sustainability Summary

3.37 Brownfield land, some with low intensity use (builders yards, B8 distribution, HGV repairs, empty plots). It is close to the town centre, with moderate access to the town centre, but with good access to the A14, Junction 9. Intensification of use would be in line with PPS6, particularly for a mixture of B1 and B2. Some floodplain issues, but existing development. Some contamination expected especially around the waste recycling centre. Access for employees, by walking, bus and with some improvements, cycling, moderate access to town centre, but good access to service such as the nearby Tesco and other services in that area. Close to deprived Wicksteed Ward. May be possible to look at linking by cycle/walkway northwards to the station. Relocation of existing businesses would be needed, to sites where they may be accessible to workforce but in a less strategic position. Further comprehensive site feasibility studies should be undertaken. Site would need intervention funding, but redevelopment and intensification of such a brownfield site in sustainable terms should take precedence over new greenfield sites.

### Commercial Summary

2.28 Site used for B1(c) & B2. May require some enabling development, including some housing and possibly leisure. Limited supply B1, B2 & B8. Good demand. Existing employment area. Individual units subject to sales/lettings over the years. New buildings B1(c)/B2, £53.82 sq m - £69.96 sq m (£5.00 -£6.50 psf). Freehold £914.96 sq m (£85 psf). B8 £48.43 sq m - £53.82 sq m (£4.50 - £5.00 psf). Freehold £699.67 sq m (£65 per sq ft). Yield 6.75 – 7.5%. Overall Master Plan and site assembly required. Detailed feasibility studies required. Access issues to be dealt with. Intervention likely to be required.

### Site Deliverability

This site would be a top Deliverability site save for the land assembly and infrastructure intervention funding required. Once a further feasibility study has been carried out, and should significant intervention funding be realistic (e.g. from Fit for Market – NP/EMDA or from the North Northamptonshire LDV/ODPM), the site may well lend itself to be designated as Special Planning Zone and/or be subject to comprehensive CPO to increase certainty of development and comprehensive redevelopment.
### Site Deliverability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>KC3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Station East empty plot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Kettering Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross ha</td>
<td>0.86 ha (2.1 acres)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Developable ha</td>
<td>Net site area 0.67 ha (1.67 acres). 2,694.1 sq m (29,000 sq ft) gross 2,322 sq m (25,000 sq ft) net.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>May be best seen as part of comprehensive East side station development to include KC1/2 KC3, KC4 and KC5 (about 7 ha in total). This would rely upon major intervention works to improve access across the railway line. Bids for such funding have been drafted. A master plan of the station area and its links and relationship to the Northfield Avenue regeneration area is needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Summary</td>
<td>Empty fenced site by station. Option/promotion by Westbury Homes, who will push for housing rather than employment. Within Local Plan employment focus area. Future station car parking needs would have to be considered. Land assembly with Network Rail can be costly and complex. Would strengthen important employment/business zone link from station to town centre. Excellent access to town centre, excellent access by foot, cycle, bus and train. Town centre site in line with PPS6 and other sustainable development policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Summary</td>
<td>Limited immediate supply for B1 office development sites particularly close to the town centre / station. Local office market limited but good levels of demand anticipated with access improvements and link to the station. Deliverability affected by required improvements to Northampton Road and link / links to the Railway Station, town centre and A14. Office rentals £150.69 sq m (£14 per sq ft) capital values £1,883 per sq m (175 per sq ft).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Deliverability</td>
<td>Whilst some limited development could be prioritised here it will have a better potential as part of the wider area regeneration (see notes above) and there is a strong argument that it be protected so that this can be achieved. Market demand. Viability affected by cost of access improvements. Intervention will be required to maximise site employment and viability potential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Number</td>
<td>KC4/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Station East car park and former sidings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Kettering Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross ha</td>
<td>KC 4: 0.78 ha (1.92 acres) and KC 5: 1.14 ha (2.8 acres). Total: 1.9 ha (4.7 acres)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Developable ha</td>
<td>KC4: Net site area 0.619 ha (1.53 acres). 2,508 sq m (27,000 sq ft) Gross 2,090 sq m (22,500 sq ft net). KC5: Net site area 0.849 ha (2.1 acres). 3,390.85 sq m (36,500 sq ft). Gross 2,879.9 sq m (31,000 sq ft net).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>May be best seen as part of comprehensive East side station development to include KC1/2 KC3, KC4 and KC5 (about 7 ha in total). This would rely upon major intervention works to improve access across the railway line. Bids for such funding have been drafted. A master plan of the station area and its links and relationship to the Northfield Avenue regeneration area is needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Summary</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Summary</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Deliverability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Sustainability Summary

