

Appendix 1: Site Specific Allocations DPD – Summary of Consultation Responses

Introduction

25	SSR Planning on behalf of Buccleuch Property	Concerned that delay in completing the SFRA will mean that it only informs the finalised DPD. The findings should inform this current stage of the DPD as some of the allocated sites may be found to be unsuitable in terms of flood risk in which case alternative sites currently being rejected will need to be identified, and reviewed. These sites may be on land adjacent to Corby Borough's administrative boundary; it is therefore essential that the SFRA includes land outside of the Corby Borough boundary.
33	Environment Agency	It is reassuring to see that the Council recognise the need to base the finalised SSA DPD on the findings of the forthcoming revisions to the SFRA. It is essential that all land allocations will have been identified by a revised SFRA on the basis of the Sequential Approach advocated by PPS25 and its accompanying Practice Guide. That approach should provide sufficient data and information on the probability of flooding from all sources to enable the Council to apply, to each site under consideration, the PPS 25 Sequential Test and where necessary the Exception Test in a transparent manner, when determining the land use allocations. In practice such an allocation process should initially relate to land identified, by a revised SFRA, as being at the lowest risk of flooding, with land in flood zones 2 and 3 being sequentially allocated only where no reasonably available sites are to be found within Flood Zone 1. Accordingly, the Environment Agency wishes to stress the importance of maintaining, within the evolving SSA DPD, the flexibility for accommodating the removal of any currently proposed allocations that may be found unsuitable in flood risk terms in the light of a revised SFRA. Before finalisation of the SSA DPD, the Environment Agency would wish to be consulted further by the Council in relation to the findings of the SFRA as revised and the Council's proposals for land allocations in the light of such SFRA. Consequently the Environment Agency OBJECTS to the current wording of para 1.12 and requests that the 2 nd and 3 rd sentences be amended as follows: <i>"The finalised SSA DPD will take into account the findings of the forthcoming revisions to the SFRA including the results of further consultation with the Environment Agency in respect of the SFRA as revised and the proposed DPD allocations. Any of the proposed allocations contained in the September 2009 SSA DPD consultation document that may be found by such revised SFRA not to be on reasonably available land that is at the lowest risk of flooding from all sources, and are unable to satisfy the requirements of the PPS25 Sequential Approach and Sequential and Exception Tests, will be not be incorporated into the finalised SSA DPD."</i>

Context

25	SSR Planning	Paragraphs 2.14 and 2.15 refer to the review of the Core Strategy (CSS) which will roll the plan forward to 2026 in line with the Regional Plan. Paragraph 2.15 states that "the Site Specific Allocations DPD for Corby will be in accordance with the adopted and emerging reviewed CSS". As the emerging review of the CSS will differ from the adopted CSS, not least in that it will be requiring the provision of more dwellings over a longer period, this statement is both contradictory and unachievable. In these circumstances, it is critical that the DPD reflects the revised CSS as it will contain amended housing figures covering the period to
----	--------------	--

		2026
--	--	------

Sustainable Development

28	Weldon Council	Parish	There is no mention of embodied energy which it is felt are crucial to genuine environmental improvements. Only this will determine ecological efficiency and comparative options for calculating real net energy savings. It is difficult to see how there may be savings in carbon emissions with the huge carbon footprint that will be created by the massive expansion proposals. Embodied energy is measured in KWh per tonne, or m ³ and is the quantity of energy required to manufacture and supply products, materials etc. to manufacture, transport, install, maintain etc. (<i>Construction Manager March 2008</i>).
----	----------------	--------	--

Economy and Employment

10	Rutland Council	County	Concerned about the potential impact of the major employment and housing developments proposed, particularly the effects of additional traffic on the highway network.
10	Rutland Council	County	Traffic flows on the A6003 in Rutland will increase by nearly 20% and developers should contribute towards any mitigation required. These effects may be further exacerbated by the increased levels of housing and employment (particularly B8 developments) now being proposed and the resultant over-supply of housing and employment land.
10	Rutland Council	County	Concerned that the document does not clearly show how the new housing developments and jobs from the new employment areas would be developed together. The oversupply of employment land in Corby will potentially result in an imbalance between housing and employment and also have a knock-on effect for the viability of employment land in Rutland and increased cross-border commuting.
10	Rutland Council	County	The impact of the developments on Rutland should be considered and policies included requiring developers to contribute towards any mitigation measures that might be needed as a result of the developments.
11	Highways Agency		The total amount of land proposed to be allocated for employment use represents an oversupply relative to the amount specified in the Core Strategy. This raises concerns as to the consistency of the document with the Core Strategy and the Regional Plan. A key requirement of Development Plan Documents, as set out in PPS12, is that DPD are consistent with such strategies
11	Highways Agency		Individually, none of the specific sites identified as being appropriate for employment use are anticipated to have a significant impact upon the operation of the truck road network in the area, specifically the A14 at Junction 7. If brought forward with associated housing growth the sites may assist in actually increasing the self containment of the town, and the need for residents to travel further afield to access employment opportunities. Any site specific proposal will however need, at application stage, to be supported by a robust Transport Assessment, which takes due account of other commitments in the area and which seeks to identify a bespoke package of measures to mitigate the traffic impact arising. Any cumulative impact arising from development on a combination of sites (whether employment or other land uses, including residential) may also need to be incorporated. In principal the Agency supports the allocation of those sites

