
Site Specific Allocations Development Plan Document

SYNOPSIS BOX

To inform Members of the outcome of community involvement on the Site Specific Allocations Development Plan Document and associated documents

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To inform Members of the outcome of community involvement on the consultation document for the proposed Site Specific Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) and associated documents. Comments will feed into the production of the Proposed Submission version of the Site Specific Allocations DPD, which will form part of the Local Development Framework for the Borough

2. Background Details

- 2.1 As Members may recall, in February 2009, revisions to the LDF programme were approved that incorporated an additional stage of public consultation on the Site Specific Allocations DPD in order to take account of the consolidation of the development plan documents and time lapse between publishing the previously consulted upon Preferred Options reports.
- 2.3 In August, Members agreed to consult on the proposed Site Specific Allocations DPD. A six week consultation commenced on 7th September 2009 and was undertaken in line with the North Northamptonshire Statement of Community Involvement and Engagement Action Plan approved at Local Plan Committee on 1st July 2009. The consultation included the substantial mail-out of notification letters, posters and displays, articles in local newspapers, staffed exhibitions in the town centre, Member workshop, and consultation with key stakeholders and the local community

3. Site Specific Allocations DPD

- 3.1 The Site Specific Allocations DPD is a key document in Corby's Local Development Framework. Once published, it will provide policy guidance for Corby Borough up until 2021, including the identification of sites for housing, employment, retail, recreation and education and other land uses and will contain policies relating to proposals that require site specific conditions, such as design guidance, conservation and protection of open spaces

4. Consultation Results

- 4.1 The consultation document addressed a variety of spatial issues relevant to the Borough and generally sought to promote the further identification and discussion of key issues in a manner that created a stepping stone between Preferred Options consultation during 2006 and proposed submission in 2010.
- 4.2 A total of 59 respondents submitted comments. Each response was logged and summarised. Most of the respondents made comments related to several different parts of the Development Plan Document, and each comment has been treated as a separate representation. In total, nearly 500 representations were recorded.
- 4.3 It should be noted that the representations contained in this report have been summarised by officers. Full documentation from respondents is available on request.
- 4.4 The key messages raised were.

Economy and Employment

- 4.5 A total of sixteen respondents put forward forty-nine comments addressing the issue of Economy and Employment.
- 4.6 The bulk of comments related to employment land supply and the employment sites proposed in the consultation document, which are summarised below. Other respondents provided a mixture of comments including, support for mixed use development, identification of detailed matters that should be considered during planning application stage, support for the use of vacant and derelict sites in precedence to agricultural land, and suggestion for the creation of a lorry park.

Employment Land Supply

- 4.7 A number of respondents provided representations addressing the issue of employment land supply. The Highways Agency expressed concerns that the amount of land allocated for employment use represents an oversupply compared to the Core Strategy. Rutland County Council expressed concern at the impact of an over-supply of employment land, particularly the effects on the highway network and viability of employment land in Rutland. Conversely, other respondents supported the oversupply of employment land to allow flexibility to meet job growth targets. The East Midlands Regional Assembly noted the allocation of more employment land than is required by the Core Strategy but understand that flexibility is needed to provide a range and choice of sites for inward investment.

