

Appendix 2f – Ashley

Comment	KBC Response
<p>36. 12.1 Ashley. HVI 081 is comprised of 2 adjacent fields, one north of the Church and the other north of No 7 Main Street.</p> <p>The field north of No 7 has been in the current owners possession for 26 years. They were not consulted when this was put up for HVI status.</p> <p>They wish to object on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neither the field nor No 7 are in the conservation area. • The field is outside the village boundary and thus is protected by open countryside policies. • There is no road access to this or even the adjoining fields and thus there are no circumstances where there is any likelihood of development. • The field has no historical significance. • Has always been used as simple grazing land. • Has no public access. • Has no public views over this land. It is flat and is surrounded by hedgerow fencing. • This land is not demonstrably special 	<p>HVI081 has undergone rigorous independent assessment, and the reasons for defining the site as an HVI are set out within the HVI report available at https://www.kettering.gov.uk/downloads/file/18274/historically_and_visually_important_open_space_update_june_2016. On this basis, the HVI is recommended to be retained.</p>
<p>37. 12.32 Ashley Parish Council would like to extend the conservation area to the whole village with special additional note to protect the extensive and increasingly rare ridge and furrow lines that surround the village on the remaining non rotated grazing land.</p>	<p>The 1990 Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act defines a conservation area as “<i>an area of architectural or historic interest the character and appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance</i>”, and imposes a duty on Local Planning Authorities to designate these areas where they are recognised. As a result, the inclusion of land within a Conservation Area must be considered against these criteria. In the case of Ashley, there are</p>

Appendix 2f – Ashley

	<p>some areas of the village which would not meet these criteria. The last Conservation Area appraisal for the village was published on 9th November 1977. There remains a case to update this appraisal together with other settlement Conservation Areas made at a similar time. However, this process can run separately to the emergence of the SSP2 Local Plan as they are not dependent upon each other.</p>
<p>38. 12.32 Ashley Parish Council would like to request that you consider Special Landscape Area protected status for the Welland villages within the borough. Because this area sits on the boundary of Leicestershire and Northants, little attention is paid to this quite special and unique area of countryside. We feels it needs some designation and protection.</p> <p>Overall, Ashley Parish council fully supports the SSLDPP proposals for Ashley village and in general.</p>	<p>A policy to identify “Strategic Gaps” was submitted as a part of the original North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy in 2008. The Planning Inspector however, set out that National Planning Policy at the time (Planning Policy Statement 7) did not favour such local designations, unless there are landscape, wildlife or historic qualities, where greater priority should be given to restraint of potentially damaging development.</p> <p>The government believes that carefully drafted criteria-based policies in Local Development Documents (now Local Plans), utilising such tools as landscape character assessment should provide sufficient protection for these areas, without the need for rigid local designations. The Inspector also said that local landscape designations should only be maintained or, exceptionally, extended where it can be clearly shown that criteria –based planning policies cannot provide the necessary protection. He added that, from the evidence provided and his visits, he did not consider the strategic gaps as a whole to have clearly identified qualities. The policy setting out specific areas was subsequently withdrawn.</p> <p>The current North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (adopted July 2016) provides a criteria-based policy, this can be found at Policy 3: <i>Landscape Character</i>. Policy 3 sets out a series of criteria to manage development within the landscape character of an area. Including that “Development should:</p> <p>a) Conserve and, where possible, enhance the character and qualities</p>

Appendix 2f – Ashley

	<p>of the local landscape through appropriate design and management;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b) Make provision for the retention and, where possible, enhancement of features of landscape importance; c) Safeguard and, where possible, enhance important views and vistas including sky lines within the development layout; d) Protect the landscape setting and contribute to maintaining the individual and distinct character, and separate identities of settlements by preventing coalescence; e) Provide appropriate landscape mitigation and/or suitable off-site enhancements; and f) Preserve tranquillity within the King’s Cliff Hills and Valleys Landscape Character Area and other areas identified in Part 2 Local Plans by minimising light and noise pollution and minimising the visual and traffic impacts of development.” <p>This policy acts to protect the countryside against negative influences of development, and at criteria f) also allow Part 2 Local Plans to identify further areas of tranquillity where considered appropriate. Considering the comments of the 2008 Inspector, the lack of any clear evidence to suggest that the current policy is providing insufficient protection, or that a specific risk exists to the character or tranquillity of the Welland Valley, there would not be a need to progress a more specific policy for the area.</p>
<p>39. 12.3 Table The George pub has protected status as a registered community asset. The village and Ashley Parish Council see its continuation as a public house as fundamental to maintaining a strong community within the</p>	<p>Proposed policy TCE6 (page 40) of the Draft SSP2 Local Plan seeks to protect local services and facilities which includes public houses, and is sufficient to address the comment raised. The fact that the pub is a registered asset of community value will be highlighted in</p>

Appendix 2f – Ashley

<p>village. No change of use should be considered for this site, ever.</p>	<p>the supporting text of the Pre-submission SSP2 Local Plan.</p>
<p>40. 12.40 Ashley Parish Council fully supports the creation of the three areas of HVI green space. We see these as being key to protecting the character and shape of the village going forward.</p>	<p>Your comment is noted.</p>
<p>46. 12.32 I feel that the Conservation Area should be extended to the whole village to protect the beautiful and historic look of the village into the future.</p>	<p>The 1990 Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act defines a conservation area as “<i>an area of architectural or historic interest the character and appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance</i>” and imposes a duty on Local Planning Authorities to designate these areas where they are recognised. As a result, the inclusion of land within a Conservation Area must be considered against these criteria. In the case of Ashley, there are some areas of the village which would not meet these criteria. The last Conservation Area appraisal for the village was published on 9th November 1977. There remains a case to update this appraisal together with other settlement Conservation Areas made at a similar time. However, this process may run separately to the emergence of the SSP2 Local Plan as they are not dependent upon each other.</p>
<p>47. 12.3 The pub is an integral part of the village and helps the community of all ages and backgrounds to get together. It should not be granted change of use.</p>	<p>Proposed policy TCE6 (page 40) of the Draft SSP2 Local Plan seeks to protect local services and facilities which includes public houses, and is sufficient to address the comment raised. The fact that the pub is a registered asset of community value will be highlighted in the supporting text of the Pre-submission SSP2 Local Plan.</p>
<p>48. 12.40 The three areas of designated green space in Ashley are of the utmost importance to the village. I support the HVI status of land surrounding The Manor because of its important location behind the historic St. Mary's Church. Any development of any kind on this land should never be allowed.</p>	<p>Your comments are noted. An HVI designation will be a material planning consideration in any planning decision and will be a constraint to development, rather than a prohibitive measure.</p>
<p>56. 12.32 Extend the conservation area to the whole village,</p>	<p>The 1990 Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act</p>

