Appendix 2n - Mawsley

Comment	KBC Response
Id 1 (Objecting) – 12.153 and 12.154 - Mawsley village was originally only ever meant to have 750 houses built on it - it was meant to be an experiment - building a lovely rural village from scratch. However, the council has been very sneaky and has allowed developers to build another 200 houses on the site which created a huge amount of traffic and has put strain on all the facilities in the village. Plus our roads are STILL NOT ADOPTED or the DRAINS! So how the council thinks this village can take another 50 houses which will mean @ 200 more people and more cars - using facilities that are still not being looked after is to me absolutely crazy. Most villagers originally moved to Mawsley because of this village atmosphere - we simply cannot take any more houses or building....the roads are not maintained, neither are the grass verges and if you have a drainage problem in your home but the pipes are under the road outside, it is the homeowners responsibility to get this fixed as the council have not adopted the roads!! The Dr, Dentist and the school are already under extreme strain so how the council thinks adding more people will help is beyond ridiculous.	While Mawsley is now bigger than originally planned, the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy identifies a requirement for 480 dwellings in the rural area in the period 2011-31. The SSP2 will need to allocate sites across the rural area to meet this requirement. The Rural Settlement Facilities Background Paper (update) (April 2018) sets out the facilities available in Mawsley. Mawsley has a good range of services and facilities and is the only village with a doctor's surgery and dentist. When assessing sites to meet the rural housing requirement access to services and facilities is part of the assessment. Taking into account the facilities available, it is considered that Mawsley is a suitable location for small scale growth. Through the site assessment work NCC Education has been consulted on provision for education. In Mawsley contributions would be sought towards Primary and Secondary education.

Appendix 2n - Mawsley

Id 2 (Objecting) – 12.11 - I am opposed to the proposed RA174 Development off Cransley Rise because Mawsley is much bigger than originally intended with 930 dwellings now. The roads are still not adopted after more than 15 years. The nature of the narrow winding streets plus the islands will make it very difficult for construction traffic to pass without causing damage which could put back adoption even longer. Parking is a major issue in Mawsley with the road layout and with potentially another 100 cars entering the village it could get worse. Anecdotally I have heard that the School, Doctors and Dentist are over stretched already. In addition the off peak bus service via Stagecoach has been withdrawn so we have very limited public transport to Kettering and surrounding areas. It is time that Mawsley is 'finished' and roads, sewers, open space and verges are adopted. Notwithstanding the above there does appear to be a demand for retirement homes , such as bungalows in Mawsley. It is understood that Clayson Homes will be shortly submitting a planning application for 29 retirement flats on what was the original 'pub site'. Maybe this fulfils your rural area development requirement?	While Mawsley is now bigger than originally planned, the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy identifies a requirement for 480 dwellings in the rural area in the period 2011-31. The SSP2 will need to allocate sites across the rural area to meet this requirement. The Rural Settlement Facilities Background Paper (update) (April 2018) sets out the facilities available in Mawsley. Mawsley has a good range of services and facilities and is the only village with a doctor's surgery and dentist. When assessing sites to meet the rural housing requirement access to services and facilities is part of the assessment. Taking into account the facilities available, it is considered that Mawsley is a suitable location for small scale growth. Limited bus services are available in the rural area; however the Council is still required to meet housing needs within these areas. NCC highways have been consulted through the site assessment process

	and in relation to the capacity of the highway network have assessed the impact as capacity limited or insufficient capacity but constraints can be overcome. If the site is progressed as an allocation an additional criteria will be added to the policy requiring proposals to be supported by a transport assessment and to mitigate the impact of development on the highway network. An allowance has been made for windfall development in determining how many dwellings the SSP2 needs to allocate. Any applications which are approved which are not identified in the development plan will contribute towards the windfall allowance.
Id 3 (Objecting) – 12.11 Mawsley proposal	Noted
Id 4 (Objecting) – 12.11 Mawsley	Noted
Id 8 (Objecting) – Mawsley - I strongly object. Whilst your representatives at the meeting tonight were nice it is typical of council and government that direct questions can never be answered thus rendering proceedings as no more than window dressing. The infrastructure in Mawsley is already oversubscribed (award winning school, doctors, dentists and roads). I moved here for it's green areas (although I was told tonight I have no right to these) and like minded people and I am proud of what has been created.	The North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy identifies a requirement for 480 dwellings in the rural area in the period 2011-31. The SSP2 will need to allocate sites across the rural area to meet this requirement. The Rural Settlement Facilities Background Paper (update) (April

Another ridiculous idea from a council that cannot run it's own affairs adequately. I left the meeting advising our council " I used to drive on the left of the road, now I drive on what's left of the road", they did not get it!	2018) sets out the facilities available in Mawsley. Mawsley has a good range of services and facilities and is the only village with a doctor's surgery and dentist. When assessing sites to meet the rural housing requirement access to services and facilities is part of the assessment. Taking into account the facilities available, it is considered that Mawsley is a suitable location for small scale growth.
Id 9 (Objecting) – RA/174 - **HOUSING ALLOCATIONS – ASSESSMENT OF ADDITIONAL SITES & UPDATE** We wish to register our very strong objection to the proposal RA174 to build **57 approx new houses** on the field bordering Birch Spinney, Malaslea and Cransley Rise. The plot of land is unsatisfactory and not appropriate for residential development for the following reasons : • The developments take no account of the wishes of villagers as expressed through our previous successful objection to previous proposals to develop the land by the playing fields RA/115. (Localism Act 2011) • Our house backs onto the field which is the reason we bought it 10 years ago • Our house and back garden will be subject to light pollution during and after the development • Our house and back garden will be subject to noise pollution both during and after	Views of local resident are noted; however the views of residents need to be balanced alongside the need to meet housing requirements set out in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy which identifies a requirement of 480 dwellings in the rural area 2011-2031. The SSP2 will allocate sites across the rural area to meet this requirement. Location of existing housing backing on to the site is not a planning reason for the site not to be developed. Policy 8 of the JCS requires

the development • We will experience loss of privacy due to the house and garden being overlooked • We chose to live in a village, if we wanted to live in town we would have bought a house in Kettering, we work hard to maintain this lifestyle for our families • It will make existing homes for sale more difficult to sell with the added competition from more new homes • Access to the site along Cransley Rise is very limited with insufficient room for vision splays. The access point is on a narrow bend on a sharp estate road and will be dangerous. • Cransley Rise is about to be adopted and construction traffic will damage the road – it has taken 10 years for the road to be top coated and we have put up with the disruption of construction for over 11 years. The current road layout will cause major traffic congestion • Adverse effect on roads or highway safety, local traffic generation, working on the assumption that there is a minimum of 1 car/house, & in many cases 2, judging by the existing volume of traffic in the village and already nuisance parking on roads we could see with 57 houses possibly 57-114 more cars, plus the impact on pedestrians, cyclists, road capacity. The junctions at the end of School Road where most of the traffic will be is very poorly designed and clogged with parked cars • Road access in and out of the village is already very congested at rush hour due to limited employment opportunities in Mawsley most people commute to work • The roundabout onto the A43 is already busy without additional traffic trying to negotiate the junction of what is a very busy carriage way as it is the main road between Kettering and Northampton • Adverse impact on the size, form, character & setting of the village, especially if taken in combination with other developments • The pumping station is undersized and raw sewerage runs across the footpaths and into water courses	development to prevent both new and existing development from contributing to or being adversely effected by unacceptable levels of light or noise pollution. Policy 8 of the JCS also requires that development proposals to not result in an unacceptable impact on the amenities of future occupiers, neighbouring properties or the wider area, by reason of noise, vibration, smell, light or other pollution, loss of light or overlooking. In addition to this draft policy MAW02 requires proposals to have particular regard to the layout scale, height, design and massing of buildings and landscaping, in order to minimise amenity impact on neighbouring residential properties. Impact on sale of existing homes is not a material planning consideration. Through the site assessment work discussions have taken place with NCC highways regarding the suitability of gaining access to the site from Cransley Rise. NCC advised that they would be able to accept a loop road serving a maximum of 50 dwellings without the need for Cransley Rise to

• The broadband connection is very slow, the Government is going to make it a Human Right that everyone has access to the internet – more residents will have a detrimental impact on existing residents making it impossible for residents and businesses to work from the village • Mawsley school has already been expanded 3 times with the loss of valuable playing fields and playgrounds. There is no possibility of further expansion and there are already children living in the village who cannot get a place at the school. The additional houses would lead to a possible 57 – 114 children who would require a school place. In addition the crèche is oversubscribed and other groups like the Scouts are also at maximum capacity. The Childrens' Halloween and Christmas parties are also sold out so that some children cannot attend. At the consultation meeting I attended the council representative tried to fob me off on this point about the end of a baby boom and falling birth rates, you cannot make this assumption that Mawsley conforms to the national trend – it doesn't. it is unacceptable for Mawsley children to leave the village to obtain a school education • The current village facilities are already stretched and it is noticeable that making a doctors or dentists appointment is taking longer. Prompt service is no longer achievable or available. It is not feasible to build more homes and encourage people to live in a village where they cannot access the school, dentist & doctors, where the local shop is overstretched and the roads choked with parked cars • Irreversible loss of valuable agricultural land. This area should remain for agricultural use in the way the farmer has always used the field, growing crops, for the benefit of the existing community • Loss of countryside view around which the layout of the village was designed, to build in this location takes away an amenity that all villagers share with view over open country. Taking away this amenity is no different to taking away the laying fields or pond • Irrevocable loss of wildlife habitat and negative impact on the populations of local birds and animals eg yellow hammer, red kites, field fayres, Waxwings, owls, woodpeckers, reed buntings, linnets and reed buntings, foxes, badgers, deer, bats, monk jack deers	be widened. The loop road would need to be 5.5 metres wide with 2x2metres footways in accordance with local highway authority standards and tracked for refuse vehicles opposed to a large family car. The detail of the access would be considered at planning application stage. NCC highways have been consulted through the site assessment process and in relation to the capacity of the highway network have assessed the impact as capacity limited or insufficient capacity but constraints can be overcome. If the site is progressed as an allocation an additional criteria will be added to the policy requiring proposals to be supported by a transport assessment and to mitigate the impact of development on the highway network. The site is a logical extension to the village and is surrounded on three sites by existing development. Draft policy MAW02 requires that the development be of a high standard of design and reflect the character, layout and density of the surrounding residential area.

Appendix 2n - Mawsley

• Detriment to residential amenity • Revision to the **Core Spatial Strategy**, due to be adopted shortly by Kettering Council will show they have a 5 year land bank • Policy 15 of North Northants Core Spatial Policy states that to meet local housing needs 30-40% more houses are needed to Kettering. Mawsley was originally 700 homes, this has been increased already by 300 homes to 1000 an increase of 42%. This proposal would mean a total of 1357 homes which is a total increase of 51% - far in excess of the Core Spatial Policy. It was categorically stated from the beginning of the building of the village that the village would consist of 700 homes. We have taken our fair share of increased development for Kettering Borough Council • The need to avoid town cramming and over development • The infill expansion on the site undermines the characteristic layout of Mawsley and goes against the original ethos of the village and extends the village beyond the boundary lines unnecessarily • One of the unique design features of Mawsley is the design layout and this should be safeguarded. Mawsley was supposed to emulate the development of a typical Northamptonshire village with nooks and crannies, as such constraints on building design, replacement windows and doors, car parking provision to keep cars hidden and off the street support this. If this proposal goes ahead Mawsley will become another suburb of Kettering and become a housing estate rather than a village • There is a possibility of developmental creep and urban crawl, the hatched area of the plan was also originally part of the new housing proposal, whilst this has been dropped for now it is not hard to see how a precedent will be set for future infilling • New houses increase the strain on police, hospitals, fire and ambulance services • Increased flood risk to Malaslea and Birch Spinney, water pools in these fields in the winter and after heavy rain and once this is tarmacked over risk of flooding will be a major concern • Little regard appears to have been paid to either the letter or the spirit of the Government's National Planning Policy Framework, and we would like to draw the Council's attention to the aims behind those paragraphs most relevant	Draft policy MAW02 requires that development proposals demonstrate that there is adequate capacity in the sewage treatment works and the foul sewage network. Using a central postcode in Mawsley the broadband speed checker indicates download speeds of 30.2 mbps and upload speeds of 32.7 mbps. This is high compared with many of the villages in the borough. Through the site assessment work NCC Education has been consulted on provision for education. In Mawsley contributions would be sought towards Primary and Secondary education. When assessing sites to meet the rural housing requirement access to services and facilities is part of the assessment. Taking into account the facilities available, it is considered that Mawsley is a suitable location for small scale growth. Agricultural land classification has been taken into account through the assessment process. This site is grade 3 agricultural land so is preferable to

to **Mawsley. Core Planning Principles**. • **Paragraph 17** • - **planning should empower local people to shape their surroundings, finding ways to enhance and improve the places in which they live their lives.** Comments already registered suggest that building on this site would be entirely at odds with the wishes of local residents. • - **the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside should be recognised**. To allow further housing to be built on the site would degrade it both visually and as a wildlife corridor. Does the Council not recognise this? • - **planning should contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment**, planning to build 57 houses on this site would be contrary to this • **Promoting Healthy Communities** • **Paragraph 74** • **existing open space… should not be built on, unless …the land is surplus to requirements**. With an already increasing population, the land is agricultural and cannot be considered to be surplus to requirements • Paragraph 76 • - Local communities should be able to identify for special protection green areas of particular importance to them. The objections have made it abundantly clear that this site is treasured. • In conclusion, we believe the area under consideration must be rejected on the grounds that it does not accord with the way in which the National Planning Policy Framework is expected to be applied. If additional housing is required in Northamptonshire it would be far preferable to build another new village designed like Mawsley or consider the brown field sites around Kettering. For all the above reasons we wish to register and you to acknowledge our very strong objection to RA/174. Mawsley was designed to be a village not an urban sprawl. The village has already been extended beyond the original scope and further houses would be counter-productive. The North Northamptonshire Development Company and the Daily Telegraph Best Village Aware cite the design layout of Mawsley as part of its unique creation as a Village rather than a housing estate. It is a village and has not become a rat	the development of grade 2 agricultural land. Loss of a countryside view is not a material planning consideration. Draft policy MAW02 requires proposals to provide appropriate evidence of the ecological potential of the site. Policy 4 of the JCS requires a net gain in biodiversity to be sought. The JCS has now been adopted. The Council does have a five year land supply, however the SSP2 will need to allocate sites to meet housing requirements up to 2031. Draft policy MAW02 requires proposals to include a site specific Flood Risk Assessment which addresses groundwater flooding. Full regard has been had to the NPPF in developing the plan.

run for commuters. There is no merit to the proposal and the existing facilities are over stretched. It is a wonderful village with a fabulous community spirit and we feel very strongly it must remain a village and not destroyed with more unwanted housing. Please do not build more houses in Mawsley Village.	
Id 75 (Objecting) – MAW02 - 12.152 "The village is now complete". I quote your own words !! 12.164 Access from the proposed development site on to Cransley Rise is on a BLIND BEND ! 12.153 "The village has winding streets". I quote your own words again. The last thing we need in Mawsley is more traffic: 50 houses = 100 more cars 50 houses = 150-200 more people The school has 7 vacancies for pupils !! Where will extra children go to school ? Where will everyone park their cars ? Mawsley already has more homes than its original plan. Enough is enough. After 15 years our roads are still mostly unadopted. We have frequent power blips and water main bursts. Our bus service was virtually withdrawn at the end of April. Infrastructure is barely coping now. We don't need or want any more pressure. Please do not let Mawsley Village become Mawsley New Town.	While Mawsley is now bigger than originally planned, the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy identifies a requirement for 480 dwellings in the rural area in the period 2011-31. The SSP2 will need to allocate sites across the rural area to meet this requirement. The Rural Settlement Facilities Background Paper (update) (April 2018) sets out the facilities available in Mawsley. Mawsley has a good range of services and facilities and is the only village with a doctor's surgery and dentist. When assessing sites to meet the rural housing requirement access to services and facilities is part of the assessment. Taking into account the facilities available, it is considered that Mawsley is a suitable location for small scale growth. Through the site assessment work NCC Education has been consulted on provision for education. In Mawsley

Thank you	contributions would be sought towards Primary and Secondary education. Through the site assessment work discussions have taken place with NCC highways regarding the suitability of gaining access to the site from Cransley Rise. NCC advised that they would be able to accept a loop road serving a maximum of 50 dwellings without the need for Cransley Rise to be widened. The loop road would need to be 5.5 metres wide with 2x2metres footways in accordance with local highway authority standards and tracked for refuse vehicles opposed to a large family car. The detail of the access would be considered at planning application stage. Limited bus services are available in the rural area; however the Council is still required to meet housing needs within these areas. The scale of development proposed will not alter the village character of Mawsley.
Id 14 (Objecting) – 12.11 Mawsley - I would like to express my strong objection to the proposal to build additional homes in Mawsley. My concerns about this proposal are:	Through the site assessment work discussions have taken place with NCC highways regarding the suitability of gaining access to the site from

* The access point would be totally unsuitable - Cransley Rise is too narrow for the volume of traffic that would result from all those extra homes. Plus, the access point would be on a sharp bend so very dangerous. * Everyone living in Mawsley needs a car. The bus service is now very minimal and cannot be relied upon. My husband and I never intended to have two cars, but realised we would have no choice after living here for only two months. In that time my husband had had to use taxis to get to work because there was no bus anywhere near the time required (even standard office hours)... and that was 5 years ago when the service was much better than it is now! * Many residents have pretty much lived on a building site for over ten years - at least give us a break while the village settles! Surely no new homes should be built while there are still unadopted roads and drains throughout the village? * Mawsley School has already been extended several times and it would not be possible to do so again. From what I understand, other schools in the area are also at capacity. A friend of mine wanted to move to Mawsley last year but could not get her three sons into the school, so had to move elsewhere. 50 houses could result in a very large number of extra children and we just cannot accomodate them all! * The proposed site is just one field away from Birch Spinney and Mawsley Marsh SSSI. The significant disruption to the area will of course have a negative impact on wildlife in the area and this should not be allowed to happen. * The area in question regularly floods during periods of high rainfall. * Mawsley is far larger than originally intended (by more than 200 homes). Plus, **** is planning to build 29 retirement flats near the village centre, so that too should be considered a contribution to the housing "deficit" in the area. With both of these points considered, I think it's fair to say that Mawsley has contributed far, far more than its fair	Cransley Rise. NCC advised that they would be able to accept a loop road serving a maximum of 50 dwellings without the need for Cransley Rise to be widened. The loop road would need to be 5.5 metres wide with 2x2metres footways in accordance with local highway authority standards and tracked for refuse vehicles opposed to a large family car. The detail of the access would be considered at planning application stage. Limited bus services are available in the rural area; however the Council is still required to meet housing needs within these areas. While Mawsley is now bigger than originally planned, the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy identifies a requirement for 480 dwellings in the rural area in the period 2011-31. The SSP2 will need to allocate sites across the rural area to meet this requirement. The Rural Settlement Facilities Background Paper (update) (April 2018) sets out the facilities available in Mawsley. Mawsley has a good range of services and facilities and is the only

share! * One final opinion I would like to express - the council should not be responsible for making sure there are enough private homes in the area. We do not have a housing crisis, we have a population crisis which is largely thanks to uncontrolled immigration. That is for the government to sort out, not the council.	village with a doctor's surgery and dentist. When assessing sites to meet the rural housing requirement access to services and facilities is part of the assessment. Taking into account the facilities available, it is considered that Mawsley is a suitable location for small scale growth. Through the site assessment work NCC Education has been consulted on provision for education. In Mawsley contributions would be sought towards Primary and Secondary education. Draft policy MAW02 requires proposals to provide appropriate evidence of the ecological potential of the site. Policy 4 of the JCS requires a net gain in biodiversity to be sought. The Birch Spinney and Mawsley Marsh SSSI is located approximately 360m north of the site. An additional criteria will be added to the policy requiring proposals to assess and mitigate impact on the SSSI. Draft policy MAW02 requires proposals to include a site specific Flood Risk