15	Northamptonshire Police	It is encouraging to note that mixed use development is being encouraged through EMP06. Mixed use development ensures that a wider spectrum of people use the area over a longer period of the day and as such there should be more active surveillance of the area, meaning opportunities for crime and anti-social behaviour should be reduced
15	Northamptonshire Police	Pleased that the design of employment sites and car storage areas is being considered. Pleased that there is a requirement for a master plan to be produced for any of the proposed employment sites. The consultation document recognises the CSS Policy 13 needs to be adhered to and can be supported by Secured by Design Commercial which is soon to be published. In addition the Sustainable Design SPD should also be referred to in this section. Through this approach issues of designing out crime and designing in fire safety should be taken into account. The Crime Prevention Design Advisor for Corby should be consulted on any master plan at the earliest stage.
15	Northamptonshire Police	It is encouraging that any master plan will be required to consider the capacity for HGV parking on the site. This is an area that has traditionally been forgotten about. In paragraph 5.104, there is recognition for the parking and traffic issues that have been caused by a lack of HGV parking. However there is also a crime issue with regard to lack of secure parking for HGV vehicles. There have been incidences across the county of theft from HGVs where there is a lack of secure parking. As such the commitment to providing parking facilities is welcomed and the provision of the facility should seek to design out crime through being built to ParkMark standards.
15	Northamptonshire Police	A further area for consideration through the provision of new employment sites is the need for sprinkler systems to be fitted within commercial buildings. This not only helps to protect lives in the event of a fire but also helps to prevent loss of property. Through preventing loss of property, significant reduction in impact on the environment can be achieved, helping to meet the wider sustainability agenda. If designed in at the outset these can be installed at low cost. As such, this should be strongly encouraged to meet community safety objectives.
16	East Midlands Regional Assembly	It is noted that the policy is proposing the allocation of more employment land than is required by the Core Strategy. This seems to be a summation of all sites already allocated and retained through the saved Local Plan or new sites identified in the preparation of the LDF. It is understood that the oversupply relates to the need to provide a 5 year 'slack' to allow enough flexibility for sites to come forward. This is referred to in Paragraph 3.90 of the Core Strategy. The document states that flexibility is needed to meet targets specified in the Roger Tym Study, but it would be useful to provide further justification for the oversupply bearing in mind the important relationships across boundaries between all the Local Authority areas in North Northamptonshire identified in the MKSM Sub regional Strategy. It would be useful to clarify whether the allocations are up to 2021. However, the need to offer a range and choice of sites for inward investment is recognised
19	Smiths Gore on behalf of Great Oakley Estate	Support the identification of Site E19 'Corby Western Urban Extension' in Table 5.5. This indicates a proposed employment site of 13.8ha in total comprising B1 and B2 use. Careful consideration would need to be given to B2 uses in terms of their nature, location and compatibility with adjacent uses
20	Smiths Gore on behalf of Great Oakley Estate and Rockingham	Support the identification of Site E19 'Corby Western Urban Extension'. This indicates a proposed employment site of 13.8ha in total comprising B1 and B2 use. General Industrial uses may not sit comfortably side by side with other uses, particularly residential content. Therefore, careful consideration would need to be given to B2 uses in terms of their nature, location and compatibility with adjacent uses