Appendix 2f – Ashley

<p>with special additional note to protect the extensive and increasingly rare ridge and furrow lines that surround the village on the remaining non rotated grazing land and to protect the historic views of the church.</p>	<p>defines a conservation area as “<i>an area of architectural or historic interest the character and appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance</i>” and imposes a duty on Local Planning Authorities to designate these areas where they are recognised. As a result, the inclusion of land within a Conservation Area must be considered against these criteria. In the case of Ashley, there are some areas of the village which would not meet these criteria. The last Conservation Area appraisal for the village was published on 9th November 1977. There remains a case to update this appraisal together with other settlement Conservation Areas made at a similar time. However, this process may run separately to the emergence of the SSP2 Local Plan as they are not dependent upon each other.</p>
<p>57. Table 12.3 The George public house acts as a community hub and brings people together from across the village. Please recognise its community asset status and ensure that change of use is never granted.</p>	<p>Proposed policy TCE6 (page 40) of the Draft SSP2 Local Plan seeks to protect local services and facilities which includes public houses, and is sufficient to address the comment raised. The fact that the pub is a registered asset of community value will be highlighted in the supporting text of the Pre-submission SSP2 Local Plan.</p>
<p>58. Policy ASH01. The principles set out in Policy ASH01 will support the protection of the shape and historic character of the village of Ashley.</p>	<p>Your comment is noted.</p>
<p>64. ASH01. 12.40 We support the creation of three areas of HVI Green Space.</p>	<p>Your comment is noted.</p>
<p>104. Table 12.2 - key statistics. There are no new housing allocations proposed which is appropriate given the rural setting of the village and the prominence of the conservation areas within the village. The conservation areas are there to preserve the character of the village.</p>	<p>Your comment is noted.</p>
<p>105. Table 12.3 - The public House. The George pub, as a community asset, is an important meeting place for villagers and, together with the Village Hall and Church, helps maintain the strong community spirit within the village.</p>	<p>Proposed policy TCE6 (page 40) of the Draft SSP2 Local Plan seeks to protect local services and facilities which includes public houses, and is sufficient to address the comment raised. The fact that the pub is a registered asset of community value will be highlighted in</p>

Appendix 2f – Ashley

	the supporting text of the Pre-submission SSP2 Local Plan.
<p>106. ASH01 and local green space 12.4. I support the settlement boundary as outlined in 12.4 and do not support any plans for new dwellings outside of the village boundary and I do not support any plans for new dwellings on the "Proposed Historically and Visually Important Local Green Space" as identified in the map in 12.4 below. I particularly object to any new development on the approach to the village from the West.</p>	Your comments are noted. The draft SSP2 Local Plan does not propose any new housing within the village of Ashley, and accords with your response.
<p>149. I fully support the creation of 3 areas of HVI green spaces as they are key to protecting the character of the village</p>	Your comment is noted.
<p>156. Ashley is a delightful village. Similar to many in Northamptonshire, Leicestershire and Rutland. It contains a mix of housing from old stone buildings, Victorian houses to social housing and several houses built at end of last century and early this one. The Church is a fairly typical village church distinguished by its interior. Very little of the original stone walls on odd side of Main Street exist anymore. The village has developed over centuries and my fear is that if we are a conservation area the village will develop no further and will be 'preserved in aspic'. There are many other villages in the local area which better represent the past buildings than Ashley does. So I do not agree with the description of the village or of the suggestion that it becomes a conservation area.</p> <p>Although the village 'wants' a pub and a church they will only survive if the pub is a commercial success and if there</p>	<p>Your comments are noted. The village description is based on a factual assessment. The village has been designated as a category A village, and allows for natural growth where development complies with Policy RS01. The draft SSP2 Local Plan does not make suggestion that the village becomes a Conservation Area as set out in responses to other comments relating to this issue. The village pub has been listed as a 'community asset' and secures a degree of protection. Policy TCE6 of the draft SSP2 Local Plan recognises the importance of local services and facilities and listed public houses within this. The policy allows for the loss of facilities, but only where specific criteria set out within that policy are met. In light of support received for the protection of the pub, and the opposite concerns raised through your comment, it is considered that Policy TCE6 strikes the right balance.</p> <p>St Marys Church is grade I listed, and as a result is considered by the Secretary of State (for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport) to be of special architectural or historic interest; as grade I property, it is of exceptional interest. Just 2.5% of listed buildings are Grade I within</p>

Appendix 2f – Ashley

<p>is a large enough worshipping congregation to support the church. It is difficult to predict if either of these institutions will survive in the long term and it is foolish to build these in to plan. The survival of both premises is outwith the control of the Local Authorities. Again I do not agree that the survival of the pub and the church can be part of the development plan for the village</p> <p>The plan talks about preserving views of the church. When the trees are in full leaf as they are presently there are limited views of the church when approaching it from Medbourne Road. Similarly if approaching from Middleton the church only comes into view when you go past the pub because of the bends in Main Street. As mentioned earlier the outside of the church is nothing special and indeed most Anglican church are listed buildings, the Ashley church is special because of its interior.</p> <p>The parish Council recently encouraged villagers to complete a survey about the type of pub we wanted, as far as I am aware the result have not been made available to the village yet. I fail to understand why the Parish Council did not conduct a survey amongst villagers or to hold a public meeting so that the whole village had the opportunity to comment on the plans. Why is the future of the pub more important than the future of the village itself? It feels very undemocratic at present. So the failure to consult widely means that I cannot support the plan or the comments of the Parish Council.</p>	<p>the UK, as opposed to 90% of listed buildings which are Grade II. Full details of the listing are available at https://britishlistedbuildings.co.uk/101052127-church-of-st-mary-ashley#.XBJrk9L7RhE</p> <p>Other comments received relate to consultation undertaken by the Parish Council who do not have direct involvement in the production of the SSP2 Local Plan, other than as statutory consultee. As a result, the comments you have raised do not relate to the process and issues raised through the Kettering Borough Council SSP2 Local Plan.</p>
<p>160. 12.35 I support the plan and the commitment to the village boundary proposed. Development outside the</p>	<p>Your comments are noted.</p>

Appendix 2f – Ashley

<p>boundary would be detrimental to the setting and character of the village.</p>	
<p>161. 12.3 The village would benefit from having conservation status extended to the whole village, as this would protect the future of the village. I support the Parish Council view on this.</p>	<p>The 1990 Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act defines a conservation area as “<i>an area of architectural or historic interest the character and appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance</i>” and imposes a duty on Local Planning Authorities to designate these areas where they are recognised. As a result, the inclusion of land within a Conservation Area must be considered against these criteria. In the case of Ashley, there are some areas of the village which would not meet these criteria. The last Conservation Area appraisal for the village was published on 9th November 1977. There remains a case to update this appraisal together with other settlement Conservation Areas made at a similar time. However, this process may run separately to the emergence of the SSP2 Local Plan as they are not dependent upon each other.</p>
<p>168. I support the Historic and visually important green space designations in the village as it is open land that helps maintain and protect the character, shape, views, sensitive locations around the village. I support the retention of the existing development boundary. I want the extension of the conservation zone to cover the whole village. I support the overall plan.</p>	<p>Your comments are noted. Through the draft SSP2 Local Plan, the existing settlement boundary has been amended slightly to account for historic development built out since the settlement boundary was originally adopted, and address any other discrepancies identified through the settlement boundary defining principles. It is understood that support is given to this new amended boundary which was set out within the consultation document.</p> <p>The 1990 Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act defines a conservation area as “<i>an area of architectural or historic interest the character and appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance</i>” and imposes a duty on Local Planning Authorities to designate these areas where they are recognised. As a result, the inclusion of land within a Conservation Area must be considered against these criteria. In the case of Ashley, there are</p>

