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Introduction

The stakeholder workshop held on 15th September 2005 at the Hilton Hotel, Corby was arranged as part of the preparatory work for the Corby Site Specific Development Document which will form part of the North Northamptonshire Joint Local development Framework (see www.corby.gov.uk for further details). It was designed to encourage debate and discussion of the issues and options relating to the need to plan for significant growth in housing as part of the growth agenda for Corby. There were 40 attendees ranging in representation from local government, voluntary organisations as well as representatives from private land holdings and other interests.

Input from these representatives through the workshop forum will aid and guide the preparation of the Preferred Options for the Corby Site Specific Development Document.

Workshop Format

Attendees were requested to sit in several sub-groups which were intended to ensure a range of representation in terms of professionals, private and public and voluntary organisations, as well as local representatives.

The workshop was split into two sessions during which each sub-group was asked to answer several set questions. At the end of each session, each sub-group was asked to identify one or two key discussion points.

Structure of Feedback Report

The remainder of this report is structured as follows:

- The Questions covered by the workshop
- An analysis of Key Issues and Outcomes (including those identified by each group)
- Detailed notes of the discussions of each sub group (Appendix A)
- Annotated maps capturing each groups drawings (Appendix B)
- Attendance Record (Appendix C)
The Questions Covered by the Workshops

Session 1
In your groups please address the following issues:

Q1: In the next 15 years there is a requirement for about 16,000 more houses than today’s 22,000; of these 13,500 dwellings will be provided on existing allocations, at Priors Hall and within the urban area. Land needs to be allocated for about 4,000 more dwellings. Beyond 2021 there are may be a need for a further 10,000. There are many different ways in which the new housing could be provided with the qualification that it is important that new housing is sustainable and this includes the need to ensure that it does not lead to the unnecessary use of cars.

There are different ways of accommodating new housing outside the urban area and we would like your ideas on the different ways in which it might be provided.

a. On the Map would you please show where you would put where you would put the 4,000 houses for the period to 2021 in two ways:
   - All together in one location
   - On 2 or 3 smaller sites
   Using your post-its would you please put the main reasons behind your decisions.

b. Which of these 2 options do prefer and why? Again use post-it notes for your reasons.

c. Are there locations where smaller extensions to the urban area could be used to generate/support new facilities for existing local residents of Corby Borough? If so, please show them on the Map and rank them in importance. These could be around the edge of Corby as well as within it or around the edge of villages. Using your post-its would you please put the main reasons behind your decisions.

d. On the Map would you show where you would allocate a further 10,000 dwellings, on at least two sites, bearing in mind your preferred options above and sustainability objectives. Again use post-it notes for your reasons.

Session 2

Q2: Rate of growth
The RSS proposes 560 new dwellings pa 2001-2006, 640 pa 2006- 2011 and 1060 pa 2011-2021. How can this be achieved? Is it dependent on greenfield sites coming forward during early stages? If so why do you consider that sufficient brownfield land cannot come forward in the early life of the plan? Should the plan seek to prevent more greenfield land coming forward before 50%, 75%, 90% of the land within the urban area has been developed?

Q3: Phasing
Please give the advantages and disadvantages of greenfield housing land being released in phases (in accordance with Government guidance) and of all sites being released at once. What would be in the best interests of Corby and why?

Q4: Affordable Housing.
Should affordable housing at 20% be provided on-site as part of all housing developments or should the requirement be changed for certain sites, with commuted payments towards provision elsewhere. If so, using Map 3, on which sites would such a relaxation be appropriate and why?
Q5: Regeneration of Existing Housing.
Corby has existing housing that needs improvement and Kingswood and Danesholme are identified as a location where an Area Action Plan is to be prepared. Please give your views on whether there are any other areas that should be treated in a similar way and why.

Q6: Housing Mix.
Corby has a lot of affordable houses but it is perceived that there is a need for more higher income housing. Please give your views on the following:
   a. Should this all be integrated within a mixed housing scheme or provided separately?
   b. Assuming some separate upper income is needed, should it be on one large site or in several smaller developments?
   c. Where would you put such developments? Please add these to Map 1.

Q7: Optional Question
Do you have any comments on the specific urban housing sites identified by the Roger Tym Urban Capacity Study?
Key Issues in Group Feedback

At the end of each session the groups were asked to set out the question and issues which raised the most discussion. These are set out by Group below:

Session 1

Group A: Q.1c
- If not careful “donut” effect and out-migration may occur.
- Balance with mixed housing in urban core.
- Dense social housing, less executive housing low density middle class areas.
- Involve developers and Corby Borough Council to lead.
- Oakley Vale negatively affected Corby town by taking residents from existing estates.
- Concern housing market may stall – need interim activity to keep market interested and better facilities.

Group B: Q1a & b
- One or two plus smaller extensions. Don’t know enough about constraints. – how much land would be required for 4000 houses?
- West of A6003.
- Stanion / Oakley Vale – not preferred (scale/size/complexity).
- Prefer more, smaller extensions.
- Corby falling behind on MKSM target – more deliverable sites needed. Suggested breakdown: 1200 dwellings East Weldon; 1400 West of A6003; 1100 Oakley Vale / Stanion. Plus some rural housing, including affordable housing – need for services.

Group C: Q1a & b
Main criterion is proximity to the town centre; larger number of smaller sites is preferable to one large one. Order of priority:
- land south of the land west of Stanion, within Kettering - the best option in all respects except political / delivery.
- Land used for car storage near town centre to avoid “donut” effect, if viable economically and physically.
- West of A6003 - but not all at once.
- Weldon but only if developed as an extension to Priors Hall; too far from town centre.
- As part of Corby villages – don’t want to change character but need housing on small scale to enable facilities.