| 2.5 | KC1 is the area identified by the Atkins town centre study. KC2 widens that area and with KC1 is a search area that may result in about 1-2ha of actual gross development. It is likely that this could only be achieved as part of a comprehensive development. Within Local Plan employment focus area. Future station car parking needs would have to be considered. Land assembly with Network Rail can be costly and complex. Would strengthen important employment/business zone link from station to town centre. Excellent access to town centre, excellent access by foot, cycle, bus and train. Town centre site in line with PPS6 and other sustainable development policies. These would require full mitigation and/or alternative equivalent locations. Significant issues will need to be addressed and may limit development, they include: flooding from the Slade Brook; loss of important amenity/open space (PPG 17); loss of important sports pitches (cricket/hockey) and bowling/tennis. Ownership includes Cricket/Hockey Club, KBC, Railtrack. In part in protected landscape area as part of town general open space (Policy LP94). However it is felt that such is the importance of this space in the light of the major housing growth over the next two decades that this whole area should be protected as enhanced Deliverability strategic open space. Consequently the 3.03 rating is reduced to 2.5. |

## Commercial Summary

| 2.27 | Limited immediate supply for B1 office development sites particularly close to the town centre / station. Local office market limited but good levels of demand anticipated with access improvements and link to the station. B1 office rental value £150.69 sq m (£14 psf). Freehold £1,883.75 sq m (£175 psf). Deliverability affected by required improvements to Northampton Road and link / links to the Railway Station, town centre and A14. With major infrastructure improvements potentially good demand. Not viable without intervention. |

## Site Deliverability

<p>|  | Whilst some limited development could be prioritised here it will be have a better potential as part of the wider area regeneration (see notes above) and as such this potential should be protected. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>KN3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Weekley Woods East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross ha</td>
<td>17.71 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Developable ha</td>
<td>14.16 ha net developable area; 55,740 sq m (600,000 sq ft)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**

**Sustainability Summary** 3.04

Identified in the Local for leisure development (golf course), the site although on the urban edge and close to historic protected Boughton House landscape, and an ancient woodland, is in a clearly defined and visually neutral area surrounded by mature woodland. Would need with a new woodland to the south-east corner to protect view towards Boughton some additional planting in the south-east corner this poor quality soils site is on flat land ideally suited to B1 employment development, but with a restriction on the height of development to 2 to 3 stories. Further analysis of potential impact of former landfill sites to the south-east and the north-west. Although this site is on the edge of the urban area with potential concerns that built development (as opposed to a golf course) may be seen as coalescing with Corby, the development proposal is no further north than the existing Weekly Woods employment site, and employment as opposed to isolated housing would be a suitable use therefore for the site, especially with the MKSM Growth Area requirements.

**Commercial Summary** 3.79

Owned by a single willing landowner. With excellent access to major roads. Suitable for high quality B1 and leisure uses. Needs to be developed as an extension to the existing Weekly Woods employment site.

- B1 office - rental values £150.69 sq m (£14 psf), capital value £1,883.75 sq m (£175 psf).
- B1c Business Park - rental value £69.96 sq m (£6.50 psf). Capital value £914.96 sq m (£85 psf).

