| **Section Title 7: Natural Environment & Heritage** | | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Abbreviations**  **BMV** Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land  **CEMP** Construction Environmental Management Plan  **GI** Green Infrastructure  **GIDP** Green Infrastructure Development Plan  **FR** Flood Risk  **FRM** Flood Risk Management  **FRMS** North Northamptonshire Flood Risk Management Study (2012)  **FRSWM** Flood Risk and Surface Water Management Policy  **JCS** North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy 2011- 2031 (2016)  **LGS** Local Green Space | **LLFA** Local Lead Flood Authority  **LFRMS** Northamptonshire Local Flood Risk Management Strategy (2012)  **NPPF** National Planning Policy Framework (2018)  **OSS** Open Space Strategy  **PPS** Playing Pitch Strategy  **SFRA** Strategic Flood Risk Assessment  **SFS** Sports Facilities Strategy  **SWD** Surface Water Drainage  **SWMP** Surface Water Management Plan  **SSP2** Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan (Consultation Draft (2018))  **SuDS** Sustainable Drainage Systems | |
| **Comment** | | **KBC Response** |
| **ID 319**  **Is your representation supporting or objecting?** Objecting  **Which part of the Draft Plan does your representation relate to?** 7: Natural Environment and Heritage  Where are the Heritage policies? They are partially hidden in the GI but not explicitly mentioned. | | Policy 2 on the historic environment in the JCS determines that the historic environment will be protected, preserved and where appropriate, enhanced. It provides a criteria-based policy for development to respond to where there might be an impact upon a heritage asset and / or its setting.  On a local level the Council’s approach to the protection, conservation, enhancement and management of heritage assets and their settings is two-fold through Policies ENV01 on the Local GI Corridors and ENV03 on Local Green Space.  ENV01 seeks to deliver projects identified in the GIDP. The GIDP determines the Local Level Green Infrastructure Corridors and then identifies project opportunities within those corridors to enhance existing and create new GI across the Borough. This approach enables the Council to guide, prioritise and co-ordinate activities to develop GI and the assets with-in including designated and non-designated heritage assets and their settings.  ENV03 provides a more site-specific approach to allocating individual historically and visually important open spaces through SSP2. These spaces have been assessed and identified in the Historically and Visually Important Open Space Background Paper (2015).  This two-fold approach had been considered to be sufficient to ensure that heritage assets would be protected, conserved, enhanced and managed as it is widely recognised that such assets are integral to GI. Where assets fall out of the GI network they are captured as a Historically and Visually Important Local Green Space.  However, it is recognised the current approach is implicit with regard to heritage assets rather than explicit. There will be a review of the supporting text and policy wording for both ENV01 and ENV03 to determine how these can be refined to strengthen the Council’s approach towards the conservation, protection and enhancement of historic landscapes.  Once this exercise is complete it will be possible to review the revised policies alongside Policy 2 from the JCS to determine if there are any further policy needs with respect to heritage. |
| **ID 13**  **Is your representation supporting or objecting?** Neither  **Which part of the Draft Plan does your representation relate to?** Section 7.1  Surface water drainage schemes are vital to prevent flooding and should be mandatory. A reservoir on Slade Brook would be a welcome addition but robust development scheme specific water management designs are equally important to ensure that connecting brooks can cope with storm water. Rain gardens or smaller catchment ponds could easily be accommodated in modest sized developments which would contribute to wildlife in addition to effectively managing surface water run-off. These must be effective - I would use the scheme at a recent development in Broughton as an example - the surface water run-off from the 60 home development is piped directly into a tributary of Slade Brook. There is a very large "attenuation pond" on the site which, despite heavy storms, a very wet winter and early spring has remained steadfastly dry. For some considerable time there was more standing water in the surrounding land than in the "pond" due to a surface layer of heavy clay. With the best will in the world this is not managing surface water run-off. | | Noted: Appropriate FRM schemes will be considered as part of the SWMP. It is anticipated that a FRSWM policy within the SSP2 will signpost to the SWMP as a source of site-specific projects for flood risk mitigation.  Projects are also included in the Green Infrastructure Development Plan (2018) and these will be updated as existing projects are delivered and new projects are identified. |
| **ID 258**  **Is your representation supporting or objecting?** Supporting  **Which part of the Draft Plan does your representation relate to?** Section 7.1  Section 7 & Question 4 - Yes there needs to be a policy of this type for any scheme that will ultimately drain into the River Ise. | | Noted. It is recognised that flood storage measures will be required in the Nene corridor and the upstream catchments of Slade Brook and the River Ise to enable future growth. It is likely that policy will be formulated to enable the development and implementation of such measures. |
| **ID 486**  **Is your representation supporting or objecting?** Neither  **Which part of the Draft Plan does your representation relate to?** Section 7.1  Flood risk and Sustainable Water Management states ‘An update of the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment last completed in 2011 will also be commissioned ahead of the preparation of the Pre-Submission Plan’ followed by 7.2 stating ‘On the basis of the above updated evidence, any new policy relating to the water environment, resources and flood risk management would likely be site or scheme specific, adding to that already contained within the Joint Core Strategy’ | | Noted. It appears that this representation may not have been completed by the respondent. |
| **ID 288**  **Is your representation supporting or objecting?** Supporting  **Which part of the Draft Plan does your representation relate to?** Flooding around the rugby ground in Waverley Road.  Episodes of flooding in the past, such as in Waverley Road near the Kettering Rugby ground, highlight where flood risks still exist. It is important to ensure that prevention is put in place where necessary. This aspect of planning should be informed by the expected impact of climate change. | | The FRMS indicates that flood risk management will need to combine traditional flood defences with more accurate flood warning and mitigation measures to incorporate the idea of resilience and resistance. Policy 5 of the JCS is a strategic approach seeking to reduce the risk of flooding. Developing a policy in the SSP2 will enable a more localised approach for the Borough of Kettering. The impact of climate changed is recognised and addressed through a variety of policies in the JCS including those relating to the water environment and flood risk management; delivery of green infrastructure; place shaping principles; biodiversity and geodiversity and renewable and low carbon energy. These will be supplemented by a localised approach through the policy of the SSP2. |
