

Report on Results of Issues and Options Consultation

Prepared for



January 2006

By

ATKINS

The Axis
10 Holliday Street
Birmingham
B1 1TF

*This report is prepared by Atkins for the sole and exclusive use of **Corby Borough Council** in response to their particular instructions. Any other party using the information contained within this report for any purpose whatsoever, do so at their own risk, and any duty of care or fitness for purpose to that party is excluded.*

CONTENTS

- 1. Introduction**
 - 1.1 Introduction**
 - 1.2 Type of consultation undertaken**
 - 1.3 Issues and Options paper**
 - 1.4 Stakeholder workshops**
- 2. The Aims for the New LDF**
- 3. Economy and Employment**
- 4. Housing**
- 5. Villages and Rural Areas**
- 6. Town Centre + Retail**
- 7. Conclusions**

APPENDIX 1- Employment and Economy

- APPENDIX 1.1 – Summary of Employment + Economy Workshop**
- APPENDIX 1.2 – Summary of Consultation Responses to Employment and Economy issues and options paper**

APPENDIX 2 – Housing

- APPENDIX 2.1 - Summary of Housing Workshop**
- APPENDIX 2.2 – Summary of consultation responses to Housing issues and options paper**

APPENDIX 3 – Villages and Rural

- APPENDIX 3.1 –Summary of Villages and Rural Areas Workshop**
- APPENDIX 3.2 – Summary of consultation responses to Villages and Rural Areas issues and options paper**

APPENDIX 4 – Town Centre and Retail

APPENDIX 4.1 – Summary of Stakeholders' workshop on Town Centre and Retail

APPENDIX 4.2 – Summary of consultation responses to Town Centre and Retail issues and options paper

APPENDIX 5- All comments made from Issues and Options Consultation and Proposed Council Responses/Comments

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

The purpose of this report is to provide a summary of the results of the consultation undertaken in respect of the Local Development Framework for Corby Issues and Options (September 2005) paper. This information will be used to develop and inform the next stage of LDF process, namely the site specific policies and allocations as well as the the Area Action Plans for the Town Centre, Kingswood and Danesholme, and the Corby Urban Extension.

1.2 Type of consultation undertaken

The consultation comprised two main methods-

1. A questionnaire in respect of the Issues and Options paper
2. A number of stakeholder workshops

Full details of the results of the consultation are given in the attached Appendices. Where given, a percentage figure for the respondents preferences relates to the proportion of the total respondents that answered that particular question. It should be noted that where there is a low response rate the percentages given will be disproportionately low/high and consequently could be misleading.

1.3 Issues and Options paper

This paper was approved by the Local Plan Committee on 14 September 2005. Consultation was undertaken over a 6 week period, between Monday 19th September 2005 and Friday 28th October 2005.

To publicise the consultation exercise a letter was sent to all stakeholders in the Local Development Framework consultation database (2452 people), members of the People's Panel (181 people) and members of the Community Planning Network (36 people) inviting them to comment on the issues raised in the document. An article was also published in the October issue of Our Borough community newsletter and the Community Planning Network newsletter informing the public of the consultation period. The Issues and Options Paper was sent to key stakeholders and posted on the Council's website. It was also sent in hard copy to respondents if requested.

A number of questions were posed in the paper, asking for feed back in respect of housing, employment, villages & rural areas, and town centre & retail planning issues.

A total of 128 respondents gave their views on the various topics, and the summaries and findings are set out below. Respondents included individuals, and interested parties such as Parish Councils, landowners and house builders (please see Appendix 5 for full details).

1.4 Stakeholder workshops

Stakeholders' workshops were held as part of the preparatory work for the Corby Site Specific Development Document that will form part of the North Northamptonshire Local Development Framework. They were designed to encourage debate and

discussion of the issues and options

1. relating to the need to plan for a significant growth of employment as part of the wider growth agenda for Corby.
2. relating to the need to plan for significant growth in housing as part of the growth agenda for Corby.
3. facing rural communities within Corby Borough Council's boundary with a particular focus on the potential impacts of the planned growth agenda.

The attendees ranged 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 have aided and guided the preparation of this report.

The stakeholders' workshop for Economy and Employment Issues was held on 14th September 2005 at the Elizabeth Hotel at Corby and was attended by 33 representatives.

The Housing issues workshop was held on 14th September 2005 at the Hilton Hotel at Corby, and was attended by 40 representatives.

The workshop for Villages and Rural areas was held on 20th September 2005 at the Hunting Lodge Hotel at Cottingham and was attended by 28 representatives from parish, town and borough councils, voluntary organisations as well as representatives from private land holdings and the rural housing development sector.

Workshop Format

Attendees were requested to sit in several groups which were selected 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 group were asked to answer several set questions. At the end of each session, each group was asked to identify one or two key discussion points.

2. THE AIMS FOR THE NEW LDF

A full list of the summaries of the consultations in respect of the aims for the new LDF included within the Issues and Options paper is given in Appendix 5. Many of the general comments received relate to the issues that are specifically picked up in the following topic-specific sections. There were however a number of additional issues/topics that respondents mentioned and these fall within the following broad categories:

- Villages – don't agree with restriction of growth for villages
- Retail – need to encourage a range of facilities of a higher order than present
- Landscape character/historic assets/woodland/green open spaces - need to protect
- Aim 4 – should refer to need to deliver government's growth agenda, Catalyst Corby Regeneration framework and PPS 1 (Planning Policy Statement: Delivering Sustainable Development)
- Need to incorporate developments that are 'secure by design'
- Need to use good modern architects to achieve appropriate development

- Need to consider need for additional land-fill as a result of increase in population
- Re-branding and imaging of Corby – need a change of attitude by existing residents toward the town,
- Need to consider higher education needs, leisure infrastructure needs, adult retraining schemes, need for playing fields and sports centres
- Transport – town centre needs a bus station, need to have additional cycleways and footpaths to reduce car dependence and outward commuting
- Implementation may be problematic
- Promote social inclusion

Of those that expressed a preference, most respondents agreed with the six aims of the LDF as set out in the document. Of those that disagreed with the stated aims, four respondents disagreed with Aim 4.

3. ECONOMY & EMPLOYMENT

In summary the results of the consultation are as follows (see Appendix 1.2 for full details):

J1 Sustainable Economic Growth: the Housing and Employment Balance

89% of respondents preferred the 'J1A' option "the balance of new housing and employment change should be regularly monitored and phasing re-assessed at say 5 year intervals – 2011, 2016, 2021 etc."

J2 Target Sectors: the range of Employment Opportunities

63% of respondents preferred option 'J2-B' that indicates "Corby should seek to diversify its economy by setting out to create the conditions whereby higher value added activities will want to invest in the town".

J3 Employment Land : Location and Quality Issues

Here, respondents were asked to indicate whether they agree with certain options, and of the five alternatives provided, the greatest support was for option 'J3C' where 96% of respondents agreed that "10 ha between Oakley Road and Cottingham Road near the Town Centre and the proposed Rail Station is of adequate size and is an appropriate location for offices/B1 development to 2031"

Additionally, 78% of respondents agreed that "40 ha in the vicinity of Stanion Lane plantation is of adequate size and is an appropriate location for growth in general industry and strategic distribution to 2031"

The workshops provided a great deal of feed back. These have been summarised and are given as Appendix 1.1, page 7 particularly provides a summary of the group discussions that focused on issues such as the need for Corby to focus upon its strengths in terms of economic activity, whilst recognising the importance of developing education and skills training in order to attract higher value office based employment.