	Assessment which addresses groundwater flooding. An allowance has been made for windfall development in determining how many dwellings the SSP2 needs to allocate. Any applications which are approved which are not identified in the development plan will contribute towards the windfall allowance. The Council is required to plan for houses to meet housing requirements. These are set locally through the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy.
Id 80 (Objecting) - **HOUSING ALLOCATIONS – ASSESSMENT OF ADDITIONAL SITES & UPDATE** We wish to register our very strong objection to the proposal RA174 to build **57 new houses** on the field bordering Birch Spinney, Malaslea and Cransley Rise. The plot of land is unsatisfactory and not appropriate for residential development for the following reasons: • The developments take no account of the wishes of villagers as expressed through our previous successful objection to previous proposals to develop the land by the playing fields RA/115. (Localism Act 2011) • Our house backs onto the field which is the reason we bought it 10 years ago • Our house and back garden will be subject to light pollution during and after the development • Our house and back garden will be subject to noise pollution both during and after	Views of local residents are noted; however the views of residents need to be balanced alongside the need to meet housing requirements set out in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy which identifies a requirement of 480 dwellings in the rural area 2011-2031. The SSP2 will allocate sites across the rural area to meet this requirement. Location of existing housing backing on to the site is not a planning reason for the site not to be developed. Policy 8 of the JCS requires

the development • We will experience loss of privacy due to the house and garden being overlooked • We chose to live in a village, if we wanted to live in a town we would have bought a house in Kettering. We work hard to maintain this lifestyle for our families • It will make existing homes for sale more difficult to sell with the added competition from more new homes • Access to the site along Cransley Rise is very limited with insufficient room for vision splays. The access point is on a narrow bend on a sharp estate road and will be dangerous. • Cransley Rise is about to be adopted and construction traffic will damage the road - it has taken 10 years for the road to be top coated and we have put up with the disruption of construction for over 11 years. The current road layout will cause major traffic congestion. • Adverse effect on roads or highway safety, local traffic generation, working on the assumption that there is a minimum of 1 car/house and in many cases 2. Judging by the existing volume of traffic in the village and already nuisance parking on roads, we could see with 57 houses possibly 57-114 more cars, plus the impact on pedestrians, cyclists, road capacity. The junctions at the end of School Road where most of the traffic will be, is very poorly designed and clogged with parked cars • Road access in and out of the village is already very congested at rush hour due to limited employment opportunities in Mawsley - most people commute to work • The roundabout onto the A43 is already busy without additional traffic trying to negotiate the junction of what is a very busy carriage way - as it is the main road between Kettering & Northampton • Adverse impact on the size, form, character & setting of the village, especially if taken in combination with other developments • The pumping station is undersized and raw sewerage runs across the footpaths and into water courses • The broadband connection is very slow, the government is going to make it a human right that everyone has access to the internet - more residents will have a detrimental impact on existing residents making it impossible for residents and	development to prevent both new and existing development from contributing to or being adversely effected by unacceptable levels of light or noise pollution. Policy 8 of the JCS also requires that development proposals to not result in an unacceptable impact on the amenities of future occupiers, neighbouring properties or the wider area, by reason of noise, vibration, smell, light or other pollution, loss of light or overlooking. In addition to this draft policy MAW02 requires proposals to have particular regard to the layout scale, height, design and massing of buildings and landscaping, in order to minimise amenity impact on neighbouring residential properties. Impact on sale of existing homes is not a material planning consideration. Through the site assessment work discussions have taken place with NCC highways regarding the suitability of gaining access to the site from Cransley Rise. NCC advised that they would be able to accept a loop road serving a maximum of 50 dwellings without the need for Cransley Rise to

businesses to work from the village • Mawsley school has already been expanded 3 times with the loss of valuable playing fields and playgrounds. There is no possibility of further expansion and there are already children living in the village who cannot get a place at the school. The additional houses would lead to a possible 57-144 children who would require a school place. In addition the crèche is oversubscribed and other groups like the scouts are also at maximum capacity. The children's Halloween and Christmas parties are also sold out so that some children cannot attend. At the consultation meeting I attended the Council representative tried to fob me off on this point about the end of the baby boom and falling birth rates. You cannot make this assumption that Mawsley conforms to the national trend - it doesn't. It is unacceptable for Mawsley children to leave the village to obtain a school education. • The current village facilities are already stretched and it is noticeable that making a doctors or dentists appointment is taking longer. Prompt service is no longer achievable or available. It is not feasible to build more homes and encourage people to live in a village where they cannot access the school, dentist or doctors. The local shop is overstretched and the roads choked with parked cars • Irreversible loss of valuable agricultural land. This area should remain for agricultural use in the way the farmer has always used the field, growing crops, for the benefit of the existing community • Loss of countryside view around which the layout of the village was designed . To build in this location takes away an amenity that all villager's share with views over open country. Taking away this amenity is no different to taking away the laying fields or pond • Irrevocable loss of wildlife habitat and negative impact on the populations of local birds and animals eg. Yellow Hammer, Red Kites, Field Fayres, Waxwings, Owls, Woodpeckers, Reed Buntings, Linnets, Foxes, Badgers, Deers, Bats & Monk-Jack Deer • Detriment to residential amenity • Revision to the **Core Spatial Strategy**, due to be adopted shortly by Kettering Council will show they have a 5 year land bank	be widened. The loop road would need to be 5.5 metres wide with 2x2metres footways in accordance with local highway authority standards and tracked for refuse vehicles opposed to a large family car. The detail of the access would be considered at planning application stage. NCC highways have been consulted through the site assessment process and in relation to the capacity of the highway network have assessed the impact as capacity limited or insufficient capacity but constraints can be overcome. If the site is progressed as an allocation an additional criteria will be added to the policy requiring proposals to be supported by a transport assessment and to mitigate the impact of development on the highway network. The site is a logical extension to the village and is surrounded on three sides by existing development. Draft policy MAW02 requires that the development be of a high standard of design and reflect the character, layout and density of the surrounding

• Policy 15 of North Northants Core Spatial Policy states that to meet local housing needs 30-40% more houses are needed for Kettering. Mawsley was originally 700 homes, this has been increased already by 300 homes to 1000- an increase of 42%. This proposal would mean a total 1357 homes which is a total increase of 51% - far in excess of the Core Spatial Policy. It was categorically stated from the beginning of the building of the village that the village would consist of 700 homes. We have taken our fair share of increased development for Kettering Borough Council • The need to avoid town cramming and over development • The infill expansion on the site undermines the characteristic layout of Mawsley and goes against the original ethos of the village and extends the village beyond the boundary lines unnecessarily • One of the unique design features of Mawsley is the design layout and this should be safeguarded. Mawsley was supposed to emulate the development of a typical Northamptonshire village with nooks and crannies. As such constraints on building design, replacement windows and doors, car parking provision to keep cars hidden and off the street support this. If this proposal goes ahead, Mawsley will become another suburb of Kettering and become a housing estate rather than a village • There is a possibility of development creep and urban crawl, the hatched area of the plan was also originally part of the new housing proposal. Whilst this has been dropped for now, it is hard to see how a precedent will be set for future infilling • New houses increase the strain on Police, Fire and Ambulance services • Increased flood risk to Malaslea and Birch Spinney, water pools in these fields in the winter and after heavy rain and once this is tarmacked over, risk of flooding will be a major concern • Little regard appears to have been paid to either the letter or the spirit of the Government's National Planning Policy Framework and we would like to draw the Council's attention to the aims behind those paragraphs most relevant to **Mawsley Core Planning Principles.** • **Paragraph 17** • **planning should empower local people to shape their surroundings, finding ways to enhance and improve the places in which they live their**	residential area. Draft policy MAW02 requires that development proposals demonstrate that there is adequate capacity in the sewage treatment works and the foul sewage network. Using a central postcode in Mawsley the broadband speed checker indicates download speeds of 30.2 mbps and upload speeds of 32.7 mbps. This is high compared with many of the villages in the borough. Through the site assessment work NCC Education has been consulted on provision for education. In Mawsley contributions would be sought towards Primary and Secondary education. When assessing sites to meet the rural housing requirement access to services and facilities is part of the assessment. Taking into account the facilities available, it is considered that Mawsley is a suitable location for small scale growth. Agricultural land classification has been taken into account through the assessment process. This site is grade

lives. Comments already registered suggest that building on this site would be entirely at odds with the wishes of local residents. • **the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside should be recognised.** To allow further housing to be built on the site would degrade it bothy visually and as a wildlife corridor. does the Council not recognise this ? • **planning should contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment.** Planning to build 57 houses on this site would be contrary to this • **Promoting Healthy Communities** • **Paragraph 74** • **existing open space...should not be built on, unless...the land is surplus to requirements.** With an already increasing population, the land is agricultural and cannot be considered to be surplus to requirements • Paragraph 76 • Local communities should be able to identify for special protection green areas of particular importance to them. The objections have made it abundantly clear that this site is treasured • In conclusion, we believe the area under consideration must be rejected on the grounds that it does not accord with the way in which the National Planning Policy Framework is expected to be applied. If additional housing is required in Northamptonshire, it would be far preferable to build another new village designed like Mawsley or consider the brown filed sites around Kettering For all the above reasons we wish to register and you to acknowledge our very strong objection to RA/174. Mawsley was designed to be a village not an urban sprawl. The village has already been extended beyond the original scope and further houses would be counter-productive. The North Northamptonshire Development Company and the Daily Telegraph Best Village Aware cite the design layout of Mawsley as part of it's unique creation as a village rather than a housing estate. It is a village and has not become a rat run for commuters. There is no merit to the proposal and the existing facilities are overstretched. It is a wonderful village, with a fabulous community spirit and we feel strongly it must remain a village and not destroyed with more unwanted housing. Please do not build more houses in Mawsley village.	3 agricultural land so is preferable to the development of grade 2 agricultural land. Draft policy MAW02 requires proposals to provide appropriate evidence of the ecological potential of the site. Policy 4 of the JCS requires a net gain in biodiversity to be sought. The JCS has now been adopted. The Council does have a five year land supply, however the SSP2 will need to allocate sites to meet housing requirements up to 2031. Draft policy MAW02 requires proposals to include a site specific Flood Risk Assessment which addresses groundwater flooding. Full regard has been had to the NPPF in developing the plan.

Appendix 2n - Mawsley

Id 76 (Objecting) - **HOUSING ALLOCATIONS – ASSESSMENT OF ADDITIONAL SITES & UPDATE** We wish to register our very strong objection to the proposal RA174 to build **57 new houses** on the field bordering Birch Spinney, Malaslea and Cransley Rise. The plot of land is unsatisfactory and not appropriate for residential development for the following reasons: • The developments take no account of the wishes of villagers as expressed through our previous successful objection to previous proposals to develop the land by the playing fields RA/115. (Localism Act 2011) • Our house backs onto the field which is the reason we bought it 10 years ago • Our house and back garden will be subject to light pollution during and after the development • Our house and back garden will be subject to noise pollution both during and after the development • We will experience loss of privacy due to the house and garden being overlooked • We chose to live in a village, if we wanted to live in a town we would have bought a house in Kettering. We work hard to maintain this lifestyle for our families • It will make existing homes for sale more difficult to sell with the added competition from more new homes • Access to the site along Cransley Rise is very limited with insufficient room for vision splays. The access point is on a narrow bend on a sharp estate road and will be dangerous. • Cransley Rise is about to be adopted and construction traffic will damage the road - it has taken 10 years for the road to be top coated and we have put up with the disruption of construction for over 11 years. The current road layout will cause major traffic congestion. • Adverse effect on roads or highway safety, local traffic generation, working on the assumption that there is a minimum of 1 car/house and in many cases 2. Judging by the existing volume of traffic in the village and already nuisance parking on	Views of local resident are noted; however the views of residents need to be balanced alongside the need to meet housing requirements set out in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy which identifies a requirement of 480 dwellings in the rural area 2011-2031. The SSP2 will allocate sites across the rural area to meet this requirement. Location of existing housing backing on to the site is not a planning reason for the site not to be developed. Policy 8 of the JCS requires development to prevent both new and existing development from contributing to or being adversely effected by unacceptable levels of light or noise pollution. Policy 8 of the JCS also requires that development proposals to not result in an unacceptable impact on the amenities of future occupiers, neighbouring properties or the wider area, by reason of noise, vibration, smell, light or other pollution, loss of light or overlooking. In addition to this draft policy MAW02 requires proposals to have particular regard to the layout

roads, we could see with 57 houses possibly 57-114 more cars, plus the impact on pedestrians, cyclists, road capacity. The junctions at the end of School Road where most of the traffic will be, is very poorly designed and clogged with parked cars • Road access in and out of the village is already very congested at rush hour due to limited employment opportunities in Mawsley - most people commute to work • The roundabout onto the A43 is already busy without additional traffic trying to negotiate the junction of what is a very busy carriage way - as it is the main road between Kettering & Northampton • Adverse impact on the size, form, character & setting of the village, especially if taken in combination with other developments • The pumping station is undersized and raw sewerage runs across the footpaths and into water courses • The broadband connection is very slow, the government is going to make it a human right that everyone has access to the internet - more residents will have a detrimental impact on existing residents making it impossible for residents and businesses to work from the village • Mawsley school has already been expanded 3 times with the loss of valuable playing fields and playgrounds. There is no possibility of further expansion and there are already children living in the village who cannot get a place at the school. The additional houses would lead to a possible 57-144 children who would require a school place. In addition the crèche is oversubscribed and other groups like the scouts are also at maximum capacity. The children's Halloween and Christmas parties are also sold out so that some children cannot attend. At the consultation meeting I attended the Council representative tried to fob me off on this point about the end of the baby boom and falling birth rates. You cannot make this assumption that Mawsley conforms to the national trend - it doesn't. It is unacceptable for Mawsley children to leave the village to obtain a school education. • The current village facilities are already stretched and it is noticeable that making a doctors or dentists appointment is taking longer. Prompt service is no longer achievable or available. It is not feasible to build more homes and encourage	scale, height, design and massing of buildings and landscaping, in order to minimise amenity impact on neighbouring residential properties. Impact on sale of existing homes is not a material planning consideration. Through the site assessment work discussions have taken place with NCC highways regarding the suitability of gaining access to the site from Cransley Rise. NCC advised that they would be able to accept a loop road serving a maximum of 50 dwellings without the need for Cransley Rise to be widened. The loop road would need to be 5.5 metres wide with 2x2metres footways in accordance with local highway authority standards and tracked for refuse vehicles opposed to a large family car. The detail of the access would be considered at planning application stage. NCC highways have been consulted through the site assessment process and in relation to the capacity of the highway network have assessed the impact as capacity limited or insufficient capacity but constraints can be overcome.

people to live in a village where they cannot access the school, dentist or doctors. The local shop is overstretched and the roads choked with parked cars • Irreversible loss of valuable agricultural land. This area should remain for agricultural use in the way the farmer has always used the field, growing crops, for the benefit of the existing community • Loss of countryside view around which the layout of the village was designed . To build in this location takes away an amenity that all villager's share with views over open country. Taking away this amenity is no different to taking away the laying fields or pond • Irrevocable loss of wildlife habitat and negative impact on the populations of local birds and animals eg. Yellow Hammer, Red Kites, Field Fayres, Waxwings, Owls, Woodpeckers, Reed Buntings, Linnets, Foxes, Badgers, Deers, Bats & Monk-Jack Deer • Detriment to residential amenity • Revision to the **Core Spatial Strategy**, due to be adopted shortly by Kettering Council will show they have a 5 year land bank • Policy 15 of North Northants Core Spatial Policy states that to meet local housing needs 30-40% more houses are needed for Kettering. Mawsley was originally 700 homes, this has been increased already by 300 homes to 1000- an increase of 42%. This proposal would mean a total 1357 homes which is a total increase of 51% - far in excess of the Core Spatial Policy. It was categorically stated from the beginning of the building of the village that the village would consist of 700 homes. We have taken our fair share of increased development for Kettering Borough Council • The need to avoid town cramming and over development • The infill expansion on the site undermines the characteristic layout of Mawsley and goes against the original ethos of the village and extends the village beyond the boundary lines unnecessarily • One of the unique design features of Mawsley is the design layout and this should be safeguarded. Mawsley was supposed to emulate the development of a typical Northamptonshire village with nooks and crannies. As such constraints on building design, replacement windows and doors, car parking provision to keep cars hidden	If the site is progressed as an allocation an additional criteria will be added to the policy requiring proposals to be supported by a transport assessment and to mitigate the impact of development on the highway network. The site is a logical extension to the village and is surrounded on three sides by existing development. Draft policy MAW02 requires that the development be of a high standard of design and reflect the character, layout and density of the surrounding residential area. Draft policy MAW02 requires that development proposals demonstrate that there is adequate capacity in the sewage treatment works and the foul sewage network. Using a central postcode in Mawsley the broadband speed checker indicates download speeds of 30.2 mbps and upload speeds of 32.7 mbps. This is high compared with many of the villages in the borough. Through the site assessment work

and off the street support this. If this proposal goes ahead, Mawsley will become another suburb of Kettering and become a housing estate rather than a village • There is a possibility of development creep and urban crawl, the hatched area of the plan was also originally part of the new housing proposal. Whilst this has been dropped for now, it is hard to see how a precedent will be set for future infilling • New houses increase the strain on Police, Fire and Ambulance services • Increased flood risk to Malaslea and Birch Spinney, water pools in these fields in the winter and after heavy rain and once this is tarmacked over, risk of flooding will be a major concern • Little regard appears to have been paid to either the letter or the spirit of the Government's National Planning Policy Framework and we would like to draw the Council's attention to the aims behind those paragraphs most relevant to **Mawsley Core Planning Principles.** • **Paragraph 17** • **planning should empower local people to shape their surroundings, finding ways to enhance and improve the places in which they live their lives.** Comments already registered suggest that building on this site would be entirely at odds with the wishes of local residents. • **the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside should be recognised.** To allow further housing to be built on the site would degrade it bothy visually and as a wildlife corridor. does the Council not recognise this ? • **planning should contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment.** Planning to build 57 houses on this site would be contrary to this • **Promoting Healthy Communities** • **Paragraph 74** • **existing open space...should not be built on, unless...the land is surplus to requirements.** With an already increasing population, the land is agricultural and cannot be considered to be surplus to requirements • Paragraph 76 • Local communities should be able to identify for special protection green areas of particular importance to them. The objections have made it abundantly clear that this site is treasured	NCC Education has been consulted on provision for education. In Mawsley contributions would be sought towards Primary and Secondary education. When assessing sites to meet the rural housing requirement access to services and facilities is part of the assessment. Taking into account the facilities available, it is considered that Mawsley is a suitable location for small scale growth. Agricultural land classification has been taken into account through the assessment process. This site is grade 3 agricultural land so is preferable to the development of grade 2 agricultural land. Draft policy MAW02 requires proposals to provide appropriate evidence of the ecological potential of the site. Policy 4 of the JCS requires a net gain in biodiversity to be sought. The JCS has now been adopted. The Council does have a five year land supply, however the SSP2 will need to allocate sites to meet housing requirements up to 2031.