| **ID 394**  **Is your representation supporting or objecting?** Neither  **Which part of the Draft Plan does your representation relate to?** Question 4  The local plan’s chapter on the natural environment needs to be strengthened to ensure it can be considered sound.  A policy on flood risk and sustainable water management within SSP2 is welcomed.  Natural England supports the statement that *strong links will also be made with opportunities for enhancing Green Infrastructure and biodiversity, in particular in connection with the River Ise and Slade Brook*.  We advise that to ensure the plan is sound and compliant with para’s 20, 171 and 175c of the revised NPPF that wording is included in the SSP2 that:   1. Ensures development firstly avoids impacts on designated sites, and that the policy follows the avoid, mitigate, compensate hierarchy; 2. protects and enhances the River Ise and Meadows SSSI from adverse impacts (including direct and indirect impact pathways of development). In particular, Natural England would support a policy within SSP2 which states that increased sediment loading upstream of River Ise and Meadows SSSI will be avoided.   We would also advise that policy wording is included to ensure that MG4 grassland alongside the River Ise and within Tailby Meadow Local Nature reserve will be protected against recreational pressures associated with the increased housing in the area (especially in-combination with DE/210). This can be avoided by, for example, suitable delivery of accessible GI within new developments, and off-site contributions to buffer and enhance the Local Nature Reserve.  The proposed new allocation KE/184a is adjacent to Slade Brook and a tributary of the River Ise. Pollution avoidance and mitigation measures must be adopted during construction and operation of potential residential units at KE/184a. This is necessary to avoid impacts to Slade Brook and Southfield Farm March SSSI, and Natural England recommend that a CEMP is conditioned into this planning application and that this requirement is specified in the policy wording. Southfield Farm Marsh SSSI is the largest known area of long-established tall grass washland in Northamptonshire. It is a characteristic, but now much reduced vegetation type of alluvial soils in river valleys, subject to regular winter flooding. The site includes base-rich and floristically diverse mire developed on silty peats and watered by calcareous spring-flows. This locally rare community supports a specialised and uncommon invertebrate fauna.  We would also advise that this section of the local plan should be considerably strengthened to include policies which address the following:   1. Biodiversity net gain as detailed in paragraphs 170d, 174b, 175d, 102, 118 of the revised NPPF; 2. The protection of soils including BMV land as required by paragraphs 170a, 170b, 171 including footnote 53, of the revised NPPF, respectively; 3. Promotion, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species populations, as required by policies 174a including footnote 57, 174b, of the revised NPPF; 4. The use of Brownfield sites as required by paragraphs 117 including footnote 44 of the revised NPPF; 5. The River Ise and the Nene Valley Nature Improvement Area, covered by policy 174a including footnote 57 of the revised NPPF | | Noted.  Policy 4 on Biodiversity and Geodiversity within the JCS sets out the principal of refusing development where significant harm cannot be avoided, mitigated or compensated. It is not necessary to repeat this provision in the SSP2 unless with respect to setting the context of a more locally specific assets. Assets such as River Ise and Meadows SSSI, MG4 Grassland alongside the River Ise and within Tailby Meadow Local Nature Reserve, Slade Brook and Southfield Farm March SSSI may benefit from specific policy wording or made reference to in the contextual text as these are locally specific assets that could warrant special mention. This will be discussed during the next phase of Plan development.  Where a CEMP is required it is usual practice for KBC to impose a condition on a planning permission. The decision to impose is assessed on a case by case process in the determination of planning applications. Given this requirement it could be argued that there is no point in reiterating the need for a CEMP in the development policies. However, the policy view is that where the need for a CEMP has been identified this should be written as an explicit policy requirement for clarity to both the determining officer and the developer.  Policy 4 on Biodiversity and Geodiversity is a criteria-based policy in the JCS. While it sets out the principals of conserving, enhancing and restoring the natural environment it is high level and strategic. Given that Kettering falls within the Nene Valley Nature Improvement Area, has assets including SSSIs, a Local Nature Reserve, Pocket Parks, Local and Potential Wildlife Sites and areas of Best and Most Versatile [agricultural] Land there is merit in seeking to strengthen the biodiversity element of the SSP2 during the next phase of Plan development. |
| **ID 350**  **Is your representation supporting or objecting?** Supporting  **Which part of the Draft Plan does your representation relate to?** Question 4  Anglian Water would support the inclusion of a specific policy in SSP2 which states that regard should be had to the findings and related actions of the Kettering SWMP. We would suggest that any policy refers to the Kettering SWMP as a whole rather than focus on a specific scheme proposal. We would wish to work with Kettering Borough and the other (flood) risk management policies to develop an effective policy for inclusion in the SSP2. As the development plan is intended to be read a whole the new policy should be prepared in the context of Policy 5 (Water Environment, Resources and Flood Risk Management) of the adopted North Northamptonshire Core Strategy | | It is anticipated that the new FRSWM policy will signpost to the SWMP as a source of site-specific projects for flood risk mitigation. The new FRSWM policy and supporting text will align with the NPPF and be prepared in the context of the JCS Policy. |