	Castle Estate	
25	SSR Planning on behalf of Buccleuch Property	The Regional Plan identifies the important cross boundary relationships in North Northamptonshire. In identifying housing provision for each local authority area, the importance of the cross boundary relationships are considered; it is stated that "Figures for Corby and Northampton include any provision made in urban extensions across local authority boundaries. Such provision would be additional to the figures for the 'receiving authorities' in the above table". Land is promoted at Corby South East and at Storefield as long term mixed use development opportunities. In considering the sites submitted to the SELA (paragraph 5.32) it appears that only the sites in the Borough's administrative area have been considered. Sites which adjoin Corby Borough and would provide sustainable urban extensions capable of accommodating a mix of uses, have been excluded presumably because the sites fall within Kettering Borough's boundary. However, it is considered essential that the DPD considers cross boundary issues and the need to facilitate the delivery of those sites within the most sustainable locations if growth for employment and housing is to be effectively delivered. The DPD currently fails to achieve this. It is requested that the Council works with the JPU during the review of the Core Strategy and throughout the further preparation of the DPD to ensure that cross boundary issues are properly addressed
27	John Martin & Associates on behalf of Rockingham Estates	Support the identification of Site E19 'Corby Western Urban Extension'. This indicates a proposed employment site of 13.8ha in total comprising B1 and B2 use. General Industrial uses, which in broad terms may not sit comfortably side by side with other uses, particularly residential content. Therefore, careful consideration would need to be given to B2 uses in terms of their nature, location and compatibility with adjacent uses
33	Environment Agency	E1 North and South of Sondes Road is within Flood Zone 1. Subject to PPS 25 requirement to take into account all sources of flooding by implementation of the "Sequential Approach". Allocation greater than 1 ha. Any planning application to be accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment primarily focusing on surface water management.
33	Environment Agency	E2 Land East of Weldon is partially within Flood Zones 2 and 3 and therefore subject to the PPS25 Sequential Test and (if necessary) the Exception Test. The test(s) must be satisfied in accordance with PPS25 prior to any grant of planning permission. Any planning application to be accompanied by a FRA which should be undertaken in accordance with PPS25. The design should take a sequential approach aiming to locate built development within Flood Zone 1 and to take into account all sources of flooding. The allocation raises issues in relation to the means of access which may need to cross a floodplain. The issues are currently being pursued with the Council and the Local Highway Authority in relation to a planning application on the allocation area.
33	Environment Agency	E3 Stanion Lane Plantation is within Flood Zone 1. Subject to PPS 25 requirement to take into account all sources of flooding by implementation of the "Sequential Approach". Greater than 1 ha. Any planning application to be accompanied by a FRA primarily focusing on surface water management.
33	Environment Agency	E4 Cenrix Park, Phoenix Parkway is within Flood Zone 1. Subject to PPS 25 requirement to take into account all sources of flooding by implementation of the "Sequential Approach". Greater than 1 ha. Any planning application to be accompanied by a FRA primarily focusing on surface water management. Flood Defence Consent required under the Water Resources Act 1991, and the Land Drainage Byelaws 1981. The prior written consent of the Environment Agency is required for any proposed works

		or structures, in, under, over or within 9.0 metres of the top of the bank of the Willow Brook North designated a 'main river'. Opportunities to increase the access and easement corridor adjacent to the Willow Brook North should be incorporated into the development layout and landscaping proposals as part of a strategic measure(s) to reduce flood risk from the watercourse. The Environment Agency requires a byelaw distance of 9.0 metres to remain clear to enable it to carry out its functions.
33	Environment Agency	E5 North of Birchington Road is within Flood Zone 1. Subject to PPS 25 requirement to take into account all sources of flooding by implementation of the "Sequential Approach". Greater than 1 ha. Any planning application to be accompanied by a FRA primarily focusing on surface water management. Flood Defence Consent required under the Water Resources Act 1991, and the Land Drainage Byelaws 1981. The prior written consent of the Environment Agency is required for any proposed works or structures, in, under, over or within 9.0 metres of the top of the bank of the Willow Brook North designated a 'main river'. Opportunities to increase the access and easement corridor adjacent to the Willow Brook North should be incorporated into the development layout and landscaping proposals as part of a strategic measure(s) to reduce flood risk from the watercourse. The Environment Agency requires a byelaw distance of 9.0 metres to remain clear to enable it to carry out its functions.
33	Environment Agency	E6 Cockerell Road is within Flood Zone 1. Subject to PPS 25 requirement to take into account all sources of flooding by implementation of the "Sequential Approach". Greater than 1 ha. Any planning application to be accompanied by a FRA primarily focusing on surface water management.
33	Environment Agency	E7 Seymour Plantation is within Flood Zone 1. Subject to PPS 25 requirement to take into account all sources of flooding by implementation of the "Sequential Approach". Greater than 1 ha. Any planning application to be accompanied by a FRA primarily focusing on surface water management.
33	Environment Agency	E8 CBC Plots, Oakley Vale is partially within Flood Zone 2. Site subject to the PPS25 Sequential Test and (if necessary) the Exception Test. The Test(s) must be satisfied in accordance with PPS25 prior to any grant of planning permission. Subject to PPS 25 requirement to take into account all sources of flooding by implementation of the "Sequential Approach". Planning application to be accompanied by a FRA which should be undertaken in accordance with PPS25. The design should take a sequential approach aiming to locate development and the means of access within Flood Zone 1.
33	Environment Agency	E9 Parkland Gateway is within Flood Zone 1. Subject to PPS 25 requirement to take into account all sources of flooding by implementation of the "Sequential Approach". Greater than 1 ha. Any planning application to be accompanied by a FRA primarily focusing on surface water management.
33	Environment Agency	E10 Corby Central is within Flood Zone 1. Subject to PPS 25 requirement to take into account all sources of flooding by implementation of the "Sequential Approach". Greater than 1 ha. Any planning application to be accompanied by a FRA primarily focusing on surface water management.
33	Environment Agency	E11 Bangrave Road, Weldon is within Flood Zone 1. Subject to PPS 25 requirement to take into account all sources of flooding by implementation of the "Sequential Approach". Greater than 1 ha. Any planning application to be accompanied by a FRA primarily focusing on surface water management.
33	Environment Agency	E12 Oakley Hay is within Flood Zone 1. Subject to PPS 25 requirement to take into account all sources of flooding by implementation of the "Sequential Approach". Greater than 1 ha. Any planning application to be accompanied by a FRA primarily focusing on surface water management.