Hotel £988,435 per hectare (£400,000 per acre). Good demand if associated with development of KN2.

**Site Deliverability**

A high Deliverability development site with the opportunity to allow for an early development of employment land to support a jobs led MKSM growth, as well as support high quality B1 offices that market requires to be located in excellent parkland setting. Ability to offer commercial leisure related development, including hotel, fitness/health care, particularly where these might benefit from use of the adjacent countryside/woodland.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>KS5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Junction 9 West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>South of A14, across from Cinema</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross ha</td>
<td>29.60 ha (73 acres) gross; but core site (eastern half) about 13 ha (32 acres)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Developable ha</td>
<td>Net area 22.25 ha (55 acres), but core site (eastern half) about 24 acres (9.7 ha)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Joint ownership of NCC and Mr Tarry, with Northern section leased by Golf Club. This site (and the majority of sites) identified along the A14 will be fully subject to the determination of a potential A14 widening/relief Rd to the south of the current A14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Summary</td>
<td>2.65 Issues involving coalescence and impact on Pytchley may be significant. Map evidence of waste disposal on the northern half of the site, close to road by Marshes Barn Farm. Electricity pylons. Some woodland. Sloping site. Open countryside at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Summary</td>
<td>3.37 This site is adjacent to the A14 via Junction 9, and to the A509/Isham Bypass to Wellingborough, with good access to the town centre it could become a high Deliverability site for B1 and B8 development. B8 demand strong supply limited. B2 demand restricted supply limited. B2 demand for land available for sale (as apposed design &amp; build) would be good. B8 values £48.43 sq m - £53.82 sq m (£4.50 - £5 psf). Yield 6.75 - 7.5%. B1c £53.82 sq m - £69.96 sq m (£5.00 - £6.50 psf). Freehold £914.96 sq m (£85 psf). (based on whole site). Site will be restricted in part due to high voltage (and lower voltage) pylons. Serviced land value B1/B2/B8 £556,104 per hectare (£225,000 per acre).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Deliverability</td>
<td>The site is the strategically important Junction 9 of the A14 where the new Isham Bypass joins the A14 and at a key transport node along the Corby-Kettering-Wellingborough axis. No development proposed unless the A14 relief road is located to the immediate south. It is also proposed that just the eastern half is developed in the first instance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Number</td>
<td>BL3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>South of Junction 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Burton Latimer, south of Junction, East of Kettering Road and West of the A6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross ha</td>
<td>13.41 ha (33 acres) Gross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Developable ha</td>
<td>Net site area 12.01 hectares (29.69 acres). 47,843 sq m (515,000 sq ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Summary</td>
<td>2.79 Excellent prominent location adjacent to Junction 10 alongside A6. May be issues with access onto A6 trunk road close to the J10 (weaving distances, sight lines etc) but also possible access off the Kettering Road from an Eastern exit to the &quot;Morrison’s junction&quot;. Possible coalescence issue with Burton Latimer, specifically impact on Rectory Farm. Area estimated. In landscape area as part of town edges (Policy LP94). Right of way to eastern edge of site. Good quality (Grade 2 ) agricultural land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Summary</td>
<td>3.81 B8 demand strong supply limited. B2 demand restricted supply limited. B2 demand for land available for sale (as apposed design &amp; build) would be good. Developers are keen to option land. B8 values £48.43 sq m - £53.82 sq m (£4.50 - £5 psf). Yield 6.25 - 7.5%. Freehold value £699.67 sq m (£65 psf). B1c/B2 £53.82 sq m - £69.96 sq m (£5.00 - £6.50 psf). Strong demand. Viability effected by costs of access onto A6. Margins tight. This site is in a prominent position on the junction 10 apex and B1 as well as B8 on the main site, may support viability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Deliverability</td>
<td>Dependent on link to A6 and planning. Potentially within a few years. Although in the sensitive &quot;Latimer Gap&quot;, development of the site would be in line with the recent Morrison’s and Weetabix development agreements. Care will need to be taken to protect the visual amenity of the Rectory Plantation housing and to reduce traffic impact generally southwards on the Kettering Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Number</td>