Group D:
- Town Centre – high priority for high density housing – safety, evening economy.
- 10,000 dwellings – is that sustainable in terms of town ceiling on growth to turn Corby into a suburb?

Group E:
- West of Corby – improve links into town; not like Oakley Vale.
- Car storage site but may be contaminated – more suitable for employment?
- Extending Oakley Vale to Stanion – political problems to be overcome.
- Didn’t agree with extension of Priors Hall around Weldon. Will swamp village and too far from town centre and urban areas.
• Primary focus should be the town centre and urban areas.

Session 2

Group A: Q2
• Problem if all sites released at once – market swamped.
• Control release over North Northants.
• As land values rise Corby Borough Council gets share.
• All interested parties maximise benefits.

Group B:
Q 2
• Brownfield / greenfield growth agenda – release both but brownfield may lag unless there is phasing. Could be problems – e.g. infrastructure

Q 3
• Debate focused on affordable housing. Council strategy 20% on every site.
• Dissent –case for not providing affordable housing on every site.
• Need to change demographics- particular problems of Corby.
• Could be provided on other sites through S.106 agreements.

Group C:
Q 2
• Flexibility – ensure development brings about transformation of all Corby.
• Variety of sites should come forward together.
• Phased release of Priors Hall – if other sites are not released, landowner may sit on large area and hold others to ransom.

Q 3
• Quality of build important.
• Mixed range of types on all large sites.
• Smaller sites in urban area should be identified and promoted for upper market housing to change mix/ image of Corby.

Group D:
• Integration.
• Mixed housing stock – no enclaves!
• Road signage should be changed to ensure that traffic is directed through centre of Corby to encourage trade.

Group E:
• Supply/Demand. Too much greenfield and not enough brownfield.
• Executive homes not appropriate.
• Type of housing important. Opportunities limited.
• Use Compulsory Purchase Order mechanisms to control process.

Group F:
Q2
• Agreed it is essential that brownfield sites be delivered as priority.
• Challenges include:
  • Clarity re: funding.
  • Greater government input/ support re infrastructure.
Summary of Group Discussions

The following section summarises the points emerging from the group discussions as evidenced from the notes taken and discussions which took place. Group notes are collated in Appendix A.

Preferred Locations for Growth

a) One large site: two preferred options were land west of Corby (A6003) and land south-east of Corby (that is east of Oakley Vale going towards Stanion - within Kettering Borough). The latter was generally recognised as better in terms of sustainability and in order to build on the existing facilities at Oakley Vale, but the political problems of bringing it forward were recognised. The former should be linked closely into existing housing areas, including Kingswood/ Danesholme, and to the town centre; one group suggested that the area should be subject to a combined AAP with Kingswood/ Danesholme.

2-3 smaller sites: There was less consensus on this, but in addition to smaller versions of the above, the main options were:

- Car storage land east of the town centre (J20 on Local Plan).
- Area south-east of the town centre, near station.
- The town centre and other existing housing areas (but see also c) below).
- Extensions to Priors Hall, in the form of land east of Weldon (but not confined to the site of the current planning application which should relate better to Priors Hall).

There was a widespread concern that development should be as close to the town centre as possible and opposition to significant development in the villages, especially Gretton, because of a concern that a “donut” effect may occur (but see below concerning more limited development). While some groups favoured the land east of Weldon (but generally not in the form currently proposed), its distance from the town centre was recognised as a problem; one group objected to it, while another put it as the last priority, for that reason. Difficult brownfield sites such as those used for car storage were favoured but some groups assumed that site condition problems ruled these out in the short term. This highlights a need for more information on such constraints.

b) Three groups preferred the 2/3 site option while 2 preferred the release of one large site.

Reasons for the 2/3 site approach included marketing range, choice, deliverability, diversity of layout and design, and assistance to regeneration as a result of a change in character of development (contrasting with Oakley Vale and Priors Hall).

Reasons for the single site option were avoiding the “donut” effect and ability to provide all required facilities (although this group also had concerns that this would become a separate commuter suburb with no links to Corby).

c) There was some overlap between answers to this question and the 2/3 site option above. The groups probably had insufficient information to fully evaluate the sustainability or otherwise of existing facilities or to suggest many smaller sites, but the following were put forward:

- Danesholme/ Kingswood and redevelopment of other existing estates.
- Villages (Gretton, Weldon, Cottingham and Middleton), providing they didn’t lose identity and it would sustain facilities.
- Town centre, especially if linked to getting leisure facilities.
- Side of West Glebe Park.
• Penn Green allotments.
• On some of the woodland near the town centre.
• City Technology College site at Oakley Vale (C10) (*post workshop note – this is currently a functioning school*)

d) One group questioned whether an extra 10,000 dwellings was a sustainable number for Corby and therefore whether we should be providing for this at all at this stage. Consensus on the best sites was limited with the following being identified:

- West of Corby (further development of site identified under a) - 2 groups.
- East of Corby, in the wider Weldon area - 2 groups.
- South and south-west of Corby towards Market Harborough / Kettering (in Kettering Borough) - 2 groups.
- Car storage land (if not developable short-term) - 1 group.

Rate of Growth / Phasing
There was a great deal of overlap between questions 2 and 3 and some groups answered them together.

In principle there was widespread support for the brownfield sites first approach, but given the *fait accompli* at Priors Hall, the scale of growth required and the relative paucity of urban brownfield sites as a result of Corby’s history and characteristics, some groups felt that a more balanced and market-led approach was justified here. Ways to link greenfield release with the development of brownfield sites should be explored.

