

<b>Section Title - Geddington</b>
<b>Number of responses - 14</b>
<b>Summary of main points</b>  Total number of Objections - 6 Total number of Support - 4 Total number of neither Object nor Support - 4
<b>Statutory Consultees</b>
<b>Environment Agency</b>  Site RA/110 Policy GED04 - Old Nursery Site, Grafton Road is within Flood Zone 2 and should be subject to the flood risk sequential test. <b>(id.439)</b>
<b>NCC Archaeology</b> Policy GED04 should be supported by an 'appropriate level of archaeological assessment'. <b>(id.316)</b>
<b>Anglian Water</b> Objection to Policy GED03 and site RA/109. SSP2 Local Plan makes reference to the preparation of a scheme to assess the impact of odour from a Water Recycling Centre in Anglian Water's ownership, however, for this to be effective the layout of the site will need to be designed to ensure that a suitable buffer distance is maintained between occupied land and buildings and Geddington Water Recycling Centre based upon an assessment of odour impact. This would ensure that there would be no adverse impact on future occupants of regularly occupied land and buildings, arising from the proximity of the proposed development to the Geddington Water Recycling Centre and that allocated site does not prejudice the continued operation of the existing site. <b>(id. 359)</b>
<b>Geddington, Newton and Little Oakley Parish Council</b> Objection to the inclusion of two small strips of land within the designated green space areas. <b>(id. 531)</b>
<b>Objection to paragraph 12.89 - Map 12.5</b> The proposed settlement boundary excludes part of the garden serving a dwellinghouse located on Queen Street, Geddington. <b>(id.173)</b>
<b>Objection to HVI016</b> The HVI includes a tarmacked carpark associated with The White Lion Pub. Views into and out of the HVI are obscured by trees and hedging and the car park should be removed from the HVI. <b>(id. 523)</b>
<b>Comment to HVI016</b> The Paddocks which were previously designated HVI016, but the village

boundary which used to follow the river line now follows the house and garden line, meaning that the paddocks are now treated as farmland. **(id. 493)**

With respect of HVI016, a previous site visit noted my garden area extended into the Paddock to include designated wood. In addition it was noted in 2016 that planning permission KE/86/0878 was granted for a Stable Block and food store. The proposed village boundary needs amending. **(id. 493)**

#### **Comment to Policy (GED01)**

Part b) preserve and enhance the green corridor running through the centre of Geddington – this part of the policy is considered to be ambiguous and requires further information on the importance of the green corridor and how it should be preserved and enhanced. It should also be made clear that enhancement measures are only required where there will be a negative impact upon this area. **(id. 541)**

Part h) contribution towards the provision of a footpath along the River Ise / traffic calming / public realm improvements - Schemes for the above improvements should be identified as it is not currently clear if these improvements are deliverable through developer contributions arising from the 30 dwellings proposed in Geddington. Developer contributions should be sought in accordance with Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 in that they are a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; b) directly related to the development; and c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. **(id. 541)**

Part i) reflect the positive character of the historic core – this part of the policy is considered to be ambiguous and further description should be provided on what the Council is aiming to achieve. **(id. 541)**

Part j) use high quality materials – any future proposals would be informed by a design code that reflect the character of the surrounding area whilst being economically viable. **(id. 541)**

Part k) high quality fenestration using natural materials – any future proposals would be informed by a design code that reflect the character of the surrounding area whilst being economically viable. **(id. 541)**

#### **Comment to Policy GED02**

The allocation of the site for 10 dwellings is supported. **(id. 542)**

The site owners prepared a noise assessment (April 2017) which concluded that subject to mitigation, housing development could be made acceptable in noise terms, and was accepted by the Council's Environmental Protection Team. **(id. 542)**

The site owners broadly accepts the proposed policy requirements at parts a) to f) of GED02, although further explanation of what the Council is trying to achieve in part b) (clearly defined street enclosure to the west of the site) should be provided. Part g) of the policy seeks to retain mature trees as part of the development. However, in order for the development to front on to the street (a proposed policy requirement of GED01), some non-mature trees along the western frontage will require removal. Trees along the southern boundary would be retained. The policy should make it clear that the removal of trees along the site frontage in order to accommodate an appropriate layout would be acceptable. **(id. 542)**