<td>BL1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Blackbridge Farm West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Junction 10, South the A14, north of the A6, east of Blackbridge Farm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross ha</td>
<td>13.12 ha (32.27 acres)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Developable ha</td>
<td>Net site area 11.3 hectares (28 acres), 45,056 sq m (485,000 sq ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Summary</td>
<td>2.83 The loss of good quality agricultural land and the gradual expansion of employment through the Latimer Gap into open countryside is a concern, that is to be balanced by the strategic employment land need, and the ability of the site to help support an early jobs led growth in a commercially attractive location. Possible coalescence issue with Burton Latimer. Right of way across site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Summary</td>
<td>3.81 An excellent located site with tight margins suggesting a B8 pre-let led development, followed in time by office B1 development on the junction 10 site apex. B8 demand strong supply limited. B2 demand restricted supply limited. B2 demand for land available for sale (as opposed design &amp; build) would be good. Developer interest in land. B2/B8 values £48.43 sq m - £53.82 sq m (£4.50 - £5 psf.) Yield 6.75 - 7.5%. B8 Freehold value £699.67 sq m (£65 psf). B1c/B2 £53.82 sq m - £69.96 sq m (£5.00 - £6.50 psf). B1c Freehold £914.96 sq m (£85 psf). Dependent on link to A6 and planning. Potentially within a few years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Deliverability</td>
<td>Although would benefit from the wider strategic road improvements that might come about as a result of the Kettering East potential major urban extension, the site is marginal even in terms of viability should it start with a major pre-let B8 use, as it is dependant upon access onto the A6. With this it is marketable for early disposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Number</td>
<td>BL2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Blackbridge Farm East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Junction 10, South the A14, north of the A6, West of Blackbridge Farm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross ha</td>
<td>23.12 ha (56.87 acres)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Developable ha</td>
<td>Net site area 19.43 hectares (48 acres). 76,642 sq m (825,000 sq ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Summary</td>
<td>2.79 The loss of good quality agricultural land and the gradual expansion of employment through the Latimer Gap into open countryside is a concern, that is to be balanced by the strategic employment land need, and the ability of the site to help support an early jobs led growth in a commercially attractive location. Possible coalescence issue with Burton Latimer. Blackbridge Farm road on the site boundary has public access route and right of way. Impact on farm dwelling and local workshops on Blackbridge Farm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Summary</td>
<td>3.75 B8 demand strong supply limited. B2 demand restricted supply limited. B2 demand for land available for sale (as opposed design &amp; build) would be good. Developer interest reported. B8 values £48.43 sq m - £53.82 sq m (£4.50 - £5 psf). Yield 6.75 - 7.5%. Freehold value £699.67 sq m (£65 psf). B1c/B2 £53.82 sq m - £69.96 sq m (£5.00 - £6.50) psf. B1c Freehold £914.96 sq m (£85 per sq ft). Dependent on link to A6 and planning. Potentially within a few years. Extension to BL1. Strong demand. Viability effected by costs of access onto A6. Same comment as for BL1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Deliverability</td>
<td>Although would benefit from the wider strategic road improvements that might come about as a result of the Kettering East potential major urban extension, the site is marginal even in terms of viability should it start with a major pre-let B8 use, as it is dependant upon access onto the A6, and needs to be an extension of BL1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Number</td>
<td>BL4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>South of Garden Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td>Due east of Burton Latimer and west of A6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross ha</td>
<td>13.09 ha (32.2 acres)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Developable ha</td>
<td>Net 10.42 hectares (25.76 acres). B1c 17,651 sq m (190,000 sq ft). B1 offices 9,290 sq m (100,000 sq ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>East of Rectory Plantation, northern part of this site has recently been developed as the Seasons Garden Centre.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sustainability Summary

2.66 Past map evidence of waste disposal in gully on southern end of site and also over the A6 to the east. In landscape area as part of town edges (Policy LP94). Although lying alongside the A6 the site is adjacent to existing housing Rectory Plantation along its length and may have a significant impact on the residential amenity. A traffic impact assessment would be needed, as there will be concerns about traffic running through the town.