33	Environment Agency	E13 Rockingham Motor Speedway is within Flood Zone 1. Subject to PPS 25 requirement to take into account all sources of flooding by implementation of the "Sequential Approach". Greater than 1 ha. Any planning application to be accompanied by a FRA primarily focusing on surface water management. Flood Defence Consent required under the Water Resources Act 1991, and the Land Drainage Byelaws 1981. The prior written consent of the Environment Agency is required for any proposed works or structures, in, under, over or within 9.0 metres of the top of the bank of the Willow Brook North designated a 'main river'. Opportunities to increase the access and easement corridor adjacent to the Willow Brook North should be incorporated into the development layout and landscaping proposals as part of a strategic measure(s) to reduce flood risk from the watercourse. The Environment Agency requires a byelaw distance of 9.0 metres to remain clear to enable it to carry out its functions.
33	Environment Agency	E14 Genner Road is within Flood Zone 1. Subject to PPS 25 requirement to take into account all sources of flooding by implementation of the "Sequential Approach". Greater than 1 ha. Any planning application to be accompanied by a FRA primarily focusing on surface water management.
33	Environment Agency	E15 South of St. James Industrial Estate is partially within Flood Zones 2 and 3 and therefore subject to the PPS25 Sequential Test and (if necessary) the Exception Test. The Tests(s) must be satisfied in accordance with PPS25 prior to any grant of planning permission. Subject to PPS 25 requirement to take into account all sources of flooding by implementation of the "Sequential Approach". Planning applications to be accompanied by a FRA which should be undertaken in accordance with PPS25. The design should take a sequential approach aiming to locate development within Flood Zone 1. Flood Defence Consent required under the Water Resources Act 1991, and the Land Drainage Byelaws 1981. The prior written consent of the Environment Agency is required for any proposed works or structures, in, under, over or within 9.0 metres of the top of the bank of the Willow Brook South designated a 'main river'. The site includes a culverted section of the Willow Brook South - no development should be proposed over the culvert or within 9.0 metres. Opportunities to increase the access and easement corridor adjacent to the Willow Brook South should be incorporated into the development layout and landscaping proposals as part of a strategic measure(s) to reduce flood risk from the watercourse. The Environment Agency requires a byelaw distance of 9.0 metres to remain clear to enable it to carry out its functions. Under the terms of the Land Drainage Act 1991, any culvert or works that may impede the flow of water on any ordinary watercourse will require prior written Flood Defence Consent from the Environment Agency.
33	Environment Agency	E16 Southern Gateway, Oakley Hay is within Flood Zone 1. Subject to PPS 25 requirement to take into account all sources of flooding by implementation of the "Sequential Approach". Greater than 1 ha. Planning applications to be accompanied by a FRA which should be undertaken in accordance with PPS25. Under the terms of the Land Drainage Act 1991, any culvert or works that may impede the flow of water on any ordinary watercourse will require prior written Flood Defence Consent from the Environment Agency.
33	Environment Agency	E17 Priors Hall is partially within Flood Zones 2 and 3. Site already enjoys outline planning permission. Further planning applications should be accompanied by a FRA which should be consistent with the approved FRAs for Zones 1 and 2 and the principles set out in PPS25, as appropriate. The design of the development should take a sequential approach aiming to locate development within Flood Zone 1. Flood Defence Consent required under the Water Resources Act 1991, and the Land Drainage Byelaws 1981. The prior written consent of the Environment Agency is required for any proposed works or structures,