Employment Sites

- 4.8 The Environment Agency provided comments in relation to the flood risk issues raised by each of the proposed employment sites. Significantly, the Environment Agency identified E2 Land East of Weldon, E8 CBC Plots, Oakley Hay, E15 South of St. James Industrial Estate and E17 Priors Hall to fall partially within Flood Zones 2 or 3, in which case, the allocation must be subject to the PPS25 Sequential Test and (if necessary) the Exception Test. Additionally the Environment Agency noted that E19 Corby Western Sustainable Extension is adjacent to the start of a number of culverted rivers that may pose a flood risk to the site.
- 4.9 E10 Land between Wheatley Avenue and Station Road received support from one respondent although it was highlighted that important issues such as design, cost and land take of the Corby Walk remain to be resolved.
- 4.10 One respondent supported the allocation at E15 South of St. James Industrial Estate as an employment site but considers that there may be opportunities to bring forward the site more quickly through a more mixed use approach, including housing.
- 4.11 Three respondents supported the allocation of E19 Corby Western Urban Extension.
- 4.12 One respondent proposed that land at Barn Close is reinstated for employment purposes. Other respondents took the opportunity to promote land for development including Brookfield Resource Recovery Site and Corby South East and at Storefield.
- 4.13 The Highways Agency confirmed that none of the specific sites identified as being appropriate for employment use are anticipated to have a significant impact upon the operation of the truck road network.

Housing

- 4.14 Thirty four respondents provided 146 representations addressing the issue of Housing. Respondent discussion regarding housing was generally grouped into two main issues including the housing sites proposed in the consultation document, and; housing supply.
- 4.15 Other representations received covered a variety of comments including, review of housing needs is required in light of the current economic climate, opportunities identified to improve the bridleway and footpath network, support for the tight control of phasing, affordable housing to be integrated, the plan horizon should be extended, long term needs of gypsy and travellers should be considered, and; two respondents considered the density and affordable housing targets too prescriptive.

Housing Sites

- 4.16 A total of seventeen respondents put forward comments relating to the housing sites proposed through the consultation document.
- 4.17 The Environment Agency provided comments in relation to the flood risk issues raised by each of the proposed housing sites. Significantly, the Environment Agency identified HA3 Land East of Weldon, HA6 North of Cottingham Road, H13 Oakley Road Garage, HA22 Danesholme Regeneration Area, HA24 Rear of 28-33 Flensburg Close, HA25 Pen Green Lane, HA26 Off Stanion Lane, HA27 Oakley Vale and HA33 Chapel Road to fall partially within Flood Zones 2 or 3, in which case, the allocation must be subject to the PPS25 Sequential Test and (if necessary) the Exception Test.
- 4.18 HA3 Land East of Weldon received support from one respondent that confirmed that development could commence shortly after 2011 and that capacity could be increased to 2000 dwellings. East Northamptonshire Council and Rutland County Council expressed concerns that the developments around Corby, in particular the North East SUE, are likely to have significant impact upon the school, health and transport infrastructure. Two respondents, including Weldon Parish Council were not convinced that further housing is needed in the North-East to meet demand in the plan period. The CPRE considers that development should not commence until the completion of existing sites.
- 4.19 Northamptonshire County Council advised that whilst some discussion has been held regarding the development of HA4 Kingswood Phase 1b, at this time the future of the land remains unclear and as yet has not been declared surplus to requirement.
- 4.20 In terms of HA7 Former Beanfield Secondary School, the County Council advise that there has been a recent application for redevelopment of a replacement school that allows residual of 3.9 hectares for residential development.
- 4.21 Land Securities noted that HA16 Evolution Corby has yet to receive planning permission and that it should be considered an aspiration rather than a commitment in light of the planning status and economic recession that will delay the delivery of dwellings.
- 4.22 HA17 Land between Wheatley Avenue and Station Road received support from one respondent although it was highlighted that important issues such as design, cost and land take of the Corby Walk remain to be resolved.
- 4.23 HA20 Kingswood School generated two representations that queried the capacity and precise boundaries of the site. However one of the respondents supported the allocation and confirmed that the land will be available for redevelopment following completion of the new school in September 2010.
- 4.24 Two respondents, including New Lodge Park Tenants and Residents Association objected to HA21 Pychley Court on the grounds of traffic congestion, loss of green buffer space, increased crime, and; loss of car parking provision.
- 4.25 One respondent supported the allocation at HA23 Oakley Vale Neighbourhood Centre but stated that the capacity should be increased and that the site could come forward before 2015.
- 4.26 The most contentious allocation was HA26 Off Stanion Lane, which received four objections, including opposition from Corby Old Village Residents Association. Objections cited impact on village character, health and safety, loss of open space, flood risk, poor accessibility, and impact on wildlife.
- 4.27 One respondent supported the allocation at HA27 Oakley Vale (former allocation in Local Plan for Science Park).
- 4.28 Two respondents objected to the boundary of the allocation at HA28 South of Copenhagen Road on the basis that the 'eastern limb' should be maintained as public open space.