### Commercial Summary

3.68 Good access onto the A6, some local road access improvement would be necessary. Good demand. Limited supply. No active marketing undertaken. B1 offices £150.69 sq m (£14 psf). B8 rental values £48.43 sq m - £53.82 sq m (£4.50 - £5.00 psf). Yields 6.75-7.5%. B1c £53.82 sq m - £69.96 (£5.00-£6.50 psf). Freehold value £914.96 sq m (£85 psf). Part developed for Seasons Garden Centre.

### Site Deliverability

Not a strong Deliverability site due to impact on nearby housing, potential for significant traffic impact if not mitigated, and moves development towards open countryside. This is balanced by it being attractive insofar as recent retail use planning permission has been accepted, and is in a good location for access to the A6 and the A14 for routes east, west and south.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>KE1/KE2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>East of Kettering potential growth development area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross ha</td>
<td>40 ha (99 acres) Employment. Expressed as based on 4000 dwellings and Structure Plan policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Developable ha</td>
<td>Net area 15.78 hectares (39 acres) – 55,275 sq m (595,000 sq ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sustainability Summary**

Difficult to assess until and unless land East of Kettering, as a major urban extension, comes forward. Employment needs to be assessed at the time, initially based on current Structure Plan housing to employment land ratio. Whilst significant B1 and some B2 employment should be integrated into all the core development areas including the neighbourhood centre(s), larger strategic sites could be needed and next located to the south of the site near, and with good access to the A14.

**Commercial Summary**

With access to A14 and northern link, B8 potential and B1/B1c. Good demand. Limited supply. No active marketing undertaken. B1 £53.82 sq m - £69.96 sq m (£5.00-£6.50 psf). Freehold value £914.96 sq m (£85 psf). B1 offices £150.69 sq m (£14 psf) and £1,883.75 sq m (£175 psf) freehold. Dependant on access link to A14 and Northern link road. Therefore estimated as 5 years plus, although developers believe it may be earlier. With substantial residential development the constraints associated with access potentially could be overcome. Market demand with access would be good.

**Site Deliverability**

Whilst employment land may come forward from this development in a viable form suitable for market it is not possible to properly quantify or locate it, nor yet be certain when it might be developed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Site Number</strong></th>
<th>KW5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Name</strong></td>
<td>Gypsy Lane west</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location</strong></td>
<td>West of Gypsy and East of A14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gross ha</strong></td>
<td>40 ha (98 acres)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gross Developable ha</strong></td>
<td>Constraints for site likely to lead to a reduced net area. Net area 16.2 ha (40 acres), 56,204 sq m (605,000 sq ft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notes</strong></td>
<td>Very major site constraints effectively limit development to a ribbon in the northern half and into segments in the southern half.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sustainability Summary**

2.66 Whilst the area is close to the town centre and lies naturally within the town boundary, the issues with adjacent housing, 3 rights of way, pipelines, pylons and slopes, and flood prevention make this a difficult site. More suited to housing development, crematorium extension and open space. High visibility from A14. Some visual and amenity impact on Gypsy Lane existing residential. Part of site with good quality (Grade 2) agricultural land.