Appendix 2f – Ashley

	<p>some areas of the village which would not meet these criteria. The last Conservation Area appraisal for the village was published on 9th November 1977. There remains a case to update this appraisal together with other settlement Conservation Areas made at a similar time. However, this process may run separately to the emergence of the SSP2 Local Plan as they are not dependent upon each other.</p>
<p>169. Local Green Space 12.40. Three areas of Historically and Visually Important Local Green Space are proposed within Ashley. There are areas HVI001, HVI002, and HVI081 which are recognised as being demonstrably special and of local significance. In accordance with Policy ENV03 these Local Green Spaces will be preserved to this effect.</p>	<p>Your comments are noted.</p>
<p>170. 12.31 & ASH01 and local green space 12.34 & 12.4. 12.31 Trees, open space and views along lanes are an important feature contributing to this village particular attractiveness. This is an important request as we have to protect the mature trees as they add to the maturity of the village and provide much needed shade on hot days and homes for local wildlife.</p> <p>I support the protection of the 3 designated HVI green areas - HVI001, HVI002, and HVI081 There are an unknown number of older settlements around Ashley and the land which surrounds Ashley may hold much history beneath it that once built on will be lost forever. The area surrounding the church is of the highest significance and should not be underestimated just for developers to line their already deep pockets along with the land on Green Lane which hosts a wealth of history below the surface long with a visually</p>	<p>Your comments are noted. There is no planned growth for Ashley within the SSP2 Local Plan which accords with your comments, however new development could still come forwards through windfall. Proposed Historically and Visually Important Local Green Space will be a key material consideration in any future proposal to develop it; only proposals which maintain its special interest may be considered more favourably. Trees within a Conservation Area or covered by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) require consent before specific works can be carried out on them, and therefore benefit from a degree of initial protection through the planning system already. Important views would be identified through a formal review of the Conservation Area when one is carried out.</p> <p>St Marys church is grade I listed, and as a result is considered by the Secretary of State (for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport) to be of special architectural or historic interest; as grade I property, it is of exceptional interest. Just 2.5% of listed buildings are Grade I within the UK, as opposed to 90% of listed buildings which are Grade II.</p>

Appendix 2f – Ashley

<p>important outlook.</p> <p>I support the settlement boundary as outlined in 12.4 and I do not support any plans for new dwellings inside or outside of the village boundary and I do not support any plans for new dwellings on the "Proposed Historically and Visually Important Local Green Space". I object to any new development on the approach to the village from the West/East/South & North</p> <p>I support the Ashley Development proposals to Protect the unique historic character of the village, the setting of its numerous Listed Buildings and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. This is of immense importance, as once the land is built on or disfigured by new builds and new ideas, it cannot be changed back. Ashley is a pretty little village that survives mostly on the back of all the hard working villagers who put there time and effort into managing it. We have no need to expand as a village, the most attractive points about Ashley is that it is mostly unspoilt. If villagers require newer housing then maybe they should consider moving to a larger village or town.</p> <p>12.34 - No growth option.</p> <p>The village is a village and should be protected. there are plenty of new builds in neighbouring Desborough and Market Harborough. Anyone wishing to adopt a more modern way of life should consider moving to one of these options. Over the years, many of Ashleys properties (mostly cottages) have been developed from two or three cottages</p>	<p>Full details of the listing are available at https://britishlistedbuildings.co.uk/101052127-church-of-st-mary-ashley#.XBJrk9L7RhE An area of land surrounding the church has also been identified as listed building curtilage and benefits from the similar protection. Any development which is considered to affect the setting of the listed building will also be subject to additional scrutiny.</p> <p>Through the draft SSP2 Local Plan, the existing settlement boundary has been amended slightly to account for historic development built out since the settlement boundary was originally adopted, and address any other discrepancies identified through the settlement boundary defining principles. It is understood that support is given to this new amended boundary which was set out within the consultation document.</p>
--	---

Appendix 2f – Ashley

<p>to one substantial property. This has admittedly pushed prices up and out of the way of young and first time buyers. But, most young families are looking to be near to schools and services, so Ashley probably wouldn't be their first choice. We cannot spoil the integrity of the village to please a few people. We all worked hard to move here and enjoy the peace and quiet of rural idyllic life. I feel it would be unjustified to allow development in Ashley now. It would be unfair and unjust on those of us who work so very hard to live in a place as beautiful as Ashley.</p>	
<p>171. 12.3. As the last remaining pub out of 5 previous pubs/Inn's in Ashley. This must be retained for the village. A change of use from a pub to a house will only support developers. The village fought hard to keep it a pub, we now need the council to declare its use to protect it further.</p>	<p>Proposed policy TCE6 (page 40) of the Draft SSP2 Local Plan seeks to protect local services and facilities which includes public houses, and is sufficient to address the comment raised. The fact that the pub is a registered asset of community value will be highlighted in the supporting text of the Pre-submission SSP2 Local Plan.</p>
<p>172. 12.4 HVI081 must be protected. Admittedly it was owned by the same owner for some 20 years or more, but was retained by the same owner when they sold the Manor House (that the land has historically been attached to) as they wish to use it to their advantage in regards to a new build they are planning in the vicinity of the church.</p> <p>I believe that every field that has a side that touches the current conservation area and village boundary should be declared an HVI status. This would not stop farmers grazing or growing crops on the land but to stop developers from increasing the village size and therefore loosing the charm and integrity of Ashley Village.</p>	<p>HVI081 will be designated as HVILGS upon adoption of the SSP2 Local Plan. Criteria for defining an HVILGS is set out within the Open Space and Allotments Background Paper (KBC, February 2012) available at https://www.kettering.gov.uk/download/downloads/id/191/open_space_and_allotments_february_2012.pdf . Whether land touches the boundary of a Conservation Area is not a defining criteria for deciding whether to include it as HVILGS, and cannot be used to justify designation of additional land as HVILGS.</p>
<p>175. ASH01. 12.40 We continue to support the creation of three areas of HVI Green Space in keeping with a rural</p>	<p>Your comment is noted.</p>

Appendix 2f – Ashley

village and its historical heritage.	
177. Support	Your comment is noted.
178. Support	Your comment is noted.
<p>179. 12.32 I object to the suggestion that Ashley Conservation Area should be extended to the whole village. Ashley Parish Council has adopted this policy without democratic participation with the whole village. Many people who live outside the present Conservation Area are unaware that this new designation is being proposed and supported by APC. The implications have not been discussed with people who will be affected.</p> <p>Since the initial Conservation Area was identified in 1977, the historic context of the village has not changed, which is a further reason why extending the Conservation Area cannot be justified.</p>	<p>The 1990 Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act defines a conservation area as “<i>an area of architectural or historic interest the character and appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance</i>” and imposes a duty on Local Planning Authorities to designate these areas where they are recognised. As a result, the inclusion of land within a Conservation Area must be considered against these criteria. In the case of Ashley, there are some areas of the village which would not meet these criteria. The last Conservation Area appraisal for the village was published on 9th November 1977. There remains a case to update this appraisal together with other settlement Conservation Areas made at a similar time. However, this process may run separately to the emergence of the SSP2 Local Plan as they are not dependent upon each other.</p>
<p>181. 12.40 Local Green Space. Ashley Parish Council has proposed two new areas as HVI (1081 and 1002) without consultation with the village as a whole, or with the landowners concerned. This is not a democratic approach. Ashley Parish Council has not raised this issue at the Annual Village Meetings or via a questionnaire to the whole village regarding future development in Ashley. This land is already outside the village boundary and therefore outside the scope of future development.</p>	<p>The sites were identified / put forward for consideration as Historically and Visually Important Local Green Space and assessed on their merits. HVI081 and HVI002 are both considered suitable for designation as set out within the Background Paper: Historically and Visually Important Open Space (September 2015). The reason given for not designating the land as HVI [<i>sites were proposed by Ashley Parish Council</i>] is insufficient to justify its removal.</p>
<p>183. 12.34 and 12.36 Future Development in Ashley. Ashley Parish Council has adopted a policy of no future development in Ashley for the next 30 years (or until 2031 - it is unclear). Under the previous policy of 'restricted infill', the village has had approximately 30 new houses, plus</p>	<p>Your comment is noted and will be taken into account during the preparation of the Pre-submission Part 2 Local Plan. Although there is currently no growth planned for Ashley, although new sites may still come forwards as windfall.</p>