4. HOUSING

In summary the results of the consultation are as follows (see Appendix 2.2 for full details):

H1 - Housing Land Requirement to 2021

For H1A 87% of respondents preferred option 'H1-A(b)' which indicates "these sites (Local Plan 1997 Allocations) should be reviewed as part of the LDF process".

For H1B 75% of respondents preferred option 'H1 –B (b) which indicates that "a higher urban capacity figure should be assumed, building on more garage sites and urban greenspaces, if these are shown to be surplus to requirements, resulting in less greenfield development around the edge of Corby."

For H1C 62.5% of respondents preferred option 'H1C(b) which indicates that "a higher figure (from that given in the issues and options paper of 510 units for the town centre development) to be achieved by positive promotion of schemes for mixed use development in the Town Centre Area Action Plan".

For H1D 64% of respondents preferred option 'H1D(b) which indicates that the housing land assumptions "should be decreased by, say, 10% to take account of some sites not being implemented within the plan period.

H2 Rate of Development

For H2A 73% of respondents preferred option H2A(d) that "the build rate on Priors Hall be accelerated to postpone further the greenfield release".

However for this answer, 68% also said yes to H2A(a) that accepts that "the trajectory of housing completions (Table 3) is accepted as a reasonable and realistic basis on which to base release of further major urban extensions"

And 61% respondents indicated "A higher figure on urban capacity sites is considered achievable at an early date, thus postponing further the need to release major urban extensions on greenfield sites".

For H2B 78% respondents indicated a preference for H2B(b) release of peripheral green field land to take place "only after the majority of brown field and urban sites have been developed as generally adopted from PPG3".

H3 Allocation of Major Urban Extensions

For H3A 71% preferred option H3A(b) that seeks to "identify a larger number (say 2-4) of smaller sites"

And 64% preferred option H3A(b) that seeks to "identify just one site to accommodate the required additional 4000 dwellings to 2021".

For H3B 65% preferred option H3B(b) that indicates if one site was chosen, the preference would be for "land east of Corby -much of the area is in Kettering Borough. The site could link to land west of Stanion to make it more sustainable".

For H3C 69% preferred "land to south of Corby", (option H3C(a)), whilst, 62.5% "preferred land south of Weldon" (Option H3C(c)).

H4 Housing Quality, Type and Mix

For H4A 74% preferred option H4A(a) which indicates “all new housing development areas provide for a mix of house types, sizes and price bands in order to provide balanced communities”.

For H4B 68% preferred option H4B(b) which indicates upper market housing should be provided on a large number of smaller sites mostly on the edges of villages, but also including some selected sites within the urban area”.

For H4C the greatest preference at 76% indicated that mixed housing development is suitable “on land south of Weldon” (option H4C(c)).

For H4D 68% preferred the option H4D(b) of the relaxation of the affordable housing for certain sites with commuted payment towards the provision of affordable housing elsewhere”.

H5 Long Term Housing Requirement to 2031

For H5A 87.5% preferred the option H5A(b) for consideration of “potential for 5,000 additional dwellings on the basis that any requirement over this level should be provided on re-used urban sites”.

For H5B 76% preferred option H5B(b) for the location of further green field extensions to be provided at “land south-east of Corby”.

H6 Sustainability Needs of Communities

For H6A with negligible opposition, all the responses have unanimously welcomed all the options as essential contributions to the creation of sustainable communities. These matters included things such as designing for a safe and healthy local environment with well designed public and green space (see Appendix 2.2 for full details).

H7 Sustainable Construction Methods

Apart from one or two exceptions, all of the responses have agreed that all the options are essential and should be incorporated in the new developments to make them more sustainable in the longer term. These matters included things such as design of buildings that both individually and collectively meet different needs over time; and the highest standards of environmental performance and innovative solutions that minimise the use of resources (see Appendix 2.2 for full details).

H8 Regenerating Existing Housing Areas

For H8A 86% of respondents indicated a preference for there being a link between the phasing of peripheral growth and the progress of housing renewal (option H8A(a)).

For H8B housing areas identified for prioritisation for revitalisation included: Arran way, Exeter canal, Lloyds, Hazelwood, Exeter and area around Pytchley court shops, Beanfield, Lincoln, Oakley Vale and other older estates, Gainsborough, Turner and Constable Road.

For H8C 87% preferred option H8C(c) that proposes a funding mechanism to resource refurbishment of selected housing areas that is a combination of public and private finance from developers through a 'roof tax'.

H9 Traveller Accommodation

For H9A 59% indicated that they felt there was a need for additional sites for travellers to be added (Option H(A(b))).

For H9B 90% of respondents indicated they felt that facilities for travellers should be provided on a County-wide basis.

The workshops provided a great deal of feed back. These have been summarised and are given as Appendix 2.1, particularly pages 6-8 provide a summary of the group discussions that focused on issues such as the preferred locations for growth, rates of growth and phasing, affordable housing and regeneration of existing housing, housing mix.

5. VILLAGE AND RURAL AREAS

In summary the results of the consultation are as follows (see Appendix 3.2 for full details):

R1 The Impact on the Villages and Rural Areas of the Potential Growth in Corby

For R1 there were little differences in the preferences expressed. 65% preferred to "allow some expansion of the existing communities, thereby redefining the village boundaries, allowing for both new housing and additional facilities should they be required" (option R1A). 62% expressed a preference for option R1-B to "Continue with the overall policy of constraint and restriction of growth of the existing villages, keeping the boundaries tight".

R2 Sustainable Communities

For this question, the greatest preference expressed (86%) was for option R2B to "Allow for the introduction of new businesses into the villages so as to create local employment opportunities".

R3 Policy and Guidance

There was little clear preference for the two suggested options, 95% preferred option R3A to "Update Building on Tradition as part of the LDF process, taking into consideration current advice on design related issues". Whilst 96% agreed with option R3-B to "Develop capacity within the village communities such that Parish/Village plans can be prepared for each of the Borough's villages setting out the way in which each community will develop in the future".

The workshops provided a great deal of feed back. These have been summarised and are given as Appendix 3.1, and particularly page 6 provides a summary of the group discussions that focused on issues such as positive and negative impacts of

the growth of Corby upon villages and the role of the countryside and villages surrounding Corby in relation to the residents of Corby.

6. TOWN CENTRE AND RETAIL

In summary the results of the consultation are as follows (see Appendix 4.2 for full details):

T1 – The Need for Additional Retail Growth

Majority of the responses are positive about the additional retail growth. Almost all of the consultees agree on the issue of tightening the town centre boundary as well as prioritising the town centre for the retail expansion, though some observations are negative. The options given were as follows:

T1-A Provide a boundary to the town centre which is tight, recognisable and reasonable in terms of expansion of retail and other town centre related uses.

T1-B Support the 'town centre first' approach by limiting the amount of out of town retail provision and agreeing floorspace targets.