While one group favoured a release-it-all approach, most wanted to retain some element of phasing, including within the Priors Hall site, if this was still possible. If all 4000 additional dwellings are to go on one site, then it should be phased. Three groups were particularly strongly in favour of phasing to ensure brownfield and town centre development, stop flooding the market, enable the monitoring of land values and housing mix, and plan the availability of infrastructure. Only one group attempted to answer when greenfield sites should be released - after 50% brownfield sites have been built on.

Affordable Housing
There was a wide range of views on this issue, although one common viewpoint is that housing developments should generally be mixed socially and provide choice of tenure and size, with affordable provision being pepper-potted. Despite the cheaper housing market and relatively high social housing provision (27%), there was a general view that affordable housing provision was needed. Some groups and individuals accepted that certain developments (especially distant sites with no public transport) need not provide affordable housing on-site but should instead contribute to provision elsewhere. However, a contrary view was that the urban sites (especially development within existing unpopular estates) should not be required to make on-site provision in order to re-balance the urban housing market, while peripheral developments should make the full 20% affordable provision to prevent single house type ghettos. Affordable housing in the villages is a particular concern, as is provision for key workers on low wages.

Regeneration of Existing Housing
General concerns included:

- Avoiding ghettos of social housing and remove stigma from certain areas; this has been exacerbated by people moving out of older estates to Oakley Vale and letting out their former properties.
- The need to differentiate between several broadly similar estates and to give them more distinct characters.
Housing conditions as revealed by the stock condition survey.
- Environmental conditions, including shopping centres, green spaces, verges and pavements, lack of car-parking, under-used garage courts.
- Need for sheltered and other special needs housing.
- Provision of some local employment opportunities.

There was general support for the strategy of selective demolition to allow new build and a re-dress of housing choice and social balance. While some groups felt the focus should stay just on Kingswood/ Danesholme, one group identified additional problem areas as follows (based on stock condition): Arran Way – Lodge park – Wedmore Court – Beanfield – Steyning Close – Tower Hill. Another group also identified Lloyds / Lodge Park and suggested a Supplementary Planning Document as an alternative to an Area Action Plan.

**Housing Mix**

While there was some overlap between this and the discussion on affordable housing, the main focus of discussion under this question was upper market housing. There was a consensus that higher income housing should be integrated within new development schemes, even (or indeed especially) within urban areas. Single house type enclaves of upper market housing were undesirable and received very little support, even from those favouring development east of Weldon. Upper market housing for young professionals should be in the town centre, linked to a new railway station and re-invigorated retail and leisure facilities, but even this should be mixed and not expel existing town centre residents. Very large mansions may be the exception to this objective, but these should go on small sites adjoining the villages. Another exception might be appropriate small sites within the urban area. Any sites uniquely for high cost housing should be phased carefully to provide a good mix across the whole area, including the urban area, and to avoid depressing the market.

**Comments on Specific Urban Capacity Sites**

Very few groups had time to address this. There was a concern from one group that sites appeared to have been missed *(post workshop note: However, only specific sites were shown - not allowances, e.g. for garage sites).* Specific additional sites proposed were land at Danesholme, behind Oxford University Press, garage sites and other Corby Borough Council owned land. The site at Seymour Plantation was opposed by one group - should be retained for B1 use, even if not suitable for a Science Park. They agreed that the Oakley Vale Science Park site is suitable for residential but a part should be retained for local employment.
APPENDIX A: NOTES OF THE DISCUSSIONS OF EACH SUB-GROUP

The general responses to each question from the various sub-groups have been transcribed and are provided in the following section for information and reference purposes.

Group A

Session 1

Q1 (Location of Major Growth)

a) (Preferred locations for a single site and for 2-3 smaller sites)
   See Map 1

   • Priors Hall could take more.
   • West of A6003 (line of least objection).
   • East of Weldon.
   • Off A43 (more likely to raise objections than the A6003 site).
   • Smaller site to north.
   • No to Gretton.
   • Don’t want donut effect by adding to all villages: can infrastructure catch up e.g. primary school/ shops/ transport?

b) (Which of these 2 options do prefer and why?)

   • Worried about donut effect if the small sites option is chosen. Therefore on balance prefer one big site.

c) (Locations where smaller extensions could be used to generate/support new facilities for existing residents)

   • Are these existing residential areas unsustainable?
   • Worried that residents will lose “Village” identity
   • Danesholme and Kingwood deteriorated with the development of Great Oakley; kudos of being in Great Oakley – not Corby. What proportion of Oakley Vale residents have moved in from other areas of Corby?
   • Concern about stall in housing market. People will move out to the wealthy areas.
   • Require more leisure/retail.

   See also Map 1

d) (Sites for a further 10,000 dwellings.)

   • Map 1 shows 3 locations

Session 2
Q2 (Rate of Growth)

- Unrealistic to have all brownfield development. Order of release should be:
  a) Urban area.
  b) Brownfield within the green.
  c) Outside urban area brownfield.
  d) Outside urban area greenfield.
  
  But if it is a part brownfield and part greenfield that should go first.

- No problem with agreeing with the principle but we have already got sites outside the urban area with “live” permission, e.g. Priors Hall. Corus issue of waiting for the “best price”.

Q3 (Phasing)

- Market collapse if you release it all at once. Therefore carefully release to monitor land values.

- Phased release especially of executive homes to ensure a good mix across the whole area including the urban area.

- Needs to be done in concert with the adjoining areas. Therefore the North Northamptonshire Joint Planning Unit needs to exert some direction in the best interests of the Growth Policy.