• In conclusion, we believe the area under consideration must be rejected on the grounds that it does not accord with the way in which the National Planning Policy Framework is expected to be applied. If additional housing is required in Northamptonshire, it would be far preferable to build another new village designed like Mawsley or consider the brown filed sites around Kettering For all the above reasons we wish to register and you to acknowledge our very strong objection to RA/174. Mawsley was designed to be a village not an urban sprawl. The village has already been extended beyond the original scope and further houses would be counter-productive. The North Northamptonshire Development Company and the Daily Telegraph Best Village Aware cite the design layout of Mawsley as part of it's unique creation as a village rather than a housing estate. It is a village and has not become a rat run for commuters. There is no merit to the proposal and the existing facilities are overstretched. It is a wonderful village, with a fabulous community spirit and we feel strongly it must remain a village and not destroyed with more unwanted housing. Please do not build more houses in Mawsley village.	Draft policy MAW02 requires proposals to include a site specific Flood Risk Assessment which addresses groundwater flooding. Full regard has been had to the NPPF in developing the plan.
Id 20 (Objecting) – Settlement Boundary 12.158 - I wish to express an objection to the proposed settlement boundary, specifically the part of the boundary that runs along the bottom of the rear gardens of numbers 5-12 Orton Close and 54-58 Hawthorn Ave, for the following reasons. For the last 2 years I have been exploring the possibility of purchasing a small strip of the field that my garden backs onto. This is so I can slightly increase our garden size in order to provide our two young children with more space to play and so all the family can enjoy a more usable space. All of the neighbours from the properties mentioned above also wish to do the same. The rear gardens of our properties are not in proportion to the size of our homes and offer very limited outdoor space. I have met with the land owner, **** and he has indicated that he would be happy to help and would consider selling a small strip of land to all the residents if KBC permitted this. This would clearly mean adjusting the proposed settlement boundary to allow for this. The residents mentioned above are in the process of submitting a pre application to	Mawsley is a new settlement. The planning applications for these plots would have been considered by a planning officer at the time and the area of garden land deemed acceptable. The garden sizes are comparable with other garden sizes in Mawsley. The land in question is open countryside. Planning policy strictly controls development in the open countryside and development is only allowed in exceptional circumstances. Given the presumption in policy against

KBC for change of use from agricultural land to residential garden land. Our proposal is to purchase and extend our gardens by only 6-8 meters. During the last 3 years that I have lived here the land has been owned by Taylor Wimpey and has not been maintained and in our opinion left in an unsuitable condition by the developers. The land slopes in towards our rear gardens and during the winter the run off water runs into our gardens turning them into a waterlogged unusable mess. Allowing us to purchase this strip of land would mean that we could rectify this and also have some garden which does not flood in winter or turn into solid hard clay in the summer. I ask that the proposed settlement boundary is delayed or re-considered while we submit and hopefully be allowed to purchase this small strip of extra garden space. Thank you	development in the open countryside and the fact that the size of garden would have been considered through the original applications for the properties relatively recently there is not sufficient justification for altering the proposed settlement boundary in this location.
Id 21 (Objecting) – Settlement Boundary 12.158 - I wish to express an objection to the proposed settlement boundary, specifically the part of the boundary that runs along the bottom of the rear gardens of numbers 5-12 Orton Close and 54-58 Hawthorn Ave, for the following reasons. For the last 2 years I have been exploring the possibility of purchasing a small strip of the field that my garden backs onto. This is so I can slightly increase our garden size in order to provide our two young children with more space to play and so all the family can enjoy a more usable space. All of the neighbours from the properties mentioned above also wish to do the same. The rear gardens of our properties are not in proportion to the size of our homes and offer very limited outdoor space. I have met with the land owner, **** and he has indicated that he would be happy to help and would consider selling a small strip of land to all the residents if KBC permitted this. This would clearly mean adjusting the proposed settlement boundary to allow for this. The residents mentioned above are in the process of submitting a pre application to KBC for change of use from agricultural land to residential garden land. Our proposal is	Mawsley is a new settlement. The planning applications for these plots would have been considered by a planning officer at the time and the area of garden land deemed acceptable. The garden sizes are comparable with other garden sizes in Mawsley. The land in question is open countryside. Planning policy strictly controls development in the open countryside and development is only allowed in exceptional circumstances. Given the presumption in policy against development in the open countryside and the fact that the size of garden

to purchase and extend our gardens by only 6-8 meters. During the last 3 years that I have lived here the land has been owned by Taylor Wimpey and has not been maintained and in our opinion left in an unsuitable condition by the developers. The land slopes in towards our rear gardens and during the winter the run off water runs into our gardens turning them into a waterlogged unusable mess. Allowing us to purchase this strip of land would mean that we could rectify this and also have some garden which does not flood in winter or turn into solid hard clay in the summer. I ask that the proposed settlement boundary is delayed or re-considered while we submit and hopefully be allowed to purchase this small strip of extra garden space. Thank you	would have been considered through the original applications for the properties relatively recently there is not sufficient justification for altering the proposed settlement boundary in this location.
Id 22 (Objecting) – The settlement boundary 12.158 - I would like to object to the proposed settlement boundary that runs along the bottom of the rear gardens of numbers 5-12 Orton Close and 54-58 Hawthorn Ave, for the reasons mentioned below... Myself and my neighbours are exploring the possibility of purchasing a small strip of the field that my garden backs onto so I can slightly increase our garden size, providing my two young children with more space to play and enjoy. This would mean adjusting the proposed settlement boundary. We are in the process of submitting a pre application to KBC for change of use from agricultural land to residential garden land. Our proposal is to purchase and extend our gardens by only 6-8 meters. The land has previously been owned by the builder which has resulted in waterlogged, weed-filled gardens as they have not been maintained. Purchasing this strip of land would mean that we could rectify this and also have some garden which does not flood in winter or turn into solid hard clay in the summer. I ask that the proposed settlement boundary is delayed or re-considered while we submit and hopefully be allowed to purchase this small strip of extra garden space.	Mawsley is a new settlement. The planning applications for these plots would have been considered by a planning officer at the time and the area of garden land deemed acceptable. The garden sizes are comparable with other garden sizes in Mawsley. The land in question is open countryside. Planning policy strictly controls development in the open countryside and development is only allowed in exceptional circumstances. Given the presumption in policy against development in the open countryside and the fact that the size of garden would have been considered through

	the original applications for the properties relatively recently there is not sufficient justification for altering the proposed settlement boundary in this location.
Id 23 (Objecting) – Borders - *I wish to express an objection to the proposed settlement boundary, specifically the part of the boundary that runs along the bottom of the rear gardens of numbers 5-12 Orton Close and 54-58 Hawthorn Ave, for the following reasons.* *For the last 2 years I have been exploring the possibility of purchasing a small strip of the field that my garden backs onto. This is so I can slightly increase our garden size in order to provide our two young children with more space to play and so all the family can enjoy a more usable space. All of the neighbours from the properties mentioned above also wish to do the same. The rear gardens of our properties are not in proportion to the size of our homes and offer very limited outdoor space. We have met with the land owner, **** and he has indicated that he would be happy to help and would consider selling a small strip of land to all the residents if KBC permitted this.* *This would clearly mean adjusting the proposed settlement boundary to allow for this. The residents mentioned above are in the process of submitting a pre application to KBC for change of use from agricultural land to residential garden land. Our proposal is to purchase and extend our gardens by only 6-8 meters.* *During the last 4 years that I have lived here the land has been owned by Taylor Wimpey and has not been maintained and in our opinion left in an unsuitable condition by the developers. The land slopes in towards our rear gardens and during the winter the run off water runs into our gardens turning them into a waterlogged unusable mess. Allowing us to purchase this strip of land would mean that we could rectify this and also have some garden which does not flood in winter or turn into solid hard clay in the summer.*	Mawsley is a new settlement. The planning applications for these plots would have been considered by a planning officer at the time and the area of garden land deemed acceptable. The garden sizes are comparable with other garden sizes in Mawsley. The land in question is open countryside. Planning policy strictly controls development in the open countryside and development is only allowed in exceptional circumstances. Given the presumption in policy against development in the open countryside and the fact that the size of garden would have been considered through the original applications for the properties relatively recently there is not sufficient justification for altering the proposed settlement boundary in this location.

I ask that the proposed settlement boundary is delayed or re-considered while we submit and hopefully be allowed to purchase this small strip of extra garden space."	
Id 26 (Objecting) – Settlement Boundary 12.158 - *I wish to express an objection to the proposed settlement boundary, specifically the part of the boundary that runs along the bottom of the rear gardens of numbers 5-12 Orton Close and 54-58 Hawthorn Ave, for the following reasons.* *For the last 2 years I have been exploring the possibility of purchasing a small strip of the field that my garden backs onto. This is so I can slightly increase our garden size in order to provide our two young children with more space to play and so all the family can enjoy a more usable space. All of the neighbours from the properties mentioned above also wish to do the same. The rear gardens of our properties are not in proportion to the size of our homes and offer very limited outdoor space. I have met with the land owner, **** and he has indicated that he would be happy to help and would consider selling a small strip of land to all the residents if KBC permitted this.* *This would clearly mean adjusting the proposed settlement boundary to allow for this. The residents mentioned above are in the process of submitting a pre application to KBC for change of use from agricultural land to residential garden land. Our proposal is to purchase and extend our gardens by only 6-8 meters.* *During the last 3 years that I have lived here the land has been owned by Taylor Wimpey and has not been maintained and in our opinion left in an unsuitable condition by the developers. The land slopes in towards our rear gardens and during the winter the run off water runs into our gardens turning them into a waterlogged unusable mess. Allowing us to purchase this strip of land would mean that we could rectify this and also have some garden which does not flood in winter or turn into solid hard clay in the summer.* *I ask that the proposed settlement boundary is delayed or re-considered while we submit and hopefully be allowed to purchase this small strip of extra garden space.*	Mawsley is a new settlement. The planning applications for these plots would have been considered by a planning officer at the time and the area of garden land deemed acceptable. The garden sizes are comparable with other garden sizes in Mawsley. The land in question is open countryside. Planning policy strictly controls development in the open countryside and development is only allowed in exceptional circumstances. Given the presumption in policy against development in the open countryside and the fact that the size of garden would have been considered through the original applications for the properties relatively recently there is not sufficient justification for altering the proposed settlement boundary in this location.
Id 27 (Objecting) – MAW01 - I wish to express an objection to the proposed settlement boundary specifically the part of the boundary which runs along the bottom of the rear	Mawsley is a new settlement. The planning applications for these plots

gardens of N0 5-12 Orton Close and 54-58 Hawthorn Ave. Having lived here for some 9 years I have always been keen to investigate the possibility of extending the rear garden, and I am aware that **** would look favourably upon this idea of selling off a strip of land bordering these dwellings. This would clearly mean adjusting the proposed settlement boundary to allow for this to happen. The residents mentioned above are in the process of submitting a pre-application to KBC for a change of use from agricultural land to residential garden land. The proposal is to purchase only a 6-8 metre strip. The land has previously been owned by the builder and has resulted in water-logged and weed filled gardens because it has not been maintained. Purchasing this land would give us a chance to rectify these problems, and in addition the extra garden space would provide the opportunity to encourage a more diverse wild life population. I ask that the proposed settlement boundary is delayed or re-considered while we submit our new proposal.	would have been considered by a planning officer at the time and the area of garden land deemed acceptable. The garden sizes are comparable with other garden sizes in Mawsley. The land in question is open countryside. Planning policy strictly controls development in the open countryside and development is only allowed in exceptional circumstances. Given the presumption in policy against development in the open countryside and the fact that the size of garden would have been considered through the original applications for the properties relatively recently there is not sufficient justification for altering the proposed settlement boundary in this location.
Id 30 (Objecting) – Settlement Boundary 12.158 - I wish to express the same objection as those raised by other commenters in regards to the proposed settlement boundary, specifically the part of the boundary that runs along the bottom of the rear gardens of numbers 5-12 Orton Close and 54-58 Hawthorn Ave. Myself along with the other residents of Orton Close and Hawthorn Ave whose houses back on to this strip of land are looking into the possibility of purchasing the land for the use of extending our small gardens.	Mawsley is a new settlement. The planning applications for these plots would have been considered by a planning officer at the time and the area of garden land deemed acceptable. The garden sizes are comparable with other garden sizes in Mawsley.

This would mean adjusting the proposed settlement boundary. We are in the process of submitting a pre application to KBC for change of use from agricultural land to residential garden land. Our proposal is to purchase and extend our gardens and put in place measures to rectify the waterlogging occurs in this area.	The land in question is open countryside. Planning policy strictly controls development in the open countryside and development is only allowed in exceptional circumstances. Given the presumption in policy against development in the open countryside and the fact that the size of garden would have been considered through the original applications for the properties relatively recently there is not sufficient justification for altering the proposed settlement boundary in this location.
Id 33 (Objecting) – Land to the West of Mawsley – RA/174 - I am writing to express my views with regards to the proposed development of the village of Mawsley. I have lived in Mawsley for eight years and **<u>strongly object</u>** to this proposed development for the following reasons: 1. My property backs onto the field subject to this proposed development. One of the reasons for purchasing this house was its location on the edge of the village and the associated countryside views; 2. My house and back garden will become overlooked thus affecting my privacy; 3. I will experience increased levels of noise during and after the development; 4. My property will be subject to increased light pollution during and after the development; 5. The proposal ignores the previous wishes of myself and other villagers when objecting to the development of a different site; 6. Mawsley first became inhabited approximately 15 years ago and to date works have never ceased, either housing development or road adoption. It must surely	Location of existing housing backing on to the site or losses of views are not planning reasons for the site not to be developed. Policy 8 of the JCS also requires that development proposals to not result in an unacceptable impact on the amenities of future occupiers, neighbouring properties or the wider area, by reason of noise, vibration, smell, light or other pollution, loss of light or overlooking. In addition to this draft policy MAW02 requires proposals to have particular regard to the layout scale, height, design and massing of buildings and landscaping, in order to

be time for stability within the village; 7. The land is currently farmed and any development will have an irreversible loss of this agricultural land; 8. Mawsley has a beautiful diversity of wildlife with frequent sightings of foxes, bats, badgers, and deer. There is also a wonderful range of birds, including migrant species such as the Waxwing, and our garden alone attracts over 30 different species including woodpeckers, yellowhammers, owls, bullfinches, linnets and reed buntings. Further development can only have a negative impact on these populations; 9. The infrastructure of the village was designed to support 700 homes, as per the original plan. There are now approximately 1,000 homes. The infrastructure is struggling to cope with present demand and further development can only exacerbate this situation; 10. The loss of countryside views will have an adverse effect on the value of my property; 11. Being overlooked will have an adverse effect on the value of my property; 12. The school has been subject to numerous extensions to accommodate the influx of children within the village. This has had a detrimental effect on the outdoor space in which the children have to play. An increased population can only add to the pressures faced by the school; 13. The spirit throughout the village is fantastic and events at the community centre are well supported and very well attended. For example the recent children's Halloween party sold out quickly leaving a number of children very disappointed. I believe the forthcoming Christmas party has also sold out, no doubt presenting the same issues. Obviously an increase in the number of families is going to create more of these problems; 14. The field subject to the proposal has a tendency to become flooded during the winter months and I fear any development may increase these problems and cause issues for those living Cransley Rise; 15. An increase in the number of homes will inevitably increase the traffic within the village which will have an adverse effect on road safety and no doubt further the issues of nuisance parking;	minimise amenity impact on neighbouring residential properties. Policy 8 of the JCS requires development to prevent both new and existing development from contributing to or being adversely effected by unacceptable levels of light or noise pollution. Views of local resident are noted; however the views of residents need to be balanced alongside the need to meet housing requirements set out in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy which identifies a requirement of 480 dwellings in the rural area 2011-2031. The SSP2 will allocate sites across the rural area to meet this requirement. Agricultural land classification has been taken into account through the assessment process. This site is grade 3 agricultural land so is preferable to the development of grade 2 agricultural land. Draft policy MAW02 requires proposals to provide appropriate evidence of the ecological potential of the site. Policy 4 of the JCS requires a net gain in

16. The current access point to the field is fairly restricted and those living in its immediate vicinity will experience problems with large vehicles negotiating tight and twisty roads. There are already parking issues in this area I envisage this will create further road safety problems; and 17. Central Government has indicated there is the "need" for a substantial increase in the number of homes in Northamptonshire. Whether this is true is quite subjective but the negatives this local proposal will bring will far out-way the alleged benefits. Mawsley is a fantastic place to live and has a wonderful community spirit. It is ideally situated and well designed. It isn't a thoroughfare for anywhere and consequently cannot be used as a rat-run for commuters. If more housing is required in Northamptonshire then surely it would make eminent sense to replicate the Mawsley concept at different sites within Northamptonshire? Once again I would like to repeat my **strong objection** to this development proposal.	biodiversity to be sought. While Mawsley is now bigger than originally planned, the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy identifies a requirement for 480 dwellings in the rural area in the period 2011-31. The SSP2 will need to allocate sites across the rural area to meet this requirement. The Rural Settlement Facilities Background Paper (update) (April 2018) sets out the facilities available in Mawsley. Mawsley has a good range of services and facilities and is the only village with a doctor's surgery and dentist. When assessing sites to meet the rural housing requirement access to services and facilities is part of the assessment. Taking into account the facilities available, it is considered that Mawsley is a suitable location for small scale growth. Impact on sale of existing homes is not a material planning consideration. Through the site assessment work NCC Education has been consulted on provision for education. In Mawsley contributions would be sought towards

	Primary and Secondary education. Draft policy MAW02 requires proposals to include a site specific Flood Risk Assessment which addresses groundwater flooding. NCC highways have been consulted through the site assessment process and in relation to the capacity of the highway network have assessed the impact as capacity limited or insufficient capacity but constraints can be overcome. If the site is progressed as an allocation an additional criteria will be added to the policy requiring proposals to be supported by a transport assessment and to mitigate the impact of development on the highway network. Through the site assessment work discussions have taken place with NCC highways regarding the suitability of gaining access to the site from Cransley Rise. NCC advised that they would be able to accept a loop road serving a maximum of 50 dwellings without the need for Cransley Rise to be widened. The loop road would need to be 5.5 metres wide with 2x2metres

	footways in accordance with local highway authority standards and tracked for refuse vehicles opposed to a large family car. The detail of the access would be considered at planning application stage. The number of homes currently needed to meet the rural housing requirement are not high enough to require another settlement the size of Mawsley, small scale extensions to existing villages are the most appropriate way to meet the level of development required through the JCS.
Id 35 (Objecting) – MAW01 - We would like to object to the proposed village boundary which would currently run along the end of our garden. We ask that this boundary be extended by a small amount to allow us to increase the size of our garden into the unused land beyond. Together with the neighbouring properties in Orton Close and Hawthorn Avenue, we are submitting a pre-application to KBC to request a change in land use of a small proportion of this unused land for residential garden use. The current size of our gardens is small and not in proportion to the size of our homes. By extending our gardens by even just 6m, some would be doubled in length. This would allow our gardens to become a much more usuable space where our children can play in safety and we can make the most of our homes. By extending our gardens into this unused area, we would also be able to complete remedial work against the on-going issue of waterlogged land and occasional flooding during particularly wet weather. (We bought our house as a new build in 2011 and these	Mawsley is a new settlement. The planning applications for these plots would have been considered by a planning officer at the time and the area of garden land deemed acceptable. The garden sizes are comparable with other garden sizes in Mawsley. The land in question is open countryside. Planning policy strictly controls development in the open countryside and development is only allowed in exceptional circumstances. Given the presumption in policy against

issues have been plaguing us for all of this time.) The original owners did not properly maintain this land, only mowing it twice a year at best. We feel this lack of maintenance has contributed to these problems. The current owner, ****, has been approached about this proposition and is amenable to selling a small strip of land for this purpose, if permitted by KBC.	development in the open countryside and the fact that the size of garden would have been considered through the original applications for the properties relatively recently there is not sufficient justification for altering the proposed settlement boundary in this location.
Id 45 (Objecting) – Settlement Boundary 12.158	Noted
Id 50 (Objecting) – 12.11 Mawsley - One of my objections is that very little surveying of the proposed site appears to have taken place. Under what weather conditions have the council/their representatives visited Mawsley and carried out any survey of traffic/parking in and on the roads surrounding the land off Cransley Rise, given the concerns raised by others regarding the increase in traffic. Also during heaving rain a natural spring appears in the centre of the field running from the Birch Spinney side towards the Cransley Rise side, and on such occasions we have witnessed the householders frantically digging ditches in order to stop their properties being flooded. Again what surveys have been carried out regarding this matter. Another objection is that we were given to understand that the waste strip backing onto the Birch Spinney properties was listed as an SSI and should the field ever be built on, would upset the water table, thereby destroying the flora and fauna situated within this boundary, given this we were advised that the land wouldn't be developed for housing. I would also concur with the other comments made about the village facilities being stretched and the lack of public transport.	The site has been thoroughly assessed for allocation purposes. Traffic/ parking surveys, if required, would be carried out at planning application stage rather than through the site allocation process. Groundwater flooding has been identified as a constraint in relation to this site, to address this a criteria has been added to Draft policy MAW02 which requires proposals to include a site specific Flood Risk Assessment which addresses groundwater flooding. There is no SSSI within the site. The Birch Spinney and Mawsley Marsh SSSI is located approximately 360m north of the site. An additional criteria will be added to the policy requiring proposals to assess and mitigate impact on the SSSI.