T1-C Based on the estimated population growth of Corby up to 2021, provision should be made for significant expansion of retail within the town centre boundary.

T2 Image and Design of the Town Centre

Option T2-A and T2-B are unanimously welcomed without exception. The options given were as follows:

T2-A A detailed three dimensional masterplan for the town centre should be drawn up and agreed by all of the key stakeholders such that future planning decisions can be taken in accordance with an agreed framework and key design principles are established.

T2-B Sufficient safe car parking, integrated with the provision of public transport, should be provided within the town centre so as to attract people into Corby.

T3 The Need for New Facilities

Most of the responses agree with the option T3-A and prefer to reject the option T3-B that is promoting the need of the new bus station. The options given were as follows:

T3-A The town centre has no need for a bus station or transport interchange but buses should stop at stops well located in terms of town centre facilities.

T3-B The town centre should have a new bus station/ transport interchange.

T4 Local/Neighbourhood Centre and Out of Centre Retailing/Retail warehouses

There were mixed responses to these issues. Whilst it was generally recognised that the town centre should be the priority for retail development, it was suggested that there is a need to identify an appropriate retail hierarchy of centres to ensure a sustainable pattern of shopping provision. There was one suggestion that out of town retailing should be an extension to the Phoenix Retail Park. However other respondents argued that out of town shopping should not be supported as it encourages car use.

A workshop with key stakeholders involved in the Town Centre was held on the 19th July 2005. The minutes from this meeting are attached in Appendix 4.1.

7. CONCLUSIONS

The results of these consultation responses, along with the various relevant background studies and documents will be used to inform and develop the allocations of the various sites within the Corby site-specific proposals and Area Action Plans for the Town Centre, Kingswood & Danesholme, and the Corby Borough Urban Extension. The next stage in the process is to develop 'preferred options and proposals' that will be subject to a further public consultation period.

**APPENDIX 1.1
Summary of Employment & Economy Workshop**

APPENDIX 1.2

Summary of Consultation Responses to Employment & Economy issues and options paper

J1 Sustainable Economic Growth : the Housing and Employment Balance

Options J1 (A and B)

J1-A The balance of new housing development and employment change should be regularly monitored and phasing re-assessed at say 5 year intervals- 2011, 2016, 2021 etc

J1-B The phasing of new housing development and employment change should be reassessed at the end of the LDF plan-period 2021

Responses to J-1(A and B)

- Most of the responses have preferred option J1-A to option J1-B. Frequent and regular monitoring and re-assessment of the phasing of new housing development and employment change is preferred by most, rather than leave it to the end of LDF plan- period 2021.
-

	J1-A		J1-B	
Yes	40	89%	19	59%
No	5	11%	13	41%
Total	45		32	

J2 Target Sectors: the range of Employment Opportunities

Options J2 (A and B)

J2-A Corby should focus mainly on building on its existing strengths in manufacturing and strategic distribution and accept that higher value added activities such as offices and research and development are unlikely to be attracted to Corby on any significant scale.

J2-B Corby should seek to diversify its economy by setting out to create the conditions whereby higher value added activities will want to invest in the town.

Responses to J-2 (A and B)

Most responses have preferred option J2-B to option J2-A, suggesting that Corby should take more assertive steps to diversify its economy by attracting higher value added activities and investment.

	J2-A		J2-B	
Yes	6	17%	43	63%
No	30	83%	25	37%
Total	36		68	

Additional Comments to J2 (A and B):

- A valid observation has been made by pointing out that building on existing strengths and not diversifying, contradicts with Aim 2 that stresses on attracting knowledge based industries.

- Manufacturing should be promoted only in case of niche market. Must be environmental gains to compensate.
- Distribution and warehousing brings low paid jobs and increases traffic on roads. It should be avoided as much as possible.
- The attraction of a growing town through jobs, trains and retail have been omitted.
- The economy should satisfy the needs of inward investors and existing firms. Delivering the correct pace of housing is paramount to employment growth and infrastructure.
- Focus on mixed use development in town centre and promotion of cultural activities is recommended. High quality tertiary education facilities are required. Education would bring high value jobs. Conditions should be created to avoid higher earners commuting out.
- Image issues need to be addressed. Natural and built environments should be respected. Aspirations of people need to be raised.

J3 Employment Land : Location and Quality Issues

Options J3 (A-D)

- J3-A** 40 ha in the vicinity of Stanion Lane plantation is of adequate size and is an appropriate location for growth in general industry and strategic distribution to 2031
- J3-B** Other sites should be considered for general industry and strategic distribution
- J3-C** 10 ha between Oakley Road and Cottingham Road near the Town Centre and the proposed Rail Station is of adequate size and is an appropriate location for offices/ B1 development to 2031
- J3-D** Other sites should be considered for offices/ B1 development
- J3-E** Further significant allocations of land for offices/B1 should only be brought forward once passenger rail services resume in Corby.

Responses to J-3 (A-D)

Majority of the consultees have responded positively to the size and location of the new allocation for manufacturing and strategic distribution though the option of considering other sites as well is welcome. Similarly the size and location for offices/B1 development is preferred keeping the option of considering other sites as well. Assessment of development at regular interval is suggested to recognize the requirement of further services.

	J3-A		J3-B		J3-C		J3-D		J3-E	
Yes	25	78%	19	66%	25	96%	22	76%	18	58%
No	7	22%	10	34%	1	4%	7	24%	13	42%
Total	32		29		26		29		31	

Additional Comments to options J3 (A-D):

- A review and improvement of stations and their ability to cope with the economic growth is recommended.
- To minimise disruption to travelling public, the impact of major developments should be assessed and tested through North Northants Transport Model. Sustainability appraisals have been recommended.

- Attention has been drawn to the two planning applications submitted to the Borough Council: Eurohub Freight Interchange at Stanion Lane, and National Distribution Centre based on requirements of prospective occupier.
- Glendon should be considered for alternative site for location of railway station.

**APPENDIX 2.1
Summary of Housing Workshop**

APPENDIX 2.2

Summary of consultation responses to Housing issues and options paper

H1 Housing Land Requirement to 2021

Options H1-A (a-b)

H1-A (a) All the Local Plan allocations should be allowed to proceed.

OR

(b) These sites should be reviewed as part of the LDF process.

Responses to H1-A

Most responses are negative towards the option H1-A(a). Almost all of them have opted for H1-A(b), supporting the suggestion of reviewing the sites as part of the LDF process.

	H1-Aa		H1-Ab	
Yes	6	27%	26	87%
No	14	73%	4	13%
Total	22		30	

Additional comments to H1-A (a-b):

- Existing and emerging parish plans should be regarded with close consultation with villages.
- All uncommitted local plan allocations should be reviewed as part of the LDF.
- Sites should be progressed through the LDF process, so that options and impacts can be examined.
- 1997 Local Plan should be reviewed against new policy.
- Local Development Documents should clearly set out the long term potential of Corby post 2021.

Options H1-B (a-c)

H1-B (a) A lower figure should be assumed for urban housing capacity, to preserve more amenity open space and landscaped areas, even if this means more greenfield development around Corby.

OR

(b) A higher urban capacity figure should be assumed, building on more garage sites and urban greenspaces, if these are shown to be surplus to requirements, resulting in less greenfield development around the edge of Corby.