### **Objections to Policy GED03**

- The site (RA/109) provides key vistas to the village which should be protected. **(id. 159)**
- Site development (RA/109) will increase traffic and give rise to adverse noise disturbance, as well as vehicular parking and highway safety impacts. **(id. 159)**
- The large number of homes will significantly impact on the privacy of occupiers of 2 Steele Way, as the majority of windows on this property which face the site serve habitable rooms. **(id. 328)**
- Noise and light pollution affecting 2 Steele Way during and post construction will be considerable. **(id. 328)**
- Development of the site will not be discrete and the loss of a soft natural view of the countryside around the village will be lost **(id. 328)**.
- The site owners prepared an indicative housing layout to address site constraints and some of the issues raised through the site assessment consultation phase (including Anglian Water assets and associated odour impacts, and character/design principles). The site owners support the allocation on the basis of a site yield of 10-11 dwellings. The site owners consider that the site boundary should be extended to achieve an enhanced layout and design and better take into account the character of existing properties to the north. **(id. 543)**
- In terms of the policy requirements set out at parts a) to m) of GED03, the accompanying layout demonstrates that parts b), c), d), e), g),h) and k) are capable of being met. The site owners accept that as part of any detailed application, details relating to parts a), f), i), k) and m) would be required by the Council. However with regards to part j), it is the Estate's position that a noise assessment would not be necessary. Kettering Road has been de-trunked, is subject to a 30mph speed limit across the site frontage and sits opposite residential development. The Council should therefore provide further justification of the need for a noise assessment. **(id. 543)**

**Site RA/107**

- General comment of support. (id. 540)

**Site RA/109**

- General comment of support. (id. 540)

**Site RA/110**

- General comment of support. (id. 94)

**Implications of New National Planning Policy Framework**

Paragraph 61 (NPPF) states that the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community should be assessed and reflected in planning policies. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment informed the Joint Core Strategy in terms of the housing need for the area, whilst local housing needs surveys (where available) informed specific requirements at a local level. Policy 28 (JCS) sets out the housing requirement for Kettering Borough, with a further breakdown set out within Policy 29. The last Housing needs survey for Geddington, Newton and Little Oakley was produced in March 2011, which provided a baseline measurement for the village at that point in time and a demonstrable need for 15 new homes of various types/sizes, the majority of which would be made available to rent.

Paragraph 63 (NPPF) states that the provision of affordable housing should not be sought for residential development that are not major developments, other than in designated rural areas (where policies may set out a lower threshold of 5 units or fewer). The Joint Core Strategy (July 2016) was published prior to the NPPF (2018), setting a higher threshold of 11 dwellings, which currently applies to development proposals brought forward under the SSP2 Local Plan. The three housing site allocations in Geddington vary between 8 and 11 dwellings, and may provide a small amount of affordable housing if the trigger is met.

Section 12 and associated paragraphs 124 – 132 (NPPF) refers to ‘Achieving well-designed places’ which planning policies should achieve. The overarching rural Policy RA04 (General Development Principles in the Rural Area) and Policies GED01 – GED 04 set out specific requirements in order to deliver good design which responds to the surrounding character of the area and site characteristics.

Section 14 (NPPF) relates to meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change. In particular, paragraph 162 states that where planning applications come forward on sites allocated in the development plan through the sequential test, applicants need not apply the sequential test. However, the exception test may need to be reapplied if relevant aspects of the proposal had not been considered when the test was applied at the plan making stage, or if more recent information about existing or potential flood risk should be taken into account. Taking into account consultation comments received from the Environment Agency, site RA/110 is recommended to be

reduced in size to exclude land falling within flood risk zone 2 and comply with the NPPF and standing advice, or include a policy criteria excluding development falling within this area of land. Development principles set out in Policy GED03 (Site RA/109) also includes criteria to mitigate against the risk of ground water flood risk, as opposed to fluvial flood risk.

Section 15 (NPPF) refers to conserving and enhancing the natural environment. Paragraph 180 (NPPF) states that planning policies and decisions should ensure that new development is appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, as well as the potential sensitivity of the site or the wider area to impacts that could arise from the development. Identified issues of potential odour nuisance emanating from a waste water treatment works near to RA/109 have sought to be addressed through site development principles (Policy GED03). Similarly, development principles (Policy GED02) seeks to mitigate against potential noise impacts on the future dwellings emanating from the adjacent saw mill through the requirement of a scheme to assess and control noise.

Section 16 (NPPF) focuses on conserving and enhancing the historic environment. Due to the historic character of Geddington, development principles for the village set out within Policy GED01, and individual housing site policies (GED02 – GED04) seek to protect and enhance heritage assets and historic features/characteristics where present.

#### **Summary of officer comments**

- Site RA/109 was promoted through a call for sites and assessed using relevant Sustainability Appraisal objectives. The site scored favourably as identified issues (impacts on noise, highway capacity and access) can be mitigated. As a result the site has been recommended as a potential housing allocation within the draft SSP2 Local Plan.
- A site visit was undertaken to a property on Queen Street, Geddington to re-assess the settlement boundary, informing a decision to include a triangular piece of land within the settlement boundary which forms part of the garden serving the property.
- A site visit is recommended to re-assess the car park land serving The White Hart, Queen Street, Geddington to re-assess inclusion of the land within HVILGS, informing a decision to exclude the land from HVI06.
- Site RA/110 was promoted by the site owners as an additional site and assessed using relevant Sustainability Appraisal objectives. As part of that process, flood risk was considered and the site owners prepared a flood risk assessment, proposing to limit development within Flood Risk Zone 1, and employ raised floor levels. Criterion (e) of Policy GED04 can be refined further to require a sequential test to be applied to future development, or to exclude zone 2 from the site allocation.