| **ID 409**  **Is your representation supporting or objecting?** Neither  **Which part of the Draft Plan does your representation relate to?** Question 4  Heritage Assets should be included within flood risk and sustainable water management.  In accordance with paragraph 20, criteria d of the NPPF, will there be a heritage section and specific heritage policy(ies), in addition to Policy 2 of the JCS, providing greater local detail or expanding upon Policy 2, such as in relation to shop-fronts and non-designated heritage assets? I would be very happy to advise on wording. | | The text and policies with respect to flood risk and sustainable water management are focused on reducing the risk of flooding and to the protection and improvement of the quality of the water environment.  The relationship between flood risk and sustainable water management with heritage assets is considered to be tenuous, unlike the connection between heritage assets and green infrastructure. Having examined the purpose of the flood risk and sustainable water sections it is not deemed appropriate to include reference to heritage assets within this topic. It will be emphasised in green infrastructure and within its own right.  Policy 2 on the historic environment in the JCS determines that the historic environment will be protected, preserved and where appropriate, enhanced. It provides a criteria-based policy for development to respond to where there might be an impact upon a heritage asset and / or its setting.  On a local level the Council’s approach to the protection, conservation, enhancement and management of heritage assets and their settings is two-fold through Policies ENV01 on the Local GI Corridors and ENV03 on Local Green Space.  ENV01 seeks to deliver projects identified in the GIDP. The GIDP determines the Local Level Green Infrastructure Corridors and then identifies project opportunities within those corridors to enhance existing and create new GI across the Borough. This approach enables the Council to guide, prioritise and co-ordinate activities to develop GI and the assets with-in including designated and non-designated heritage assets and their settings.  ENV03 provides a more site-specific approach to allocating individual historically and visually important open spaces through SSP2. These spaces have been assessed and identified in the Historically and Visually Important Open Space Background Paper (2015). This two-fold approach had been considered to be sufficient to ensure that heritage assets would be protected, conserved, enhanced and managed as it is widely recognised that such assets are integral to GI. Where assets fall out of the GI network they are captured as a Historically and Visually Important Local Green Space.  However, it is recognised the current approach is implicit with regard to heritage assets rather than explicit. There will be a review of the supporting text and policy wording for both ENV01 and ENV03 to determine how these can be refined to strengthen the Council’s approach towards the conservation, protection and enhancement of historic landscapes. Once this exercise is complete it will be possible to review the revised policies alongside Policy 2 from the JCS to determine if there are any further policy needs with respect to heritage |
| **ID 434**  **Is your representation supporting or objecting?** Neither  **Which part of the Draft Plan does your representation relate to?** Question 4  Policy 5 of the adopted Joint Core Strategy is sufficient to cover the risk of flooding within our remit.  Your authority should ensure that specific scheme proposals include evidence from an up to date Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) and or Surface Water Management Plan (SWMP).  **Section 7.1 Flood risk and Sustainable Water Management**  Section 7.1: With regard to updating or referencing the SFRA, it is our understanding that this evidence requirement should have been completed prior to looking at and discounting any of the proposed allocations as there are proposed sites within the floodplain. It is unclear whether the selection of sites has been subject to the flood risk sequential test.  The SFRA (or current floodmap for planning) should have been used to sequentially test the proposed allocations and it appears that a lot of sites have been discounted already. Although we are aware that there may be timescale issues in updating the SFRA, we do find that the current evidence held is not up to date.  Section 7.2: Upstream flood storage on the Slade Brook. We understand there are gaps in the SWMP that require further consideration and action. Please review the SWMP to ensure it addresses any concerns we previously raised. | | Noted.  Scheme proposals will be updated accordingly to include evidence from the updated SFRA and / or SWMP as appropriate  The SFRA is currently being updated. The update of the SWMP has been completed. These documents will provide an evidence base to inform the final site selection in the Pre-submission Plan. All sites have been subject to sequential testing for flood risk in accordance with Policy 5 on FR management in the JCS. Para 4.2 of the SSP2 highlights that the methodology for assessing housing sites is set out in the Background Paper: Housing Allocations (2012), the Site Specific Proposals LDD Housing Allocations Assessment of Additional Sites and Update (2013) and the Background Paper: Housing Allocations (2018).  As noted above, the SFRA is currently being updated. The update for the SWMP has been completed. |
| **ID 488**  **Is your representation supporting or objecting?** Neither  **Which part of the Draft Plan does your representation relate to?** Question 4  In considering this question and on review of the SSP2 we note the following points,  The SSP2 indicates a further development of 1848-1887 dwellings to meet the required development as set by the NNJCS of 10400 dwellings within the plan period of 2011-2031 plus a 10% buffer. Of this 140 are of windfall development.  The plan identifies development areas and the number of dwellings allocated for each area. Unless development is infill the development area is allocated a policy number with specific criteria for development of the site.  The following Policies refer to major development, ie 10 dwellings or more as defined by the Town and Country Planning Act.  KET03, 04, 05, 06, 07, 08, 09, 10, 11, 12 and 13 BLA04, 06 and 07 DES04 and 05 ROT04 BRT02 CRA03 GED02, 03 and 04 GRC02 MAW02 STA02 and 03 WES02  Within the criteria of the above policies there is an inconsistency towards Flood Risk Management. Policy KET03, 07 and 11, BLA04 and 07, GED04 and MAW02 require a flood risk assessment or provision of suitable measures to assess flood risk. 19 policies make no reference to flood risk management.  Policy DES05 is the only policy of the 27 policies that refers to the incorporation of sustainable urban drainage systems, SuDS.  In regard to Flood Risk Assessments footnote 50 of the revised NPPF states,  ‘A site-specific flood risk assessment should be provided for all development in Flood Zones 2 and 3. In Flood Zone 1, an assessment should accompany all proposals involving: sites of 1 hectare or more; land which has been identified by the Environment Agency as having critical drainage problems; land identified in a strategic flood risk assessment as being at increased flood risk in future; or land that may be subject to other sources of flooding, where its development would introduce a more vulnerable use’.  All major development within Northamptonshire must conform to local as well as national standards as detailed within the ‘Local Standards and Guidance for Surface Water Drainage in Northamptonshire’ document which requires submission of a drainage assessment. A drainage assessment is a specific requirement set by the LLFA for all major applications in Northamptonshire regardless of whether or not an FRA has been prepared. The drainage assessment will include information on the detailed design, management and maintenance of surface water management systems. It will also include an assessment of all types of flood risk posed to the development and how the risk will be mitigated.  Proposal.  