OR

(c) Is the UHCS figure of 2139 dwellings about right?

Responses to H1-B (a-c)

Option H1B-(a) has been rejected by most in favour of the option H1-B(b) suggesting a higher urban capacity figure resulting in less greenfield development. The figure 2139 dwellings in the option H1-B(c) has attracted mixed response.

	H1-Ba		H1-Bb		H1-Bc	
Yes	11	46%	18	75%	7	44%
No	13	54%	6	25%	9	56%
Total	24		24		16	

Additional Comments to H1-B (a-c):

- Half the responses suggest that the figure of proposed dwellings is too low.
- It is suggested to stick to the agreed density of 30 per ha, and not to use urban green space, or minimise the loss of urban green space. Greenfield sites should not be used unless major sites are nearly completed. Greenspace development is politically unacceptable.
- Open green space should only be developed where impact is minimised or improved. Development of green infrastructure within existing urban area should be supported. A well balanced mixed environment should be encouraged.
- Priority should be given to brownfield and previously developed land to the greenfield development. Building on green spaces should be kept in line with national policy.
- More buildings in urban areas are favoured.
- Need development of green infrastructure and better design.
- Housing development should be supplemented with significant investment in the infrastructure and links with Kettering and Wellingborough. Road links between settlements.
- Benefits to the centre should be maximised. Rural surroundings should be protected. And unnecessary journeys should be minimised.
- An increase in density at Oakley Vale is welcome. 500 more dwellings should be supported at Oakley Vale. Oakley Vale and Priors Hall should be completed quickly to be sustainable.
- Shopping centre extension needs to keep pace with housing growth. Mixed use development in town centre is important in helping to regenerate the town centre.
- Primary schools in urban area have falling numbers. Town centre development tends to be flats, which would have little impact on pupil numbers.
- Development of UHCS sites via additional redevelopment is not easily achievable as it offers limited development attraction.

Options H1-C (a-c)

H1-C (a) A lower figure for development in the town centre on the basis that the town centre will not be a attractive residential environment until the proposed railway station and/or expansion of the shopping centre have been achieved.

OR

(b) A higher figure to be achieved by positive promotion of schemes for mixed use development in the Town Centre Area Action Plan.

OR

(c) Is the figure of 510 dwellings about right?

Responses to H1-C

Option H1-C(a) and Option H1-C(b) have received very mixed responses. Though most responses do agree with the mixed use development in the town centre, a general feel is that the figure for development is too high.

	H1-Ca		H1-Cb		H1-Cc	
Yes	13	48%	15	62.5%	10	50%
No	14	52%	9	37.5%	10	50%
Total	27		24		20	

Additional Comments to H1-C (a-c):

- Figure for town centre development is too high. It should be reduced by 50%.
- Planning permission figure is too high. Many of them may not be given permission against LDF policies.
- Urban capacity figure is reasonable only if wider regeneration occurs.
- Urban housing capacity figures should be open to review.
- Only a proportion of urban capacity is deliverable. 510 dwellings capacity figure is too optimistic.
- Increase dwellings to sustain leisure and commercial facilities.

Options H1-D (a-b)

H1-D (a) The above assumptions on commitments, urban and town centre capacity and windfalls are accepted as reasonable and realistic.

OR

(b) They should be decreased by, say, 10% to take account of some sites not being implemented within the plan period.

Responses to H1-D (a-b)

Most responses have favoured the option H1-D(b) to the option H1-D(a). Majority of the responses have expressed the view that the assumptions and figures are higher. Regular monitoring should be done to check if the figures are reasonable.

	H1-Da		H1-Db	
Yes	11	55%	16	64%
No	9	45%	9	36%
Total	20		25	

H2 Rate of Development

Options H2-A (a-d)

H2-A (a) The trajectory of housing completions (Table 3) is accepted as a reasonable and realistic basis on which to base release of further major urban extensions.

OR

(b) It is regarded as an over-estimate of the likely contribution from urban sites, such that there would be a need to release more greenfield extension land at an earlier date.

OR

(c) A higher figure on urban capacity sites is considered achievable at an early date (see H1-B (b) above), thus postponing further the need to release major urban extensions on greenfield sites.

AND/OR

(d) Could the build rate on Priors Hall be accelerated to postpone further the greenfield release?

Responses to H2-A (a-d)

Majority of the responses have opted for option H2-A(a). Release of more Greenfield extension land at an early date, as suggested in option H2-A(b) has received a very cold response. Suggestion in option H2-A(c) of postponing the release of Greenfield sites has

received mixed response. Very clearly the postponing is preferred and welcomed more than the preponing of the release of Greenfield sites.

	H2-Aa		H2-Ab		H2-Ac		H2-Ad	
Yes	15	68%	4	22%	11	61%	16	73%
No	7	32%	14	78%	7	39%	4	27%
Total	22		18		18		22	

Additional Comments to option H2-A (a-d):

- Annual figures for completion are realistic. Increase numbers at Oakley Vale.
- Urban greenspace should be protected to enhance, restore or add to biodiversity.
- Local consultation essential, especially for Weldon. Priors Hall development approved despite strong local opposition.
- Sequential approach to new housing provision should be adapted when allocating sites. Mix of both brown and Greenfield sites should be brought forward at the same time.
- Accelerated build on Priors Hall should be carefully managed to avoid a donut effect on the town centre and negative effects on the surroundings.
- Housing completions may be influenced by controls on discharge to watercourses until infrastructure is in place.
- System needs to offer choice to the purchaser.
- Derelict brown field sites in Corby will detract from the overall desirability of coming to live in Corby.

Options H2-B (a-c)

H2-B (a) In accordance with RSS8 policy, further peripheral Greenfield land (in addition to Priors Hall and land west of Stanion) should be released before the majority of identified urban housing potential has been developed.

OR

(b) Such further release should take place only after the majority of brown field and urban sites have been developed as generally adopted from PPG3

OR

(c) Further greenfield release should be programmed after most brownfield sites but before resorting to urban greenfield sites.

Responses to H2-B (a-c)

H2-B(b) suggesting to wait for the Greenfield release until the brownfield and urban sites are adopted from PPG3, has been preferred by the most of the responses. H3-B(a) has been voted out by the majority and so is the early release of Greenfield sites. The middle way suggested in the option H2-B(c) has received mixed response. Overall suggestion is to avoid the early release of Greenfield sites and go for a sequential approach.

	H2-Ba		H2-Bb		H2-Bc	
Yes	4	20%	18	78%	10	50%
No	16	80%	5	22%	10	50%
Total	20		23		20	

Additional comments to option H2-B (a-c):

- Brownfield and employment sites should be considered before moving on to Greenfield.

- A need for more flexible LDF is identified. Flexible approach is necessary.
- Approach should confirm the government guidance.
- Phasing of new housing should be in a North Northants context.
- Land should be prepared five years ahead of likely need, to make it more attractive to developers. Earlier completion of infrastructure should be considered.
- Level of completions in one year is dependent on economic situation and market. Appropriate sites needed at an early stage for higher socio-economic groups to be attracted.
- Sequential approach should be adopted.
- Build rate could be exceeded if local housing market strengthens.
- Peripheral sites should not be released prematurely.