Q4 (Affordable Housing)

- Generally yes but there may be exceptions e.g. Charles Church; others not convinced – don’t just want the executive housing around the outside of Corby.

- Do a deal to build affordable housing in the villages. Some key workers are on low wages – they need affordable housing as well. Relate to wage structure locally – need to be affordable.

Q5 (Regeneration of Existing Housing)

- High level of social housing in Corby but note comment by Martin Field, Corby Borough Council: “All former public housing areas now have at least 50% owner occupation. Of the 22,000 houses in the borough only 6,000 (27%) are still in public ownership.”

- Older housing is better quality than the “newer” Danesholme/ Kingswood area - higher density.


- Need to look at shopping areas within the estates and green spaces need improvement.

- Older areas still require “tarting up”. Pavement and car parking provision inadequate in the older areas. Ploughed up verges – issues over using the garage courts which are not popular now.

Q6 (Housing Mix)

- See above comments – be careful not to depress the market.

- If we identify that we need high cost housing then phase it carefully to avoid pre-empting the market and making it not work.

- Mixed development required on most sites.

Q7 Optional Question (Comments on capacity study sites)
• Seemed to miss some sites.
• e.g. Danesholme – behind Oxford University Press – decent mixed site.
• Other land that Corby Borough Council owns may be suitable for development e.g. garage sites.
Group B

Session 1

Q1 (Location of Major Growth)

a) (Preferred locations for a single site and for 2-3 smaller sites)

See Map 2

- Places for one location
  - Available land indicated at west of A6003.
  - South between Stanion and Oakley Vale.
- Places/reasons for 2/3 smaller sites:
  - Various studies looked at broad areas for further development.
  - Too much infrastructure needed for one site.
  - More manageable than a large 4000 site.
  - Weldon (up to 750-1200 more).
  - Between Stanion and Oakley Vale.
  - West of A6003.
- Concern about over-extension of villages - loss of character.

General
- No single “tenure” ghettos.
- Impact of A43 bypass and later “in fill”.
- Impact on Kettering boundary and tensions.
- North Northamptonshire strategy - tension between the four authorities.
- Housing choice important.

b) (Which of these 2 options do prefer and why?)

- Preference is for 2/3 sites.
- Housing choice.
- Deliverability with smaller sites.
- Already a shortfall of completions/permissions.
- Diversity of design/layout.
- Phoenix Parkway identified in Urban Capacity Study as suitable for any residential development.

c) (Locations where smaller extensions could be used to generate/support new facilities for existing residents)

- Smaller developments that could assist existing community areas.
- Corby originally built to fairly high density. Difficult to find areas close to existing neighbourhoods where smaller extensions could be located of a size to really help improve local facilities.
- Agreed need is to resource town centre especially entertainment wise.
- Ideas for side of West Glebe Park.
- Penn Green allotments.
- Group not confident about their local knowledge for facilities needed in village areas.
- Debate ongoing about smaller local health/community facilities.
d) (Sites for a further 10,000 dwellings.)

- 10,000 - east of Corby in wider Weldon area.

Session 2

Q2 (Rate of Growth)

- Few brownfield sites otherwise market would have found them. Sustainability more of a key issue.
- More a degree of market confidence to start new building which is now growing.
- Level of completions is growing and rising.
- Use of planning conditions/phasing conditions to push development on.
- Build on brownfield and greenfield – too difficult to be based on %!!

Q3 (Phasing)

- Government keen on phasing. Different for "growth" agenda areas.
- Phasing important to infrastructure provision.
- Release of all greenfield would work against brownfield -use of greenfield seen as easier.
- Should be some phasing conditions.

Q4 (Affordable Housing)

- Small pepper-pot development on site.
- More than one point of view regarding selective off-site provision.
- Mix of new development needs to be different from the past.
- Proposal to have Weldon scheme with no affordable housing on site.

Q5 (Regeneration of Existing Housing)

- Supplementary Planning Document or “topic” paper suggested for sheltered housing.
- Lloyds/ Lodge Park -some similar Area Action Plan approach via Supplementary Planning Documents.

Q6 (Housing Mix)

- Scale of upper end of market = 5/6 bedroom houses and expensive apartments.
- Weldon as one site.

Q7 Optional Question (Comments on capacity study sites)

- This question was not answered.

Group C
Session 1

Q1 (Location of Major Growth)

a) (Preferred locations for a single site and for 2-3 smaller sites)

See Map 3
- Preferred location if all in one place - west of Corby.
- Preferred locations if in more than one place (in order of preference):
  - South of Corby, i.e. land in Kettering south of the land west of Stanion site.
  - West of Corby (small area of large site above).
  - Large car storage site east of Corby (J20 on Local Plan), if feasible (further investigation needed).
  - Land east of Weldon as an alternative to 3. and if 1. and 2. not enough.

Main reason behind decisions was concern about keeping development as close as possible to Corby Town Centre in order to maximise benefits for the town.

b) (Which of these 2 options do prefer and why?)

- Preference was for the 2 or 3 site option because:
  - It provides a range of sites for marketing purposes.
  - More sites will help the regeneration of Corby by improving its character.
  - One large site would not represent a change from the previous approach (i.e. Oakley Vale but also Priors Hall).

c) (Locations where smaller extensions could be used to generate/support new facilities for existing residents)

- Emphasis must be on intensification of residential use within the town, including redevelopment of existing estates.
- Arguments also for some development at the villages if it will sustain facilities, especially primary schools; must include affordable housing as well as upper market. Preferred villages were Gretton, Weldon, Cottingham and Middleton, not Rockingham, East Carlton and Stanion. See Map 3.
- City Technology College site at Oakley Vale (C10 on Local Plan).

d) (Sites for a further 10,000 dwellings)

- 2 options for long term extensions:
  - Land west of Corby.
  - Land south and south west of Corby, in Kettering Borough.
- Also the car storage land if feasible, only in the longer term.
Session 2

Q2 (Rate of Growth)
Nothing recorded.