Appendix 2f – Ashley

<p>renovations and extensions over the last 30 years. This additional housing has brought newcomers to the village with creativity and energy to support the village infrastructure and make it a vibrant community. The village has no more potential for infill. It has been used up. What 'Village Plan' has the Ashley Parish Council come up with to keep the village alive for the next 30 years? Unfortunately there is no village plan except to protect the status quo.</p>	
<p>184. Support.</p>	<p>Your comment is noted.</p>
<p>201. ASH01. Fully support the proposals laid out in policy ASH01, in particular the creation of three areas of HVI Green Space which we see as important in preserving the historical character of the village.</p>	<p>Your comment is noted.</p>
<p>202. ASH01. Support.</p>	<p>Your comment is noted.</p>
<p>203. ASH01. We are in favour of the village boundary as it fits the natural and historical linear layout of the village as set out in the design statement</p> <p>We also support the proposed HVI designations as they would protect the important visual and historical aspects of these parts of the village.</p>	<p>Through the draft SSP2 Local Plan, the existing settlement boundary has been amended slightly to account for historic development built out since the settlement boundary was originally adopted, and address any other discrepancies identified through the settlement boundary defining principles. It is understood that support is given to this new amended boundary which was set out within the consultation document. Your comment regarding the HVI designations is noted.</p>
<p>206. Village Category. Ashley is a good village to live in, it works well, the PC, VHC and PCC do a good job and most people get involved, therefore many community projects have been successful over the years, village hall, playground, rec ground, church fundraising etc. Therefore it is also very desirable to live in with several opportunistic planning applications regularly on the go. I am not opposed</p>	<p>Your comments are noted. The 1990 Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act defines a conservation area as “<i>an area of architectural or historic interest the character and appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance</i>” and imposes a duty on Local Planning Authorities to designate these areas where they are recognised. As a result, the inclusion of land within a Conservation Area must be considered against these criteria. In the case of Ashley, there are some areas of the village which would not meet</p>

Appendix 2f – Ashley

<p>to change but it should be managed and organic. A review of the conservation zone is a very good idea and long overdue. Ashley's in 1977 was one of the first in the borough, though the village has not changed hugely the world around it has, this is now over 40 years old! Most recent conservation zone designations cover whole villages and communities, Ashley's is an anomaly. The village is seen as a whole and it is odd that some valuable buildings exist outside the zone and some marginal ones exist within it both with different sets of planning rules. I fully support this objective of a review, it is long overdue.</p> <p>It should also be pointed out that this would start a process in which there would be a full consultation, giving everyone a say for and against, so very democratic!! The suggestion made by Ashley PC registers the suggestion and if Kettering BC take it up they manage it.</p>	<p>these criteria. The last Conservation Area appraisal for the village was published on 9th November 1977. There remains a case to update this appraisal together with other settlements Conservation Areas made at a similar time. However, this process may run separately to the emergence of the SSP2 Local Plan as they are not dependent upon each other. However, at this stage a review is not planned.</p>
<p>209. Facilities. Pub. I feel it is important to safe guard the pub against opportunistic conversion to housing. It is the last pub of five in the village. Though listed as a community asset it should be noted and protected as part of the plan.</p> <p>The play and new recreational grounds are a great asset to the village should these be noted, and the farm shop is excellent. The village has some very good facilities built through the hard work of the community.</p> <p>There has been talk of a Welland valley cycle way along the old rail line which I would urge the plan to note this and the</p>	<p>Your comments are noted. Proposed policy TCE6 (page 40) of the Draft SSP2 Local Plan seeks to protect local services and facilities which includes public houses, and is sufficient to address the comment raised. The fact that the pub is a registered asset of community value will be highlighted in the supporting text of the Pre-submission SSP2 Local Plan.</p> <p>The notional Welland Valley Cycle Way needs to be explored further with Northamptonshire County Council Highways – Rights of Way team through a scoping exercise to establish the merits of introducing a new right of way.</p>

Appendix 2f – Ashley

<p>borough to support it. This would be a great asset to the area and bring employment if promoted properly. Could the borough look at developing a plan for this as East Northants have done with the Greenway.</p>	
<p>213. Development. I strongly support the plan as regards the village boundary and the development line. There have been some very questionable applications recently challenging this, it needs reinforcing.</p> <p>I also support the HVI designations, these do not affect the agricultural use of the land and protect the church, green space etc, this is important, i strongly support this.</p> <p>I also understand there is a landscape area designation being suggested for the Welland valley. This is a great idea especially if it brings environmental investment money to the valley as is being done currently by the environment agency to the river Welland. The wildlife potential is huge and anything to help encourage that should be supported.</p> <p>I would also support the review and establishment of a consultation of the conservation zone suggested by the PC, they are right, it should cover the whole village, I would support that.</p> <p>Employment. There are a lot of small home based businesses in the village as well as agricultural/equestrian ones. This could diversify if things such as the cycle route from Market Harborough to Peterborough along the top of the borough were more actively supported by the Borough</p>	<p>Your comments are noted. Through the draft SSP2 Local Plan, the existing settlement boundary has been amended slightly to account for historic development built out since the settlement boundary was originally adopted, and address any other discrepancies identified through the settlement boundary defining principles. It is understood that support is given to this new amended boundary which was set out within the consultation document.</p> <p>Regarding a potential landscape area designation for the Welland Valley, a policy to identify “Strategic Gaps” was submitted as a part of the original North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy in 2008. The Planning Inspector however, set out that National Planning Policy at the time (Planning Policy Statement 7) did not favour such local designations, unless there are landscape, wildlife or historic qualities, where greater priority should be given to restraint of potentially damaging development.</p> <p>The government believes that carefully drafted criteria-based policies in Local Development Documents (now Local Plans), utilising such tools as landscape character assessment should provide sufficient protection for these areas, without the need for rigid local designations. The Inspector also said that local landscape designations should only be maintained or, exceptionally, extended where it can be clearly shown that criteria –based planning policies cannot provide the necessary protection. He added that, from the evidence provided and his visits, he did not consider the strategic gaps as a whole to have clearly identified qualities. The policy setting out</p>

Appendix 2f – Ashley

<p>and county councils and tourism was encouraged. The area would massively benefit from this and it would bring a younger/ family age group to the village which is needed.</p>	<p>specific areas was subsequently withdrawn.</p> <p>The current North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (adopted July 2016) provides a criteria-based policy, this can be found at Policy 3: <i>Landscape Character</i>. Policy 3 sets out a series of criteria to manage development within the landscape character of an area. Including that “Development should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a) Conserve and, where possible, enhance the character and qualities of the local landscape through appropriate design and management;b) Make provision for the retention and, where possible, enhancement of features of landscape importance;c) Safeguard and, where possible, enhance important views and vistas including sky lines within the development layout;d) Protect the landscape setting and contribute to maintaining the individual and distinct character, and separate identities of settlements by preventing coalescence;e) Provide appropriate landscape mitigation and/or suitable off-site enhancements; andf) Preserve tranquillity within the King’s Cliff Hills and Valleys Landscape Character Area and other areas identified in Part 2 Local Plans by minimising light and noise pollution and minimising the visual and traffic impacts of development.” <p>This policy acts to protect the countryside against negative influences of development, and at criteria f) also allow Part 2 Local Plans to identify further areas of tranquillity where considered appropriate. Considering the</p>
--	--