- 4.29 Three respondents supported the allocation at HA29 Western Sustainable Urban Extension. Another respondent claims that it is unrealistic to propose that 4,000 dwellings will be delivered in the plan period. The CPRE considers that development should not commence until the completion of existing sites.
- 4.30 Other respondents took the opportunity to promote housing, including land to the West of St. Marks Road and land off Southfield Road, Gretton.

Housing Provision

- 4.31 EMRA comment that justification for the proposed overprovision of housing land in comparison with the Regional Plan and Core Strategy will be essential, in particular the infrastructure capacity to support the level of provision proposed.
- 4.32 One respondent supported the overprovision which provides greater flexibility allowance for allocated sites that don't come forward as anticipated. Another respondent questioned whether the rural provision was sufficient to sustain village communities.

Villages and Rural Areas

- 4.33 Eleven respondents submitted comments in relation to the Villages and Rural Areas.
- 4.34 The majority of comments were received in relation to the village confines, with Gretton Parish Council, Harrington Parish Council and Weldon Parish Council providing support for the retention of village confines. Two respondents objected to the village confines or suggested amendment to the boundary in order to promote development sites. The response from Weldon Parish Council questioned the role and function of village confines in the context of significant growth in the North East Sustainable Urban Extension.
- 4.35 The remaining respondents broadly supported the proposals of the consultation document including, support for the approach to farm diversification, Parish Plans and conversion of buildings. One respondent objected to the designation of Rockingham as a restraint village, citing the need for a more flexible approach in the rural area.

Town Centre and Retail

- 4.36 Ten respondents provided thirty-five representations addressing the issue of Town Centre and Retail.
- 4.37 Four respondents submitted comments specifically related to the retail hierarchy. One respondent welcomed the inclusion of Phoenix Parkway in the hierarchy, while Land Securities objected to its inclusion. One respondent suggested that Rockingham Park should be included in the hierarchy of centres. The inclusion of a district centre at Western Urban Extension was supported by three respondents although it was felt that the document should give an indication of the expected scale.
- 4.38 The Town Centre Master Plan attracted a number of comments, including objection from Lockhart and Garratt at the loss of Hazel Wood, and; support from Northamptonshire Police for activity hubs, evening economy and diverse mix of uses but a warning that increased permeability can be an issue for crime.
- 4.39 The remaining comments were particularly varied in their concerns and include reference to Core Strategy, points of clarification and terminology, and; objection to out of town and retail warehousing and requirement to demonstrate the sequential test. The EMRA said that any retail expansion above Core Strategy will need to be justified in terms of the relationship with the development of other town centres in North Northamptonshire.

Green Infrastructure, Open Space, Sport and Recreation Facilities

- 4.40 Ten respondents provided representations addressing the issue of green infrastructure, open space, sport and recreation facilities. Comments were very diverse and there was no common focus of concern or approval regarding this issue amongst respondents.
- 4.41 The commitment to protect and enhance green spaces was welcomed by three respondents. Another respondent identified several areas in Oakley Vale that should be designated as green spaces and an area next to Former Beanfield Secondary School should be re-designated.
- 4.42 Respondents, including Sport England and Lockhart and Garratt raised concern that the approach to green infrastructure, open space, sport and recreation facilities is not integrated. Lockhart and Garratt recommended that the document is restructured to present green infrastructure as a separate chapter in order to ensure a connected approach. Additionally, Sport England expressed concern that the evidence base is becoming increasingly dated.
- 4.43 Two respondents made the same objection to the payment of monies for future maintenance obligations, making reference to Circular 05/2005.
- 4.44 Other respondents provided a mix of comments including, anti-social behaviour and opportunities for green links should be addressed, strategy for indoor sports facilities should be developed, identification of footpath improvements, and; suggestion by the Wildlife Trust that a GI strategy should be produced.