Q3 (Phasing)
- Concern about too much greenfield development too early - Oakley Vale is not seen as part of Corby and further greenfield development would be seen as just another Oakley Vale.
- On the other hand it is recognised that developers must be encouraged to come into the area.
- Need a range of sites at any one time in order to offer choice; quality of development is vital.
- If necessary, should intervene to ensure development meets special needs (e.g. for the elderly).
- In conclusion, no real objection to release of all the land at once, if option 2 from Session 1 is adopted; but if all the extra greenfield release is to be west of Corby, this should be released in smaller phases.

Q4 (Affordable Housing)
- Problem identified of right to buy housing being bought to rent with the owners moving to Oakley Vale, thus exacerbating social differentiation and stigma of certain areas.
- Queries raised about the need for affordable housing given the relatively low house prices.
- In order to avoid the creation of affordable housing ghettos and encourage better quality housing/ regeneration in the centre, off-site contributions should be allowed for urban housing sites, but greenfield sites must provide the 20% on-site.

Q5 (Regeneration of Existing Housing)
- No other specific areas suggested for regeneration - all existing housing areas should be looked at.
- General concern that ghettos must be avoided and that there must be flexibility in how existing urban areas and sites are developed.
- Problem of all housing estates looking the same. Should look to differentiate them and give them character.

Q6 (Housing Mix)
- Upper market housing should be provided as part of a larger site, not separately on one large site.
- Even smaller sites should include an affordable element.
- But there may be a few sites, even within the urban area, where a single small site is appropriate for upper market housing, e.g. Hazelwood Home site behind the ambulance station.
- Key is flexibility.

Q7 Optional Question (Comments on capacity study sites)
- Seymour Plantation site is not supported for housing.
- Oakley Vale Science Park site should keep a small element for employment use.
Group D

Session 1

Q1 (Location of Major Growth)

a) (Preferred locations for a single site and for 2-3 smaller sites)

See Map 4

- Where will people work – in Corby or commuting.
- Don’t want to create dormitory areas around Corby where residents don’t use Corby facilities. Need to be part of Corby community.
- Town centre must attract people to use it.
- Difficulty of new housing areas, e.g. Oakley Vale, becoming mini towns. Means no investment support for problem housing areas.
- Need to look at impacts of new developments on existing communities.
- Infrastructure must come forward with housing not after – essential.
- Sustainability for the Borough, not just urban extensions.
- Build new houses in the centre of town – young single people e.g. around boating lake – young professionals – won’t be a large number but would positively influence the centre and encourage night time activities etc. Include mixed development with social housing.
- If rail comes could become attractive commuter town. Get these people in and around the town centre. Rail needs to be a route on the way to somewhere else not just a shuttle service.

Sites –

- Executive housing around the town centre. Need the higher incomes to regenerate the centre but then what happens to the existing people in the town centre- so would need to be mixed. New rail station – use this to link the town and the station to make it safe.
- Add new town centre higher density housing that is sympathetic to the centre.
- If this is done, the centre needs to be twenty four hours.
- Open up the boating lake and forest for use by people. Make it feel safe by better management. Groundwork have action in place.
- Have approximately 100-300 dwellings in town centre.
- If go for one big urban extension, must link into Corby and have facilities developed with the housing.
- Must keep beautiful countryside to encourage people into Corby. That is what will bring higher income households into Corby.
- Put new developments near to Kingswood/Danesholme and other estates. Use section 106s to improve these estates as well as executive housing – integrate newer executive housing with these estates.
- Market for young families as well as executives – lots of open space, close to London, cheap house/land prices.
- Get people away from the car – create safe walkways – links to buses/railway stations etc.

Options –

- Develop as much as possible within existing housing areas as mixed use housing (including town centre).
• Remarket in area SE of the station (see Map 4) – links to existing housing – Oakley Vale – still close to town centre and would link Oakley Vale with Priors Hall – encourage walking and would link in old village.

b). (Which of these 2 options do prefer and why?)

Prefer 2/3 smaller sites option. Reasons above and outlined on Map 4.

c) (Locations where smaller extensions could be used to generate/support new facilities for existing residents)

• Development around woodland in area of town centre and Kingswood to encourage use, make it feel safe – also would be desirable place if make it green space.

• Need sports/leisure facilities in Corby (including cinema/bowling) – although issue of catchment area – if can’t get cinema try and get bowling/skating rink skating park etc – need something for young people to do at night/weekends. Need these facilities in existing estates and options above.

d) (Sites for a further 10,000 dwellings)

• Could put housing south west, towards Market Harborough – but would need to link with existing areas (probably Kingswood) – may need to be sustainable in its own right – big question mark over this.
• Is an extra 10,000 houses sustainable? Does Corby/ Kettering/ Wellingborough become one big suburb or do they try and keep their individual identities?
• What is the agreed sustainable number for Corby – extra 10,000 housing may not be!