		in, under, over or within 9.0 metres of the top of the bank of the Willow Brook North designated a 'main river'. The site includes a culverted section of the Willow Brook North - no development should be proposed over the culvert or within 9.0 metres. Opportunities to increase the access and easement corridor adjacent to the Willow Brook South should be incorporated into the development layout and landscaping proposals as part of a strategic measure(s) to reduce flood risk from the watercourse. The Environment Agency requires a byelaw distance of 9.0 metres to remain clear to enable it to carry out its functions. Under the terms of the Land Drainage Act 1991, any culvert or works that may impede the flow of water on any ordinary watercourse will require prior written Flood Defence Consent from the Environment Agency.
33	Environment Agency	E18 Willowbrook North is within Flood Zone 1. Subject to PPS 25 requirement to take into account all sources of flooding by implementation of the "Sequential Approach". Greater than 1 ha. Any planning application to be accompanied by a FRA primarily focusing on surface water management. Flood Defence Consent required under the Water Resources Act 1991, and the Land Drainage Byelaws 1981. The prior written consent of the Environment Agency is required for any proposed works or structures, in, under, over or within 9.0 metres of the top of the bank of the Willow Brook North designated a 'main river'. Opportunities to increase the access and easement corridor adjacent to the Willow Brook North should be incorporated into the development layout and landscaping proposals as part of a strategic measure(s) to reduce flood risk from the watercourse. The Environment Agency requires a byelaw distance of 9.0 metres to remain clear to enable it to carry out its functions.
33	Environment Agency	E19 Western SUE is within Flood Zone 1, but adjacent to the start of a number of culverted rivers which may pose a flood risk to this site. The forthcoming revised SFRA for Corby is intended consider the possibility and impact of any water backing up within this drainage system and causing flooding on the site. Planning permission should be granted only where development proposals observe the findings of the forthcoming revised SFRA for Corby. Subject to PPS 25 requirement to take into account all sources of flooding by implementation of the "Sequential Approach". Any planning application to be accompanied by a FRA primarily focusing on surface water management. Under the terms of the Land Drainage Act 1991, any culvert or works that may impede the flow of water on any ordinary watercourse will require prior written Flood Defence Consent from the Environment Agency.
38	SSR Planning on behalf of Sywell Land Ltd	There should be a short policy, possibly within the employment section which identifies the requirement for a Lorry Park and includes the site (Land at Fircroft Park, Corby) as there are no other known Lorry Park facilities planned. The document should recognise the approved reserved matters permission.
43	The Ramblers Association	A shortcut is needed to go to the north-west corner of HA2 to exit closer to Gretton football GN13 at the junction of Kirby Lane and Gretton Road. This will greatly reduce road walking.
43	The Ramblers Association	Through pedestrian routes /cycleways are needed to connect Weldon and this area to Upper Laundimer & Harry's Park Woods, Brigstock, Benefield and the surrounding countryside via Bear Lane, to reduce road walking and open up the countryside without the need for car use. The footway on the Oundle Road should be extended out from Weldon
43	The Ramblers Association	E3 Stanion Lane Plantation needs good purposeful routes to Town, Old village etc, from Stanion and Little Stanion plus some recreational use
43	The Ramblers Association	This area needs its current bridleway and footpath access to Middleton, Cottingham, East Carlton and the Welland Valley to be retained and improved on. This includes routes from Tower Hill area as well as Danesholme and Oakley Hay

44	CPRE	In the urban area there are still sites vacant and derelict which should be developed before the loss of farmland. There are vast areas devoted to vehicle storage alone, if this is required multi-storey facilities should be constructed to release land for productive activities
45	Lambert Smith Hampton on behalf of Northamptonshire County Council	The overall proposal for the wider site, including the adjacent land in other ownerships, is welcomed and it is confirmed that NCC will work with the relevant authorities to bring forward a suitable scheme based upon the current draft masterplan. In terms of the Corby Walk this an important element of the site and whilst NCC recognise the importance of this link and will as far as possible facilitate its development, there are important issues concerning design, cost and land take which have not been resolved and which will need to be taken into account in considering what, if any other contributions and/or benefits are to be sought from the wider site.
47	Pegasus Planning Group on behalf of Greatline Developments Ltd	Support allocation E15 for the following reasons. First, there is a clear need for additional employment land to be allocated to meet the requirements in the Core Strategy. CSS notes that existing employment sites areas provide the main supply of employment land and that the retention of older mixed use areas within towns allows for journeys by foot or cycle. In principle, this approach is supported in respect of E15 which adjoins an existing established employment area which is currently well let and occupied. Policy 11 of the CSS also requires additional employment land be allocated within or adjoining the main urban areas in order to achieve the levels of job growth set out in Table 6. For Corby, an additional 1,900 jobs in Class B2 are required, an additional 3,640 jobs for Class B8 and 2,450 extra jobs in Class B1. The Site Allocations DPD consultation draft then translates these employment requirements into land requirements over the period to 2021 (and 2026) in Table 5.1. The conversion ratios used and 1 job per 18m ² for B1, 1 per 35m ² for B2 and 1 per 88m ² for Class B8. A plot ratio of 40% has also been assumed. These assumptions appear to be a realistic basis upon which to allocate future employment land requirements and are therefore supported. Second, the characteristics of E15 and immediate locality are such that the site is suitable for employment development, with existing access, and neighbouring development which is compatible with a range of employment uses. More specifically, Site E15 will benefit the regeneration of Corby being centrally located within the established urban area and enabling the 'rounding off' of the existing employment area. In addition, there may be opportunities to bring forward this site more quickly by considering a more mixed use approach towards the development potential of this area, with an ability to enhance its contribution to enabling an urban renaissance and to support sustainable transport opportunities.
47	Pegasus Planning Group on behalf of Greatline Developments Ltd	Policy EMP01, through Table 5.5 and the Proposals Map, includes a range of sites including Site E15. The proposed mix and range of employment uses for B1, B2 and B8 is supported, having regard to the opportunities of the site in terms of its location, size and market sector.
47	Pegasus Planning Group on behalf of Greatline Developments Ltd	An oversupply of employment land is proposed for all three Class B1 uses to allow flexibility to meet the job growth targets. This approach is supported. There is a need to provide for choice of sites to be able to meet specific employer requirements and to allow for unforeseen constraints to a development proceeding on a particular allocation to be addressed elsewhere on other sites
47	Pegasus Planning	Notwithstanding the merits of E15 as suitable employment allocation, there is also a strong case for part of E15 to be brought