In considering question 4 ‘Should the SSP2 provide a policy on flood risk and sustainable water management, and if so, on what specific scheme proposal would you expect for it to cover?  So as to   1. To avoid confusion and inconsistences in regards surface water flood risk and the requirement for an FRA, 2. Take into account requirements of Northamptonshire County Council Local Standards for a drainage assessment protect 3. Promote the use of sustainable drainage systems so supporting sustainable development   To encompass all proposed development sites, align with the NPPF and Local Standards the LLFA would request a policy on flood risk that requires an FRA/Drainage strategy which assesses and mitigates all sources of flood risk for all major developments. The policy should require the incorporation of sustainable urban drainage systems to reduce the risk of surface water flooding.  As detailed within the SSP2 approximately 10% of future development will be windfall and as such will not conform to local flood risk management standards  The LLFA would also request that a specific policy on flood risk and sustainable water management requires that SuDS are considered for all new development not defined as a major development, ie, of less than 10 dwellings, non-residential sites of less than 1 ha and wind fall sites to reduce the risk of surface water flooding.  Further the policy should encourage the retrofitting of SuDS to existing properties.  We would request that the policy, or introduction to such policy refers to the Flood Toolkit https://www.floodtoolkit.com/ and the Local Standards and Guidance for Surface Water Drainage in Northamptonshire https://www.floodtoolkit.com/planning/surface-water-drainage | | Drafting of the Pre-submission Plan will provide an opportunity to review and revise any inconsistencies within the Major Development Policies with regard to FRM  Para 3.59 of the JCS requires developers to demonstrate how their schemes are informed by local studies including the relevant SFRAs, SWMP and the LFRMS, and where applicable, design to a higher standard of protection.  The requirement of a site-specific flood risk assessment is set out as part of the planning application process and applies to all types and sizes of development. Given this requirement it could be argued that there is no point in reiterating the need for an FRA in the development policies. However, the policy view is that where a flood risk has been identified the need for a FRA should be highlighted as an explicit policy requirement as clarity for both the determining officer and the developer.  The requirement of a drainage assessment is usually observed through the development management process which requires the authority to consult with the LLFA on all major applications. However, to ensure developers have due regard for the Flood Toolkit and the Local Standards and Guidance for Surface Water Drainage at an early stage they will be required, through the FRSWM policy, to demonstrate how their proposal has had due regard to these obligations e.g. by the commitment to undertake a drainage assessment (where appropriate).  Policy 5 of the JCS sets out a criteria-based approach towards the water environment, resources and flood risk management. Policy 5 of the JCS requires development (irrespective of size / type) to be designed from the outset to incorporate SuDS. Therefore, it is unnecessary for the SSP2 to reiterate this requirement.  No such provision is made with respect to retrofitting SuDS which could, as part of a package of FRM projects, contribute to and harness more resilience. This provision will be set out in the supporting text and / or policy during the redrafting of the SSP2.  The requirement of a drainage assessment is usually observed through the development management process which requires the authority to consult with the LLFA on all major applications. However, to ensure developers have due regard for the Flood Toolkit and the Local Standards and Guidance for Surface Water Drainage at an early stage they will be required, through the FRSWM policy, to demonstrate how their proposal has had due regard to these obligations e.g. by the commitment to undertake a drainage assessment (where appropriate).  The new FRSWM policy and supporting text will align with the NPPF and be prepared in the context of the JCS Policy. There is apparent merit for the supporting text to refer to the Flood Toolkit and the Local Standards and Guidance for Surface Water Drainage in Northamptonshire.  This is because while para 3.59 of the JCS requires developers to demonstrate how their schemes are informed by local studies and where applicable, designed to a higher standard of protection, the Guidance on SWD Standards is distinct from these studies and can be overlooked.  Inclusion in the supporting text will emphasise the need to refer to the Standards in association with the studies. This approach will ensure a local level means of providing direction to developers, helping them align their proposals and / or contributions with Kettering specific priorities, county wide requirements and good practice objectives. |
| **ID 510**  **Is your representation supporting or objecting?** Objecting  **Which part of the Draft Plan does your representation relate to?** Question 4  It is considered that a further policy relating to site specific flood risk and sustainable water management is not required.  Policy 5 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (2016) provides principles which ensure development reduces the site-specific (and environs) risk of flooding alongside protecting and improving the quality of the water environment. In addition, criteria d) of Policy 5 ensures provision is made for relevant development to contribute (where appropriate) to specific flood risk management in North Northamptonshire, which includes flood storage measures in the upstream catchments of the Slade Brook. If the Council thinks it necessary to include a policy to define what schemes it should cover, then it should only relate to development that materially affects the relevant parts of the catchment of Slade Brook. | | The JCS sets out the strategic policy with respect to flood risk and surface water management and criteria d) of Policy 5 ensures provision is made by development to contribute (where appropriate) to flood risk management. By adding a policy in the SSP2 it’s possible to provide a local direction which will help developers align their proposals and / or contributions with Kettering specific project priorities.  In accordance with the 1990 Town & Country Planning Act; any contributions required from a developer to compensate or mitigate a developments impact must be directly relevant to that proposed development |