Community Facilities, Services and Infrastructure

- 4.45 Fifteen respondents submitted comments in regard to community facilities, services and infrastructure. Respondent discussion was generally structured around the policy topics, which are discussed below. Other respondents provided a mixture of comments including, Weldon Parish Council would like to see the allocation for burial provision expanded, three respondents expressed concern that health care requirements are still unknown, Northamptonshire County Council supported the approach to education, concern was expressed at the omission of a section on emergency services, and; conflicting views were presented in terms of the approach to public art provision. Northamptonshire Policy supported the approach but the Government Office for the East Midlands considered the policy unnecessary.

Developer Contributions

- 4.46 Eight respondents, including the Highways Agency, Environment Agency, Sport England, Northamptonshire Police, Rutland County Council and Weldon Parish Council welcomed the commitment to developing a developer contribution strategy. A number of respondents suggested additional facilities that developer funding should be used, including emergency services, foul drainage infrastructure and greater emphasis on sport facility requirements. Three respondents objected to maintenance contributions, improvements to utilities infrastructure, SUDS and staff contributions items being included within the list of items to be secured from developer contributions. Rutland County Council welcomed the reference to involving neighbouring local authorities

Utilities Infrastructure

- 4.47 The Environment Agency objected to the proposed approach to infrastructure provision that was considered inconsistent with the Core Strategy. The Government Office for the East Midlands considered the policy unnecessary because the matter was already covered by the Core Strategy.

Sustainable Urban Drainage

- 4.48 The Environment Agency suggested additional wording to the policy approach. Four respondents including the Government Office for the East Midlands considered the policy unnecessary.

Transport Infrastructure

- 4.49 One respondent considered that improvements to the A43 should be phased early in the plan period. Another respondent expected further details on the improvements to the A6003. The Highways Agency said that the approach should be broadened to encompass walking and cycling.

Environment and Heritage

- 4.50 Eight respondents submitted comments on environment and heritage, including Northamptonshire County Council and the Wildlife Trust. Comments were very diverse and there was no dominant focus of concern or approval regarding this matter amongst respondents.
- 4.51 Wildlife Trust suggested alternative wording to strengthen the approach to the protection and enhancement of environmental designations, and recommended that potential wildlife sites are included within the hierarchy of nature conservation sites.
- 4.52 Weldon Parish Council supported the protection of Conservation Areas. However, one respondent considered that policy should be strengthened and two identical comments were submitted that considered the wording from the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act should be used instead.
- 4.53 Two respondents repeated an objection to the approach to unlisted building of local interest. One respondent supported the approach to the protection of historic parks and Northamptonshire County Council generally supported the approach to the protection of the historic environment subject to minor amendment.
- 4.54 Finally, Wildlife Trust and Lockhart and Garratt identified a number of typographical and factual mistakes.

Kingswood

- 4.55 Six respondents provided representations addressing the issue of Kingswood, including Northamptonshire Police, Highways Agency, CPRE and Northamptonshire County Council. The comments were overwhelmingly supportive although one respondent would like to see greater emphasis on linkages to Morrisons Supermarket and the County Council would like to see reference to Plan and Movement Guide.

Corby Western Urban Extension

- 4.56 Six respondents submitted forty-three comments addressing the issue of the Corby Western Urban Extension, including the key landowners.
- 4.57 The comments ranged from matters of clarification and consistency to detailed matters to be included within the Master Plan. One respondent took the opportunity to promote housing at land off Southfield Road, Gretton.