	Group on behalf of Greatline Developments Ltd	forward for residential use. Policy EMP02 acknowledges that there may be other forms of development considered to that outlined in Policy EMP01 and Table 5.5 in respect of certain sites, including site E15. Site E15 borders the 'Corby Central Area' and the northern part of the allocation lies within a walking radius of the proposed Station Gateway. The site is also in good proximity to Corby's schools, health centres, town centre facilities and is able to readily access the existing adjacent employment areas. The development of the site would not unduly adversely affect any environmental designations and a mixed use form of development is likely to offer a better prospect of being able to address any site specific nature conservation issues by having a more flexible pattern of land use in a mixed use scheme. There are not significant contamination issues and the majority of the site is in Flood Risk Zone 1, and is therefore suitable for residential development in terms of PPS25. Part of the site towards the south east corner is likely to be in a higher flood risk category (Flood 3a) and employment uses are regarded as appropriate. In principle therefore, the site is suitable for residential development subject to careful design. There exists the potential to allocate up to 3.7 hectares of residential land to the west of St Marks Road, in a manner which would allow for a suitable and sustainable residential environment to be created. The new employment areas further to the south would extend to 4.9 hectares. In addition, a new commercial site at the gateway to the site would be created extending to 0.3 hectares. A development concept plan has been put forward to demonstrate the potential for a mixed use allocation and how good quality design principles can be achieved.
48	GP Planning Ltd	Object to the discounting of Brookfield Resource Recovery Site. The site was not incorporated into the 'Northamptonshire Sites for Waste Development DPD' because of the timing of the proposals but this should not be a reason to preclude the site in this document; and it is promoted as an employment site
50	M3 Agency LLP	Site J20 Barn Close was allocated for employment purposes in the Local Plan and proposed to be saved by the Secretary of State. The site is currently used for car storage purposes. In the consultation document the Council have concluded that the site is now to be discounted ".....due to no realistic prospect of...coming forward for the development of B class uses". We are uncertain as to how the Council have arrived at this conclusion. Having regard to the existing lease arrangements for the property together with the current state of the UK car industry there is a possibility that this site will be available for employment uses within the period of the Plan. We would request that the employment allocation be reinstated for this site.
59	John Martin & Associates on behalf of Rockingham Estates and Great Oakley Estates	Support the identification of Site E19 'Corby Western Urban Extension'. This indicates a proposed employment site of 13.8ha in total comprising B1 and B2 use. General Industrial uses, which in broad terms may not sit comfortably side by side with other uses, particularly residential content. Therefore, careful consideration would need to be given to B2 uses in terms of their nature, location and compatibility with adjacent uses

Housing

5	P.E. Enterprises Ltd	Weldon does not need a development at Weldon Park. Government strategy may change in the next year.
---	----------------------	---