| **ID 435**  **Is your representation supporting or objecting?** Neither  **Which part of the Draft Plan does your representation relate to?** 7.2 Green infrastructure  Section 7.2 of the Flood risk and Sustainable Water Management section (please review the numbering, there are two different sets of 7.2 on the same page) states that ‘strong links will also be made with opportunities for enhancing Green Infrastructure (GI) and biodiversity, in particular in connection with the River Ise and Slade Brook’.  GI provides opportunities for flood risk betterment and increases the access and easement corridor adjacent to the watercourse which should be incorporated into design layout and landscaping proposals as part of a strategic measure(s) to reduce flood risk from the watercourse. The 8.0m permitting distance should be left clear so that we can undertake our maintenance duties and exercise our permissive powers, if necessary.  Such opportunities to increase the access and easement corridor adjacent to the watercourse should be taken and incorporated into specific policies within the Local Plan. | | Numbering will be reviewed and amended accordingly.  Individual projects that make a positive contribution to flood risk management are being identified all the time and incorporated into strategies and organisational action plans such as the GIDP, SWMP and Catchment Management Plans. When developing the FRSWM policy the preferred approach will be to provide a policy hook to key documents such as the SWMP and the GIDP. Making strategies or action plans the reference point for policy is logical as these documents will be regularly updated to remove projects which have been delivered and include new projects coming forward. If you are aware of any project opportunities that will increase the access and easement corridor adjacent to the watercourse you should prepare a project plan which can be submitted to the Council for inclusion in the relevant strategy / action plan update. |
| **ID 297**  **Is your representation supporting or objecting?** Supporting  **Which part of the Draft Plan does your representation relate to?** 7.2 Green infrastructure  Very pleased to see this in the plan. I cannot work out whether the Twywell Hills and Dales are included in this, but that park is a wonderful, much-needed resource of nature preservation. It really needs to be preserved | | Noted. The Twywell Hills and Dales are not included in the Borough level GI corridors as the reserve is located in East Northamptonshire. |
| **ID 490**  **Is your representation supporting or objecting?** Supporting  **Which part of the Draft Plan does your representation relate to?** 7.2 Green infrastructure  Support is given to the overall approach towards Green Infrastructure across Kettering Borough. Figure 7.1identifies both the ‘Borough Level’ and ‘Local Level’ GI Corridors. It is recommended that the Council has a distinct policy approach for each of the relevant levels.  The NPPF (2018) defines Green Infrastructure “A network of multi-functional green space, urban and rural, which is capable of delivering a wide range of environmental and quality of life benefits for local communities” (page 67).  Paragraph 7.5 of the SSP2 recognises the importance new development provides as an opportunity for the creation of additional open space and supporting recreation facilities. In addition, it is acknowledged that new development can bring about improvements in the Green Infrastructure (GI) network.  Paragraph 7.10 of the SSP2 identifies in respect of new development that Borough level GI corridors “…will be protected and enhanced through ensuring that new development does not compromise the integrity of these corridors and by seeking to ensure that, where appropriate, new development contributes to their enhancement, provides connections to Borough level corridors and that open space within new development is located to ensure that it contributes to and enhances these corridors.”  The suggested policy position for Local Green Infrastructure Corridors is set out at Draft Policy ENV01.  Response: General support is given to Draft Policy ENV01 ‘Local Green Infrastructure Corridors’ which seeks to promote green infrastructure connectivity. However, additional consideration should also be given to how this relates to connectivity as part of the wider transport network at the local level. For example, the Council should consider the benefits of tree lined streets, green pedestrian routes, and cycle links make to both local green infrastructure and transport connectivity at the local level without comprising the wider aims of the GI network. | | There are distinct policy approaches for the three tiers of GI corridors which are set out in the JCS and the SSP2 respectively. The JCS sets out the policy approach to the Sub-regional and Local GI Corridors. The SSP2 provides the policy approach for the Borough Level GI Corridors. It may be useful to highlight this fact in the supporting text of section 7 to provide clarity.  JCS Policy 15 is about strengthening connectivity within and around settlements. It does make reference to extending the existing GI network into new developments and therefore begins to recognise the role GI has in being part of the neighbourhood and local transport network.  Ensuring connectivity and enhancing access and movement networks form part of the underlying principles for the planning and delivery of GI (Planning for a Healthy Environment – Good Practice Guidance for Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity (TCPA and the Wildlife Trusts, 2012)). Particularly with respect to sustainable forms of transport e.g. enhancing existing and creating new pedestrian and cycle routes to encourage less reliance on private vehicular use.    As such the policy does seek, albeit implicitly, to improve sustainable transport routes which form part of the wider transport network at both a neighbourhood and local level. The GIDP identifies initiatives such as planting in public areas and on verges to improve the pedestrian experience and way-finding to improve local knowledge and walking guides; such initiatives provide measures to encourage healthier modes of travel.  The supporting text and GI policy will be refined to emphasise these points more effectively and build on the existing JCS Policy 15. |
| **ID 535**  **Is your representation supporting or objecting?** Neither  **Which part of the Draft Plan does your representation relate to?** 7.2 Green infrastructure  15. This section identifies a number of green infrastructure corridors and green infrastructure development projects, including North Kettering Country Park.  The Boughton Estate wishes to make comments in respect of Policy ENV01, specifically in relation to the North Kettering SUE, a planning application for which is currently being worked up by Buccleuch Property (Kettering) Ltd.  The Kettering North employment scheme will, due to its density, provide significant levels of green infrastructure in line with the policy requirements of the JCS. It is therefore considered that the development is capable of meeting the requirements listed at parts a) to c) of the Policy ENV01 (i.e. will not compromise the integrity of the Borough GI corridors or the wider GI network; provide open space within the development which connects with Borough GI corridors; and provides connections between the development and Borough GI corridors).  As a result of this onsite provision, the Estate / Buccleuch do not expect to make offsite financial contributions towards North Kettering Country Park (identified as a green infrastructure development project in Table 7.1 of the LPP2 Draft Plan). | | This is a development management issue and will not be addressed through policy in the SSP2 |