Appendix 2n - Mawsley

Id 66 (Objecting) – Cransley Rise - First off, the local landowner *** hasn't been approached. Then, how on earth are any lorries (building) ever gong to get into said site without causing an accident as thee s a sharp bend there. Then if built how is there going to be traffic management?? Then what about extra traffic. The drains are still substandard, how will that be addressed if they cannot cope now?? What about school. There are hardly any places now. What about crossing unsafe roads. It's bad enough already. Doctors/dentists limited places now. It's just ridiculous to even propose it. Get your infrastructure right first before building. This is a non starter	Representations have been submitted on behalf of the landowner promoting the site for development and supporting the identification of the site as a potential housing allocation. Through the site assessment work discussions have taken place with NCC highways regarding the suitability of gaining access to the site from Cransley Rise. NCC advised that they would be able to accept a loop road serving a maximum of 50 dwellings without the need for Cransley Rise to be widened. The loop road would need to be 5.5 metres wide with 2x2metres footways in accordance with local highway authority standards and tracked for refuse vehicles opposed to a large family car. The detail of the access would be considered at planning application stage. NCC highways have been consulted through the site assessment process and in relation to the capacity of the highway network have assessed the impact as capacity limited or insufficient capacity but constraints can be overcome. If the site is progressed as an

	allocation an additional criteria will be added to the policy requiring proposals to be supported by a transport assessment and to mitigate the impact of development on the highway network. Draft policy MAW02 requires that development proposals demonstrate that there is adequate capacity in the sewage treatment works and the foul sewage network. Through the site assessment work NCC Education has been consulted on provision for education. In Mawsley contributions would be sought towards Primary and Secondary education. The Rural Settlement Facilities Background Paper (update) (April 2018) sets out the facilities available in Mawsley. Mawsley has a good range of services and facilities and is the only village with a doctor's surgery and dentist. When assessing sites to meet the rural housing requirement access to services and facilities is part of the assessment. Taking into account the facilities available, it is considered that Mawsley is a suitable location for small

	scale growth.
Id 77 (Objecting) – 12.161, 12.164	Noted
Id 78 (Objecting) – 12.1.67 and MAW01	Noted
Id 79 (Objecting) – MAW02	Noted
Id 81 (Objecting) – MAW02 - As a resident of Mawsley, I wish to object to the proposed housing allocation RA/174 – Land to the West of Mawsley. I object for the following reasons: • This will have an adverse effect on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties in Cransley Rise, Malaslea and Birch Spinney. This location is currently agricultural land, and the development of the land into housing would potentially result in additional noise, disturbance, overlooking and loss of privacy in the immediate vicinity. In addition, the orientation of some of the houses in Cransley Rise is such that they are designed to front onto open space. Whilst I appreciate that householders have no right to a view, the enjoyment of this view is an important part of the residential amenity of these properties, and as such, should be protected. • One of the unique features of the village is the design layout. The proposal for infill development would materially harm the character of Mawsley and I believe that this is directly contradictory with principle (a) set out in Policy MAW01, that development in Mawsley will "Be designed to reflect the distinct character of the village". • Further to the point above, KBC have imposed an Article 4 direction in place in certain areas in Mawsley to "control works that could threaten the character of an area". This development is undoubtedly a greater threat to the character of the village than that which the Article 4 direction aims to control. • I have concerns about the proposed number of dwellings, in terms of density and possible over-development of the site. • There is poor drainage in the vicinity of this site resulting in waterlogging and flooding in existing gardens and public open space when it has been raining heavily. If this development goes ahead the problem will worsen in the immediate area, as the existing site is self-draining.	Policy 8 of the JCS also requires that development proposals do not result in an unacceptable impact on the amenities of future occupiers, neighbouring properties or the wider area, by reason of noise, vibration, smell, light or other pollution, loss of light or overlooking. In addition to this draft policy MAW02 requires proposals to have particular regard to the layout scale, height, design and massing of buildings and landscaping, in order to minimise amenity impact on neighbouring residential properties. The site is a logical extension to the village and is surrounded on three sides by existing development. Draft policy MAW02 requires that the development be of a high standard of design and reflect the character, layout and density of the surrounding residential area. This site is not located in the area covered by the Article 4 direction. Groundwater flooding has been

• The development may lead to a significant impact upon road safety. The proposed access point for the development is in Cransley Rise which is already a busy and winding road, where access is regularly restricted by parked vehicles. The increase in traffic to a new junction within Cransley Rise and passing along Cransley Rise to and from the junction with School Road will make the situation even worse to the point of being dangerous. • For the reasons above, I believe that Cransley Rise is an unsuitable access point for construction traffic. • The roads in Mawsley are still not adopted, and therefore the authority is not under any obligation to pay for maintenance. I am concerned that any construction traffic associated with this development may damage the road surface in Cransley Rise and that the responsibility for the cost of repairs will then rest with the frontagers in Cransley Rise. • KBC has previously stated that Provision of schools and adequate medical facilities are an important consideration when planning for future growth. The village currently has 930 households, which is an additional 230 over what was originally planned. The local amenities and infrastructure would have been designed to meet the need of the original number of households and they are already overstretched. It is inevitable that a further increase in the number of households in the village will stretch the infrastructure even further. It is unacceptable for primary aged children who are resident in the village to have to go to school outside of the village due to lack of capacity at the village school. • The development will not be connected very well to local services such as public transport, since the bus service to the village has been recently reduced. This will inevitably lead to an increase in traffic on the roads as residents have no option other than to drive to leave the village. • A poor decision on this proposed allocation could set a precedent for a pattern of development that is not sustainable and could lead to a further expansion of the village. • There is very strong feeling in the village against this development, as per the comments for Mawsley on the Site Specific Proposals for Housing Allocations made in 2013. These should be taken into account by KBC when making a	identified as a constraint in relation to this site, to address this a criteria has been added to Draft policy MAW02 which requires proposals to include a site specific Flood Risk Assessment which addresses groundwater flooding. Through the site assessment work discussions have taken place with NCC highways regarding the suitability of gaining access to the site from Cransley Rise. NCC advised that they would be able to accept a loop road serving a maximum of 50 dwellings without the need for Cransley Rise to be widened. The loop road would need to be 5.5 metres wide with 2x2metres footways in accordance with local highway authority standards and tracked for refuse vehicles opposed to a large family car. The detail of the access would be considered at planning application stage. NCC highways have been consulted through the site assessment process and in relation to the capacity of the highway network have assessed the impact as capacity limited or insufficient capacity but constraints can be overcome. If the site is progressed as an

decision since it is existing residents who will have to live with the consequences of any decisions. • Policy 11 of the Joint Core Strategy states that "development in the rural areas will be limited to that required to support a prosperous rural economy or to meet a locally arising need, which cannot be met more sustainably at a nearby larger settlement". Unless evidence can be provided which shows that this proposed housing allocation is actually needed, this proposal directly conflicts with the policy.	allocation an additional criteria will be added to the policy requiring proposals to be supported by a transport assessment and to mitigate the impact of development on the highway network. While Mawsley is now bigger than originally planned, the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy identifies a requirement for 480 dwellings in the rural area in the period 2011-31. The SSP2 will need to allocate sites across the rural area to meet this requirement. The Rural Settlement Facilities Background Paper (update) (April 2018) sets out the facilities available in Mawsley. Mawsley has a good range of services and facilities and is the only village with a doctor's surgery and dentist. When assessing sites to meet the rural housing requirement access to services and facilities is part of the assessment. Taking into account the facilities available, it is considered that Mawsley is a suitable location for small scale growth.

	Through the site assessment work NCC Education has been consulted on provision for education. In Mawsley contributions would be sought towards Primary and Secondary education. The proposal would not set a precedent for development. The SSP2 will define a settlement boundary for Mawsley, development outside of the boundary would only be limited to exceptional circumstance. Views of local resident are noted; however the views of residents need to be balanced alongside the need to meet housing requirements set out in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy which identifies a requirement of 480 dwellings in the rural area 2011-2031. The SSP2 will allocate sites across the rural area to meet this requirement.
Id 82 (Objecting) – RA/174 MAW02 - **HOUSING ALLOCATIONS – ASSESSMENT OF ADDITIONAL SITES & UPDATE** We wish to register our very strong objection to the proposal RA174 to build **57 new houses** on the field bordering Birch Spinney, Malaslea and Cransley Rise. The plot of land is unsatisfactory and not appropriate for residential development for the following reasons:	Views of local resident are noted; however the views of residents need to be balanced alongside the need to meet housing requirements set out in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy which identifies a requirement of 480 dwellings in the rural area 2011-2031. The SSP2 will allocate sites across the rural area to meet this

• The developments take no account of the wishes of villagers as expressed through our previous successful objection to previous proposals to develop the land by the playing fields RA/115. (Localism Act 2011) • Our house and back garden will be subject to noise pollution both during and after the development. • It will make existing homes for sale more difficult to sell with the added competition from more new homes • Access to the site along Cransley Rise is very limited with insufficient room for vision splays. The access point is on a narrow bend on a sharp estate road and will be dangerous. • Cransley Rise is about to be adopted and construction traffic will damage the road - it has taken 10 years for the road to be top coated and we have put up with the disruption of construction for over 11 years. The current road layout will cause major traffic congestion. • Adverse effect on roads or highway safety, local traffic generation, working on the assumption that there is a minimum of 1 car/house and in many cases 2. Judging by the existing volume of traffic in the village and already nuisance parking on roads, we could see with 57 houses possibly 57-114 more cars, plus the impact on pedestrians, cyclists, road capacity. The junctions at the end of School Road where most of the traffic will be, is very poorly designed and clogged with parked cars • Road access in and out of the village is already very congested at rush hour due to limited employment opportunities in Mawsley - most people commute to work • The roundabout onto the A43 is already busy without additional traffic trying to negotiate the junction of what is a very busy carriage way - as it is the main road between Kettering & Northampton • Adverse impact on the size, form, character & setting of the village, especially if taken in combination with other developments • The pumping station is undersized and raw sewerage runs across the footpaths and into water courses • The broadband connection is very slow, the government is going to make it a human right that everyone has access to the internet - more residents will have a	requirement. Policy 8 of the JCS requires development to prevent both new and existing development from contributing to or being adversely effected by unacceptable levels of light or noise pollution. Policy 8 of the JCS also requires that development proposals do not result in an unacceptable impact on the amenities of future occupiers, neighbouring properties or the wider area, by reason of noise, vibration, smell, light or other pollution, loss of light or overlooking. In addition to this draft policy MAW02 requires proposals to have particular regard to the layout scale, height, design and massing of buildings and landscaping, in order to minimise amenity impact on neighbouring residential properties. Impact on sale of existing homes is not a material planning consideration. Through the site assessment work discussions have taken place with NCC highways regarding the suitability of gaining access to the site from Cransley Rise. NCC advised that they would be able to accept a loop road

detrimental impact on existing residents making it impossible for residents and businesses to work from the village • Mawsley school has already been expanded 3 times with the loss of valuable playing fields and playgrounds. There is no possibility of further expansion and there are already children living in the village who cannot get a place at the school. The additional houses would lead to a possible 57-144 children who would require a school place. In addition the crèche is oversubscribed and other groups like the scouts are also at maximum capacity. The children's Halloween and Christmas parties are also sold out so that some children cannot attend. At the consultation meeting I attended the Council representative tried to fob me off on this point about the end of the baby boom and falling birth rates. You cannot make this assumption that Mawsley conforms to the national trend - it doesn't. It is unacceptable for Mawsley children to leave the village to obtain a school education. • The current village facilities are already stretched and it is noticeable that making a doctors or dentists appointment is taking longer. Prompt service is no longer achievable or available. It is not feasible to build more homes and encourage people to live in a village where they cannot access the school, dentist or doctors. The local shop is overstretched and the roads choked with parked cars • Irreversible loss of valuable agricultural land. This area should remain for agricultural use in the way the farmer has always used the field, growing crops, for the benefit of the existing community • Loss of countryside view around which the layout of the village was designed . To build in this location takes away an amenity that all villager's share with views over open country. Taking away this amenity is no different to taking away the laying fields or pond • Irrevocable loss of wildlife habitat and negative impact on the populations of local birds and animals eg. Yellow Hammer, Red Kites, Field Fayres, Waxwings, Owls, Woodpeckers, Reed Buntings, Linnets, Foxes, Badgers, Deers, Bats & Monk-Jack Deer • Detriment to residential amenity • Revision to the **Core Spatial Strategy**, due to be adopted shortly by Kettering	serving a maximum of 50 dwellings without the need for Cransley Rise to be widened. The loop road would need to be 5.5 metres wide with 2x2metres footways in accordance with local highway authority standards and tracked for refuse vehicles opposed to a large family car. The detail of the access would be considered at planning application stage. NCC highways have been consulted through the site assessment process and in relation to the capacity of the highway network have assessed the impact as capacity limited or insufficient capacity but constraints can be overcome. If the site is progressed as an allocation an additional criteria will be added to the policy requiring proposals to be supported by a transport assessment and to mitigate the impact of development on the highway network. The site is a logical extension to the village and is surrounded on three sides by existing development. Draft policy MAW02 requires that the development be of a high standard of

Council will show they have a 5 year land bank • Policy 15 of North Northants Core Spatial Policy states that to meet local housing needs 30-40% more houses are needed for Kettering. Mawsley was originally 700 homes, this has been increased already by 300 homes to 1000- an increase of 42%. This proposal would mean a total 1357 homes which is a total increase of 51% - far in excess of the Core Spatial Policy. It was categorically stated from the beginning of the building of the village that the village would consist of 700 homes. We have taken our fair share of increased development for Kettering Borough Council • The need to avoid town cramming and over development • The infill expansion on the site undermines the characteristic layout of Mawsley and goes against the original ethos of the village and extends the village beyond the boundary lines unnecessarily • One of the unique design features of Mawsley is the design layout and this should be safeguarded. Mawsley was supposed to emulate the development of a typical Northamptonshire village with nooks and crannies. As such constraints on building design, replacement windows and doors, car parking provision to keep cars hidden and off the street support this. If this proposal goes ahead, Mawsley will become another suburb of Kettering and become a housing estate rather than a village • There is a possibility of development creep and urban crawl, the hatched area of the plan was also originally part of the new housing proposal. Whilst this has been dropped for now, it is hard to see how a precedent will be set for future infilling • New houses increase the strain on Police, Fire and Ambulance services • Increased flood risk to Malaslea and Birch Spinney, water pools in these fields in the winter and after heavy rain and once this is tarmacked over, risk of flooding will be a major concern • Little regard appears to have been paid to either the letter or the spirit of the Government's National Planning Policy Framework and we would like to draw the Council's attention to the aims behind those paragraphs most relevant to **Mawsley Core Planning Principles.** • **Paragraph 17** • **planning should empower local people to shape their surroundings, finding**	design and reflect the character, layout and density of the surrounding residential area. Through the site assessment work NCC Education has been consulted on provision for education. In Mawsley contributions would be sought towards Primary and Secondary education. The Rural Settlement Facilities Background Paper (update) (April 2018) sets out the facilities available in Mawsley. Mawsley has a good range of services and facilities and is the only village with a doctor's surgery and dentist. When assessing sites to meet the rural housing requirement access to services and facilities is part of the assessment. Taking into account the facilities available, it is considered that Mawsley is a suitable location for small scale growth. Agricultural land classification has been taken into account through the assessment process. This site is grade 3 agricultural land so is preferable to the development of grade 2 agricultural land.

ways to enhance and improve the places in which they live their lives. Comments already registered suggest that building on this site would be entirely at odds with the wishes of local residents. • **the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside should be recognised.** To allow further housing to be built on the site would degrade it bothy visually and as a wildlife corridor. does the Council not recognise this ? • **planning should contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment.** Planning to build 57 houses on this site would be contrary to this • **Promoting Healthy Communities** • **Paragraph 74** • **existing open space...should not be built on, unless...the land is surplus to requirements.** With an already increasing population, the land is agricultural and cannot be considered to be surplus to requirements • Paragraph 76 • Local communities should be able to identify for special protection green areas of particular importance to them. The objections have made it abundantly clear that this site is treasured • In conclusion, we believe the area under consideration must be rejected on the grounds that it does not accord with the way in which the National Planning Policy Framework is expected to be applied. If additional housing is required in Northamptonshire, it would be far preferable to build another new village designed like Mawsley or consider the brown filed sites around Kettering For all the above reasons we wish to register and you to acknowledge our very strong objection to RA/174. Mawsley was designed to be a village not an urban sprawl. The village has already been extended beyond the original scope and further houses would be counter-productive. The North Northamptonshire Development Company and the Daily Telegraph Best Village Aware cite the design layout of Mawsley as part of it's unique creation as a village rather than a housing estate. It is a village and has not become a rat run for commuters. There is no merit to the proposal and the existing facilities are overstretched. It is a wonderful village, with a fabulous community spirit and we feel strongly it must remain a village and not destroyed with more unwanted	Loss of a countryside view is not a material planning consideration. Draft policy MAW02 requires proposals to provide appropriate evidence of the ecological potential of the site. Policy 4 of the JCS requires a net gain in biodiversity to be sought. Policy 8 of the JCS also requires that development proposals do not result in an unacceptable impact on the amenities of future occupiers, neighbouring properties or the wider area, by reason of noise, vibration, smell, light or other pollution, loss of light or overlooking. In addition to this draft policy MAW02 requires proposals to have particular regard to the layout scale, height, design and massing of buildings and landscaping, in order to minimise amenity impact on neighbouring residential properties. The JCS has now been adopted. The Council does have a five year land supply; however the SSP2 will need to allocate sites to meet housing requirements up to 2031. While Mawsley is now bigger than

housing. Please do not build more houses in Mawsley village.	originally planned, the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy identifies a requirement for 480 dwellings in the rural area in the period 2011-31. The SSP2 will need to allocate sites across the rural area to meet this requirement. Groundwater flooding has been identified as a constraint in relation to this site, to address this a criteria has been added to Draft policy MAW02 which requires proposals to include a site specific Flood Risk Assessment which addresses groundwater flooding. Full regard has been had to the NPPF in developing the plan.
Id 85 (Objecting) – MAW02 - I strongly object to the proposed development for the following reasons: The current access from Cransley Rise/ School Road as you approach the junction at Loddington Way, is at most hours 'one way' due to parked cars(on the left). It is by no means equipped to cope with construction vehicles. As stated by several of the other residents, many of he roads/drains have yet to be adopted by Kettering Borough Council. Surely this should be dealt with as a matter of priority over any further development? The village has already been expanded beyond the original proposed number of dwellings and there generally seems to be numerous properties for sale at any given	Through the site assessment work discussions have taken place with NCC highways regarding the suitability of gaining access to the site from Cransley Rise. NCC advised that they would be able to accept a loop road serving a maximum of 50 dwellings without the need for Cransley Rise to be widened. The loop road would need to be 5.5 metres wide with 2x2metres footways in accordance with local highway authority standards and tracked for refuse vehicles opposed to a large family car. The detail of the

point. I would argue that there is no call for another 50 houses. Another 50 homes will add apply further pressure to the already strained infrastructure; school places, medical/dental practices and so forth.	access would be considered at planning application stage. Kettering Borough Council does not currently adopt roads or drains; these are adopted by Northamptonshire County Council and Anglian Water. While Mawsley is now bigger than originally planned, the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy identifies a requirement for 480 dwellings in the rural area in the period 2011-31. The SSP2 will need to allocate sites across the rural area to meet this requirement. The Rural Settlement Facilities Background Paper (update) (April 2018) sets out the facilities available in Mawsley. Mawsley has a good range of services and facilities and is the only village with a doctor's surgery and dentist. When assessing sites to meet the rural housing requirement access to services and facilities is part of the assessment. Taking into account the facilities available, it is considered that Mawsley is a suitable location for small scale growth.