H3 Allocation of Major Urban Extensions

Options H3-A (a-b)

H3-A (a) Identify just one site to accommodate the required additional 4000 dwellings to 2021.

OR

(b) Identify a larger number (say 2-4) of smaller sites.

Responses to Option H3-A (a & b)

No one option was predominant, a 50/50 split prevailed. However, consultee comments suggested that the protection of existing natural assets including the green belt was an issue that could be affected by any development and regard should be had to existing protection policies of the Local Plan and location of any development should be informed by an Environmental Character Assessment.

	H3-Aa		H3-Ab	
Yes	14	64%	12	71%
No	8	36%	5	29%
Total	22		17	

Additional Comments to option H3-A (a-b):

- Market and economic forces are likely to determine the result.
- Large site allocations are unsuitable for Corby to 2021 and could be detrimental to Corby regeneration opportunities; a combination of urban extensions is required.
- That land at Corby Road Cottingham should constitute a site within a selection of smaller sites
- The location of a new secondary school is a key issue to cope with the rise in demand and should influence the location of any new development, therefore one large site is preferred as an extension to Corby.

Options H3-B (a-b)

H3-B If one site is chosen, of the directions for Major Growth identified in the RSS, there are two options shown on Plan 2:

(a) Land west of Corby

OR

(b) Land east of Corby -much of the area is in Kettering Borough. The site could link to land west of Stanion to make it more sustainable.

Responses to Option H3-B (a-b)

Mixed support for the options identified, however the overall consensus was for the development of land east of Corby.

	H3-Ba		H3-Bb	
Yes	10	56%	13	65%
No	8	44%	7	35%
Total	18		20	

Additional Comments to option H3-B (a-b):

- Land east of Corby should be developed provided that the existing green field sites are protected from further encroachment.
- An urban extension consisting of one site west of Corby is preferred with the aim of meeting sustainability objectives

Options H3-C (a-d)

H3-C If a number of sites are preferred, the options, in addition to parts of the sites above, are also shown on Plan 2:

- (a) Land south of Corby
- (b) Land north west of Corby
- (c) Land south of Weldon
- (d) Land east of Weldon

Responses to Option H3-C (a-d)

This indicates a marginal preference for development on land south of Corby.

	H3-Ca		H3-Cb		H3-Cc		H3-Cd	
Yes	11	69%	5	38%	10	62.5%	3	23%
No	5	31%	8	62%	6	37.5%	10	77%
Total	16		13		16		13	

Additional Comments to option H3-C (a-d):

- Land south of Corby and land south of Weldon were the most favourable sites chosen
- Policy regarding the allocation of land for housing development should be reviewed within a 5 year time frame, any development sites chosen during that time period should be completed despite any pending alteration in Government policy
- Development proposed towards the Welland Valley could prove detrimental to the designated Special Landscape Area in the north and west of the region.
- Northamptonshire characterisation work should be used to inform the siting of the proposed development and should incorporate careful design where the development borders the countryside.
- Regard should be had to sustainability including the use of public transport.
- Development to the north and north west of Corby are not suitable and could impact on Kirby Hall and Rockingham.

H4 Housing Quality, Type, and Mix

Options H4-A (a-b)

H4-A (a) Should all new housing development areas provide for a mix of house types, sizes and price bands in order to provide balanced communities

OR

(b) Should certain development sites comprise almost entirely upper market housing?

Responses to Option H4-A(a-b)

The response indicated that the majority of Corby residents would prefer a mix of both house types and affordability in order to achieve balanced communities and furthermore avoid the risk of creating enclaves.

	H4-Aa		H4-Ab	
Yes	26	74%	16	53%
No	9	26%	14	67%
Total	35		30	

Additional Comments to Option H4-A (a-b):

- Mixed tenures and types would provide opportunities for first time buyers to gain a foothold on the housing ladder.
- However there is concern that a requirement does exist for upper market homes but they should be of a mixed tenure in order to widen market interest.
- Concern was also raised to the sufficient quantity of affordable homes in Corby and whether an additional requirement exists, however it is important that affordable housing is fully integrated into new developments.
- A mix of housing should be promoted throughout the area which could vary at specific sites and locations if it can be demonstrated how this fits into promoting Corby as a balanced urban location.
- Important not to create communities according to their earning potential, this reiterates the consensus that there is minimal support for development of sites entirely devoted to upmarket housing.

Options H4-B (a-b)

H4-B (a) Should upper market housing be provided on one large site

OR

(b) On a larger number of smaller sites mostly on the edges of the villages, but also including some selected sites within the urban area.

Response to Option H4-B (a & b)

The response indicated that development should take place on a larger number of smaller sites mostly on the edges of the villages and selected sites within the urban area.

	H4-Ba		H4-Bb	
Yes	5	20%	17	68%
No	20	80%	8	32%
Total	25		25	

Additional Comments to option H4-B (a-b):

- Emphasis on a need to address the lack of upper market housing on single use sites and on the few sites on the edges of the urban area, also that upper market housing could be used to attract senior management personal to the area.

Options H4-C (a-e)

H4-C Are the following suitable sites for mixed housing development?

- (a) Land east of Weldon
- (b) Land between Weldon Park and the village of Weldon
- (c) Land south of Weldon
- (d) Land north west of Corby
- (e) Land west of Corby and south of Rockingham Park.

Response to Option H4-C (a-e)

The margin between the site options was minimal; however land south of Weldon and land north west of Corby had a greater response.

	H4-Ca		H4-Cb		H4-Cc		H4-Cd		H4-Ce	
Yes	14	63%	13	62%	16	76%	14	74%	14	70%
No	8	37%	8	38%	5	24%	5	26%	6	30%
Total	22		21		21		19		20	

Additional Comments to option H4-C (a-e):

- Comment was made on the need to provide buffer zones around villages to protect them from encroachment from new developments.
- Opposition was expressed regarding development on land between Weldon Park and Weldon village, whereas land east of Weldon is noted as being suitable for mixed use development
- Land south west of Corby could be regarded as suitable for upper market housing
- Option **H4-D (a & b)** concentrates on the provision of affordable housing and whether 20% be provided as part of all housing developments **or** should the requirement be relaxed for certain sites, with commuted payments towards the provision of affordable housing elsewhere.

Options H4-D (a-b)

H4-D (a) Should affordable housing at 20% be provided as part of all housing developments,

OR

(b) Should the requirement be relaxed for certain sites, with commuted payments towards the provision of affordable housing elsewhere?

Response to Option H4-D (a-b)

The emphasis was on the avoidance of a rigid formula which would encourage flexibility when determining the % of affordable housing to include in a development. This could be calculated on site by site basis. Furthermore, commuted payments potentially drive up land values thus makes securing suitable sites difficult to achieve.

	H4-Da		H4-Db	
Yes	14	58%	15	68%
No	10	42%	7	32%
Total	24		22	

H5 Long Term Housing Requirement

Options H5-A (a-b)

H5-A (a) In considering locations for major urban extensions, take into account their potential for expansion for up to a further 10,000 dwellings in total.