| **ID 299**  **Is your representation supporting or objecting?** Neither  **Which part of the Draft Plan does your representation relate to?** 7.3, 7.4, 7.5 7.6  7.3 Green Infrastructure (GI) is defined as a network of multi-functional green spaces that contribute to a high quality natural and built environment this should also include a consideration of the historic environment GI is not only about the natural environment.  No reference to undesignated heritage assets, historic landscapes, including ridge and furrow.  7.4 This should include a reference to the historic environment  7.5 Given the population increase which will take place within the plan period it is important that careful consideration is given to how GI in the Borough can be managed and enhanced. Including the historic environment  7.6 The NPPF requires the planning system to contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment and also the Historic Environment | | Noted. The table under para 7.3 does make reference to Scheduled Ancient Monuments. However, there is an opportunity through the text in this section to emphasise the contribution green infrastructure can make towards the protection, conservation, enhancement and management of historic landscapes, archaeological and built heritage assets and their settings irrespective of whether such assets are designated or non-designated. This will be addressed in the next phase of Plan development for the SSP2. |
| **ID 320**  **Is your representation supporting or objecting?** Supporting  **Which part of the Draft Plan does your representation relate to?** 7.3 Open Space, sport and recreation and Local Green Space  7.14 Open Space makes a valuable contribution to quality of life, health and well-being of communities, biodiversity, climate regulation, historic conservation and more. Provision of open space is an important part of sustainable development. Support this although some uses of open space can be detrimental to historic assets. | | Noted. |
| **ID 15**  **Is your representation supporting or objecting?** Supporting  **Which part of the Draft Plan does your representation relate to?** ENV01  Excellent policy - let's hope it is implemented robustly | | Noted. |
| **ID 298**  **Is your representation supporting or objecting?** Supporting  **Which part of the Draft Plan does your representation relate to?** ENV01  The maintenance of those parks is a credit to the local authority; the parks are a lifeline for local communities. They need to be protected for the future. | | Parks are an important and well recognised resource. They are multi-functional open spaces that benefit people, wildlife and the environment. The JCS determines that areas of open space will be designated for protection through the Part 2 Local Plans. The Council have recently commissioned the development of an open space strategy to provide the evidence that will ensure the Borough’s valued spaces such as parks, allotments and play areas are protected. The strategy will provide the basis for policy development on the protection and enhancement of existing and creation of new open spaces including allotments and historically and visually important local green spaces. |
| **ID 290**  **Is your representation supporting or objecting**? Supporting  **Which part of the Draft Plan does your representation relate to?** ENV01  Figure 7.1 identifies the green infrastructure corridors and projects within Kettering Borough, including those within Burton Latimer. Paragraph 7.12 states that “*The Council will work with partners to deliver these projects and to identify new projects which will support the delivery of GI in the Borough. Where appropriate, development proposals should seek to deliver or contribute towards GI projects”*.  Policy ENV01: Green Infrastructure seeks to protect the integrity of the green infrastructure network and encourages connections to the green infrastructure network from new development.  It is considered that the proposed development at land off Higham Road in Burton Latimer could meet the aims of Policy ENV01 by providing green infrastructure (allotments, open space, and natural green space) and by connecting with the wider green infrastructure network (the Barton Seagrave to Burton Latimer Green Infrastructure Corridor).  There are a number of factors that support the provision of additional green infrastructure in conjunction with residential development at land off Higham Road in Burton Latimer, as follows:   1. The majority of the new homes that had been approved in Burton Latimer are located to the south east of the town and specifically along Higham Road. 2. These recent residential developments to the south east of Burton Latimer (completed, under construction, or approved) have delivered or will deliver a limited amount of public open space. 3. The newly created areas of open space in Burton Latimer are relatively modest in size and are fragmented, and do not provide a useable and connected network of open spaces. 4. The majority of the existing open spaces are spread throughout the town with the majority being to the north and west. These spaces are not well connected to the recently approved housing developments to the north of Higham Road.   These factors are highlighted on the Green Infrastructure Strategy Plan submitted with these representations. The proposed development at land south of Higham Road in Burton Latimer includes a significant amount of green infrastructure to address some of the factors highlighted above i.e. provide open space and natural green space in the south eastern part of Burton Latimer, and provide connections  to the wider green infrastructure network.  The proposed development and the green infrastructure provision at the site are described in the Concept Layout Plan submitted with these representations. It is considered that the delivery of green infrastructure in conjunction with residential development at land south of Higham Road in Burton Latimer will make a significant contribution to the green infrastructure network.  Paragraph 73 of the NPPF 2012 identifies a need to assess requirements for open space, and highlights the benefits and opportunities associated with the provision of open space [Paragraphs 91 and 92 of NPPF2 2018 also identify a need to assess open space requirements]. As set out above, the proposed development at land south of Higham Road in Burton Latimer would deliver open space and other green infrastructure within the site, would address the lack of green infrastructure provided with other developments in the south eastern part of Burton Latimer, and would create connections to the wider green infrastructure network. | | Noted. The proposal and opportunities for it to contribute to the development of GI will be looked at in more detail through the development management process. |
| **ID 352**  **Is your representation supporting or objecting**? Neither  **Which part of the Draft Plan does your representation relate to?** ENV01  Reference is made to development where appropriate contributing to the Green Infrastructure projects in the borough through on-site provision or financial contributions. There is a need to define in what circumstances this requirement would apply to new development within the Borough. As currently drafted it appears to apply all types and scales of development but it is unclear whether this is the intention. | | Agreed, the policy wording could be improved to provide clarity. This will be reviewed in the next phase of Plan development for the SSP2. |