	Through the site assessment work NCC Education has been consulted on provision for education. In Mawsley contributions would be sought towards Primary and Secondary education.
Id 86 (Objecting) – 1. Sewage treatment works and the foul sewage network not yet adopted by water supplier, annual flood risk at storage pond 2. Water supply network regularly disrupted completely due to leaks elsewhere in the system. 3. Vehicular, cycle and pedestrian access from Cransley Rise not sufficient for additional traffic 4. Local school at capacity 5. No of dwellings already significantly above original plans 6. Doctors surgery close to capacity, with additional registrations resulting in them being unable to dispense drugs, hence affecting funding and services 7. Entrance roads into village already heavy with traffic at peak times	Draft policy MAW02 requires that development proposals demonstrate that there is adequate capacity in the sewage treatment works and the foul sewage network and that there is adequate capacity in the water supply network. Through the site assessment work discussions have taken place with NCC highways regarding the suitability of gaining access to the site from Cransley Rise. NCC advised that they would be able to accept a loop road serving a maximum of 50 dwellings without the need for Cransley Rise to be widened. The loop road would need to be 5.5 metres wide with 2x2metres footways in accordance with local highway authority standards and tracked for refuse vehicles opposed to a large family car. The detail of the access would be considered at planning application stage. Through the site assessment work

	NCC Education has been consulted on provision for education. In Mawsley contributions would be sought towards Primary and Secondary education. While Mawsley is now bigger than originally planned, the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy identifies a requirement for 480 dwellings in the rural area in the period 2011-31. The SSP2 will need to allocate sites across the rural area to meet this requirement. The Rural Settlement Facilities Background Paper (update) (April 2018) sets out the facilities available in Mawsley. Mawsley has a good range of services and facilities and is the only village with a doctor's surgery and dentist. When assessing sites to meet the rural housing requirement access to services and facilities is part of the assessment. Taking into account the facilities available, it is considered that Mawsley is a suitable location for small scale growth. NCC highways have been consulted through the site assessment process

	and in relation to the capacity of the highway network have assessed the impact as capacity limited or insufficient capacity but constraints can be overcome. If the site is progressed as an allocation an additional criteria will be added to the policy requiring proposals to be supported by a transport assessment and to mitigate the impact of development on the highway network.
Id 91 (Objecting) – MAW02	Noted
Id 402 (Neither) - **RA/174:** This allocation is 0.3km from Birds Spinney and Mawsley Marsh SSSI. Since this allocation is for 50 houses, in a rural area, and is in such close proximity to the SSSI, we would regard the development as higher risk. Only discharges into mains sewers would be acceptable in this location. In addition, Natural England advise that recreational pressure in combination with that from RA/115 is considered. This is particularly in relation to informal footpaths running through the SSSI. We suggest that as a minimum, compensation by way of provision of Suitable Alternative Green Spaces (SANGS) is supplied at Mawsley to alleviate potential recreational pressures on the SSSI, which includes associated impact pathways such as dog fouling; in order to retain and improve the quality of its marsh habitat. In addition, we further advise that access to the site during construction should be carefully placed in order to minimise disturbance to the SSSI. These mitigation measures should be specified in the policy to ensure the policy is sound and in compliance with the NPPF (paragraph 175c revised NPPF).	The SSSI is located north of the site. There are no direct footpath links between Mawsley and the SSSI. There is a semi natural open space located to the south west of the site. The site provides the opportunity to connect the two ends of the cycle path in Mawsley enhancing the opportunity for recreation. An additional criteria will be added to the policy requiring proposals assess and mitigate impact on the SSSI.
Id 133 (Objecting) – RA/174 - I strongly object to these plans for the following reasons 1) Road adoption	Kettering Borough Council is not currently responsible for adopting roads. Road adoption is dealt with by Northamptonshire County Council.

-The roads in Mawsley are still not currently adopted. If any development would take place this would create a legal battle for the repair and maintenance of the existing roads with the previous developer and any potential new one. This could leave to the roads being left in an unsafe and unusable condition whilst a dispute was resolved. This in turn could result in large claims against the council for any damage to vehicles as a result of this dispute. Currently the existing developer takes responsibility for the roads and these should be adopted before any significant increase in throughput and weight which would be required to complete development of the site. -Access to the proposed site is via a sharp bend which is unsuitable for large vehicles and due to the residential nature there are vehicles on the road which could be damaged as a result of large unsuitable vehicles for residential area's passing. Typically heavy goods vehicles are restricted from entering residential area's so there should be a separate access route that does not result in large heavy vehicles passing through the village and this would also support the impacts to the un-adopted roads. -Safety of the children in the village Mawsley is a great community in which many children walk to school. Currently there is low levels of traffic and due to the nature of the roads (large tight bends) there is minimal large vehicles in the area. Any building work would require this and the roads are not suitable or safe for this especially given the number of children residing in Mawsley. Building sites also create dust and other air pollutants and this activity could also impact the health of residents whilst large scale development takes place in an established and settled village. Sewerage and water mains -Mawsley is already greater than the original planned number of homes and subsequently the infrastructure is already stretched to the point that it is unsuitable. Any additional dwellings would only create more usage and therefore the full infrastructure of all services for the whole village must be fully measured, validated and substantiated prior to any	NCC highways have been consulted through the site assessment process and in relation to the capacity of the highway network have assessed the impact as capacity limited or insufficient capacity but constraints can be overcome. If the site is progressed as an allocation an additional criteria will be added to the policy requiring proposals to be supported by a transport assessment and to mitigate the impact of development on the highway network. Any development on the site would need to conform to health and safety and construction standards. Draft policy MAW02 requires that development proposals demonstrate that there is adequate capacity in the sewage treatment works and the foul sewage network and that there is adequate capacity in the water supply network. Groundwater flooding has been identified as a constraint in relation to this site, to address this a criteria has

further homes being added Flood risk -Having recently moved to the village I was made aware that the proposed site has a flood risk due to the brook in the field. Living next to the proposed site I am shocked and deeply concerned that a site has been suggested with the only comments of a "risk assessment will be required" when the details of our searches from buying the property are available on public record and are therefore fully known to the council. This lack of responsibility to not raise this specific point as part of the application demonstrates a case of negligence as it is fully known and therefore irresponsible to put forward the site with full disclosure and highlighting of this risk. Privacy -Living on a plot immediately next to the proposed site raise significant concerns that any properties built would be overlooked by my own property. This would impact the privacy of those people who would live in this development and the design of the existing homes ensures this is kept to a minimum and such the layout of the surrounding homes to the site has been created on the basis that the area of land is not residential properties but agricultural land. Other land far more suitable -There are parts of land on the peripheral of the village that could be developed that would not impact the roads or cause issues for existing properties. These area's have not been put forward and the reasons would raise questions about the motives for the suggested site as the same landowner (a member of the Mawsley Parish Council) has chosen to not include these sites as possible where the proposed site would have a significant impact on the existing village and residents. This would need to be explored and explained to justify why this piece of land has been put forwards when there are more suitable ones on the edge of the village.	been added to Draft policy MAW02 which requires proposals to include a site specific Flood Risk Assessment which addresses groundwater flooding. Policy 8 of the JCS also requires that development proposals do not result in an unacceptable impact on the amenities of future occupiers, neighbouring properties or the wider area, by reason of noise, vibration, smell, light or other pollution, loss of light or overlooking. In addition to this draft policy MAW02 requires proposals to have particular regard to the layout scale, height, design and massing of buildings and landscaping, in order to minimise amenity impact on neighbouring residential properties. The Council has considered sites which have been promoted for development in Mawsley using a set of sustainability appraisal criteria, the site identified in the Draft Plan performs better than alternative sites which have been promoted when considered against these criteria.

Appendix 2n - Mawsley

Id 142 (Objecting) – Mawsley Village Cransley Rise Development - I would like to raise my objection to the Cransley Rise development. I moved here 15 years ago and we had years of heavy traffic speeding through the narrow roads of the village. All breathed a sigh of relief when the building work completed. Since then Mawsley has settled into a lovely village which is full to capacity. Adding extra hoses would put a strain on the already stretched resources. We now have no bus service to speak of and building extra houses would ensure that the roads would become even more congested and dangerous Mawsley should remain a village not become a town.	While Mawsley is now bigger than originally planned, the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy identifies a requirement for 480 dwellings in the rural area in the period 2011-31. The SSP2 will need to allocate sites across the rural area to meet this requirement. The Rural Settlement Facilities Background Paper (update) (April 2018) sets out the facilities available in Mawsley. Mawsley has a good range of services and facilities and is the only village with a doctor's surgery and dentist. When assessing sites to meet the rural housing requirement access to services and facilities is part of the assessment. Taking into account the facilities available, it is considered that Mawsley is a suitable location for small scale growth. NCC highways have been consulted through the site assessment process and in relation to the capacity of the highway network have assessed the impact as capacity limited or insufficient capacity but constraints can be overcome.

	If the site is progressed as an allocation an additional criteria will be added to the policy requiring proposals to be supported by a transport assessment and to mitigate the impact of development on the highway network.
Id 143 (Objecting) – 12.15.2 – 12.16.8	Noted
Id 144 (Objecting) – Mawsley – all development - I wish to express my strong objection to any further development in Mawsley for the time being. I feel that the village must be allowed to settle after so many years of on-going construction. Particularly as there are still roads and sewers to be adopted. Proposing further development at this stage is ridiculous. Plus, the access to public transport is becoming virtually non-existent so development in rural parts of the borough does not seem very sensible at all. I also have particular concerns about the site off Cransley Rise. The access point would be totally unsuitable and dangerous. It is also close to a SSSI which should be protected, not threatened by development. In addition, the area regularly becomes waterlogged so I fail to see how development in that field would not be at significant risk of flood. I would also like to echo a previous comment about Mawsley being far larger than originally intended and having already contributed far more than its fair share to local housing "needs". Not that I think there is much of a genuine need for more private homes, with so many new builds in the area going to special offer etc as nobody wants them!!	While Mawsley is now bigger than originally planned, the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy identifies a requirement for 480 dwellings in the rural area in the period 2011-31. The SSP2 will need to allocate sites across the rural area to meet this requirement. Limited bus services are available in the rural area; however the Council is still required to meet housing needs within these areas. Through the site assessment work discussions have taken place with NCC highways regarding the suitability of gaining access to the site from Cransley Rise. NCC advised that they would be able to accept a loop road serving a maximum of 50 dwellings without the need for Cransley Rise to be widened. The loop road would need to be 5.5 metres wide with 2x2metres

	footways in accordance with local highway authority standards and tracked for refuse vehicles opposed to a large family car. The detail of the access would be considered at planning application stage. The Birch Spinney and Mawsley Marsh SSSI is located approximately 360m north of the site. An additional criteria will be added to the policy requiring proposals to assess and mitigate impact on the SSSI. Groundwater flooding has been identified as a constraint in relation to this site, to address this a criteria has been added to Draft policy MAW02 which requires proposals to include a site specific Flood Risk Assessment which addresses groundwater flooding.
Id 154 (Objecting) – All - i am objecting in the strongest possible sense for various reasons which I shall provide step by step. 1. Although the village is well resourced in terms of facilities I.e. doctors and School, this is actually over subscribed as provides and is used by several of the surrounding villages such as Old and Walgrave to name just two - has this been considered. 2. As yet the roads are not adopted and have not been maintained and there are often queues to get in and out of the village and various people demonstrating dangerous parking and this will be compounded with further houses and no doubt additional vehicles. Has a review been undertaking at various times of day such as School finish,	The Rural Settlement Facilities Background Paper (update) (April 2018) sets out the facilities available in Mawsley. Mawsley has a good range of services and facilities and is the only village with a doctor's surgery and dentist. When assessing sites to meet the rural housing requirement access to services and facilities is part of the

early morning, late afternoons and evening 3. In pint 1i mentioned infrastructure but there is limited bus routes allowing people to travel for facilities that might not be available to them in the village as per point 1. 4. Access will be a problem with either needing to enter and exit the proposed areas through what could be a dangerous bend in the road or a quiet culdesac. 5. My biggest concern is that the field has flooded, where would this water escape to and would there be a potential flooding issues for not only the new houses but then also existing properties. Would guarantees be given and are the Council prepared for the potential litigation should this happen.	assessment. Taking into account the facilities available, it is considered that Mawsley is a suitable location for small scale growth. NCC highways have been consulted through the site assessment process and in relation to the capacity of the highway network have assessed the impact as capacity limited or insufficient capacity but constraints can be overcome. If the site is progressed as an allocation an additional criteria will be added to the policy requiring proposals to be supported by a transport assessment and to mitigate the impact of development on the highway network. Limited bus services are available in the rural area; however the Council is still required to meet housing needs within these areas. Through the site assessment work discussions have taken place with NCC highways regarding the suitability of gaining access to the site from Cransley Rise. NCC advised that they would be able to accept a loop road

	serving a maximum of 50 dwellings without the need for Cransley Rise to be widened. The loop road would need to be 5.5 metres wide with 2x2metres footways in accordance with local highway authority standards and tracked for refuse vehicles opposed to a large family car. The detail of the access would be considered at planning application stage. Groundwater flooding has been identified as a constraint in relation to this site, to address this a criteria has been added to Draft policy MAW02 which requires proposals to include a site specific Flood Risk Assessment which addresses groundwater flooding.
Id 174 (Objecting) - We wish to register our strong objection against the new developments in Mawsley. • Each time a proposition has occurred, the villagers have always expressed their objection to it taking place • We moved here with the hope of having a quiet village life, so further houses will go against the main principle of why we are here • The schools are over-subscribed, further houses will just cause more issues for our future generations of children • Some sections near the proposed land have difficulties parking, if you factor families visiting the new homes and the volume of cars in general from the new properties, this will just exacerbate it more • There are so many new developments in this local areas, do we really need more?	Views of local resident are noted; however the views of residents need to be balanced alongside the need to meet housing requirements set out in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy which identifies a requirement of 480 dwellings in the rural area 2011-2031. The SSP2 will allocate sites across the rural area to meet this requirement. Through the site assessment work NCC Education has been consulted on provision for education. In Mawsley

	contributions would be sought towards Primary and Secondary education. Policy 8 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy requires developments to make adequate provision for parking, the proposed development should not therefore impact on parking in the surrounding area.
Id 188 (Objecting) – 12.152, 12.153, 12.154, 12.155 - You state in your own outline plan the Mawsley is now complete, yet the majority of the roads remain unadopted and the grass verges and overgrown bushes and trees often having to be cut back by local residents, additional traffic will just increase wear and tear on the village roads. Our property has a clause in the deeds which specifically prevents us from parking in the street, local residents seem to ignore these clauses and the streets are already overly congested with parked cars, where it is suspected there should be none. The village is also approximately 200 houses larger than it was originally planned to be. Expanding the village will do nothing for the unique character referred to 12.153. The school has already been expanded a number of times, this expansion has resulted in a loss of space in the playing fields next to the school and further expansion to accommodate 50 more families will almost certainly necessitate expansion into the playing fields / playground and / or the inability to accommodate children locally. The roads are already too busy at school drop off and pick up times, and with the lack of adoption referred to above, parents and carers park their cars where they like with almost impunity, additional traffic will make the road safety issues worse and not better.	While Mawsley is now bigger than originally planned, the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy identifies a requirement for 480 dwellings in the rural area in the period 2011-31. The SSP2 will need to allocate sites across the rural area to meet this requirement. Policy 8 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy requires developments to make adequate provision for parking; the proposed development should not therefore impact on parking in the surrounding area. The site is a logical extension to the village and is surrounded on three sides by existing development. Draft policy MAW02 requires that the development be of a high standard of

	design and reflect the character, layout and density of the surrounding residential area. Through the site assessment work NCC Education has been consulted on provision for education. In Mawsley contributions would be sought towards Primary and Secondary education. NCC highways have been consulted through the site assessment process and in relation to the capacity of the highway network have assessed the impact as capacity limited or insufficient capacity but constraints can be overcome. If the site is progressed as an allocation an additional criteria will be added to the policy requiring proposals to be supported by a transport assessment and to mitigate the impact of development on the highway network.
Id 189 (Objecting) – 12.22 - The table contains incorrect information and is out of date. Idolz Hair Boutique closed years ago, there is now a pharmacy in its place. There is also a clothing shop present in the village in Barnwell Court. It is disappointing that proper research is not being conducted around plans which will change the lives of many villagers, especially those adjoining the proposed development who will suffer years of building site noise, and loss of the visual amenity of their	The facilities were correct at the point they were surveyed, however facilities do change over time. These will be updated in the next version of the Rural Settlement Facilities Background Paper.

properties permanently if this development is permitted. What other seemingly minor issues have been overlooked in drafting this plan?	
Id 192 (Objecting) – 12.11 Mawsley - This table is out of date and must be reviewed. Why have the writers of this document not considered this when putting the plan together. This gives me no confidence in any information provided by Kettering Borough Council	Noted
Id 196 (Objecting) – MAW02 a-k – a) The sewerage network would appear to be close to capacity, probably due to the general standard of construction employed within Mawsley at the build stage, seemingly by the lowest bidder and with the cheapest possible materials. We regularly experience a stench from the drains which can only be expected to get worse with an increase in demand on them with the addition of 50 or so new homes, our property is directly adjacent to the site so the likelihood of the sewerage system being directly affected is high. c) The roads around Cransley Rise are already difficult enough to drive through with cars and vans regularly parked on pavement outside houses and not in allocated spaces / areas. At times the entrance of school road is almost blocked by residents ability to park on the corners due to no double Yellow lines on junctions. There is a blind bend where the entrance to the proposed development will most likely be, the development will only make traffic worse not better. The entrance to the site will be on what is already a blind bend, this may not matter to the planners but living here the bend is already bad enough without trucks initially, and then 50-100 new cars needing to use the road to access the site. d) The cycleway is a minor consideration, and seemingly the lack of completion an error on the part of the original designers, using this development to justify it's completion is hardly justified, if the development happens the cycle way should be completed, however this will either mean routing it behind new houses on the edge of the development or through the centre, which will most likely mean on the roads, which is no improvement	Draft policy MAW02 requires that development proposals demonstrate that there is adequate capacity in the sewage treatment works and the foul sewage network. NCC highways have been consulted through the site assessment process and in relation to the capacity of the highway network have assessed the impact as capacity limited or insufficient capacity but constraints can be overcome. If the site is progressed as an allocation an additional criteria will be added to the policy requiring proposals to be supported by a transport assessment and to mitigate the impact of development on the highway network. Through the site assessment work discussions have taken place with NCC highways regarding the suitability of gaining access to the site from

over the current need to ride on roads to circle the entire village by bike. e) The build standard achieved by some (if not all) of the developers in Mawsley is attrocious, we use a number of local tradesmen who are kept constantly busy fixing the same issues in different houses around Mawsley, how to achieve a high standard when this was permitted to happen in the past, and seemingly signed off by inspectors should be questioned and further low quality building, especially that which affects infrastructure should be prevented. g) The Proposed site floods every year, developing it would need to ensure that the flood risk is not merely diverted to local properties and their risk increased, any developer should be required to compensate local property owners in the event their properties flood either during or post development. The site appears to be unsuitable for development without risk to existing property. h) We bought a property on the basis of it's surroundings in a village which this document refers to as complete, the visual impact on us will be immense, not to mention the potential for devaluation of our property (which we were told at the consultation event in Mawsley is something we just have to accept if permission is granted, as I pointed out at the event I am sure most of the people involved in this project would not welcome the thought of having for example a years worth of their salary wiped off the value of their home).	Cransley Rise. NCC advised that they would be able to accept a loop road serving a maximum of 50 dwellings without the need for Cransley Rise to be widened. The loop road would need to be 5.5 metres wide with 2x2metres footways in accordance with local highway authority standards and tracked for refuse vehicles opposed to a large family car. The detail of the access would be considered at planning application stage. Policy MAW02 requires provision of a cycle way, the intention is that this would be an off road cycle way. Groundwater flooding has been identified as a constraint in relation to this site, to address this a criteria has been added to Draft policy MAW02 which requires proposals to include a site specific Flood Risk Assessment which addresses groundwater flooding. Property prices are not a material planning consideration.
Id 197 (Objecting) – 12.156/ MAW01 - 12.156 There seems to be no credit given to the voice of the villagers who objected to the expansion of the village a number of years ago when an expansion was first discussed / consulted upon as an option by KBC, listening to the objections for all bar one site, which some would argue is the worst site it could possibly be, is just wrong.	Views of local resident are noted; however the views of residents need to be balanced alongside the need to meet housing requirements set out in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core