Appendix 2f – Ashley

	<p>comments of the 2008 Inspector, the lack of any clear evidence to suggest that the current policy is providing insufficient protection, or that a specific risk exists to the character or tranquillity of the Welland Valley, there would not be a need to progress a more specific policy for the area.</p>
<p>228. All. I support the plan overall. I have lived in Ashley many years and it is a well run, vibrant village. Its important that the integrity of the village is maintained, a large development dumped on the edge of the village would destroy it, marginal growth is better. The proposal by the Parish council to review the conservation zone seems sensible, especially if most zones cover entire villages so the village is taken as a whole not just a section. What was not significant and special when the original plan was done may well be now and Ashley has a lot of special green areas and houses outside the zone that should be kept.</p>	<p>Your comments are noted. The 1990 Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act defines a conservation area as “<i>an area of architectural or historic interest the character and appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance</i>” and imposes a duty on Local Planning Authorities to designate these areas where they are recognised. As a result, the inclusion of land within a Conservation Area must be considered against these criteria. In the case of Ashley, there are some areas of the village which would not meet these criteria. The last Conservation Area appraisal for the village was published on 9th November 1977. There remains a case to update this appraisal together with other settlement Conservation Areas made at a similar time. However, this process may run separately to the emergence of the SSP2 Local Plan as they are not dependent upon each other. However, at this stage a review is not planned.</p>
<p>229. 12.34-36. I support the no growth option as the original options for expansion were not taken up. I support retaining the boundary as it is and focusing on organic growth. I would urge the Parish council and Kettering to look at possibly looking at some smaller lower cost housing as most development is large expensive houses so the village is becoming unbalanced.</p> <p>The Pub is an important social centre and must be kept as a pub, the new recreation ground is great, and the farm shop is an important asset. I also support the idea of a cycle route</p>	<p>Your comments are noted. Through the draft SSP2 Local Plan, the existing settlement boundary has been amended slightly to account for historic development built out since the settlement boundary was originally adopted, and address any other discrepancies identified through the settlement boundary defining principles. It is understood that support is given to this new amended boundary which was set out within the consultation document. As a no growth option is proposed within Ashley, any new development which does occur will be treated as windfall.</p> <p>Regarding lower cost housing, no rural exception sites have been promoted through the plan making process or call for sites. In</p>

Appendix 2f – Ashley

<p>along the old rail line. The surface water drains are a mess in the village and constantly block.</p>	<p>addition, as a no growth option is proposed for the village, it is unlikely that affordable housing will come forwards within the village.</p> <p>With respect of the pub, proposed policy TCE6 (page 40) of the Draft SSP2 Local Plan seeks to protect local services and facilities which includes public houses, and is sufficient to address the comment raised. The fact that the pub is a registered asset of community value will be highlighted in the supporting text of the Pre-submission SSP2 Local Plan.</p>
<p>230. 12.1 to 12.40 re Ashley and policy ASH01. Strongly support maintenance of village boundary which fits the natural and historical linear layout of the village (as set out in the design statement).</p> <p>Strongly support the proposed HVI designations which would protect the visual and historical aspects of these parts of the village.</p> <p>Support Ashley Parish Council's proposal to extend the conservation area to encompass the whole village with a special additional note to protect the extensive and increasingly rare ridge and furrow lines that surround the village on the remaining non rotated grazing land.</p> <p>Strongly support the absence of any new housing allocations being proposed given the rural setting of the village, prominence of the conservation areas within the village and lack of public transport/amenities making the village an unsuitable place for further development.</p>	<p>Your comments are noted. Through the draft SSP2 Local Plan, the existing settlement boundary has been amended slightly to account for historic development built out since the settlement boundary was originally adopted, and address any other discrepancies identified through the settlement boundary defining principles. It is understood that support is given to this new amended boundary which was set out within the consultation document.</p> <p>The 1990 Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act defines a conservation area as “<i>an area of architectural or historic interest the character and appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance</i>” and imposes a duty on Local Planning Authorities to designate these areas where they are recognised. As a result, the inclusion of land within a Conservation Area must be considered against these criteria. In the case of Ashley, there are some areas of the village which would not meet this criteria. The last Conservation Area appraisal for the village was published on 9th November 1977. There remains a case to update this appraisal together with other settlement Conservation Areas made at a similar time. However, this process may run separately to the emergence of the SSP2 Local Plan as they are not dependent upon each other. However, at this stage a review is not planned. When a review is</p>

Appendix 2f – Ashley

	<p>carried out, the ridge and furrow referred to should be taken into account.</p>
<p>231. 12.40. I fully support the allocation of HVI green space its a great idea to protect certain parcels of land that keep the character of the village intact. I understand there is also under discussion the possibility of the creation of a special landscape area to help the environmental side of the village, this would be good.</p> <p>I support the village boundary remaining as it is and keeping the overall historic linear layout. and maintains the green soft surround and inroads to the village. Its important to reference the adopted village design statement in any consultation.</p>	<p>Your comments are noted. Regarding a potential landscape area designation for the Welland Valley, a policy to identify “Strategic Gaps” was submitted as a part of the original North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy in 2008. The Planning Inspector however, set out that National Planning Policy at the time (Planning Policy Statement 7) did not favour such local designations, unless there are landscape, wildlife or historic qualities, where greater priority should be given to restraint of potentially damaging development.</p> <p>The government believes that carefully drafted criteria-based policies in Local Development Documents (now Local Plans), utilising such tools as landscape character assessment should provide sufficient protection for these areas, without the need for rigid local designations. The Inspector also said that local landscape designations should only be maintained or, exceptionally, extended where it can be clearly shown that criteria –based planning policies cannot provide the necessary protection. He added that, from the evidence provided and his visits, he did not consider the strategic gaps as a whole to have clearly identified qualities. The policy setting out specific areas was subsequently withdrawn.</p> <p>The current North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (adopted July 2016) provides a criteria-based policy, this can be found at Policy 3: <i>Landscape Character</i>. Policy 3 sets out a series of criteria to manage development within the landscape character of an area. Including that “Development should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Conserve and, where possible, enhance the character and qualities of the local landscape through appropriate design and management;

Appendix 2f – Ashley

- b) Make provision for the retention and, where possible, enhancement of features of landscape importance;
- c) Safeguard and, where possible, enhance important views and vistas including sky lines within the development layout;
- d) Protect the landscape setting and contribute to maintaining the individual and distinct character, and separate identities of settlements by preventing coalescence;
- e) Provide appropriate landscape mitigation and/or suitable off-site enhancements; and
- f) Preserve tranquillity within the King's Cliff Hills and Valleys Landscape Character Area and other areas identified in Part 2 Local Plans by minimising light and noise pollution and minimising the visual and traffic impacts of development.”

This policy acts to protect the countryside against negative influences of development, and at criteria f) also allow Part 2 Local Plans to identify further areas of tranquillity where considered appropriate. Considering the comments of the 2008 Inspector, the lack of any clear evidence to suggest that the current policy is providing insufficient protection, or that a specific risk exists to the character or tranquillity of the Welland Valley, there would not be a need to progress a more specific policy for the area.