OR

(b) Consider potential for 5,000 additional dwellings on the basis that any requirement over this level should be provided on re-used urban sites

Response to Option H5-A (a-b)

The preference here is for 5,000 additional dwellings as opposed to 10,000 in total

	H5-Aa		H5-Ab	
Yes	11	41%	21	87.5%
No	16	59%	3	12.5%
Total	27		24	

Additional Comments to option H5-A (a-b):

- The reuse of urban sites for the potential provision of 5,000 additional dwellings was favoured over option (a).
- Future planning policy and LDF's should be flexible enough to respond to the sudden availability of brownfield sites and that a sequential approach should be adopted when allocating sites.
- A mix of both brown and Greenfield sites would enable a flexible approach to the siting of new developments.
- Remediation of contaminated land should be encouraged within urban areas and support given for conversion of redundant and derelict buildings to act as a possible solution to the supply of land.
- Concern was also raised regarding the time period (2031) and how growth could be predicted over such a time period, given market forces and demographics.

Options H5-B (a-d)

H5-B If further greenfield extensions are to be provided of in the long term, the main options are:

- (a)** Land west of Corby
- (b)** Land south-east of Corby
- (c)** Land east or south of Weldon
- (d)** Land south of Corby

Response to Option H5B (a-d)

The marginal preference is for long term, development up to 2031 to go on land south-east of Corby

	H5-Ba		H5-Bb		H5-Bc		H5-Bd	
Yes	11	61%	13	76%	8	53%	13	68%
No	7	39%	4	24%	7	47%	6	32%
Total	18		17		15		19	

Additional Comments to option H5-B (a-d):

- Only land east or south of Weldon was indicated as an unfavourable option as a greenfield extension
- Emphasis portrayed on the protection of Welland Escarpment from development
- Iterated that development should be within the existing boundaries to avoid merging with neighbouring towns especially Kettering, concern was also raised regarding the allocation of land and especially Greenfield land.

H6 Sustainability Needs of Communities

Options H6-A (a-h)

H6-A In order to ensure that all new developments contribute to the creation of sustainable communities, which of the following should they be required to incorporate?

- (a) Designing for a safe and healthy local environment with well-designed public and green space;
- (b) A 'sense of place', community cohesion and low levels of crime and fear of crime;
- (c) Provision of local services such as shops, health care, community facilities and small scale local employment uses within housing areas;
- (d) Opportunities for home working;
- (e) New or extended local public transport facilities that are sufficiently attractive and frequent to encourage a significant reduction in car use;
- (f) Travel plans including measures to reduce Corby's contribution to climate change, encouraging use of cleaner fuels and low carbon technology in vehicles, together with car-share schemes;
- (g) Access to or creation of pedestrian and cycle routes;
- (h) Creation of new 'green infrastructure' including recreational and sports facilities, pathways and routes, enhancing biodiversity assets, historic sites and water spaces, increasing public access into multi-function green spaces in urban areas, urban fringe and the wider countryside.

Responses to H6-A (a-h)

With negligible opposition, all the responses have unanimously welcomed all the options as essential contributions to the creation of sustainable communities.

	H6-Aa		H6-Ab		H6-Ac		H6-Ad		H6-Ae		H6-Af		H6-Ag		H6-Ah	
Yes	51	100	44	98	44	98	36	88	39	97.5	36	88	41	98	32	97
		%		%		%		%		%		%		%		%
No	0	0	1	2%	1	2%	5	12	1	12.5	5	12	1	2%	1	3%
							%	%		%		%				
Total	51		45		45		41		40		41		42		33	

Additional Comments to option H6-A (a-h):

- Essential components of a move towards more sustainable developments. incumbent upon policy makers to ensure matters are fully integrated into new LDF.
- All options seem sustainable. For any development to be truly sustainable, everything on this list should be included. Need to be seen to be actioned.
- All the factors are important in reduction of car use by offering attractive safe and accessible pedestrian and cycle routes. The Safe Routes to school initiative should be taken into account and access to schools should be made easy by foot and bicycle.
- Public transport facilities have to fit shift patterns. Reduce impact of traffic on villages. New developments should be subject to a sustainability and traffic appraisal to assess impact on surrounds.
- Sports facilities are needed. Could have built an Olympic Pool for schools etc
- Corby needs to be a better place to live and raise children. If arranged in small pockets, it adheres to less chance of cohesion. Need to create a sense of place where people like to belong.
- New Green infrastructure crucial and sums it up best. In order to deliver scale of growth required by RSS8, Greenfield urban extensions should be delivered. Links and access to green spaces outside of Corby Borough should be increased.
- Greenbelt and buffer zones around Weldon could be developed. Traffic section of the Environmental report does not address the rat-run impact on Gretton.
- Development should not be developer led. Correlation between jobs and homes to provide desired sustainability. Rural advocacy has to be recognised.
- Developments should be of a high standard of design, with a 'sense of place'. Consider design, layout, transport, community facilities and green infrastructure to create sustainable communities.
- Protect residential amenity and promote efficiency in the use of the land. Development should be designed to eco-homes standards.
- Along with all positive comments, concerns have been raised against Home working, as it only works for certain people by IT links. Also have been mentioned that green infrastructure sounds like a developer tax which would reduce things like affordable housing.

H7 Sustainable Construction Methods

Options H7-A (a-j)

H7-A In order to make housing developments more sustainable in the long term, which of the following should all new developments be required to incorporate?

- (a) Design of buildings that both individually and collectively meet different needs over time;
- (b) The highest standards of environmental performance and innovative solutions that minimise the use of resources;
- (c) Construction methods that contribute to improved air and water quality and minimise pollution in terms of noise, visual intrusion and emissions;
- (d) Use of recycled building materials and building materials from renewable sources;
- (e) Sustainable surface water drainage systems, including on-site water collection and re-cycling;
- (f) Measures to minimise flood risk;

- (g) Demand management to achieve savings of some 25–30% on current water usage;
- (h) Energy efficient construction methods and high standards of energy efficiency in buildings;
- (i) Maximising use of energy from renewable sources including solar panels and combined heat and power plants;
- (j) Reduction, recycling and sustainable management of waste.

Responses to H7-A (a-j)

Apart from one or two exceptions, all of the responses have agreed that all the options are essential and should be incorporated in the new developments to make it more sustainable in the longer term.

	H7-Aa		H7-Ab		H7-Ac		H7-Ad		H7-Ae	
Yes	38	93%	38	100%	36	90%	36	90%	37	97%
No	3	7%	0	0	4	10%	4	10%	1	3%
Total	41		38		40		40		38	

	H7-Af		H7-Ag		H7-Ah		H7-Ai		H7-Aj	
Yes	38	97%	32	84%	38	97%	35	95%	37	95%
No	1	3%	6	16%	1	3%	2	5%	2	5%
Total	39		38		39		37		39	

Additional Comments to option H7-A (a-j):

- All options seem sensible and they do support the use of sustainable construction measures. They are essential components of a move towards more sustainable developments. Incumbent upon policy makers to ensure matters are fully integrated into new LDF.
- Minimum houses, maximum quality, renewable energy, limited landfill space- should be the intention.
- Energy saving is way forward, less reliance on fossil fuels. All new housing and commercial buildings should have solar panels both for heat and electricity.
- New developments should be of high quality standards, environment friendly and efficient. Designed so as to eliminate ASBO's. Development should be secure by Design Standards.
- Flexibility to cope with long term change e.g. climate change. Flood risks need solving. Public apprehension regarding building on floodplains should be recognised. Encourage the use of SUDS to absorb run-off.
- All options seem attainable but necessary to have large building inspectorate. Don't rely on developers for this.
- Such matters are generally macro or fiscal issues controlled by Central Government.
- Improvement needed in the quality of architecture. Character and vernacular design of townscapes should be considered. Local environment should be reflected in design and materials. Initiative called 'New Vernacular' looking at sustainable design and construction should be considered.
- As local land values rise measures will become more affordable. Policies on such matters should not be stringent, while reflecting the potential for higher environment standard to be achieved.
- Renewable products should be substituted for non-renewable. Sustainable produced timber should be used to reduce climate change.