MAW01 b) Unless additional roads are added which to the road known locally as C31 (the link to the A43) how will connections to the countryside improve, unless this point is intended to imply less infrastructure related and more intangible things like views and access. The properties surrounding the site at the moment enjoy the visual amenity of the site ,as do many walkers / dog walkers / runners on a very regular basis. One only has to look at the Mawsley Facebook site to see regular pictures taken from the fence at the Cransley Rise end of this site in all weathers, mainly of sunsets and trees to appreciate that construction here will decimate that and the only properties which will benefit are those which will be constructed and not all on the periphery of the site, only those at the furthest end of the site from Cransley Rise will have open countryside access. c) At least 6 of the properties bordering the site face away from it and seemingly most of them want to expand into the site as their gardens flood and they are about to ask for planning permission to do so. e) The only sensible place to locate allotments on this site would be along the far edge away from Cransley Rise, failing that, not only would existing residents be burdened with housing at their front or back doors, but also the potential for allotments with their well known issues (lack of visual amenity, odours, increased theft risk, parking concerns) could be a factor for the existing local residents. The entire development will potentially result in lower local housing prices, more competition to sell existing houses, and a developer who will want the best return on their investment. Mawsley has the potential to be a great community, but KBC need to allow it to be finished first before considering any further development.	Strategy which identifies a requirement of 480 dwellings in the rural area 2011-2031. The SSP2 will allocate sites across the rural area to meet this requirement. Criteria b seeks to improve connections to the open countryside through pedestrian access, it doesn't seek to provide additional roads. Criteria c seeks to ensure that open space and roads are overlooked to provide natural surveillance. If allotments were provided on the site the location of these would be considered through the application process. Proposals could also make a financial contribution towards the provision of allotments off site.
Id 249 (Objecting) – MAW/02 Mawsley - We would like to strongly object to the 50 houses	While Mawsley is now bigger than originally planned, the North

development as proposed above. We do not understand why the village is being expanded again when there are no spaces at the School, the Drs or the Dentist. We are aware that because of these factors residents are having to search further a field for these facilities. The school is unable to expand anymore and when they did the children lost much needed space for them to play during break times and for their sporting activities to accommodate extra pupils. The parking on Cransley Rise to the right of Malaslea is very restrictive for the home owners on this stretch of road, particularly those that have 3 or more cars, and more often that not the cars are being parked along the bottom of our fore garden in Malaslea and along the blind bend on Cransley Rise. If there are no spaces in our street for other residents and visitors, cars are then being parked where they can on Cransley Rise which is not at all suitable, and I find it ridiculous that access to this development is proposed on this blind bend. I regularly watch heavier vehicles and oncoming traffic meeting on this bend and having to reverse back and forth to get round. The potential traffic in the mornings going up through Cransley Rise of what I can only assume would be an additional 100 cars plus if this development goes ahead seems very dangerous. In addition to this, children walking to and from school and having to cross either over at the top of Cransley Rise, or from Cransley Rise onto School Lane in the mornings is an accident waiting to happen as both of those roads will then become very very busy. If we are not allowed to put a zebra crossing outside the school how the hell are you going to make that junction safe? Even now, cars are parked in front of this junction all along School Road making turning in and out of Cransley Rise very difficult. Adding 50 houses that will use this road to exit the village will compromise this already dangerous junction and I for one would now not be happy for my children to navigate their way across those 2 roads on their own. I do not understand why another Mawsley style village cannot be built elsewhere? Mawsley is a unique village and people move here for the community that it has so proudly become, the fantastic school, the facilities, and the annual events that take place here. I for one would not be happy buying a new house here and then having to travel out	Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy identifies a requirement for 480 dwellings in the rural area in the period 2011-31. The SSP2 will need to allocate sites across the rural area to meet this requirement. The Rural Settlement Facilities Background Paper (update) (April 2018) sets out the facilities available in Mawsley. Mawsley has a good range of services and facilities and is the only village with a doctor's surgery and dentist. When assessing sites to meet the rural housing requirement access to services and facilities is part of the assessment. Taking into account the facilities available, it is considered that Mawsley is a suitable location for small scale growth. Policy 8 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy requires developments to make adequate provision for parking; the proposed development should not therefore impact on parking in the surrounding area. NCC highways have been consulted

of the village because we were not able to access services what would of not doubt of been sold to us as selling points to being here. When we brought our house 8 years ago it was sold to us on the basis that our view out of our house would not change and that the development was being finished off at the bottom of the village. I find it very arrogant that our concerns about loss of our picturesque view and devaluation of our property is something that I just have to accept and put up with.	through the site assessment process and in relation to the capacity of the highway network have assessed the impact as capacity limited or insufficient capacity but constraints can be overcome. If the site is progressed as an allocation an additional criteria will be added to the policy requiring proposals to be supported by a transport assessment and to mitigate the impact of development on the highway network. The strategy for development set out in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy focuses development at Kettering with some growth at the market towns and limited growth in the rural area. The number of dwellings being planned for through the SSP2 in the rural area is not large enough to deliver a new village. Loss of a view and property value are not material planning considerations.
Id 457 (Neither) - This note has been prepared on behalf of Home Farm Pytchley Ltd in relation to the draft Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan (SSP2) and is submitted to Kettering Borough Council for consideration. It is made in respect of Land to West of Mawsley (referred to as the Site from here on in)	This site is of a strategic scale and would result in a level of growth beyond that which would be envisaged in the hierarchy for development set out in the North Northamptonshire JCS for

which extends to circa 23.35 hectares and identified by Figure 1.1 below. Figure 1.1 Site Plan It is our belief that the proposed approach to housing delivery in the rural areas, including Mawsley would fail to meet the specific housing needs of the area. **The Site** The Site is located to the west of Mawsley and is currently in agricultural use. It is bound on its southern edge by the main access road to Mawsley and to the north and west by open countryside. The built of area of Mawsley lies to the east of the site. Mawsley is a new village and was developed in the mid 1990s through the previous Local Plan. It is the largest village in the rural areas and includes an excellent range of facilities including 2 retail units, 2 café/restaurants, health clinic, opticians, primary school, day nursery, dentist, community buildings and business units. It is a sustainable location for further growth and capable of accommodating a significant amount of additional development.	this location. Development of a site of this scale in this location would not conform to the hierarchy for development in the JCS. This site was considered through the Rural Masterplanning Work. The assessment concluded that the majority of the site is more than 800m from the village centre and that this was not considered a suitable location to expand the village.
Id 460 (Neither) - *3. Mawsley Section* Paragraph 12.162 refers to the housing allocation 'Land to West of Mawsley' and states built development should not extend beyond the north western extent of the site i.e. beyond Cransley Rise and Birch Spinney. Whilst this is a site specific policy, and not relevant to the Site promoted by these representations, we fundamentally disagree with the approach as it implies that development beyond the west of this area is unacceptable. Policy MAW02 should be amended so that it does not preclude development to the west of Mawsley, recognising the important contribution that this sustainable village can make to overall housing provision in the rural areas. Furthermore, the allocation of the Site would allow a natural progression of development to the west of Mawsley both now and in the next Local Plan period.	The site assessment for RA/174 – land to the west of Mawsley considered the impact of development of the existing character of the settlement and landscape. To mitigate the impact of development the assessment highlighted the need to ensure built development did not result in a significant extension to the current build form. The criteria in MAW02 is required for this reason. The settlement boundaries have been

Map 12.11 defines the settlement boundary for Mawsley where development may be permitted. This tightly defined boundary excludes many areas of developable land, including the Site and is clearly at odds with the allocation of Mawsley as the largest Category A village. Mawsley has the capacity to accommodate a far greater level of growth due to its existing facilities / services and should be expanded further to reflect this. Whilst it is noted that settlement boundaries are an appropriate mechanism for development plans, the SSP2 seems to have created a situation in Mawsley, and indeed the other Category A villages, where the village boundary is defined to support the positive planning for growth, and yet restricts it by leaving limited sites suitable for future development. The omission of the Site is a clear and obvious example of this. It is proposed that the settlement boundary be redrawn to include the Site for future development.	drawn using a set of principles which have been developed through consultation. The boundaries will include sites which are allocated for development. The purpose of settlement boundaries is to provide a clear distinction between the settlement and the open countryside. The SSP2 will identify enough land to meet housing requirements.
Id 462 (Neither) - Due to the scale of the village and its associated infrastructure, Mawsley can accommodate a significantly larger quantum of growth than currently planned for in the SSP2. Therefore, it is suggested that the rural housing strategy and allocations in SSP2 is reviewed and the Site is allocated for residential development on the basis that it is a sustainable location and a logical site for future growth. This will ensure that the Plan meets the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework. In addition to the allocation of the site, it is also suggested the Borough Council adjusts the village boundary to include the site so that it can be brought forward for development.	This site is of a strategic scale and would result in a level of growth beyond that which would be envisaged in the hierarchy for development set out in the North Northamptonshire JCS for this location. Development of a site of this scale in this location would not conform to the hierarchy for development in the JCS.
Id 265 (Objecting) - 12.11 Mawsley - I strongly object to this proposal for the following reasons • The field where the development is proposed regularly floods, not only from heavy rainfall but also a natural spring that appears periodically. Where will this water escape to and how will this be managed to prevent flooding to existing houses and	Groundwater flooding has been identified as a constraint in relation to this site, to address this a criteria has been added to Draft policy MAW02 which requires proposals to include a site specific Flood Risk Assessment which addresses groundwater flooding.

the new houses should these proposal be approved. • Whilst the village has doctors, dentist, school, some retail units, many of these are at capacity and couldn't service the needs of up to another 400 people (50 houses with 4 occupants each). Mawsley School has limited places available. I understand the school cannot be extended further to support the proposed development. The other local schools in the area Broughton, Walgrave, Loddington and Pytchley are all full or close to capacity and I don't believe would have space for the number of places required for this size of development. Already a number of village children attend these schools as they have been unable to obtain a place at Mawsley School. This will also impact the traffic in these villages as parents will be forced to drive their children to school. Have these schools been consulted or made aware of this proposal so that they can comment? The doctors provides a good service currently but should the village expand they too may become overstretched. I understand they are almost up to the maximum number of registrations they can take • The roads within the village are not yet adopted and therefore not maintained. There are already queues at peak times to get in and out of the village, this will be compounded with up to 50 further houses. Parking is already a problem at school drop off and pick up times, again these problems will increase with the number of houses proposed even if places were available. • Mawsley already has 200 more houses than was originally intended and planned for. There are currently 2074 properties (up to 3 bed) for sale within a 5 mile radius of Kettering so I would question why this proposal is needed. • it is my understanding that a third entrance to the village is not being considered to support this development and entrance would be via Cransley Rise, This is already a dangerous blind bend and to consider an access road here would not be in the best interests of the village. it would only be a matter of time before someone was killed or seriously injured. Parking is already a problem in Cransley Rise with cars	The Rural Settlement Facilities Background Paper (update) (April 2018) sets out the facilities available in Mawsley. Mawsley has a good range of services and facilities and is the only village with a doctor's surgery and dentist. When assessing sites to meet the rural housing requirement access to services and facilities is part of the assessment. Taking into account the facilities available, it is considered that Mawsley is a suitable location for small scale growth. NCC highways have been consulted through the site assessment process and in relation to the capacity of the highway network have assessed the impact as capacity limited or insufficient capacity but constraints can be overcome. If the site is progressed as an allocation an additional criteria will be added to the policy requiring proposals to be supported by a transport assessment and to mitigate the impact of development on the highway network.

already parking in neighbouring streets. • There is a strip of land that borders the proposal that is an SSS1 which should be protected, how can building up to 50 houses support this. This would have significant disruption to wildlife in this area and should not be allowed to happen. to summarise I strongly object to this proposal	While Mawsley is now bigger than originally planned, the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy identifies a requirement for 480 dwellings in the rural area in the period 2011-31. The SSP2 will need to allocate sites across the rural area to meet this requirement. Through the site assessment work discussions have taken place with NCC highways regarding the suitability of gaining access to the site from Cransley Rise. NCC advised that they would be able to accept a loop road serving a maximum of 50 dwellings without the need for Cransley Rise to be widened. The loop road would need to be 5.5 metres wide with 2x2metres footways in accordance with local highway authority standards and tracked for refuse vehicles opposed to a large family car. The detail of the access would be considered at planning application stage. There is no SSSI within the site. The Birch Spinney and Mawsley Marsh SSSI is located approximately 360m north of the site. An additional criteria will be added to the policy requiring proposals to assess and mitigate

	impact on the SSSI.
Id 266 (Objecting) – RA/174 Mawsley - I strongly object to the proposal for the following reasons • My house and back garden will be subject to noise pollution both during and after the proposed development. • My house and back garden will be subject to dust pollution during the development. I understand that construction sites have a duty to minimise this but when the wind blows across the proposed site, this will be impossible and could have health risks for those living nearby. • The proposed access road is on a blind bend and extremely dangerous. The current road layout will cause major disruption and construction traffic will not be able to access via Cransley Rise due to the road layout. • The a43 towards both Northampton and Kettering is already busy (and a designated red route) without additional traffic. Due to limited employment options within Mawsley, the majority of people commute to work. • The pumping station is undersized already for the size of the village. It will not cope with up to 50 more houses • Broadband connections is very slow as is mobile phone networks. They too will not cope with the proposal of up to 50 more houses. • Mawsley School does not have capacity for up to 100 more children. There are already children in the village who have to travel to other schools in the area for example Walgrave, Loddington, Broughton and Pytchley. Whilst they may be limited spaces none of these schools would be able to take this amount of children. if parents were forced to travel, this would have an impact on already busy roads • Current village facilities are stretched and a prompt appointment at the doctors is now rarely possible. • Loss of agricultural land, if all land is built on how will the future population grow crops. • Loss of countryside views around which the village layout was designed. Mawsley Village has a very unique design layout that should be preserved. The later developments in Orton Close are very different to those on the oldest part of the	Policy 8 of the JCS requires development to prevent both new and existing development from contributing to or being adversely effected by unacceptable levels of light or noise pollution. Policy 8 of the JCS also requires that development proposals do not result in an unacceptable impact on the amenities of future occupiers, neighbouring properties or the wider area, by reason of noise, vibration, smell, light or other pollution, loss of light or overlooking. In addition to this draft policy MAW02 requires proposals to have particular regard to the layout scale, height, design and massing of buildings and landscaping, in order to minimise amenity impact on neighbouring residential properties. Through the site assessment work discussions have taken place with NCC highways regarding the suitability of gaining access to the site from Cransley Rise. NCC advised that they would be able to accept a loop road serving a maximum of 50 dwellings without the need for Cransley Rise to be widened. The loop road would need

village. • Negative impact on the areas wildlife eg Red Kites, badger, foxes and deer to name a few. • As Mawsley was originally designed to be 700 homes and there is now approximately 1000 without any additional services I believe that the village has taken its share of additional development to support the housing needs. if this proposal goes ahead Mawsley will become another housing estate rather than a village. • If this proposal goes ahead building on this site underminds the character of the layout of Mawsley and goes against the ethos of the village as it extends beyond the original village boundary. • Increased risk of flooding to houses in Birch Spinney, Malaslea and Cransley Rise, there are frequently water pools in this area after rainfall and there is also an underground spring that appears periodically. • No consideration appears to have been given to the view of either the proposal in 2013 when a number of objections were raised to development of this site. I would like Kettering Borough Council to provide a response to why this is. This question was raised at the consultation meeting in early July and none of the council representatives in attendance could answer this. • There are parts of land on the peripheral of the village that could be developed that would not impact the roads or cause issues for existing properties. These area's have not been put forward and the reasons would raise questions about the motives for the suggested site as the same landowner (****) has chosen to not include these sites as possible where the proposed site would have a significant impact on the existing village and residents. This would need to be explored and explained to justify why this piece of land has been put forwards when there are more suitable ones on the edge of the village. to summarise I strongly object to this proposal	to be 5.5 metres wide with 2x2metres footways in accordance with local highway authority standards and tracked for refuse vehicles opposed to a large family car. The detail of the access would be considered at planning application stage. NCC highways have been consulted through the site assessment process and in relation to the capacity of the highway network have assessed the impact as capacity limited or insufficient capacity but constraints can be overcome. If the site is progressed as an allocation an additional criteria will be added to the policy requiring proposals to be supported by a transport assessment and to mitigate the impact of development on the highway network. Draft policy MAW02 requires that development proposals demonstrate that there is adequate capacity in the sewage treatment works and the foul sewage network and that there is adequate capacity in the water supply network. Using a central postcode in Mawsley

	the broadband speed checker indicates download speeds of 30.2 mbps and upload speeds of 32.7 mbps. This is high compared with many of the villages in the borough. Through the site assessment work NCC Education has been consulted on provision for education. In Mawsley contributions would be sought towards Primary and Secondary education. Agricultural land classification has been taken into account through the assessment process. This site is grade 3 agricultural land so is preferable to the development of grade 2 agricultural land. The site is a logical extension to the village and is surrounded on three sides by existing development. Draft policy MAW02 requires that the development be of a high standard of design and reflect the character, layout and density of the surrounding residential area. Loss of a countryside view is not a material planning consideration. Draft policy MAW02 requires proposals

	to provide appropriate evidence of the ecological potential of the site. Policy 4 of the JCS requires a net gain in biodiversity to be sought. While Mawsley is now bigger than originally planned, the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy identifies a requirement for 480 dwellings in the rural area in the period 2011-31. The SSP2 will need to allocate sites across the rural area to meet this requirement. Groundwater flooding has been identified as a constraint in relation to this site, to address this a criteria has been added to Draft policy MAW02 which requires proposals to include a site specific Flood Risk Assessment which addresses groundwater flooding. The Council has considered sites which have been promoted for development in Mawsley using a set of sustainability appraisal criteria, the site identified in the Draft Plan performs better than alternative sites which have been promoted when considered against these criteria.
Id 279 (Objecting) – RA/174 - We have chose Mawsley because of its village feel and location. The roads are narrow to alleviate excess speeding and allow careful	The scale of development proposed will not alter the village character of

consideration when driving around the village. We have moved from an area of great development and would hate to experience this again. In the future we would like our children to attend the local school. However, if a surplus of houses is built this will only lessen the chances of a quiet village life where we can walk to the school and back. I fear that with the added traffic before, during and after development pollution will only increase and therefore lower the standards of living for all of those in the village.	Mawsley or limit people's ability to walk around the village. NCC highways have been consulted through the site assessment process and in relation to the capacity of the highway network have assessed the impact as capacity limited or insufficient capacity but constraints can be overcome. If the site is progressed as an allocation an additional criteria will be added to the policy requiring proposals to be supported by a transport assessment and to mitigate the impact of development on the highway network.
Id 321 (Supporting) – RA/174 - j Provide appropriate evidence of the archaeological potential and significance of the site.	Noted
Id 335 (Objecting) – Mawsley – all - **HOUSING ALLOCATIONS – ASSESSMENT OF ADDITIONAL SITES & UPDATE** We wish to register our very strong objection to the proposal RA174 to build **new houses** on the field bordering Birch Spinney, Malaslea and Cransley Rise. The plot of land is unsatisfactory and not appropriate for residential development for the following reasons: • The developments take no account of the wishes of villagers as expressed through our previous successful objection to previous proposals to develop the land by the playing fields RA/115. (Localism Act 2011)	Views of local resident are noted; however the views of residents need to be balanced alongside the need to meet housing requirements set out in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy which identifies a requirement of 480 dwellings in the rural area 2011-2031. The SSP2 will allocate sites across the rural area to meet this requirement. Policy 8 of the JCS requires