Session 2

Q2 (Rate of Growth)

• Put as much development on brownfield sites – brownfield fill – to link to Greenfield development – problem is contamination issues – costs of development.
• Make Corby more attractive if build on brownfield sites – save beautiful greenfield (greenfield also good for tourism). Maintain integrity of landscape so use brownfield sites. First get national government support for reclaiming contaminated land. Can’t expect developers to do that because it won’t be profitable for them.
• Brownfield sites are often an eyesore – build over them.
• Perhaps use 106 agreements – pay off for getting permission for greenfield site is that they have to develop brownfield site – or invest in centre.
• Because Priors Hall takes up majority of needed housing in the short term- give incentives to develop brownfield for housing but need to ensure that brownfield is available for employment (start up units etc.).
• Use some brownfield sites in town for infrastructure provision in town.
• Number of units built on brownfield land is important (say 50%). Once this has occurred then could release Greenfield sites.
Q3 (Phasing)

- Not all at once would all be competing against each other and makes it very difficult to manage. Check that correct infrastructure is in place. If go for massive growth quickly it is difficult to get infrastructure in place. Too much risk if release all at once. Better if phase it – more competition – developers provide incentives to get people in.

- Phasing good way to use brownfield sites.

Q4 (Affordable Housing)

- Perhaps look at things like part ownership/shared ownership rather than trying to get outright buying.
- Must make sure that affordable housing is provided for in section 106 agreements – must get facilities in executive areas into social housing areas. Critical to create integrated community.
- Needs to be 15-20% of all housing but issues with this – not agreement around table because some areas might not be appropriate – way out of centre without public transport – would be creating ghettos – but still should aim for 20% of all housing development.
- Village issue – difficult for younger families to stay because too expensive – need to look at affordable housing here.

Q 5 (Regeneration of Existing Housing)

- Hazel Lees and town centre and Beanfield and Stephenson way/Lodge Park
- Areas of deprivation of health – Lloyds West and Lodge Park – probably high % of old people. Talk to neighbourhood managers to determine particular hot spots, in addition to the above, that need work.
- Existing residents in these areas – improve liveability of their immediate environment – make housing better for older people, access issues etc.

Q6 (Housing Mix)

- See question 4 – same answer.
- Smaller sites - need some around town centre but all housing developments should have a link of housing. See map 1 and answer to questions in section 1.

Q7 Optional Question (Comments on capacity study sites)

- This question not answered.
Group E

Session 1

Q1 (Location of Major Growth)

See Map 5

• The group did not progress far beyond the first part of the task – indicated one large urban extension either:
  (a) east of Oakley Vale (Kettering land) or
  (b) land west of A6003.

• One large extension was preferred as this could be developed with all ancillary facilities, despite fears that Priors Hall will become another separate village.

• Preferred location to the west of Corby to balance Priors Hall to east; protect villages by planting new woodland around fringes; keep growth areas central, near town centre and train service; protect all urban green spaces that are important to Corby.

• Land east of Oakley Vale was preferred as this extension could add to the facilities in Oakley Vale – considered to be just a large housing estate at present. People in Corby have no reason to go there and it doesn’t connect into the urban area as it is. Oakley Vale plus a large extension to the east could provide more facilities, eg sports and recreation, to benefit existing communities.

• Land east Weldon is considered to be too far from the town centre and won’t benefit the regeneration of the town; land west of Weldon may be more appropriate for employment.

• Concerns that one large extension could mean commuters travel to Kettering and London and not into Corby; need to provide new local employment to reduce need to travel. Comments that a lot of people now come in to Corby to work and they may be attracted to live in Corby by new housing (Priors Hall).

Important to provide skills and training to attract higher skilled businesses; mixed use in town centre; not just reliant on single employer like Corus.

Session 2

Q2 (Rate of Growth)

• Group preferred land in the urban area to be developed in preference to greenfield urban extensions.

• Strong views in the group that growth must lead to regeneration of existing communities.

• Require developers to deal with regeneration sites before more greenfield is released.

• Concentrate efforts in centre and use greenfield only when absolutely necessary.
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- Use Compulsory Purchase Order powers to assemble sites so regeneration doesn’t slow rate of growth; and/or involve English Partnerships to parcel up land; put in infrastructure; stop land values becoming inflated.

Q3 (Phasing)

- Not all at once: would all be competing against each other and makes it very difficult to manage. Check that correct infrastructure is in place. If go for massive growth quickly, it is difficult to get infrastructure in place. Too much risk if release all at once. Better if phased – more competition – developers provide incentives to get people in.
- No specific response though views that should delay further extensions until Priors Hall has been developed, post 2015.
- Suggestion that regeneration of town centre should be first to make it more welcoming and to change people’s perceptions of Corby.
- Suggestion that new housing should first of all be within the urban area though accept there is not a lot of brownfield land.

Q4 (Affordable Housing)

- Strong views about the need to mix communities socially and provide choice of tenure.
- Should always require affordable to be provided within new development sites; S.106 affordable units provided when so many dwellings completed.
- Only exception might be existing unpopular estates that are predominantly social housing though adopted 80/20 mix even in Kingswood.
- Housing Associations need to overcome poor reputation for management by local presence; people prefer to live in Council-owned houses.

Q5 (Regeneration of Existing Housing)

- Strong support for regeneration and renewal.
- Welcome some demolitions to allow new build with a mix of housing types; create a balance appropriate to each local area.
- People want to stay in their local area but still want to move up the housing ladder; offer choice; at least 2 bed – no-one wants 1 bed units; lifetime homes adaptable to changing needs.
- Also need to build local employment opportunities into existing housing estates to overcome traditional separation in Corby of employment and housing; local people trained for construction jobs.
- Concentrate on Kingswood (four sections) and Danesholme, allow existing residents to return after redevelopment.