| **ID302**  **Is your representation supporting or objecting?** Neither  **Which part of the Draft Plan does your representation relate to?** 7.2 Green Infrastructure Borough Level Green Infrastructure Corridors and Projects  7.11 Does the GIDP have any consideration with regard to the historic environment or the impact on it?  Policy ENV01- Local Green Infrastructure Corridors will not have a detrimental impact on undesignated heritage assets or landscapes but tree planting habitat creation can be detrimental to archaeological activity | | The Council’s approach to the protection, conservation, enhancement and management of heritage assets and their settings is two-fold. The Green Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2018) (GIDP) determines the Local Level Green Infrastructure Corridors and then identifies project opportunities within those corridors to enhance existing and create new GI across the Borough. This approach enables the Council to guide, prioritise and co-ordinate activities to develop GI and the assets with-in including designated and non-designated heritage assets and their settings.  In addition to the GIDP the Council have a site-specific approach to allocating individual historically and visually important open spaces in SSP2. These have been assessed and identified in the Historically and Visually Important Open Space Background Paper (2015). This two-fold approach had been considered to be sufficient to ensure that heritage assets would be protected, conserved, enhanced and managed as it is widely recognised that such assets are integral to GI. Where assets fall out of the GI network they are captured as a Historically and Visually Important Local Green Space.  However, the Council now acknowledges that the GIDP adopts an implicit approach where an explicit approach would provide a clearer message of the commitment to protect and enhance the historic environment and assets within. As a consequence, the sections relating to GI and Local Green Space will be reviewed to ensure the supporting text and policy are more explicit in their regard to the historic landscape and assets within. |
|  | |  |
| **ID 100**  **Is your representation supporting or objecting?** Supporting  **Section 7.3 Open Space, sport and recreation and Local Green Space**  Sports England supports the intention of paragraphs 7.17 to 7.22 and supports the need to complete the built sports facilities strategy, the need for a playing pitch strategy and an open space strategy. The need for this evidence is critical to inform the development of the local plan and decisions of site allocations and having regard to paragraph 70 of NPPF (2012) - planning positively and should be completed as soon as possible. Sport England would therefore support a policy which is based on evidence and protects existing facilities (as identified) supports the enhance of facilities and identifies the correct new facilities and the right location for those facilities. | | Noted. The Council has recently commissioned for the development of a playing pitch, sports facilities and open space strategies. These documents will provide the evidence to ensure policy can be developed that that protects and enhances existing facilities and identifies the right location for new facilities. |
| **ID 259**  **Is your representation supporting or objecting?**  Neither  **Which part of the Draft Plan does your representation relate to?** Policy ENV02  Policy ENV02 & Section 10.19 - Allotment provision - seems at odds with the S106 register (see KBC313) monies available and proposed allotment provision within Desborough Open Space. | | The SSP2 will be updated to refer to the allotments planned at Desborough Green Space. |
| **ID 300**  **Is your representation supporting or objecting?** Supporting  **Which part of the Draft Plan does your representation relate to?** Policy ENV02  Allotments are important to local people. It is very important that their provision is safeguarded in the Local Plan | | Allotments are an important and well recognised resource. They are multi-functional spaces that benefit people, wildlife and the environment. The JCS determines that areas of open space will be designated for protection through the Part 2 Local Plans. The Council have recently commissioned the development of an open space strategy to provide the evidence that will ensure the Borough’s valued spaces such as allotments, parks and play areas are protected. The strategy will provide the basis for policy development on the protection and enhancement of existing and creation of new open spaces including allotments. |
| **ID 303**  **Is your representation supporting or objecting?** Neither  **Which part of the Draft Plan does your representation relate to?** Policy ENV02  Support the concept as long as they don’t have an impact on known or potential archaeological activity/landscapes. | | Noted. Policy 2 on the historic environment in the JCS does determine that the historic environment will be protected, preserved and where appropriate, enhanced. This establishes the overarching principle that development should not have a detrimental impact on any historic assets including known or potential archaeological activities or landscapes. Policy 2 should provide sufficient protection for the historic environment in the context of allotments and therefore amending the allotments policy to repeat the provision of Policy 2 is not deemed necessary. |
| **ID 304**  **Is your representation supporting or objecting?** Neither  **Which part of the Draft Plan does your representation relate to?** Policy ENV03  “local historic significance" I’m assuming that this could include non-designated archaeological assets. | | It is recognised the current approach with regard to heritage assets (including designated and non-designated assets such as those of archaeological importance) is implicit rather than explicit within the SSP2. There will be a review of the supporting text and policy wording for both ENV01 and ENV03 to determine how these can be refined to strengthen the Council’s approach towards the conservation, protection and enhancement of historic landscapes and the assets within them. Once this exercise is complete it will be possible to review the revised policies alongside Policy 2 from the JCS to determine if there are any further policy needs with respect to heritage. |
| **ID 343**  **Is your representation supporting or objecting?** Objecting  **Which part of the Draft Plan does your representation relate to?** Policy ENV03 (LGS Policy)  Site HVI069 – Land off Braybrooke Road, Desborough I write on behalf of my clients who own the land shown edged red on the attached plan and in response to the consultation on the Kettering Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan. My clients object to the proposal to designate their land south of Braybrooke Road, Desborough as Historically and Visually Important Local Green Space. We objected on behalf of our clients to the proposed designation within the context of the Kettering Borough Open Space Assessment. My client remains strongly of the view that this designation is inappropriate.  **Sustainability Appraisal** – In accordance with Section 19 of the 2004 Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act, policies set out in Local Plans must be subject to sustainability appraisal. Incorporating the requirements of the environmental assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulation 2004, a sustainability appraisal is a systematic process that should be undertaken at each stage of the plans preparation, assessing the effects of the Local Plan’s proposals on sustainable development when judged against reasonable alternatives.  