• Given the lack of access, a significant part of the village ill experince much increased levels of noise, traffic and pollution duing the building phase • Access to the site along Cransley Rise is very limited with insufficient room for vision splays. The access point is on a narrow bend on a sharp estate road and will be dangerous. • The current road layout will cause major traffic congestion. • Adverse effect on roads or highway safety, local traffic generation, working on the assumption that there is a minimum of 1 car/house and in many cases 2. Judging by the existing volume of traffic in the village and already nuisance parking on roads, we could see with 57 houses possibly 57-114 more cars, plus the impact on pedestrians, cyclists, road capacity. The junctions at the end of School Road where most of the traffic will be, is very poorly designed and clogged with parked cars • Road access in and out of the village is already very congested at rush hour due to limited employment opportunities in Mawsley - most people commute to work • The roundabout onto the A43 is already busy without additional traffic trying to negotiate the junction of what is a very busy carriage way - as it is the main road between Kettering & Northampton • Adverse impact on the size, form, character & setting of the village, especially if taken in combination with other developments • The pumping station is undersized and raw sewerage runs across the footpaths and into water courses • The broadband connection is very slow, the government is going to make it a human right that everyone has access to the internet - more residents will have a detrimental impact on existing residents making it impossible for residents and businesses to work from the village • Mawsley school has already been expanded 3 times with the loss of valuable playing fields and playgrounds. There is no possibility of further expansion and there are already children living in the village who cannot get a place at the school. The additional houses would lead to a possible 57-144 children who would require a school place. In addition the crèche is oversubscribed and other groups like the scouts are also at maximum capacity. I understand that Mawsley has 5	development to prevent both new and existing development from contributing to or being adversely effected by unacceptable levels of light or noise pollution. Through the site assessment work discussions have taken place with NCC highways regarding the suitability of gaining access to the site from Cransley Rise. NCC advised that they would be able to accept a loop road serving a maximum of 50 dwellings without the need for Cransley Rise to be widened. The loop road would need to be 5.5 metres wide with 2x2metres footways in accordance with local highway authority standards and tracked for refuse vehicles opposed to a large family car. The detail of the access would be considered at planning application stage. NCC highways have been consulted through the site assessment process and in relation to the capacity of the highway network have assessed the impact as capacity limited or insufficient capacity but constraints can be overcome. If the site is progressed as an

times the national average of children under 10 at this time, which means that previous planning decisions re school age childrn amenity pvisions were woefully under resourced. • The current village facilities are already stretched and it is noticeable that making a doctors or dentists appointment is taking longer. Prompt service is no longer achievable or available. It is not feasible to build more homes and encourage people to live in a village where they cannot access the school, dentist or doctors. • Irreversible loss of valuable agricultural land. This area should remain for agricultural use in the way the farmer has always used the field, growing crops, for the benefit of the existing community • Loss of countryside view around which the layout of the village was designed . To build in this location takes away an amenity that all villager's share with views over open country. Taking away this amenity is no different to taking away the playing fields or pond • Irrevocable loss of wildlife habitat and negative impact on the populations of local birds and animals eg. Yellow Hammer, Red Kites, Field Fayres, Waxwings, Owls, Woodpeckers, Reed Buntings, Linnets, Foxes, Badgers, Deers, Bats & Monk-Jack Deer • Revision to the **Core Spatial Strategy**, due to be adopted shortly by Kettering Council will show they have a 5 year land bank • Policy 15 of North Northants Core Spatial Policy states that to meet local housing needs 30-40% more houses are needed for Kettering. Mawsley was originally 700 homes, this has been increased already by 300 homes to 1000- an increase of 42%. This proposal would mean a total 1357 homes which is a total increase of 51% - far in excess of the Core Spatial Policy. It was categorically stated from the beginning of the building of the village that the village would consist of 700 homes. We have taken our fair share of increased development for Kettering Borough Council • The infill expansion on the site undermines the characteristic layout of Mawsley and goes against the original ethos of the village and extends the village beyond the boundary lines unnecessarily • One of the unique design features of Mawsley is the design layout and this should	allocation an additional criteria will be added to the policy requiring proposals to be supported by a transport assessment and to mitigate the impact of development on the highway network. The site is a logical extension to the village and is surrounded on three sides by existing development. Draft policy MAW02 requires that the development be of a high standard of design and reflect the character, layout and density of the surrounding residential area. Draft policy MAW02 requires that development proposals demonstrate that there is adequate capacity in the sewage treatment works and the foul sewage network and that there is adequate capacity in the water supply network. Using a central postcode in Mawsley the broadband speed checker indicates download speeds of 30.2 mbps and upload speeds of 32.7 mbps. This is high compared with many of the villages in the borough. Through the site assessment work

be safeguarded. Mawsley was supposed to emulate the development of a typical Northamptonshire village with nooks and crannies. As such constraints on building design, replacement windows and doors, car parking provision to keep cars hidden and off the street support this. If this proposal goes ahead, Mawsley will become another suburb of Kettering and become a housing estate rather than a village • There is a possibility of development creep and urban crawl, the hatched area of the plan was also originally part of the new housing proposal. Whilst this has been dropped for now, it is hard to see how a precedent will be set for future infilling • Increased flood risk to Malaslea and Birch Spinney, water pools in these fields in the winter and after heavy rain and once this is tarmacked over, risk of flooding will be a major concern • Little regard appears to have been paid to either the letter or the spirit of the Government's National Planning Policy Framework and we would like to draw the Council's attention to the aims behind those paragraphs most relevant to **Mawsley Core Planning Principles.** • **Paragraph 17** • **planning should empower local people to shape their surroundings, finding ways to enhance and improve the places in which they live their lives.** Comments already registered suggest that building on this site would be entirely at odds with the wishes of local residents. • **the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside should be recognised.** To allow further housing to be built on the site would degrade it bothy visually and as a wildlife corridor. does the Council not recognise this ? • **planning should contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment.** Planning to build 57 houses on this site would be contrary to this • **Promoting Healthy Communities** • **Paragraph 74** • **existing open space...should not be built on, unless...the land is surplus to requirements.** With an already increasing population, the land is agricultural and cannot be considered to be surplus to requirements • Paragraph 76 • Local communities should be able to identify for special protection green areas of	NCC Education has been consulted on provision for education. In Mawsley contributions would be sought towards Primary and Secondary education. The Rural Settlement Facilities Background Paper (update) (April 2018) sets out the facilities available in Mawsley. Mawsley has a good range of services and facilities and is the only village with a doctor's surgery and dentist. When assessing sites to meet the rural housing requirement access to services and facilities is part of the assessment. Taking into account the facilities available, it is considered that Mawsley is a suitable location for small scale growth. Agricultural land classification has been taken into account through the assessment process. This site is grade 3 agricultural land so is preferable to the development of grade 2 agricultural land. Loss of a countryside view is not a material planning consideration. Draft policy MAW02 requires proposals to provide appropriate evidence of the

particular importance to them. The objections have made it abundantly clear that this site is treasured • For all the above reasons I wish to register and you to acknowledge the very strong objection to RA/174.	ecological potential of the site. Policy 4 of the JCS requires a net gain in biodiversity to be sought. The JCS has now been adopted. The Council does have a five year land supply; however the SSP2 will need to allocate sites to meet housing requirements up to 2031. While Mawsley is now bigger than originally planned, the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy identifies a requirement for 480 dwellings in the rural area in the period 2011-31. The SSP2 will need to allocate sites across the rural area to meet this requirement. Groundwater flooding has been identified as a constraint in relation to this site, to address this a criteria has been added to Draft policy MAW02 which requires proposals to include a site specific Flood Risk Assessment which addresses groundwater flooding. Full regard has been had to the NPPF in developing the plan.
Id 336 (Objecting) 12.153	Noted
Id 338 (Objecting) – RA174 - Mawsley is a beautiful village with the correct balance of facilities, infrastructure and services as the village stands. The village has already	The scale of development proposed will not alter the village character of

expanded beyond what was discussed on more than one occasion. The roads are now heavily restricted with arms parking in unsafe locations due to lack of parking. Most of the roads are not yet adopted causing issues also. The school is unable to expand anymore and is a hugely important feature of the village. Sewers are near maximum capability with the added strain.unknown what affects this would cause. Public transport has been cut back further so residents have been forced to use their own transport adding more vehicles on the road. Northamptonshire as a county needs to keep hold of its green land. Mawsley is no different to this, soon it will be swallowed up with housing and roads reducing the village identity.	Mawsley. While Mawsley is now bigger than originally planned, the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy identifies a requirement for 480 dwellings in the rural area in the period 2011-31. The SSP2 will need to allocate sites across the rural area to meet this requirement. The Rural Settlement Facilities Background Paper (update) (April 2018) sets out the facilities available in Mawsley. Mawsley has a good range of services and facilities and is the only village with a doctor's surgery and dentist. When assessing sites to meet the rural housing requirement access to services and facilities is part of the assessment. Taking into account the facilities available, it is considered that Mawsley is a suitable location for small scale growth.
Id 339 (Neither) – paragraph 12.156 - Site RA/115 – Land adjacent to Mawsley, was identified by the Council as a potential site for some small-scale growth and in this regard has been promoted through the Councils call for sites, as acknowledged in paragraph 12.156. However, site RA/115 has been discounted and the SSP2 proposes site RA/174 – Land to the west of Mawsley as the preferred site for allocation.	The Housing Allocations Background Paper (February 2012) sets out the criteria for assessing the sites. The Assessment under the heading 'water conservation and management' assesses location in flood risk zones 1,

Appendix 2n - Mawsley

According to the Background Paper: Settlement Boundaries (Update) April 2018, Site RA/115 has been discounted as a housing option due to the potential access to the site. Which according to the Council *"access into the site is a significant issue and a satisfactory solution has not been provided".* In order to establish the merits of a site a coloured traffic light system is used. Each site has been assessed against a category and given either green, yellow or red status. In this regard Site RA/174 – Land to the west of Mawsley, resulted in: - 4 red, 10 amber, 14 Green. Site RA/115 – Land adjacent to Mawsley resulted in:- 5 red, 10 amber, 13 Green. With the only difference between the two sites being access to highway. WS have analysed both the Council's traffic light assessments for the two sites and consider that the weight afforded to the traffic light system has not been equally applied. In particular, under the heading 'water conservation and management', the assessment for site RA/174 - Land to the West of Mawsley states: "South eastern half of the site is at high risk of groundwater flooding". This assessment has then been given a 'green' status. Clearly the assessment should have been given red status. Under the same heading the assessment for site RA/115 – Land adjacent to Mawsley, there is no concerns raised as the site is not in a flood zone 2 or 3 or likely to have any risk of ground water flooding. However, this is also, rightly so, given a 'green' status. Given that site RA/174 has a high risk of ground water flooding, it is considered that at the very least under the traffic light system, this assessment should receive an red/amber	2 or 3, both sites are located in flood zone 1 and therefore the assessment of both sites is correct. Risk of groundwater flooding is noted under this section but this is not the criteria for the site scoring. Groundwater flooding has been identified as a constraint in relation to this site, to address this a criteria has been added to Draft policy MAW02 which requires proposals to include a site specific Flood Risk Assessment which addresses groundwater flooding. Comments relating to the community benefits of this scheme are noted. While it is stated that access can be achieved by providing access across the community centre car park, no evidence has been provided to demonstrate that this can be achieved. This option requires the use of third party land and it is not clear whether any agreement has been reached with third parties which would allow the development to be accessed across this land.

status. Section 14 of the NPPF (2018) is concerned with planning and flood risk, paragraph 158 states "*The aim of the sequential test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding. Development should not be allocated or permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower risk of flooding. The strategic flood risk assessment will provide the basis for applying this test. The sequential approach should be used in areas known to be at risk now or in the future from any form of flooding".* Paragraph 160 & 161 state: "The application of the exception test should be informed by a strategic or site-specific flood risk assessment, depending on whether it is being applied during plan production or at the application stage. For the exception test to be passed it should be demonstrated that: a) the development would provide wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh the flood risk; and b) the development will be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and, where possible, will reduce flood risk overall. Both elements of the exception test should be satisfied for development to be allocated or permitted". Therefore, if a site is known to have a high risk of flooding it is for the Council to quantify this prior to the allocation of any site for development. This crucial procedure has not been undertaken and therefore the assessments have not been positively prepared correctly and as stated above at the very least the site should be afforded a red status.	

It is noted that a flood risk document is submitted with the background papers for SSP2, however, this document is dated February 2012, which pre dates the NPPF and is not site specific, having been published prior to the sites coming forward. In addition, under the heading 'community' site RA/174 – Land to the west of Mawsley the assessment states *"scope to provide comprehensive linear park/buffer and cycle route"* and given a green status. Under the same heading for the site RA/115 – Land adjacent to Mawsley nothing has been stated and this has been given an amber status. However, plans were submitted to the Council and the Parish Council, setting out provisions for an allotment and more recently additional parking for the existing community facilities and an improved outside play area for the existing day nursery. As set out in paragraph 12.167 of the SSP2, there is an identified need for allotment provision in Mawsley and therefore this site would provide a much-needed community benefit. The site would also be able to provide potential pedestrian access to and from the site from Paddock End and provide a link to the existing footpath which would connect to/from Main Street into the development and to the countryside to the east. Site RA/115 therefore can provide significant benefits to the community and should be afforded a green status. Access, to site RA/115 – Land to adjacent to Mawsley, is proposed via the existing community building car park. Any loss of parking would be replaced within the site together with additional parking spaces. Access via this area is considered a viable option and as such under the Infrastructure assessment should be afforded an orange status. The Council's assessment that the access into the site is a significant issue is incorrect. Therefore, just based on these observations, this would alter the sites assessment to RA/174 – Land to the west of Mawsley,	

5 red, 10 amber, 14 green. Site RA/115 – Land adjacent to Mawsley 4 red, 10 amber, 14 green. Therefore, we consider that Site RA/115 – Land adjacent to Mawsley, is an option for small scale growth and should been considered further in the SSP2	
Id 340 (Objective) 12.11, 12.152, 12.154/ RA/174 - I strongly object. 12.152 - Mawsley village is defined as complete therefore it is irrational to suggest that further development is needed. 12.153 - the design of the roads are inadequate to support increased traffic.Street parking on Cransley Rise is already a safety problem. The size of the houses on the upper part of CR are famly houses with teenagers which mean many houses have more than two cars. Cars park on the street, blocking junctions, and lines of sight around corners. CR also has an island at its top end which means that when a car parks on CR an emergency vehicle is already unlikely to be able to proceed down CR. There is no public transport during the core day, meaning no access out of village for those working or for older residents to access services such as hospitals outside the village. 12.154 - the local school is already oversubscribed on current local population so cannot support further growth in the village. Local secondary schools rated 'good' are over subscribed and have projected they will be over subscribed for the next 10 years, so again cannot support additional growth. This means children in any new houses will have to attend OFSTEAD rated RI schools and have no choice.	The reference to Mawsley being complete is in relation to the fact that the village as planned has now been built out. However, the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy identifies a requirement for 480 dwellings in the rural area in the period 2011-31. The SSP2 will need to allocate sites across the rural area to meet this requirement. NCC highways have been consulted through the site assessment process and in relation to the capacity of the highway network have assessed the impact as capacity limited or insufficient capacity but constraints can be overcome. If the site is progressed as an allocation an additional criteria will be added to the policy requiring proposals to be supported by a transport assessment and to mitigate the impact

	of development on the highway network. Housing allocations to meet requirements set out in the North Northamptonshire JCS need to be identified; Ofstead rating of schools is not a reason for not meeting housing requirements.
Id 344 (Objecting) – All - I strongly object to the RA174 proposal to build **new houses** on the field bordering Birch Spinney, Malaslea and Cransley Rise. The plot of land is unsatisfactory and not appropriate for residential development for the following reasons: • The developments take no account of the wishes of villagers as expressed through our previous successful objection to previous proposals to develop the land by the playing fields RA/115. (Localism Act 2011) • Roads have not been adopted despite the age of the village and the village building phase supposed to have been completed • Given the lack of access, a significant part of the village ill experince much increased levels of noise, traffic and pollution duing the building phase • Access to the site along Cransley Rise is very limited with insufficient room for vision splays. The access point is on a narrow bend on an estate road and will be dangerous. • The current road layout will cause major traffic congestion. • Adverse effect on roads or highway safety, local traffic generation, working on the assumption that there is a minimum of 1 car/house and in many cases 2. Judging by the existing volume of traffic in the village and already nuisance parking on roads, we could see with 57 houses possibly 57-114 more cars, plus the impact on pedestrians, cyclists, road capacity. The junctions at the end of School Road where most of the traffic will be, is very poorly designed and clogged with parked	Views of local resident are noted; however the views of residents need to be balanced alongside the need to meet housing requirements set out in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy which identifies a requirement of 480 dwellings in the rural area 2011-2031. The SSP2 will allocate sites across the rural area to meet this requirement. Policy 8 of the JCS requires development to prevent both new and existing development from contributing to or being adversely effected by unacceptable levels of light or noise pollution. Through the site assessment work discussions have taken place with NCC highways regarding the suitability of gaining access to the site from Cransley Rise. NCC advised that they

cars • Road access in and out of the village is already very congested at rush hour due to limited employment opportunities in Mawsley - most people commute to work • The roundabout onto the A43 is already busy without additional traffic trying to negotiate the junction of what is a very busy carriage way - as it is the main road between Kettering & Northampton • Adverse impact on the size, form, character & setting of the village, especially if taken in combination with other developments • The pumping station is undersized and raw sewerage runs across the footpaths and into water courses • The broadband connection is very slow, the government is going to make it a human right that everyone has access to the internet - more residents will have a detrimental impact on existing residents making it impossible for residents and businesses to work from the village • Mawsley school has already been expanded 3 times with the loss of valuable playing fields and playgrounds. There is no possibility of further expansion and there are already children living in the village who cannot get a place at the school. The additional houses would lead to a possible 57-144 children who would require a school place. In addition the crèche is oversubscribed and other groups like the scouts are also at maximum capacity. I understand that Mawsley has 5 times the national average of children under 10 at this time, which means that previous planning decisions re school age children amenity provisions were woefully under resourced. • The current village facilities are already stretched and it is noticeable that making a doctors or dentists appointment is taking longer. Prompt service is no longer achievable or available. It is not feasible to build more homes and encourage people to live in a village where they cannot access the school, dentist or doctors. • Irreversible loss of valuable agricultural land. This area should remain for agricultural use in the way the farmer has always used the field, growing crops, for the benefit of the existing community • Irrevocable loss of wildlife habitat and negative impact on the populations of local birds and animals eg. Yellow Hammer, Red Kites, Field Fayres, Waxwings, Owls,	would be able to accept a loop road serving a maximum of 50 dwellings without the need for Cransley Rise to be widened. The loop road would need to be 5.5 metres wide with 2x2metres footways in accordance with local highway authority standards and tracked for refuse vehicles opposed to a large family car. The detail of the access would be considered at planning application stage. NCC highways have been consulted through the site assessment process and in relation to the capacity of the highway network have assessed the impact as capacity limited or insufficient capacity but constraints can be overcome. If the site is progressed as an allocation an additional criteria will be added to the policy requiring proposals to be supported by a transport assessment and to mitigate the impact of development on the highway network. The site is a logical extension to the village and is surrounded on three sides by existing development. Draft policy MAW02 requires that the

Woodpeckers, Reed Buntings, Linnets, Foxes, Badgers, Deers, Bats & Monk-Jack Deer • Revision to the **Core Spatial Strategy**, due to be adopted shortly by Kettering Council will show they have a 5 year land bank • Policy 15 of North Northants Core Spatial Policy states that to meet local housing needs 30-40% more houses are needed for Kettering. Mawsley was originally 700 homes, this has been increased already by 300 homes to 1000- an increase of 42%. This proposal would mean a total 1357 homes which is a total increase of 51% - far in excess of the Core Spatial Policy. It was categorically stated from the beginning of the building of the village that the village would consist of 700 homes. • The infill expansion on the site undermines the characteristic layout of Mawsley and goes against the original ethos of the village and extends the village beyond the boundary lines unnecessarily • Increased flood risk to Malaslea and Birch Spinney, water pools in these fields in the winter and after heavy rain and once this is tarmacked over, risk of flooding will be a major concern • Little regard appears to have been paid to either the letter or the spirit of the Government's National Planning Policy Framework and we would like to draw the Council's attention to the aims behind those paragraphs most relevant to Mawsley Core Planning Principles. • Paragraph 17 - planning should empower local people to shape their surroundings, finding ways to enhance and improve the places in which they live their lives. Comments already registered suggest that building on this site would be entirely at odds with the wishes of local residents. • The intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside should be recognised. To allow further housing to be built on the site would degrade it both visually and as a wildlife corridor. • Planning should contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment. Planning to build 57 houses on this site would be contrary to this • Paragraph 74 - existing open space...should not be built on, unless...the land is surplus to requirements. With an already increasing population, the land is	development be of a high standard of design and reflect the character, layout and density of the surrounding residential area. Draft policy MAW02 requires that development proposals demonstrate that there is adequate capacity in the sewage treatment works and the foul sewage network. Using a central postcode in Mawsley the broadband speed checker indicates download speeds of 30.2 mbps and upload speeds of 32.7 mbps. This is high compared with many of the villages in the borough. Through the site assessment work NCC Education has been consulted on provision for education. In Mawsley contributions would be sought towards Primary and Secondary education. When assessing sites to meet the rural housing requirement access to services and facilities is part of the assessment. Taking into account the facilities available, it is considered that Mawsley is a suitable location for small scale growth.

agricultural and cannot be considered to be surplus to requirements	Agricultural land classification has been taken into account through the assessment process. This site is grade 3 agricultural land so is preferable to the development of grade 2 agricultural land. Draft policy MAW02 requires proposals to provide appropriate evidence of the ecological potential of the site. Policy 4 of the JCS requires a net gain in biodiversity to be sought. The JCS has now been adopted. The Council does have a five year land supply; however the SSP2 will need to allocate sites to meet housing requirements up to 2031. While Mawsley is now bigger than originally planned, the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy identifies a requirement for 480 dwellings in the rural area in the period 2011-31. The SSP2 will need to allocate sites across the rural area to meet this requirement. The site is a logical extension to the village and is surrounded on three sides by existing development. Draft policy MAW02 requires that the

	development be of a high standard of design and reflect the character, layout and density of the surrounding residential area. Groundwater flooding has been identified as a constraint in relation to this site, to address this a criteria has been added to Draft policy MAW02 which requires proposals to include a site specific Flood Risk Assessment which addresses groundwater flooding. Full regard has been had to the NPPF in developing the plan.
Id 346 (Objecting) – RA/174 Land west of Cransley Rise - As this is at consultation stage, I see little point in going into further technical detail on services infrastructure etc, but I am mindful of many meetings when I was a member of the local parish council and multiple issues regarding sewage and other services where residents have never been given assurances that these have been properly addressed. Clearly adding additional housing can only exacerbate this problem. My view, I believe, is held by many people in the village and is centred on impact. We have already seen our village grow from its original plan to well over 900 houses and it could well be argued that we have effectively "done our bit" to provide additional rural housing. Given that we are talking in terms of 50 houses, the impact on building these houses on a larger plan development in Kettering or elsewhere would be virtually unnoticeable, whereas it would be very significant in in the village of Mawsley. I would also question why the proposed allocation of land to build 50 additional houses in Mawsley is higher than larger , less developed villages in the area?	Draft policy MAW02 requires that development proposals demonstrate that there is adequate capacity in the sewage treatment works and the foul sewage network and that there is adequate capacity in the water supply network. The dwellings proposed are to meet the rural requirement, Kettering and the market towns have separate requirements. The scale of the proposal for Mawsley is reflective of the services and facilities available in the village when compared

	to smaller villages in the borough.
Id 348 (Objecting) - 12.11; 12152; 12.153; 12.154, 12.161- 12.165 , RA/174 - The building plan does not meet the design principles as follows: a) the nature of the existing development around Cransley Rise (CR) and Birch Spinney (BS) is for larger family homes. looking at the plans of the existing development , and keeping any future development in line with nature of area, the area of RA/174 could support a maximum of 15-20 like-sized large family dwellings. 50 houses could only be accommodated if these were smaller, tightly packed small houses or flats. This is not in keeping with the existing development and is therefore contrary to design principles so must be rejected at first instance. In addition there has been no evidence to indicate that larger family homes are needed to meet the projected housing need. Developing smaller houses is illogical in this settling due to lack of any pubic transport during the core day, and lack of access to growing employment, education and health care services. b) any development will not have any positive impact on connection with the existing countryside and in fact will reduce the enjoyment of the countryside for the existing villagers. There is no provision for any additional road links to connect to/from or with the countryside. The cycle track could be completed wholly independently of any housing development. c) any development will be overlooked by existing development, and as the RA/174 is currently bounded by CR and BS there is no opportunity for most of the development to front onto streets or open spaces. d) no commnt e) this plan is wholly independent of any decision on allotment provision so it is illogical to suggest the planning development will contribute to allotment provision. The issue if allotment provision is currently at an impasse with no workable solutions therefore disingenuous to suggest otherwise.	The proposed development would need to provide a mix of housing in accordance with policy 30 of the JCS. Draft policy MAW02 requires that the development be of a high standard of design and reflect the character, layout and density of the surrounding residential area. Detail of the size and mix of housing would be determined through the planning application process. The requirements of policy MAW01 apply to all proposals in Mawsley, criteria b. would need to be applied where there are particular opportunities to connect the settlement to the countryside. Development would only be required to front onto open spaces where there is open space to front onto. There will be streets and open space within the proposed development which development would be expected to front on to. Criteria e has been added to enable development to contribute to the provision of allotments where appropriate.