Q6 (Housing Mix)

- All higher income housing should be integrated within new development schemes, even in existing urban areas.
- Enclaves of high value exclusive housing is wrong; everyone should have high quality environment, good quality homes and schools.
- No support for separate provision except mansions with large gardens for directors which will inevitably be in the villages; may choose to live in Parkland Gateway apartments if they are trendy.

Q7 Optional Question (Comments on capacity study sites)
This question not answered
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Potential location of housing allocations (4000 Up To 2021) which would help support existing/new facilities
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Map 1

Scale: 1:45,000
Possible Locations of Urban Extensions To Meet The Requirement For 4000 Houses Up To 2021

- Possibly 4000 houses
- Possibly 1200 houses
- Possibly 1400 houses
Potential locations for sites of urban extensions to meet requirements for 4000 houses up to 2021 which could support new/existing facilities.

2-3 Sites
A range of smaller sites around the town & a range of housing will improve the characteristic of the town & contribute to the regeneration of the town & use of underused spaces in the town.

Potential Sites For 10000 Houses Post 2021

Close to town centre close to amenities i.e. school

Advantages close to: town centre & railway amenities our favourite

Two developments supporting each other provides bypass for weldon

Close to town centre land to be investigated
Need for significant housing in town centre. A mix of development including some aimed at single people with disposable income. Leave greenspace intact but managed.

Maximise development in existing estates to increase mix and regenerate the town generally (not just Kingswood).

Peripheral build (safety)

Potential site for 10000 additional houses post 2021.

Most new housing to the South East to build on and link to Oakley Vale & Priors Hall and use facilities.
Potential sites for urban extensions to meet requirement for 4000 houses up to 2021

Key:
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- Route 1G
- District Boundary
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Potential sites for urban extensions to meet requirement for 4000 houses up to 2021