Through the draft SSP2 Local Plan, the existing settlement boundary has been amended slightly to account for historic development built out since the settlement boundary was originally adopted, and address any other discrepancies identified through the settlement boundary defining principles. It is understood that support is given to this new amended boundary which was set out within the consultation document. The village design statement will be referred

Appendix 2f – Ashley

	to for the Ashley Section of the Pre-submission SSP2 Local Plan.
<p>283. Table 12.3 Status of Public House. The pub is the only “community asset” that provides a meeting place for villagers of all ages and backgrounds, where everyone feels comfortable. Its importance to village life was clearly demonstrated during the 18-month period when it was shut. Change of use should not be granted.</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. Proposed policy TCE6 (page 40) of the Draft SSP2 Local Plan seeks to protect local services and facilities which includes public houses, and is sufficient to address the comment raised. The fact that the pub is a registered asset of community value will be highlighted in the supporting text of the Pre-submission SSP2 Local Plan.</p>
<p>296. 12.3 Retention of the status The George Pub in Ashley as a Community Asset. The George Pub is a vital part of the community life in Ashley.</p> <p>It is most important that regardless of the success or failure of whatever tenant is appointed to run the pub, it remains as a pub and the status is not changed so that it can be delicensed and then sold off for housing.</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. Proposed policy TCE6 (page 40) of the Draft SSP2 Local Plan seeks to protect local services and facilities which includes public houses, and is sufficient to address the comment raised. The fact that the pub is a registered asset of community value will be highlighted in the supporting text of the Pre-submission SSP2 Local Plan.</p>
<p>301. 12.35 Restriction of development within the existing village boundary. When the Rev. Richard Thomas Pulteney arrived in Ashley in 1853 he found a very down at heel and desolate village, with the Church, cottages and roads, such as there were, in a state of severe disrepair. He used much of his personal fortune to buy up land and cottages and start a large-scale building program that created the buildings that have been listed and are prominent in the conservation area.</p> <p>Ashley has had 30+ new houses built within the village over the last 30 years, plus a village hall, a farm shop and the conversion of the Pub Coach House to B&B rooms. This continuing development has allowed newcomers to enliven</p>	<p>Although a no-growth option is being pursued within Ashley, the Council anticipates that limited growth will still come forwards over the plan period through windfall development. This decision has been based on an absence of sites being identified or coming forwards through the plan making process. Although the settlement boundary has been tightened up in places in accordance with the settlement boundary defining principles, it is not considered that this will preclude limited windfall development coming forwards.</p>

Appendix 2f – Ashley

<p>the village and provide support for the many village activities that are important to the inhabitants. If no further building is allowed the village will ossify and it's activities will die.</p> <p>Almost all-available building land within the village boundary has now been utilised. To say that no change should occur to the village boundary will prevent any further development of the village. It would be far better to prepare a Village Plan that would allow development at a rate that can be comfortably absorbed into our community. Profits from the increase in value of development land could be shared with the village. For a Village Plan be accepted by the Borough (or the new Unitary Authority) the whole village would need to be consulted and the views of the majority taken in account. This is how we can we can create a village that is valued in the future, rather than one “preserved in aspic”.</p>	
<p>305. 12.32 Extension of Conservation Area. The existing conservation area protects very effectively the central core of the village developed in the 19th Century and the majority of listed properties in the village - apart from those at the east end of the village. Despite recent “Pulteneyesque” developments, many properties outside the existing conservation area do not warrant such a designation or the restrictions that go with it.</p>	<p>Your comments are noted, although it is unclear whether you are seeking no change to the existing Conservation Area, or a retraction of it. The 1990 Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act defines a conservation area as “<i>an area of architectural or historic interest the character and appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance</i>” and imposes a duty on Local Planning Authorities to designate these areas where they are recognised. As a result, the inclusion of land within a Conservation Area must be considered against these criteria. In the case of Ashley, it is agreed that there are some areas of the village which would not meet this criteria. The last Conservation Area appraisal for the village was published on 9th November 1977. There remains a case to update this appraisal together with other settlement Conservation Areas made at a similar time. However, this process may run separately to the emergence of the SSP2 Local Plan as they are not dependent</p>

Appendix 2f – Ashley

	upon each other. However, at this stage a review is not planned.
306. 12.35 Settlement Boundary. Agree retention of existing Settlement Boundary.	Your comment is noted.
307. ASH01 sub-para j Style of New Buildings. In general, the principles are sound, but I do feel that sub-para j limits development to Pulteney-style dwellings even outside the conservation area – we do not wish to be a “living museum”. Reference to the general rural principles at RS04(j), which offers exemptions to buildings of “exceptional quality and innovative, contemporary design”, might reflect a more enlightened view.	Your comment is noted. Policy ASH01, criteria (j) sets out the need for use of high quality materials which responds to the local vernacular. There may be some exceptional circumstances where high quality modern materials may be acceptable, particularly if the proposed development is of very good design. The current wording of criterion (j) of Policy ASH01 is not restrictive in preventing contemporary materials from being used where they are of high quality, as it refers to a list of traditional materials as possible examples rather than a definitive list. As a result, the existing draft policy ASH01 is considered sufficient to address concerns over support the use of alternative materials in the right context.
310. 12.40 Local Green Space. I agree the designation of green spaces in areas HVI 001 and 002, which have road access, and, in the case of HVI 001 is within the settlement boundary. However, HVI 081 has no road or public access, is outside the settlement boundary and seems little different to any of the other green spaces that surround the village - including the new recreation area. The reasons for this designation do not seem coherent or logical.	Your comments are noted. Highway access is not a criteria applied when considering the designation of Historically and Visually Important Local Green Space areas. Criteria for defining an HVILGS is set out within the Open Space and Allotments Background Paper (KBC, February 2012) available at https://www.kettering.gov.uk/download/downloads/id/191/open_space_and_allotments_february_2012.pdf
313. 12.32 Extension of the Conservation Area to the whole village. When Ashley conservation area was created 1977, a boundary was agreed that encompassed the most important historical buildings. No “new” historical buildings have been built within the village so what justification is there for the conservation area to be extended? If some justification were proposed then any change would need to be discussed with the entire village. It would be	Your comments are noted. The 1990 Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act defines a conservation area as “ <i>an area of architectural or historic interest the character and appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance</i> ” and imposes a duty on Local Planning Authorities to designate these areas where they are recognised. As a result, the inclusion of land within a Conservation Area must be considered against these criteria. In the case of Ashley, it is agreed that there are some areas of the village which would not meet this criteria. The last Conservation Area appraisal for

Appendix 2f – Ashley

<p>quite wrong to impose the restrictions of a conservation area on those within the village that are not in the current conservation area without them having any say in this matter. The current proposal by Ashley Parish Council has been circulated to a (relatively) small group within the village solely by the internet. Many of the villagers living in the area that is not conservation are either not on email or not in this circulated group. So the present proposal is being done in an entirely undemocratic manner. This proposal would not promote harmony, friendship and unity within the village. It could be legally challenged as outside the Parish Council's remit or not according to correct procedure.</p>	<p>the village was published on 9th November 1977. There remains a case to update this appraisal together with other settlement Conservation Areas made at a similar time. However, this process may run separately to the emergence of the SSP2 Local Plan as they are not dependent upon each other. However, at this stage a review is not planned.</p>
<p>325. 12.32 and a proposal to extend the Conservation Area to the whole village. That there appear to be no/zero proposed housing allocations for Ashley to 2031 seems ludicrous. Ashley needs to evolve on move-on, and play a part, all be it small, in helping to ease a UK housing crisis. To extend the Conservation Area to the entire village, much of which doesn't merit it, risks 'freezing' any development out. Development that is sympathetic to the wider village in size/form/character should be encouraged. Rural communities need the size and vitality to support the local amenities, such as the pub, church, village hall and farm shop.</p> <p>That the majority of the Kettering Borough designated Rural Areas villages appear to be Category A, is more ludicrous still. All, including Ashley, enjoy relative close proximity to Market Harborough and Corby, with good transport links</p>	<p>The no-growth option pursued in Ashley is as a result of a lack of housing sites being allocated within the SSP2 Local Plan. However, natural growth may still occur at a limited scale through the delivery of windfall sites over the plan period, which has been taken into account.</p> <p>The 1990 Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act defines a conservation area as “<i>an area of architectural or historic interest the character and appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance</i>” and imposes a duty on Local Planning Authorities to designate these areas where they are recognised. As a result, the inclusion of land within a Conservation Area must be considered against these criteria. In the case of Ashley, it is agreed that there are some areas of the village which would not meet this criteria. The last Conservation Area appraisal for the village was published on 9th November 1977. There remains a case to update this appraisal together with other settlement Conservation Areas made at a similar time. However, this process may run separately to the emergence of the SSP2 Local Plan as they are not dependent</p>