Id 353 (Objecting) - 12.11; 12152; 12.153; 12.154, 12.161- 12.165 , RA/174 - I strongly object t this development. The allocated land cannot support up to 50 houses and be in keeping with exisitign development. Teh surrroundign development is large family houses, and the maximum this strip of land could accommodate would be 10-15 large family houses, for which there is no evidence of need. In addition, any development does not meet the planning policy requirements as follows a)Anglian Water have already raised the issue f ongoing legal action with regard to the water treatment works and therefore it is unreasonable for any further decision to be taken until this is resolved. b) as above c) Cransley Rise is unsuitable for vehicular access. Parking is already a problem meaning that junctions and sight lines around corners are already blocked. Access to the site would be via the existent farm gates, adjacent to my property and a safe sight line is not possible without pulling out immediately onto a blind bend. e) 50 houses is not in keeping with the density of existing surrounding housing. An approximate overay of RA/174 with existing development suggest a max of 10-15 large family houses is all that is possible, evidence by the existing gap in the numbering of Cransley rise. f) no comment g) this land already regularly floods . I live adjacent to the plot and have had to have additional drainage put into the ground to protect from waterlogging. The land is lower than existing development so would attract run off from surrounding land.	The proposed development would need to provide a mix of housing in accordance with policy 30 of the JCS. Draft policy MAW02 requires that the development be of a high standard of design and reflect the character, layout and density of the surrounding residential area. Detail of the size and mix of housing would be determined through the planning application process. The development principles are drafted to ensure that development proposals address the issues identified through the site assessment process. Until a proposal is submitted it is not possible to assess whether the requirements of the policy have been met. Draft policy MAW02 requires that development proposals demonstrate that there is adequate capacity in the sewage treatment works and the foul sewage network. Through the site assessment work discussions have taken place with NCC highways regarding the suitability of gaining access to the site from Cransley Rise. NCC advised that they would be able to accept a loop road

h) 50 houses does not take into account any existing parameters set out in relation to existing properties, and in fact blatently ignores these. i) the land is an active farm land, farmed for crops for the food chain and is a welcome part of village life. Farming activity encourages, promotes and sustains a wide range of wildlife, which would be displaced by housing development. j) - no comment k) there is no evidence this plan has fully complied with other required polices and seems to be a bit of a land sale for profit with alleged significant conflicts of interest in the decision making structures due to the people involved.	serving a maximum of 50 dwellings without the need for Cransley Rise to be widened. The loop road would need to be 5.5 metres wide with 2x2metres footways in accordance with local highway authority standards and tracked for refuse vehicles opposed to a large family car. The detail of the access would be considered at planning application stage. Groundwater flooding has been identified as a constraint in relation to this site, to address this a criteria has been added to Draft policy MAW02 which requires proposals to include a site specific Flood Risk Assessment which addresses groundwater flooding.
Id 354 (Objecting) – MAW02 – RA/174 - I agree with the comments made by many of my fellow Mawsley residence, on this portal, and would like to add I am also concerned about the lack of privacy and overlooking any development when completed may cause to my property and to my neighbours. To be specific I am not objecting about the loss of a private view, as I realise that this is not a material planning consideration. Furthermore, I feel that myself and my neighbours will no longer have the right to peaceful enjoyment of all our possessions, additionally I feel that the impact of this proposed development will impact on my private and family life as stated under Article 8 of the Human Rights Act. I cannot see how this development in its proposed form can be considered to be fair.	Policy 8 of the JCS also requires that development proposals do not result in an unacceptable impact on the amenities of future occupiers, neighbouring properties or the wider area, by reason of noise, vibration, smell, light or other pollution, loss of light or overlooking. In addition to this draft policy MAW02 requires proposals to have particular regard to the layout scale, height, design and massing of buildings and landscaping, in order to minimise amenity impact on

	neighbouring residential properties. The proposal would not impact on existing residents peaceful enjoyment of their possessions. The provision of homes on this site would not impact on the rights set out in Article 8 of the Human Rights Act.
Id 357 (Objecting) – table 12.23 - the table is out of date by at least 3 years. due diligence has clearly not been undertaken in preparing this plan which undermines the credibility and objectivity of the whole plan because the electorate cannot be sure it has been presented with honest, accurate and objective facts in a transparent manner	The facilities were correct at the point they were surveyed, however facilities do change over time.
Id 358 (Objecting) - 12.156, 12.160, RA/174 - 12.156 - I strongly object to RA/174. Mawsley village is complete so no justification for further development 12.160 - the proposed development does not satisfy the design principles set out	The North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy identifies a requirement for 480 dwellings in the rural area in the period 2011-31. The SSP2 will need to allocate sites across the rural area to meet this requirement. The development principles are drafted to ensure that development proposals address the issues identified through the site assessment process. Until a proposal is submitted it is not possible to assess whether the requirements of the policy have been met.
Id 365 (Objecting) All of the document	Noted
Id 369 (Objecting) – MAW02 - There really isn't enough room to fit more houses into the village. There are already hideous parking issues at present, and you can only imagine they	Policy 8 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy requires developments to make adequate

would get worse should this development be given the go-ahead. The school is clearly near capacity, so what happens to children who have been born into a village, hoping to get a place at the local school, edged out by people who move here when the new houses are built? There are already complaints about parking around schools, and this would add to the debate if you're expecting parents to travel further afield. I can appreciate that more houses are needed within the region, but Mawsley isn't the place for them. We only moved into the village last year, but you can see the frustration from long standing residents with regards to extra houses, the vision they were sold on originally and the expectation that we should bear the brunt.	provision for parking; the proposed development should not therefore impact on parking in the surrounding area. Priority for school places would be given based on NCC's admissions criteria. North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy identifies a requirement for 480 dwellings in the rural area in the period 2011-31. The SSP2 will need to allocate sites across the rural area to meet this requirement. The Rural Settlement Facilities Background Paper (update) (April 2018) sets out the facilities available in villages in Kettering Borough. Mawsley has a good range of services and facilities and is the only village with a doctor's surgery and dentist. When assessing sites to meet the rural housing requirement access to services and facilities is part of the assessment. Taking into account the facilities available, it is considered that Mawsley is a suitable location for small scale growth.
Id 371 (Objecting) – All - I would like to strongly object to the plan to build additional	The scale of development proposed

houses off Cransley Rise in Mawsley. I have lived in Mawsley for 15 years, and the village is still not finished from then. The roads, greenlands and sewage works remain unadopted, leaving issues that do not get resolved. I live in Cransley Rise and the grass on the island in our street has not been cut for months, with the grass being high enough to hide a toddler. How can you possibly be considering adding more houses to this? When we brought our property we brought into the plan of an idyllic village, which has already been altered with the additional of 200+ more houses than were originally planned. The village is struggling to keep the unique character that is was intended to have already, if you put another 57 houses in to this I fear it will be gone forever. There is a proposal for a retirement home to be on what we were promised was going to be a Pub site, again another let down from the vision we were sold. Surely this should be enough that Mawsley has contributed to the local housing need? You need to let our village settle with what has already been added before you consider anything further. The School, Nursery, Doctors and Dentists are already oversubscribed and your proposal that any children would be able to go to Walgrave is ludicrous given it is reportedly already oversubscribed, and surely the point of attending a village school is that you go to the school in your village!! It is already challenging to get an appointment quickly with the amount of people using the doctors and dentists. The public transport links have been reduced, with the bus service being cut, so it will mean that the houses will all be car driving houses, putting more traffic onto our roads. The site you are proposing will take away our countryside feel forever, just last night I stood watching the farmer in the field, and marvelled at the views, something I will no longer be able to do if you carry on with your proposal. The site is reported to flood, as detailed in many comments already made, so is surely unsuitable to build on? It would also impact on the local wildlife that habit that area, that should be protected from any	will not alter the village character of Mawsley. While Mawsley is now bigger than originally planned, the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy identifies a requirement for 480 dwellings in the rural area in the period 2011-31. The SSP2 will need to allocate sites across the rural area to meet this requirement. The Rural Settlement Facilities Background Paper (update) (April 2018) sets out the facilities available in Mawsley. Mawsley has a good range of services and facilities and is the only village with a doctor's surgery and dentist. When assessing sites to meet the rural housing requirement access to services and facilities is part of the assessment. Taking into account the facilities available, it is considered that Mawsley is a suitable location for small scale growth. Through the site assessment work NCC Education has been consulted on provision for education. In Mawsley contributions would be sought towards

further impact than they have already had. The access that would need to be used to the proposed site would mean an additional potential 100+ cars, all driving down our street, with the proposal for the entrance being on a blind bend. It is already heavily congestion in both Cransley Rise and School Road, with the on road parking that happens, posing potential dangerous driving conditions. There are already occasions when visitors cannot get parked outside our house (which is a detached property) due to other cars being parked there, if you add in these proposed houses I can only foresee that situation getting worse. The road is already not fit for purpose as it is without adding another 100+ cars to it. The village will not be a village if you keep adding houses to it, please leave our village to retain a village feel, enough is enough, leave Mawsley alone.	Primary and Secondary education. Loss of a countryside view is not a material planning consideration. Groundwater flooding has been identified as a constraint in relation to this site, to address this a criteria has been added to Draft policy MAW02 which requires proposals to include a site specific Flood Risk Assessment which addresses groundwater flooding. Draft policy MAW02 requires proposals to provide appropriate evidence of the ecological potential of the site. Policy 4 of the JCS requires a net gain in biodiversity to be sought. Policy 8 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy requires developments to make adequate provision for parking; the proposed development should not therefore impact on parking in the surrounding area.
Id 372 (Objecting) – 12.11 Mawsley - The proposed development at Mawsley has been rejected on a previous occasions due to highways access.	NCC highways have been consulted through the site assessment process and in relation to the capacity of the highway network have assessed the

There remains significant issues:- 1. Traffic generation - significant personal and commercial vehicles movements through an existing village route which is congested with on street parking. A 50 houses, 120 people, with 2 cars per household this could lead to an estimated movement of 100 cars, not to mention other commercial vehicles. 2. Access point proposed through a dangerous bend on road with restricted viewing points and parked cars. This route is not salted in the winter. As this not a bus, no, salting will happen during winter. Extremely dangerous for pedestrian and cyclist. 3. Low level land, with surface water potential. Houses in Mawsley have been affected by flooding, the surface water run off would created a major flooding concern. As the current road network is not fully adopted, drains are not being cleared adding to the issue. 4. The settlement line of development protrudes out beyond the natural outline of the village where it adjoins the woodlands. This affect the sightlines from the village. This settlement line should be realigned so that the two ends of the pathway. The protruding line causes overshadowing overlooking and loss of privacy to the adjacent properties. 5. There is no allocation for allotment land within the development. The housing proposal should be reduced to account for allotments. 6. A proposed roadway to allow for 50 dwelling would cause noise and disturbance to the existing School Road and Cransley Rise residents. 7. Loss of amenities - this development is not sustainable as the public bus service is being reduced and potentially withdrawn. This encourages car use and pollution which is in contradiction of environmental policies around sustainable development. 8. Loss of amenities - grade 3 agricultural land, building on agricultural land and wildlife	impact as capacity limited or insufficient capacity but constraints can be overcome. If the site is progressed as an allocation an additional criteria will be added to the policy requiring proposals to be supported by a transport assessment and to mitigate the impact of development on the highway network. Through the site assessment work discussions have taken place with NCC highways regarding the suitability of gaining access to the site from Cransley Rise. NCC advised that they would be able to accept a loop road serving a maximum of 50 dwellings without the need for Cransley Rise to be widened. The loop road would need to be 5.5 metres wide with 2x2metres footways in accordance with local highway authority standards and tracked for refuse vehicles opposed to a large family car. The detail of the access would be considered at planning application stage. Groundwater flooding has been identified as a constraint in relation to this site, to address this a criteria has

natural habitat loss for muntjac, red kites, hares. 9. The effect on trees - established mature trees are located behind Birch Spinney. 10. This will have a significant visual impact from the dwellings of Birch Spinney, Cransley Rise - destroying the natural views, causing overshadowing and loss of privacy. 11. This will overload amenities built for the original village, which, has exceeded original capacity with built properties along Cransley Rise and Birch Spinney. therefore, we would ask that this allocation of housing is reduced to take account of extra dwelling built on the original footpath. 12. Mawsley is a remote village which is unsuitable for development for residents with accessibility issues or non-car owners. Therefore, this does not make this site suitable for target housing groups. 13. There is already significant social housing planning proposals going ahead for flats at the former 'pub site', this also should contribute to the housing allocation. That is more suitable as being on a bus route for gaining access to other services in neighbouring towns. This dwelling allocation should be deducted from the housing targets.	been added to Draft policy MAW02 which requires proposals to include a site specific Flood Risk Assessment which addresses groundwater flooding. MAW02 e. requires that build development does not extend significantly beyond the existing properties on the western edge of Cransley Rise and Birch Spinney. MAW01 required development proposals to contribute towards the provision of allotments. This could be on-site or through off-site contributions, the detail of this would be dealt with at planning application stage. Policy 8 of the JCS requires development to prevent both new and existing development from contributing to or being adversely effected by unacceptable levels of light or noise pollution. Agricultural land classification has been taken into account through the assessment process. This site is grade 3 agricultural land so is preferable to the development of grade 2 agricultural land.

	Draft policy MAW02 requires proposals to provide appropriate evidence of the ecological potential of the site. Policy 4 of the JCS requires a net gain in biodiversity to be sought. Loss of a countryside view is not a material planning consideration. While Mawsley is now bigger than originally planned, the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy identifies a requirement for 480 dwellings in the rural area in the period 2011-31. The SSP2 will need to allocate sites across the rural area to meet this requirement. The Rural Settlement Facilities Background Paper (update) (April 2018) sets out the facilities available in Mawsley. Mawsley has a good range of services and facilities and is the only village with a doctor's surgery and dentist. When assessing sites to meet the rural housing requirement access to services and facilities is part of the assessment. Taking into account the facilities available, it is considered that Mawsley is a suitable location for small

	scale growth. An allowance has been made for windfall development in determining how many dwellings the SSP2 needs to allocate. Any applications which are approved which are not identified in the development plan will contribute towards the windfall allowance.
Id 375 (Objecting) – MAW02 - No space at the school for expansion and already at full capacity. No room for more traffic within the village	Through the site assessment work NCC Education has been consulted on provision for education. In Mawsley contributions would be sought towards Primary and Secondary education. NCC highways have been consulted through the site assessment process and in relation to the capacity of the highway network have assessed the impact as capacity limited or insufficient capacity but constraints can be overcome. If the site is progressed as an allocation an additional criteria will be added to the policy requiring proposals to be supported by a transport assessment and to mitigate the impact of development on the highway network.
Id 376 (Objecting) - MAW02	Noted
Id 516 (Objection) – 12.11 Mawsley - I would like to strongly object to the plan to build	The scale of development proposed

additional houses off Cransley Rise in Mawsley. I have lived in Mawsley since 2003, when we brought our property we brought into the plan of a traditional village, which has already been altered with the additional of 200+ more houses than were originally planned. The village is struggling to keep the unique character that is was intended to have already, if you put another 57 houses in to this I fear it will be gone forever. There is a proposal for a retirement home to be on what we were promised was going to be a Pub site, again another let down from the vision we were sold. Surely this should be enough that Mawsley has contributed to the local housing need? You need to let our village settle with what has already been added before you consider anything further. The School, Nursery, Doctors and Dentists are already oversubscribed and your proposal that any children would be able to go to Walgrave is ludicrous given it is reportedly already oversubscribed, and surely the point of attending a village school is that you go to the school in your village!! It is already challenging to get an appointment quickly with the amount of people using the doctors and dentists. The public transport links have been reduced, with the bus service being cut, so it will mean that the houses will all be car driving houses, putting more traffic onto our roads. The site you are proposing will take away our countryside feel forever, just last night I stood watching the farmer in the field, and marvelled at the views, something I will no longer be able to do if you carry on with your proposal. The site is reported to flood, as detailed in many comments already made, so is surely unsuitable to build on? It would also impact on the local wildlife that habit that area, that should be protected from any further impact than they have already had. The access that would need to be used to the proposed site would mean an additional potential 100+ cars, all driving down our street, with the proposal for the entrance being	will not alter the village character of Mawsley. While Mawsley is now bigger than originally planned, the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy identifies a requirement for 480 dwellings in the rural area in the period 2011-31. The SSP2 will need to allocate sites across the rural area to meet this requirement. The Rural Settlement Facilities Background Paper (update) (April 2018) sets out the facilities available in Mawsley. Mawsley has a good range of services and facilities and is the only village with a doctor's surgery and dentist. When assessing sites to meet the rural housing requirement access to services and facilities is part of the assessment. Taking into account the facilities available, it is considered that Mawsley is a suitable location for small scale growth. Limited bus services are available in the rural area; however the Council is still required to meet housing needs within these areas.

on a blind bend. It is already heavily congestion in both Cransley Rise and School Road, with the on road parking that happens, posing potential dangerous driving conditions. There are already occasions when visitors cannot get parked outside our house (which is a detached property) due to other cars being parked there, if you add in these proposed houses I can only foresee that situation getting worse. The road is already not fit for purpose as it is without adding another 100+ cars to it. The village will not be a village if you keep adding houses to it, please leave our village to retain a village feel, enough is enough, leave Mawsley alone.	Loss of a countryside view is not a material planning consideration. Groundwater flooding has been identified as a constraint in relation to this site, to address this a criteria has been added to Draft policy MAW02 which requires proposals to include a site specific Flood Risk Assessment which addresses groundwater flooding. Draft policy MAW02 requires proposals to provide appropriate evidence of the ecological potential of the site. Policy 4 of the JCS requires a net gain in biodiversity to be sought. Policy 8 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy requires developments to make adequate provision for parking; the proposed development should not therefore impact on parking in the surrounding area.
Id 503 (Supporting) - Having now consulted with our client ******* , owner of the above proposed housing site, I am able to confirm his support of the current Local Plan proposals .	Noted