- Some of the comments against the options is that, can't define future needs within reason. Sustainable construction methods are a matter best left to negotiators, site specific. Recycled building materials not realistic on a large scale. Solar panels etc not popular or cost effective.

H8 Regenerating Existing Housing Areas

Options H8-A (a-b)

H8-A (a) Should there be a link between the phasing of peripheral growth and the progress of housing renewal in the core areas

OR

(b) Is housing renewal a problem that should be addressed separately?

Responses to H8-A (a-b)

Most of the responses have applauded option H8-A(a) suggesting a link between the peripheral growth and the progress of housing renewal.

	H8-Aa		H8-Ab	
Yes	24	86%	14	58%
No	4	14%	10	42%
Total	28		24	

Additional Comments to option H8-A (a-b):

- Some concerns have raised against option H8-A(a) suggesting that such link would be a hostage to fortune and threaten delivery requirement.
- Majority of the responses state that to avoid jealousy/resentment on existing estates, option H8-A(a) should be preferred. A link between growth and renewal is necessary to avoid ghettos and to promote integration between contrasting areas and communities.
- A need to avoid the lack of holistic thinking is identified. Developers should address value and quality and take up this opportunity to plan for long term sustainability.
- Integration with sustainable urban extensions is important. Regeneration and peripheral growth should go together. If growth moves faster than renewal, it will make things worse in the core areas.
- Regenerating existing housing should be a priority, so that they are not alienated. Green infrastructure should also improve. Planning and design need to fit environment.

Options H8-B

H8-B The Kingswood and Danesholme estates are prioritised for revitalisation; what other housing areas should be addressed?

Responses to H8-B

The reasons why Kingswood and Danesholme were selected, should be applied to other estates. Some of the suggested names are: Arran way, Exeter canal, Lloyds, Hazelwood, Exeter and area around Pytchley court shops, Beanfield, Lincoln, Oakley Vale and other older estates, Gainsborough, Turner and Constable road.

Options H8-C (a-c)

H8-C What funding and implementation mechanisms could be adopted to resource public and private sector refurbishment/ redevelopment of selected housing areas?

(a) Public funding

OR

(b) Private finance from developers through a "roof tax"

OR

(c) A combination of both?

Responses to H8-C (a-c)

Majority of the responses have preferred the combination of public and private sector funding. Only private sector funding is rejected by large.

	H8-Ca		H8-Cb		H8-Cc	
Yes	7	47%	5	29%	20	87%
No	8	53%	12	71%	3	13%
Total	15		17		23	

Additional Comments to option H8-C (a-c):

- Reservations using S106 monies to fund offsite housing regeneration. Leads to sense of unfairness and feeling that value for money not being achieved at local level in compensation for any impact from development.
- Peripheral growth should contribute towards funding for housing renewal. Development should not be held back for renewal. Scope for private finance is limited by Government policy, needing public funding.
- Section 106 New Build - off site contribution. Should concentrate on run down areas. Provide Government funding to help those communities and enhance their environment.
- Pre-war and post-war housing is apposite. Finance should be from Central Government.

H9 Traveller Accommodation

Options H9-A (a-b)

H9-A (a) Are existing facilities for travellers adequate or

OR

(b) Is there a need for additional sites to be identified?

Responses to H9-A (a-b)

A mixed response has been given to option H9-A(a). But majority responses have inclined positively to option H9-A(b) suggesting that additional sites should be identified for travellers.

	H9-Aa		H9-Ab	
Yes	14	56%	13	59%
No	11	44%	9	41%
Total	25		22	

Additional Comments to H9-A (a-b)

- Facilities for travellers should be close to schools and healthcare.

- Additional site is indicated to south of Weldon on A43.
- Need for additional sites should be assessed to avoid any negative future impact.
- If travellers are well catered for, it is easier to limit the negative impacts of litter.
- Possible locations need to satisfy the needs both of existing communities and the differing factions of the traveller fraternity.

Options H9-B (a-b)

H9-B (a) Should facilities be provided on a County-wide basis

OR

(b) On a Borough-wide basis?

Responses to H9-B (a-b)

There appears to be a strong preference that facilities for travellers are provided on a County Wide basis.

	H9-Ba		H9-Bb	
Yes	19	90%	8	40%
No	2	10%	12	60%
Total	21		20	

Additional Comments to H9-B (a-b)

- Provisions should not be on a piecemeal basis, seasonal travellers should be discouraged.
- Combination of both- county-wide and borough-wide facilities is suggested. Co-ordinated countywide with some local autonomy seems like an ideal solution.

**APPENDIX 3.1
Summary of Villages and Rural Areas Workshop**

APPENDIX 3.2

Summary of consultation responses to Villages and Rural Areas

R1 The Impact on the Villages and Rural Areas of the Potential Growth in Corby

Options R1 (A-B)

R1-A Allow some expansion of the existing communities, thereby redefining the village boundaries, allowing for both new housing and additional facilities should they be required.

R1-B Continue with the overall policy of constraint and restriction of growth of the existing villages, keeping the boundaries tight.

Responses to Option R1 (A-B)

Issue R1 has received mixed response from the consultees. Though majority of the responses prefer the expansion of the existing communities by redefining village boundaries, serious concern has been raised to the negative effects it may cause. Fears have been expressed that redefining village boundaries will destroy the community.

	R1-A		R1-B	
Yes	30	65%	23	62%
No	16	35%	14	38%
Total	46		37	

Additional Comments to R1 (A-B):

- Expansion needs to be carefully managed with village engagement ensuring the sustainability of the village community. Infilling can destroy the scale and therefore attractiveness of villages.
- With expansion and development the traffic in villages will double, impacting on sustainability of the village. Village plans should include a transport management strategy to protect residents and sustainability.
- Collyweston parish council has opposed to any growth of the village.
- Weldon parish council insists on limited infill only.
- Less restrictive planning policy framework to reflect needs for diversification away from traditional agricultural activity. The 'one size fits all' approach is unsustainable. Each application should be treated individually on its own merit.
- Limited expansion of villages may secure additional community facilities.
- Expansion of Cottingham should be planned to take in some development on land on Corby road opposite Mill Close. Village boundary should be adapted to the rear of No 21 Ashley Rd, Middleton, and include the former piggery, Rockingham Rd, Cottingham.

R2 Sustainable Communities

Options R2 (A-B)

R2-A Based on option R1-A above, allow some limited growth in the villages linked to developer contributions towards the required additional facilities such that the communities can become more sustainable in the future.