The Local Plan should ensure that the results of the sustainability appraisal process clearly justify its policy choices, including the proposed site allocations and the approach taken to new growth when judged against “all reasonable alternatives”. In meeting the development needs of the area, it should be clear from the results of the assessment where some policy options have been progressed and others have been rejected. The Council’s decision making and scorage should be robust, justified and transparent and should be undertaken through a comparative and equal assessment of each reasonable alternative. Too often the sustainability appraisal process flags up the negative aspects of development, whilst not fully considering the positive aspects which can be brought about through new opportunities for housing development and how these connect to its landscape issues, social factors and the economy.  **Local Green Space** – Paragraph 100 of the recently revised National Planning Policy Framework states that Local Green Space designation should only be used where the green space is:   1. in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves; 2. demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and 3. local in character and is not an extensive tract of land”.   The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) provides further guidance on Local Green Space designations, including paragraph ID.37-015-20140306, “There are no hard and fast rules about how big a local green space can be because places are different and a degree of judgement will inevitably be needed”. However, paragraph 77 of the original National Planning Policy Framework is clear that local green Powered by Objective Online 4.2 - page 2 space designation should only be used where the green area concerned is not an extensive tract of land. Consequently, blanket designation of open countryside adjacent to settlements will not be appropriate. In particular, designation should not be proposed as a “back door” way to try to achieve what would amount to a new area of Greenbelt by another name.  **Historically & Visually Important Open Space** – I note that the evidence supporting the proposed designation of my clients’ land as Local Green Space is derived from the September 2015 Historically and Visually Important Open Space study. Within this document a total of 4 sites in Desborough are identified as potential Local Green Spaces yet only my clients’ land, HVI069 seems to have been considered to meet the requirements set out in the NPPF and guidance mentioned above. It is important to note that the land extends to over 27 acres of privately owned grazing land, which is not crossed by any public rights of way and as such no public access is afforded to the local community. We would suggest that this site represents exactly the type of “extensive tract of land” which policy suggests should not be designated as Local Green Space.  As a result, my clients do not consider that their land should be designated as Local Green Space, there is no evidence to suggest that the area is demonstrably special to the local community and since the site cannot be legally accessed by local residents, is of no recreational value to the community.  Therefore, in line with the national policy referred to above, my clients consider that this site does not meet the basic requirements for designation of Local Green Space. Indeed, having reviewed the sites proposed for potential designation in September 2015, my clients note that sites of similar size, proximity to new development and of local importance have been discounted. We would therefore urge the Borough Council to review their earlier study in the light of national policy and guidance, in order to ensure that all sites are assessed consistently and fairly, which we do not feel has happened in this case. National policy and guidance requires that such a designation is thoroughly considered and justified by robust evidence, which has not occurred in connection with our clients’ land.  As a result, my clients do not consider that the inclusion of their land as Historically and Visually Important Local Green Space is justified and request that the designation is reconsidered and deleted | | The Historically and Visually Important Open Space Background Paper (2015) sets out the rationale for progressing HVI069 (Desborough) as a Historically and Visually Important Local Green Space the principle of which is supported in the Historically and Visually Important Open Space Background Paper Update (2016).  These documents establish that the area contains well preserved ridge and furrow which, whilst once a ubiquitous feature of the English midlands, is now mainly seen to survive in small fields following much disturbance from the second world war. The assessment goes on to stipulate that the impact of large-scale development on this site could not be mitigated and it is therefore appropriate for the area to be designated.  Para 100 of the revised NPPF (2018) determines the test for the designation of a Local Green Space. The criteria state that the space should be a) reasonably close proximity to the community it serves; b) demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, e.g. because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value, tranquillity and / or richness of wildlife and c) is local in character and not an extensive tract of land.  The site is located on the west edge of Desborough opposite a residential settlement and is therefore in close proximity to the community it serves. The historic significance of the ridge and furrow in an area where much of this landscape feature has been lost makes it a demonstrably special space to the local community. It is not an extensive tract of land and is local in character. Having met the tests set out in the NPPF and it is not contrary to the national Planning Practice Guidance it can be concluded that this site is appropriate to be progressed as a Historically and Visually Important Open Space. |
| **ID 349**  **Is your representation supporting or objecting?** Objecting  **Which part of the Draft Plan does your representation relate to?** All  All sites proposed are not suitable, are not in keeping with the spirit and aesthetic of the village and are strongly opposed | | Section 7.3 provides a focus on green infrastructure, open space, sport and recreation facilities and Local Green Spaces. There are no proposed sites identified for Mawsley in this section though Figure 7.1 (Borough Level GI Corridors) does identify a project which is included in the North Northamptonshire Green Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2014). The project is for the provision of a new amenity green space in the village, a recommendation identified in the Open Space Needs Assessment (2007) to reduce the deficit of open space in that area.  The provision of open space as a community amenity is not generally deemed to be unsuitable and out of keeping with the spirit and aesthetic of a village setting. However, the Council is currently updating the open space audit and needs assessment so it may be that with the revision that this project is no longer deemed a need. |