**Commercial Summary**

2.78 East of A14. Good access to A14 via Junction 7, with some improvement to the Northfield Rd junction with the A4300, and potentially access to Junction 8. Possible B1(c) & B1 office site. Limited supply. Good demand for B1c and offices. Not marketed. Owner of lower section considering residential development. B1(c) rental values £53.82 sq m - £69.96 sq m (£5.00-£6.50 psf). Freehold £914.96 sq m (£85 psf). Offices £150.69 sq m (£14 psf). Freehold £1,883.75 sq m (£175 psf). Reasonable demand. Substantial constraints may make commercial development unviable without intervention.

**Site Deliverability**

Its closeness to the town centre, and natural place within the town boundary balances some serious site constraints and alternative uses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>KS7 and used as a typical appraisal for sites (KW2, KW3, KW7, KW8 and KN5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Various sites mainly west of A14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross ha</td>
<td>23 hectares (57 acres) overall gross including non-developable land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Developable ha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>These sites are only ever likely to be able to be considered as and if the A14 improvements / relief road comes forward in a suitable location, with suitable accesses. If this happens the current understanding is that this is unlikely to be before 2017 – so these sites cannot be identified as suitable or deliverable at this time. A rolling review of the Employment study should regularly review these sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Summary</td>
<td>At present the sites are in open countryside with generally poor access to the A14, limited access to the town centre, and have a variety of environmental constraints, different for each site, that might include high voltage electricity pylons, rights of way, deciduous woodland, river/brook with flooding issues, sloping site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Summary</td>
<td>Not possible to assess, until and unless A14 new route and/or relief road has been confirmed. Those sites that are closest to accessible junctions and with limited abnormal costs are evidently the more likely to be able to be progressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Deliverability</td>
<td>Again not possible to assess until and unless new route to A14 is confirmed in a suitable location. Heavily dependant upon access to A14 and into the town centre. Each site to be assessed re planning implications/environmental issues. One or more of the following issues will affect these sites: flooding (Slade Brook), steep slopes, distant views of possible development; rights of way, high voltage electricity lines, poor access to town centre, poor access to non-car access for employees. Generally not likely to be sustainable, attractive sites.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Key Area Location Maps

The Key Area Location Maps are the large folded maps, being part of this report.

The three maps cover the following areas:

- Desborough and Rothwell
- Kettering and Burton Latimer
- Kettering Town Centre

For primary selected sites, more detailed location maps for each site may be found as part of “Chapter 5: Summary of Key Sites”.
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APPENDIX D

GLOSSARY
OF TERMS USED IN THIS REPORT
## GLOSSARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B 1</td>
<td>Land identified for business/offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 2</td>
<td>Land identified for general industrial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 8</td>
<td>Land identified for storage and distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPELA</td>
<td>An employment study looking at future land needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIRFT</td>
<td>Daventry International Rail Freight Terminal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMDA</td>
<td>East Midlands Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBS</td>
<td>Financial and Business Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOEM</td>
<td>Government Office for the East Midlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HGV</td>
<td>Heavy Goods Vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPD</td>
<td>Investment Property Databank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPU</td>
<td>Joint Planning Unit of the NNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBC</td>
<td>Kettering Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDD</td>
<td>Local Development Documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDF</td>
<td>Local Development Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDV</td>
<td>Local Delivery Vehicle (NNT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSH</td>
<td>Lambert Smith Hampton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MKSM</td>
<td>Milton Keynes and South Midlands growth area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNT</td>
<td>North Northamptonshire Together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>Northamptonshire Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O2C</td>
<td>Oxford to Cambridge Hi-tec development arc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODPM</td>
<td>Office of the Deputy Prime Minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPG</td>
<td>Planning Policy Guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPS</td>
<td>Planning Policy Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psf</td>
<td>Per square foot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;D</td>
<td>Research and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSS</td>
<td>Regional Spatial Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDA</td>
<td>Strategic Development Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIPPs</td>
<td>Self Invested Personal Pension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPZ</td>
<td>Special Planning Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sq ft</td>
<td>Square Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sqm and m sq</td>
<td>Square metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWOT</td>
<td>Strengths and Weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTD</td>
<td>Working Time Directive from the EU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>