R2-B Allow for the introduction of new businesses into the villages so as to create local employment opportunities.

Responses to Option R2 (A-B)

Option R2-A allowing limited growth linked to developer contributions towards the additional facilities, receives a mixed, though positively inclined response. R2-B is preferred by the majority, welcoming the introduction of new businesses into the villages to create employment opportunities.

	R2-A		R2-B	
Yes	30	64%	36	86%
No	17	36%	6	14%
Total	47		42	

Additional Comments to R2 (A-B):

- New businesses should be on the boundaries.
- Initially allow infill only. Ensure sewage and other services are capable and consider the constraints of size for the schools in villages. Limited housing developments in villages could help to keep the school-aged population reasonably stable.
- Village developments should have clear provision for infrastructure to ensure environmental impacts are understood and mitigated
- Green infrastructure and environmental issues and safeguarding of open spaces within villages have been advocated.

R3 Policy and Guidance

Options R3 (A-B)

R3-A Update Building on Tradition as part of the LDF process, taking into consideration current advice on design related issues.

R3-B Develop capacity within the village communities such that Parish/Village plans can be prepared for each of the Borough's villages setting out the way in which each community will develop in the future.

Responses to Option R3 (A-B)

Updating of Building on Tradition as part of LDF process as suggested in option R3-A is preferred by most responses. Also welcomed is the suggestion of option R3-B of engaging the community and their needs and aspirations in the development process.

	R3-A		R3-B	
Yes	41	95%	44	96%
No	2	5%	2	4%
Total	43		46	

Additional Comments to R3 (A-B):

- Only the villagers know what they want for their area.
- One planner should be assigned to each village.

**APPENDIX 4.1
Summary of Stakeholders' workshop on Town centre and Retail**

APPENDIX 4.2 Summary of consultation responses to Town Centre and Retail

T1 – The Need for Additional Retail Growth

Options T1 (A-C)

T1-A Provide a boundary to the town centre which is tight, recognisable and reasonable in terms of expansion of retail and other town centre related uses.

T1-B Support the 'town centre first' approach by limiting the amount of out of town retail provision and agreeing floorspace targets.

T1-C Based on the estimated population growth of Corby up to 2021, provision should be made for significant expansion of retail within the town centre boundary.

Responses to T1 (A-C)

Majority of the responses are positive about the additional retail growth. Almost all of the consultees do agree on the issue of tightening the town centre boundary as well as prioritising the town centre for the retail expansion, though some observations are negative.

	T1-A		T1-B		T1-C	
Yes	24	83%	22	79%	27	93%
No	5	17%	6	21%	2	7%
Total	29		28		29	

Additional Comments to T1 (A-C):

- Enclosed shopping facility is required to raise the tone.
- Out of town shopping is rejected due to its car reliant nature alternative transport uses such as buses should be gas powered and not diesel. Urban extensions should only provide local neighbourhood facilities to avoid competition with town centre.
- Concerns have been raised that development in town centre may discourage investment elsewhere, and therefore the need for an appropriate hierarchy is suggested.
- Retail growth should be consistent with the housing growth.
- Joint planning approach should be adopted with the other towns of north Northampton. Instead of competitive, the development should be complimentary.
- Boundary to the town centre needs to ensure that supermarkets don't expand at the edges of town.
- Encroachment of the AAP upon parkland is strongly objected. AAP should be redesigned to exclude woodland from development area and include a buffer zone to protect habitat.
- Need and capacity exercise based on analysis of population and expenditure within the catchments of Corby is suggested for the planning of floor-space for retail and other related uses.
- The LDF should have a policy on farm shops which is supportive to help with diversification with the usual provisions that a small % of goods can be sold that are not produced on the farm and the farm shop does not detract from the local village shops.

T2 Image and Design of the Town Centre

Options T2 (A-B)

T2-A A detailed three dimensional masterplan for the town centre should be drawn up and agreed by all of the key stakeholders such that future planning decisions can be taken in accordance with an agreed framework and key design principles are established.

T2-B Sufficient safe car parking, integrated with the provision of public transport, should be provided within the town centre so as to attract people into Corby.

Responses to T2 (A-B)

Option T2-A and T2-B are unanimously welcomed without exception.

	T2-A		T2-B	
Yes	30	94%	30	97%
No	2	6%	1	3%
Total	32		31	

Additional Comments to T2 (A-B):

- The need for safe car parks, better roads, signage and pedestrian requirements is identified as the major issue to be dealt with for the regeneration of the town centre.
- A suggestion has been made for the 3D plans to be kept up to date with the latest changes.
- It is stated unanimously that regeneration of Corby town centre is the cornerstone to the future development plans and growth of the area.
- Investing in public transport, better commuter bus service with strong links to rail station is strongly recommended. This will enable people from surrounding parishes to reach the centre easily. Well-lit cycle routes are also needed.

T3 The Need for New Facilities

Options T3 (A-B)

T3-A The town centre has no need for a bus station or transport interchange but buses should stop at stops well located in terms of town centre facilities.

T3-B The town centre should have a new bus station/ transport interchange.

Responses to T3 (A-B)

Most of the responses do go along with the option T3-A with less support for the option T3-B that is promoting the need of the new bus station.

	T3-A		T3-B	
Yes	16	59%	13	52%
No	11	41%	12	48%
Total	27		25	

Additional Comments to T3 (A-B):

- 'Improvement in quality, not quantity' is the main tone of the responses. However, strengthening and improving the transport links is advocated by almost all.
- One resident has noted that town centre would be more vibrant without the bus station.
- An observation is made that integration of transport doesn't necessarily need a bus station format.

T4 Local/Neighbourhood Centre and Out of Centre Retailing/Retail warehouses

Options T4(1-8)

- T4-1** What hierarchy of shopping provision, below the level of the town centre, should there be?
- T4-2** What level of out of centre retailing should be allowed as against provision in the town centre?
- T4-3** What is an acceptable level of convenience shopping elsewhere in the town, especially at Priors Hall and other major expansion sites?
- T4-4** Where are these other shopping centres to be located and are they required?
- T4-5** How and in what way should out of centre retailing be restricted?
- T4-6** Are we right in assuming there are no edge of centre sites for such stores?
- T4-7** Where should additional retail warehousing be located? E.g. an extension to the Phoenix Centre or an entirely new site which would not compete in terms of scale with the town centre?
- T4-8** How should the Council deal with other types of retailing that may present a special case, such as; builders and plumbers merchants; hire depots; car and caravan sales; petrol filling stations (and their shops); car accessory shops; tyre and exhaust centres; nurseries and garden centres; factory shops and showrooms, and farm shops?

Response to T4 (1-8)

There were mixed responses to these issues. Whilst it was generally recognised that the town centre should be the priority for retail development, it was suggested that there is a need to identify an appropriate retail hierarchy of centres to ensure a sustainable pattern of shopping provision. There was one suggestion that out of town retailing should be an extension to the Phoenix Retail Park. However other respondents argued that out of town shopping should not be supported as it encourages car use. There was support for farm shops as they do not detract from existing village shops.

**APPENDIX 5- All comments made from Issues and Options Consultation and
Proposed Council Responses/comments**