To meet local needs

Major refurbishment universal provision

To meet local needs
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### APPENDIX C: SCHEDULE OF ATTENDEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forename</th>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Attended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHAUN</td>
<td>ANDREWS</td>
<td></td>
<td>LAND SECURITIES</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVID</td>
<td>BAINBRIDGE</td>
<td>SENIOR PLANNING ASSOCIATE</td>
<td>BIDWELLS PROPERTY CONSULTANTS</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARBARA</td>
<td>BALDWIN</td>
<td></td>
<td>ORBIT HOUSING GROUP</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN</td>
<td>BOLTON</td>
<td></td>
<td>TAXI OWNERS CORBY</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAULA</td>
<td>BOULTON</td>
<td></td>
<td>CORBY DOMESTIC VIOLENCE FORUM</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEVIN</td>
<td>MCKEEVER</td>
<td></td>
<td>BEE BEE DEVELOPMENTS</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM</td>
<td>CALLAGHAN</td>
<td>SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT</td>
<td>NORTHAMPTONSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICKI</td>
<td>CHAPMAN</td>
<td>PLANNING OFFICER</td>
<td>HARBOROUGH DISTRICT COUNCIL</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOAN</td>
<td>CLARKE</td>
<td>TEAM MANAGER</td>
<td>STONHAM HOUSING ASSOCIATION</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CROSIER</td>
<td>SPORTS REGENERATION MANAGER</td>
<td>NORTHAMPTONSHIRE FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICE</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HELEN</td>
<td>CUND</td>
<td></td>
<td>CORBY REGENERATION IN SPORTS PARTNERSHIP (CRISP)</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALEX</td>
<td>DE CAPELLE BROOKE</td>
<td></td>
<td>THE GREAT OAKLEY ESTATES</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIKE</td>
<td>DOWDICAN</td>
<td></td>
<td>GOVERNMENT OFFICE FOR THE EAST MIDLANDS (GOEM)</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGINA</td>
<td>DREDGE</td>
<td>HEADTEACHER</td>
<td>ROWLETT COMMUNITY PRIMARY SCHOOL</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAREN</td>
<td>EDWARDS</td>
<td>COMMUNITY PLANNING CO-ORDINATOR</td>
<td>ROCKINGHAM FOREST TRUST</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOY</td>
<td>EVERITT</td>
<td>HEALTH PROMOTION SPECIALIST</td>
<td>CORBY LOCAL HEALTH GROUP</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICK</td>
<td>FELTHAM</td>
<td>PLANNING LIAISON OFFICER</td>
<td>ENVIRONMENT AGENCY</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forename</th>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Attended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALAN</td>
<td>FITZ</td>
<td>SCHOOLS SERVICE</td>
<td>NORTHAMPTONSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRACEY</td>
<td>FRANCIS</td>
<td></td>
<td>SPORTS COUNCIL EAST MIDLANDS REGION (SPORT ENGLAND)</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDDIE</td>
<td>GORDON</td>
<td></td>
<td>CORBY COUNCILLOR</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRIAN</td>
<td>HADDON</td>
<td>SENIOR DEVELOPMENT MANAGER</td>
<td>BEDFORDSHIRE PILGRIMS HOUSING ASSOCIATION</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRIS</td>
<td>HOWLETT</td>
<td>PRINCIPAL PLANNER-SPATIAL PLANNING</td>
<td>NORTHAMPTONSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIMON</td>
<td>JAMES</td>
<td></td>
<td>NORTHAMPTONSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LYNN</td>
<td>JOHNSTON</td>
<td>CHAIR</td>
<td>FEDERATION OF RESIDENTS &amp; TENANTS ASSOCIATION CORBY (FORTAC)</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLARE</td>
<td>KEATING</td>
<td>DEVELOPMENT MANAGER</td>
<td>BEDFORDSHIRE PILGRIMS HOUSING ASSOCIATION</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVID</td>
<td>LANCASTER</td>
<td>FORCE CRIME PREVENTION DESIGN ADVISOR</td>
<td>NORTHAMPTONSHIRE POLICE</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOB</td>
<td>LANE</td>
<td>CHIEF EXECUTIVE</td>
<td>CATALYST CORBY</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESLIE</td>
<td>LUCK</td>
<td>HEALTH IMPROVEMENT DEVELOPMENT OFFICER</td>
<td>HEARTLANDS PCP</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KATIE</td>
<td>MAIRS</td>
<td>DEPUTY HEAD</td>
<td>PEN GREEN CHILDRENS CENTRE</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATHERINE</td>
<td>MCCARRON</td>
<td>DEPUTY PRINCIPAL</td>
<td>TRESHAM INSTITUTE OF FURTHER &amp; HIGHER EDUCATION</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRISH</td>
<td>MCCOURT</td>
<td></td>
<td>ROCKINGHAM FOREST HOUSING ASSOCIATION</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSAN</td>
<td>MILLS</td>
<td>CORBY ACCOMMODATION PROJECT</td>
<td>CORBY VOLUNTARY &amp; COMMUNITY SERVICES</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERRY</td>
<td>O'BRIEN</td>
<td>DIRECTOR</td>
<td>CHARLES CHURCH</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forename</td>
<td>Surname</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Attended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOIFE</td>
<td>O’TOOLE</td>
<td>PLANNING MANAGER</td>
<td>HIGHWAYS AGENCY - NETWORK STRATEGY EAST MIDLANDS</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAN</td>
<td>RADCLIFFE</td>
<td>PRINCIPAL ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH OFFICER</td>
<td>CORBY BOROUGH COUNCIL</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KATHLEEN</td>
<td>RIVETT</td>
<td>SENIOR PLANNING OFFICER</td>
<td>KETTERING BOROUGH COUNCIL</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEBRA</td>
<td>SMITH</td>
<td>DIRECTOR OF CORPORATE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>KETTERING GENERAL HOSPITAL NHS TRUST</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIMON</td>
<td>SMITH</td>
<td>MANAGING DIRECTOR</td>
<td>SMITH STUART REYNOLDS</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATT</td>
<td>SPARKES</td>
<td>EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR</td>
<td>GROUNDWORK NORTH NORTHERN HIGHLANDS</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRISTOPHER</td>
<td>STANBRA</td>
<td></td>
<td>CORBY COUNCILLOR</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEE</td>
<td>STRICKLAND</td>
<td></td>
<td>ROCKINGHAM CASTLE ESTATE</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROB</td>
<td>TEMPERLEY</td>
<td>PRINCIPAL PLANNER, DEVELOPMENT CONTROL</td>
<td>CORBY BOROUGH COUNCIL</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARBARA</td>
<td>THOMSON</td>
<td>SECRETARY</td>
<td>LINWOOD TENANTS &amp; RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION (FOR KINGSWOOD AND LINCOLN ESTATES)</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GARY</td>
<td>TURNER</td>
<td>SENIOR DEVELOPMENT MANAGER</td>
<td>SANCTUARY HOUSING ASSOCIATION</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAM</td>
<td>WALMSLEY</td>
<td></td>
<td>ORBIT HOUSING GROUP</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANDHYA</td>
<td>WARD</td>
<td>DEVELOPMENT MANAGER</td>
<td>LEICESTER HOUSING ASSOCIATION</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JONATHAN</td>
<td>WARD-LANGMAN</td>
<td>BUSINESS PARTNERSHIPS</td>
<td>NORTHAMPTONSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANE</td>
<td>WARMAN</td>
<td></td>
<td>CONSULTANT</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELAINE</td>
<td>YOUNG</td>
<td>SENIOR COORDINATOR</td>
<td>HOME-START - CORBY</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forename</td>
<td>Surname</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Attended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALLY</td>
<td>GILL</td>
<td></td>
<td>SPORT ENGLAND, EAST MIDLANDS</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAN</td>
<td>MCDougall</td>
<td></td>
<td>CATALYST CORBY</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SARAH</td>
<td>BALDERSON</td>
<td></td>
<td>WARDEN HOUSING</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARTIN</td>
<td>FIELD</td>
<td></td>
<td>CORBY BC</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIMON</td>
<td>EVANS</td>
<td></td>
<td>CATALYST CORBY</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MELISSA</td>
<td>AZOKE-EDWARDS</td>
<td></td>
<td>NORTHAMPTONSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL COMMUNITY PLANNING</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JENNIE</td>
<td>NOOLAN</td>
<td></td>
<td>BEE BEE DEVELOPMENTS</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIMMY</td>
<td>CANE</td>
<td></td>
<td>CHAIRMAN OF PLANNING COMMITTEE</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EILUNED</td>
<td>MORGAN</td>
<td>FACILITATOR</td>
<td>ENVISION</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KATE</td>
<td>BAILEY</td>
<td>FACILITATOR</td>
<td>ENVISION</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEVE</td>
<td>YATES</td>
<td>FACILITATOR</td>
<td>ENVISION</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEITH</td>
<td>KEELEY</td>
<td>FACILITATOR</td>
<td>ENVISION</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEITH</td>
<td>REED</td>
<td>FACILITATOR</td>
<td>ENVISION</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>FAINE</td>
<td>SENIOR PLANNER</td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KATANYA</td>
<td>BARLOW</td>
<td>PLANNING OFFICER</td>
<td>CBC</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL ATTENDED** 47