- An appropriate level of archaeological assessment can be secured by making criterion (f) of Policy GED04 more explicit.
- An additional development principle criterion is proposed for Policy GED03 which will require development on RA/109 to be laid out and designed in a way which incorporates a scheme of measures to protect the amenity (including protecting privacy, and impacts from noise and light pollution) of occupiers of properties to north. The scheme of measures will include an appropriate separation buffer between properties and their curtilages, as well as appropriate boundary treatments.
- Criterion (i) of Policy GED04 sought to address the issues raised, however, further amendment to criterion (i) is proposed to be included in the Pre-submission SSP2 Local Plan to fully address concerns regarding the proximity and layout of new dwellings on site RA/109 to the nearby Geddington Water Recycling Centre.
- Comment noted regarding support for the allocation of housing sites RA/107, RA/109 and RA/110.
- The Local Planning Authority has decided it is more appropriate to address issues covered by criterion (b) of the development principles of Policy GED01, to be included instead within Policy ENV01 (Local Green Infrastructure Corridors), as these are more general and will apply to the whole borough. Policy ENV01 will therefore be strengthened further as a result of other comments received through the draft SSP2 Local Plan Consultation and criterion (b) of Policy GED01 will be removed.
- Policy GED01, criterion (h) clearly states that 'development' will 'contribute towards' enhancements referred to. This will be necessary in order to mitigate against the negative impacts from increased use of these routes arising from inhabitants of new development, but can only be required where development yield triggers the requirement for a S106 agreement. The River Ise is a key feature running through Geddington which benefits all residents (existing and new). Stamford Road / New Road / Kettering Road is a key arterial route serving the village.
- Within Policy GED01, criterion (i), it is considered that further reference can be given, to highlight the special character of the historic core including the street enclosure, use of traditional building materials, etc.
- Policy GED02, criterion (b) seeks to achieve a clear sense of street enclosure as achieved within the historic core by the positioning of buildings along the highway; this can also be achieved through the use of boundary walls, which also reinforces a key historic feature present within the town.

- Policy GED02, criterion (g) will be revised to respond to comment about conflict between criterion (g) and (b) and provide greater clarity. The revision will instead require a tree management scheme is provided instead, which would incorporate a survey and management plan and could set out a justification for the retention/loss of trees.
- With respect to Policy GED01, criterion (j) and (k), the JCS does not explicitly require a design code to be prepared; this is normally a requirement for larger schemes, and is not necessarily applicable to smaller schemes, such as individual dwellings and/or extensions to existing dwellings. As a result, a requirement for the use of high quality materials is something which should be retained.
- Site RA/109 was originally considered through the Kettering Borough Rural Masterplanning Report (February 2012), where a recommendation was followed to reduce the site size in order to respect the character of the area and deliver a gateway development on this site. As a result, the Council is not minded to re-extend the site boundary.
- A site visit was undertaken to a property (and land adjacent the property) on New Road, Geddington to re-assess the settlement boundary, informing a decision to include some additional land which provides enclosed garden serving the property in accordance with the settlement boundary defining principles (1) and (2c). Adjacent paddock land is considered visually open and separate from adjoining garden land, and development of the land is considered harmful to the green wedge running through Geddington. As a result, the paddock land should remain outside of the settlement boundary in accordance with settlement boundary defining principles 3(d) and 3(e).
- Land south of St. Mary Magdalen's Church and along Church Hill to the west of the church is highway verge / amenity land and is not open space in the sense of falling within one of the PPG17 typologies. In addition, it is located between / adjacent a number of grade I and II listed properties in a central position of the village within the designated Conservation Area. As a result, the land already benefits from a high degree of protection through these constraints and although the land is located within the historic core of the village, it is considered that additional protection through HVILGS designation is not necessary in this instance.

#### **Next steps**

- Update the settlement boundary to reflect changes discussed in relation to comments received.
- Update HVILGS Background Paper (2015) to exclude the car park serving the The White Hart, Geddington from HVI016.;

- Amend the boundary of RA/110 to remove land falling within flood risk zone 2, or further refine policy GED04, criterion (e) to clarify the position on excluding development within the flood risk zone 2 to address Environment Agency concerns raised through comment received;
- Amend Policy GED04, criterion (f) to be more explicit about requiring an appropriate level of archaeological assessment and address NCC Archaeology's concerns raised through comment received;
- Amend Policy GED04, criterion (i) to use the wording agreed with Anglian Water and address their concerns raised through comment received;
- Remove criterion (b) from Policy GED01 and include it or a version of it within Policy ENV01 to address concerns raised through comment received;
- Provide further detail to criterion (i) of Policy GED01 or within the supporting policy text, to highlight the special character of the historic core including the street enclosure, use of traditional building materials, etc to address concerns raised through comment received;
- Revise criterion (g) of Policy GED02 to address the existing potential conflict with criterion (b) and concerns raised through comment received.