7	Weldon Caravan Storage	No more houses for Weldon, at Weldon Park. There is enough already with Priors Hall
7	Weldon Caravan Storage	No more houses for Weldon, at Weldon Park. There is enough already with Priors Hall
7	Weldon Caravan Storage	No more houses for Weldon, at Weldon Park. There is enough already with Priors Hall
9	East Northamptonshire Council	No comments to make regarding Priors Hall, given that Corby Borough Council and East Northamptonshire Council have both already agreed to this development in principle.
9	East Northamptonshire Council	Concerned at the additional phase of development at North East Corby. A further 1000 dwellings are proposed over and above the 5100 dwellings at Priors Hall that is anticipated in the CSS. The proposed developments are likely to have a significant impact upon highway infrastructure, schools and health services in the rural north of the East Northants
9	East Northamptonshire Council	Concerned as to the impact of the Priors Hall development upon services within East Northamptonshire, particularly Oundle. These concerns are reiterated, given the proposed additional levels of development at North East Corby.
9	East Northamptonshire Council	Phasing of the proposed new Local Centre at Weldon East in relation to other aspects of the SUE (i.e. housing and employment) is not clear. It is considered that Weldon East ought to be subject to a Master Plan approach, similar to those proposed for Kingswood or Corby West, given the scale of development being proposed at this location.
9	East Northamptonshire Council	The Proposals Map appears to show the SUE as effectively merging with the existing village. It is unclear whether a separation between Weldon village and the SUE will form part of the detailed development proposals. The Master Plan ought to address this relationship between Weldon East SUE and the existing village.
10	Rutland County Council	Concerned about the potential impact on its area of the major employment and housing developments proposed, particularly the effects of additional traffic on the highway network.
10	Rutland County Council	An assessment of the impact of planned developments in Corby on traffic flows on the A6003 in Rutland previously undertaken by the Council concluded that they will increase by nearly 20% and that developers should contribute towards any mitigation required. These effects may be may be further exacerbated by the increased levels of housing and employment (particularly B8 developments) now being proposed and the resultant over-supply of housing and employment land.
10	Rutland County Council	There is concern that the document does not clearly show how the new housing developments and jobs from the new employment areas would be developed together. The oversupply of employment land in Corby will potentially result in an imbalance between housing and employment and also have a knock-on effect for the viability of employment land in Rutland and increased cross-border commuting.
10	Rutland County Council	The LDF should consider the impact of the developments on Rutland and include policies requiring developers to contribute towards any mitigation measures that might be needed as a result of the developments.
11	Highways Agency	The level of housing land identified represents an over provision from the requirement identified in the Core Strategy and Regional Plan, which raises concerns as to the consistency of the document

11	Highways Agency	None of the sites included within the table are anticipated on their own to significantly impact upon the operation of the A14. Support the inclusion of the sites on the basis of their sustainability and regeneration credentials and on the emphasis on well located brownfield sites in advance of greenfield releases.
11	Highways Agency	The provision for an SUE to the North East of Corby provides an opportunity for a mix of residential, employment and community facilities on-site and accords with the Highway Agency's aim for balanced, sustainable communities, with opportunities for sustainable transport opportunities to be maximised. Any future proposal will however need, at application stage, to be supported by a Transport Assessment. Any cumulative impact arising from development on a combination of sites may also need to be incorporated
13		Development on Pytchley Court would create congestion on Denford Road through the loss of this car park. At the moment the space is a buffer between Pytchley Court shopping precinct and the estate. As the precinct is recognised by the police as a youth gathering area building further development would only increase problems in the estate. The car park is also used by visitors/residents in this part of the estate and it's also used fairly well all day. Opposite the car park we have a public house and a club which create further parking problems on Denford Road. This car park is in fact the only recognised car park in the whole of the Park Lodge Estate
14	New Lodge Park Tenants and Residents Association	Development on Pytchley Court would create congestion on Denford Road with the loss of the car park which by the way is the only public car park in the whole of the Lodge Park Estate. The space acts as a buffer between the shopping precinct and the estate. The shop deliveries use the area behind the shops and to close the car park would create huge problems with parking. Opposite the site is the Club Silverband that has a small car park and tends to use this car park. Also Kingfisher public house. The Tenants Association unanimously object to the proposed site and the building of houses on the site
15	Northants Police and Northants Fire and Rescue Service	The principle of providing new houses in large sustainable urban extensions is supported. This enables a critical mass to be achieved to develop communities to ensure community cohesion. In addition, it provides a level that can provide for new infrastructure for the community to ensure social interaction
15	Northamptonshire Police	It is understood why the consultation document does not propose to include additional policies on design of residential areas beyond that which is already included in the Core Strategy and Sustainable Design SPD. However it is important that issues of design relating to community safety are seriously considered through this process. The principles of Secured by Design, including issues of designing out opportunities for arson should be considered as part of the process, particularly in privately developed areas. There is an increase currently in houses being built privately and then sold to a RSL who then have to retrofit to Secured by Design standards. This could be avoided through pushing for Secured by Design on private dwellings as well. The CPDA and relevant NFRS officers need to be involved at an early stage in any planning application for new residential development, in accordance with the recently produced 'Planning for Safer Places' protocol
15	Northamptonshire Police	Affordable housing is recognised as an important issue for the plan. The suggestion within the document is that market sale and affordable housing will be evenly distributed and fully integrated across a site. This needs further clarification. The preference would be for small clusters of affordable units within a site (although evenly distributed and integrated) so that the management of the units can be made easier for the provider but still ensuring that integration of the units within the overall