Appendix 2f – Ashley

<p>and shopping.</p>	<p>upon each other. However, at this stage a review is not planned by Kettering Borough Council.</p> <p>The designation of villages into 3 category types evolves from the original Local Plan for Kettering Borough (1995) which sought to distinguish villages by virtue of their character and the degree of growth which could be acceptable within these locations. Through the plan making process for the Core Spatial Strategy 2008, an additional tier of villages to serve as local centres was not pursued because whilst these villages may have more services/facilities readily available than other rural settlements, they would not necessarily provide a strong enough offer to support focused growth for the rural area. This was carried through into the Joint Core Strategy (2016). As a result, a large number of villages fall within category A where there is an emphasis to protect their environment due to their limited ability to absorb further development. Identified housing site allocations have taken into account local needs as well as the character of the villages, and whilst some villages have better transport links or are closer proximity to main towns than others, they all fall within category A as they share a number of other similar characteristics.</p>
<p>326. ASH01 Development Principles. Modern building materials have moved and include metals, timber and such like. Modern contemporary architecture and development should aim to embrace that.</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. Policy ASH01, criteria (j) sets out the need for use of high quality materials which responds to the local vernacular. There may be some exceptional circumstances where high quality modern materials may be acceptable, particularly if the proposed development is of very good design. The current wording of criterion (j) of Policy ASH01 is not restrictive in preventing contemporary materials from being used where they are of high quality, as it refers to a list of traditional materials as possible examples rather than a definitive list. As a result, the existing draft policy ASH01 is considered sufficient to address concerns over support the use of alternative materials in the right context.</p>

Appendix 2f – Ashley

<p>327. 12.31 - 12.36. I agree with almost all of the Draft Plan. I do not think an 'informal' footpath through a private garden and/or pony paddock is required.</p>	<p>Your comment is noted, although it is unclear where an informal footpath through a private garden and/or pony paddock is required by the plan as none of the paragraphs referred to by the comment make such a reference. As a result, no action will be taken within the further iteration of the plan.</p>
<p>330. Q12.40 Local Green Space. For what must be 10+ years the area marked HVI002 has been an eyesore, with failure on the part of the Parish Council and landowner to reach any resolution and compromise. Something should be done to move this unsatisfactory position on.</p> <p>I am not clear where the proposed HVI081 designation has come from...? I would guess that the great majority of the village hasn't even clamped eyes on it - there is no public access. I can only think that because the landowner owner is proposing to develop the land to its south - inside the settlement boundary - that a knee-jerk reaction has been to designate their adjacent land, an HVI. There is no justification - the land is simply grazed, and falls outside to settlement boundary.</p> <p>A not insignificant proportion of HVI001 - the land the NW and to the north of the stream - is now a private garden/lawn. An HVI there is inappropriate. The remainder of HVI001 is grazed by horses, mainly, and cattle, which are not always friendly. Any possible informal footpath risks escaped animals and/or injury.</p>	<p>The matter of untidy land at HVI002 falls outside of the scope of this SSP2 Local Plan.</p> <p>The justification for the proposed designation of HVI081 is set out within https://www.kettering.gov.uk/downloads/file/18274/historically_and_visually_important_open_space_update_june_2016 . The criteria for designating Historically and Visually Important Local Green Space is set out within the Open Space and Allotments Background Paper (KBC, February 2012) available at https://www.kettering.gov.uk/download/downloads/id/191/open_space_and_allotments_february_2012.pdf; public access is not a requirement.</p> <p>Retrospective planning permission KET/2016/0109 granted planning permission for part of the HVILGS to be used as domestic garden subject to condition which removed permitted development rights in order to protect the character and appearance of the area. Although the site HVI001 was included within the September 2015 SSPLDD Historically and Visually Important Open Space Background Paper, and was assessed before planning permission was granted, it is considered that the conditions attached to the planning permission are sufficient to protect the land from inappropriate development in accordance with the HVILGS designation, and that this should not be amended.</p>
<p>331. 12.3 Facilities. I wholeheartedly support the George pub and wish to retain it as a Community Asset. The more people in the village, in its present form and through future</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. Proposed policy TCE6 (page 40) of the Draft SSP2 Local Plan seeks to protect local services and facilities which includes public houses, and is sufficient to address the</p>

Appendix 2f – Ashley

<p>development, to help support the pub and other amenities, the better.</p>	<p>comment raised. The fact that the pub is a registered asset of community value will be highlighted in the supporting text of the pre-submission SSP2 Local Plan.</p>
<p>332. B and F. I support the Ashley Development Principles. I believe conservation to be particularly important in Ashley, not only in designated conservation areas but outside these where unsympathetic development nearby is likely to be detrimental.</p>	<p>Your comments are noted.</p>
<p>333. 12.32 Ashley Parish Council would like to extend the conservation area to the whole village with special additional note to protect the extensive and increasingly rare ridge and furrow lines that surround the village on the remaining non rotated grazing land. Important and essential to have a consistent approach that preserves the conservation areas in the village</p>	<p>Your comments are noted. The 1990 Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act defines a conservation area as “<i>an area of architectural or historic interest the character and appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance</i>” and imposes a duty on Local Planning Authorities to designate these areas where they are recognised. As a result, the inclusion of land within a Conservation Area must be considered against these criteria. In the case of Ashley, it is agreed that there are some areas of the village which would not meet this criteria. The last Conservation Area appraisal for the village was published on 9th November 1977. There remains a case to update this appraisal together with other settlement Conservation Areas made at a similar time. However, this process may run separately to the emergence of the SSP2 Local Plan as they are not dependent upon each other. At a time when the Conservation Area is reviewed, the presence of historic ridge and furrow will be taken into account where it is considered relevant to the historic interest of the Conservation Area and is desirable to preserve. However, at this stage a review is not planned by Kettering Borough Council.</p>
<p>334. 12.3 Retention of the status The George Pub in Ashley as a Community Asset. Critical part of the Village infrastructure and heart, which has been proved a number of times since its reopening and the support provided by the</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. Proposed policy TCE6 (page 40) of the Draft SSP2 Local Plan seeks to protect local services and facilities which includes public houses, and is sufficient to address the comment raised. The fact that the pub is a registered asset of</p>