5. Public Consultation Events Analysis

- 5.1 As part of the consultation for the proposed Site Specific Allocations DPD, a series of consultation events were organised as a forum for local feedback on the emerging proposals of the Local Development Framework.
- 5.2 The summary report that follows demonstrates the thinking of the members of the public that engaged in the public consultation events.

Public Workshop, Wednesday 23rd September 2009

- 5.3 In total, 18 people attended the workshop event. Attendees were offered the opportunity to sit in workshops groups based on the chapters in the consultation document. The discussion concentrated on HA26 Off Stanion Lane. The main points from the workshop provided as follows:

- Significant flood risk, including a natural spring that runs through the site;

- Power cables and main sewers cross the site;
- The site supports strong wildlife with a local nature reserve at the bottom of the site and presence of crested newts;
- Protected trees are present on the site;
- Public footpath across the site;
- Highway access could be problematic;
- Well used open space, including for educational purposes, in an area that has limited supply;
- Health and safety concerns from the clay holes and ponds; and
- Lighting from nearby car storage

Public Exhibition, Cinema Suite, Willow Place on Friday 2nd October and Saturday 3rd October 2009

5.4 Staffed exhibitions held in the town centre during the weekend commencing 2nd October attracted nearly 250 people. The main comments provided from the consultation event as follows:

- Cowthick Plantation should be preserved;
- Development of HA27 Oakley Vale (former allocation in Local Plan for Science Park) would impact on views across the countryside;
- Wind farms are an eyesore; and
- Respondents suggested that the town centre needed a number of additional facilities, including cinema, bowling alley, indoor shopping centre, hospital, football pitch in Coronation Park, more shops and toilets.

4. Issues to be taken into account:-

Policy Priorities

The adoption of the North Northamptonshire Local Development Framework, including the Site Specific Allocations DPD is and will remain a Corby Borough Council priority.

Financial

None as a direct result of this report

Legal

None as a direct result of this report

Performance Information

None as a direct result of this report

Best Value, Human Rights, Equalities and Community Safety

None as a direct result of this report but all are key considerations during the preparation of the Local Development Framework.

Sustainability

Legislation requires the Site Specific Allocations DPD to be prepared with a view to contributing to the achievement of sustainable development. To this end a Sustainability Appraisal Report accompanied the Site Specific Allocations DPD.

5. Conclusion

5.1 From the number and nature of comments received it is considered that there are no major issues preventing the Site Specific Allocations DPD from proceeding.

5.2 Work has commenced on the pre-submission consultation document, including further work on strengthening the evidence base and review of representations submitted at previous

consultation stages. Once the final version of the document is produced and agreed by Members, members of the public and stakeholders will be able to make final comments on the Proposed Submission version of the Site Specific Allocations DPD for a further six week period, which will be taken into account at the Examination. Comments at this stage of DPD adoption can only relate to legality or the soundness of the Plan. Tests of soundness and legality ensure that the final Plan conforms to legal statute and that the DPD is justified, effective and consistent with national policy. The submission documents will include:

- The development plan document (as proposed to be submitted)
- A Proposals map
- The Sustainability Appraisal
- A public consultation statement setting out:
 - who was invited to be involved in the plan preparation
 - how they were invited to be involved in the plan preparation
 - main issues raised and how they have been addressed
- Any other supporting documents relevant to the preparation of the development plan document.

5.3 It is anticipated that the Proposed Submission consultation will commence in spring 2010. A report and Pre-Submission Plan will be presented to Members at a future Local Plan Committee.

6. Recommendation

It is recommended that Members note the results of the public consultation on the proposed Site Specific Allocations Development Plan Document

Background Papers

Committee reports and minutes dated 1st July 2009, 18th February 2009, and 4th August 2009

List of Appendices

Appendix 1: Summary of Consultation Responses

Officer to Contact

Terry Begley, Local Plans Principal Planner (ext. 3185)