Appendix 2f – Ashley

<p>villagers</p>	<p>community value will be highlighted in the supporting text of the Pre-submission SSP2 Local Plan.</p>
<p>337. POLICY ASH01. We strongly support the suggestions of preservation in Policy Ash01 and agree with the submission overall. The exception is that, we believe, in the right setting, modern aluminium fenestration done nicely can enhance old properties and is never permanent (policy ASH01, paragraph K), although this should be looked at on a case by case basis. We support all other submissions in their entirety. Ashley's uniqueness and sense of history should be preserved at all costs by ensuring the use of natural building materials and resisting development outside of the village boundary. Already, there are modern houses in Ashley which, in our view, are not in keeping with the village and there is a fragile balance before such houses overtake the village and we find that it has lost what makes it a unique page of history. We fully agree that views of the church should be maintained, as the church is the principal historic feature of Ashley and the first historical building as you see as you enter the village from the main road. It is not only the buildings but the views of the open countryside in Ashley which contribute to its unique spirit, and these views should be maintained.</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. Policy ASH01, criteria (j) sets out the need for use of high quality materials which responds to the local vernacular. There may be some exceptional circumstances where high quality modern materials may be acceptable, particularly if the proposed development is of very good design. The current wording of criterion (j) of Policy ASH01 is not restrictive in preventing contemporary materials from being used where they are of high quality, as it refers to a list of traditional materials as possible examples rather than a definitive list. As a result, the existing draft policy ASH01 is considered sufficient to address concerns over support the use of alternative materials in the right context.</p>
<p>347. Policy ASH01. I support the proposed the development principles for Ashley, and agree that development in the village should be limited. To this end, I support retaining the current village settlement boundary.</p> <p>In the interests of preserving the rural heritage of the village, I also support the designation of three areas of Historical</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. Through the draft SSP2 Local Plan, the existing settlement boundary has been amended slightly to account for historic development built out since the settlement boundary was originally adopted, and address any other discrepancies identified through the settlement boundary defining principles. It is understood that support is given to this new amended boundary which was set out within the consultation document.</p>

Appendix 2f – Ashley

<p>and Visual Interest. By the same token, and also in the interests of protecting the rich architectural history of our village, I agree with the suggestion to review the conservation area boundaries.</p>	<p>The 1990 Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act defines a conservation area as “<i>an area of architectural or historic interest the character and appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance</i>” and imposes a duty on Local Planning Authorities to designate these areas where they are recognised. As a result, the inclusion of land within a Conservation Area must be considered against these criteria. In the case of Ashley, it is agreed that there are some areas of the village which would not meet this criteria. The last Conservation Area appraisal for the village was published on 9th November 1977. There remains a case to update this appraisal together with other settlements Conservation Areas made at a similar time. However, this process may run separately to the emergence of the SSP2 Local Plan as they are not dependent upon each other. At a time when the Conservation Area is reviewed, the presence of historic ridge and furrow will be taken into account where it is considered relevant to the historic interest of the Conservation Area. However, at this stage a review is not planned by Kettering Borough Council.</p>
<p>362. 12.35. It is a great concern that the proposals herein are seeking to restrict and limit the possibility of well managed evolution and expansion of the village. The National Planning Policy Framework published just last month sets out the Government’s planning policies for England and in particular highlights that “To promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services.” and further: “Planning policies and</p>	<p>The NPPF is supportive of housing growth, in terms of there being a presumption in favour of sustainable development. With respect of rural housing, paragraph 77 (NPPF) states that planning policies should be responsive to local circumstances and support housing developments that reflect local needs, particularly in terms of bring forwards rural exception sites that provide affordable housing. There is no up-to-date Housing Needs Survey available for Ashley to provide an evidence base of identified need, and no housing sites have been promoted within or on the edge of the village. In addition, Ashley has limited community facilities to support significant growth. As a result, a no growth option has been proposed for the village, which relies on limited growth through windfall development. This will still allow for sustainable development in rural areas, but at a limited</p>

Appendix 2f – Ashley

<p>decisions should recognise that sites to meet local business and community needs in rural areas may have to be found adjacent to or beyond existing settlements,"</p> <p>Given that Ashley has a wealth of 'infrastructure' and 'local services' that all need supporting - including the George public house, surely there should be a more positive approach in this plan to development.</p>	<p>scale. Given the opportunities for rural development in other nearby villages within the borough where sites have been promoted e.g. Weston-by-Welland is the nearest, it is considered that the SSP2 Local Plan is compliant with the NPPF.</p>
<p>364. 12.3. The George pub is an important asset for the village and should be registered as a Community Asset to preserve its status.</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. Proposed policy TCE6 (page 40) of the Draft SSP2 Local Plan seeks to protect local services and facilities which includes public houses, and is sufficient to address the comment raised. The fact that the pub is a registered asset of community value will be highlighted in the supporting text of the pre-submission SSP2 Local Plan.</p>
<p>366. 12.4 I strongly support the protection of the three green spaces as identified.</p>	<p>Your comment is noted.</p>
<p>367. 12.3 Retention of The George Pub as a Community Asset. I support the Welland Valley Cycle Route along the railway line.</p>	<p>Proposed policy TCE6 (page 40) of the Draft SSP2 Local Plan seeks to protect local services and facilities which includes public houses, and is sufficient to address the comment raised. The fact that the pub is a registered asset of community value will be highlighted in the supporting text of the pre-submission SSP2 Local Plan.</p> <p>The notional Welland Valley Cycle Way needs to be explored further with Northamptonshire County Council Highways – Rights of Way team through a scoping exercise to establish the merits of introducing a new right of way.</p>
<p>368. Ashley 12.34-36. Growth of the village. Ashley is a much loved village. Many give time freely to make it succeed. There was a very collaborative fight to save the George, the last pub in Ashley. But what about progress?</p>	<p>Your comments are noted. There is no planned growth for Ashley within the SSP2 Local Plan which accords with your comments, however new development could still come forwards through windfall.</p>

Appendix 2f – Ashley

We must look to the future and that means *change and growth*. We are a conservative (small 'c') rural lot, we don't like change. But if Ashley is to thrive as a living & vibrant village, we need more people using/being in Ashley; for the success of the pub, the growth of the church, use of village hall and our destination farm shop. We need to look to the future, not hark back to what was (even is). Village infill (or other growth) with a mix of small, middle and large homes is surely progressive? We have the 3 designated green spaces, plus the rec that are preserved/safe from housing. KBC planners will always do the right thing by us. We are all privileged to live in such a well loved place.

I **object** to any extension of the village conservation area. We are not a model village, nor museum. I'd be happy for the village boundary to change if it allowed sensible, sympathetic growth of Ashley. We must not stagnate please.

The 1990 Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act defines a conservation area as “*an area of architectural or historic interest the character and appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance*” and imposes a duty on Local Planning Authorities to designate these areas where they are recognised. As a result, the inclusion of land within a Conservation Area must be considered against these criteria. In the case of Ashley, it is agreed that there are some areas of the village which would not meet this criteria. The last Conservation Area appraisal for the village was published on 9th November 1977. There remains a case to update this appraisal together with other settlements Conservation Areas made at a similar time. However, this process may run separately to the emergence of the SSP2 Local Plan as they are not dependent upon each other. At a time when the Conservation Area is reviewed, the presence of historic ridge and furrow will be taken into account where it is considered relevant to the historic interest of the Conservation Area and is desirable to preserve. However, at this stage a review is not planned by Kettering Borough Council.

Through the draft SSP2 Local Plan, the existing settlement boundary has been amended slightly to account for historic development built out since the settlement boundary was originally adopted, and address any other discrepancies identified through the settlement boundary defining principles. It is understood that support is given to this new amended boundary which was set out within the consultation document. There are no further plans to alter the settlement boundary unless specific comments are raised through the plan making consultation process.