		estate can be achieved
15	Northamptonshire Police	It is important that some of the housing is provided to enable more people to live at home for longer. This contributes to social inclusion. However it is important that what are being provided are Lifetime Homes and that they sit within Lifetime Neighbourhoods.
15	Northamptonshire Police	Consideration needs to be given to incorporating residential sprinkler systems within affordable units, houses in multiple occupation, nursing homes and sheltered accommodation. Statistically people in these types of accommodation are more likely to be seriously injured or die in fires. Sprinklers can save lives in these instances. In addition, sprinklers help to save the building and therefore contribute towards the sustainable development principles of the plan.
15	Northamptonshire Police	Policy H10 is welcomed as affordable units will be provided to standards of the Homes and Communities Agency. This includes requirements to build units to Secured by Design principles
15	Northamptonshire Police	It is important that the existing housing stock is used effectively. Therefore the policy H12 to ensure the conversion of existing housing in suitable locations is to be welcomed. This should help to reduce instances of unoccupied or derelict housing and the associated issues with crime and anti-social behaviour that occur in these dwellings
15	Northamptonshire Police	Policy H14 is welcomed. Involvement through the CPDA to regenerate these areas is a must to not duplicate historic problems in the area. The need to ensure that active natural surveillance is built into these areas is key. It is also vital that the area is appealing for people to use and that the redesign allows for a sense of ownership to be gained in the environment by the residents. A clear split between public and private space must be ensured
16	East Midlands Regional Assembly	Paragraph 6.16 and Table 6.1 appear to confirm that the document is covering the period up to 2021. Justification for the proposed overprovision in Policy H 01 and Table 6.1 in comparison with the RSS and Core Strategy will be essential. Policy 13a of the RSS does state that local authorities can test higher numbers through their development plan documents provided they are consistent with the principles of sustainable development in PPS1 and tested through sustainability appraisal. In particular it will be essential to show that there is sufficient infrastructure capacity to support the level of provision proposed
16	East Midlands Regional Assembly	It is reiterated that Policy MKSM SRS Northamptonshire 4 of the RSS states that the capacity of the existing built up area of Corby to accommodate additional development will be utilised to the full, through measures to assess and bring forward surplus employment sites and other previously developed land and through the opportunities for intensification and mixed use provided by regeneration and redevelopment
19	Smiths Gore on behalf of Great Oakley Estate	Support Policy H01 and Table 6.1 (Site H(iii)) which proposes 4,000 dwellings at West Corby in the form of a sustainable urban extension
19	Smiths Gore on behalf of Great Oakley Estate	Support the identification of Site HA23 – Oakley Vale Neighbourhood Centre. The completions figures appear to be incorrect. The site is 0.5 ha and, with a proposed density of 48 units/ha, would provide some 24 dwellings. However, the completions figures suggest just 18 dwellings so there is an inconsistency in the figures. This site could potentially be delivered <i>prior</i> to 2015
19	Smiths Gore on behalf of Great Oakley Estate	Support Site HA27 at Oakley Vale – the former Local Plan allocation for the science park. This 11.08ha site is earmarked for some 330 dwellings. We would comment that, while there is no planning permission for residential use, the site does benefit from outline planning permission for a science park

19	Smiths Gore on behalf of Great Oakley Estate	30 dwellings per hectare (in PPS3) is an <i>indicative</i> minimum target and is not prescriptive
19	Smiths Gore on behalf of Great Oakley Estate	Table 6.4 can only be a general guide. SUEs are likely to have a greater variety of housing types than those listed in the table including, for example, 1 bed units, 5 bed units, sheltered housing, care homes, live/work units and so forth. We are uncertain how the 15 unit threshold might be applied to a 4,000 unit SUE
19	Smiths Gore on behalf of Great Oakley Estate	Do not understand the basis of Policy H10 which does not appear to be a planning policy relevant to a Site Allocations DPD. It appears to refer to the controls imposed on RSLs in procuring grant-aided affordable housing. The policy should be deleted from this DPD
19	Smiths Gore on behalf of Great Oakley Estate	Support Policy H13 concerning the longer term housing requirements for the post 2021 period. Our own masterplanning work has revealed capacity for an additional 2,000 dwellings over and above the current proposals for 4,000 dwellings at West Corby SUE. The design of West Corby, in terms of highways, infrastructure provision and site requirements, will take account of the possibility of longer term expansion
20	Smiths Gore on behalf of Great Oakley Estate and Rockingham Castle Estate	Support policy and Table 6.1 (Site H (iii)) which proposes 4,000 dwellings as the Corby Western <i>Sustainable</i> Urban Extension. This description is slightly different to others within the DPD; there should be consistency of reference
20	Smiths Gore on behalf of Great Oakley Estate and Rockingham Castle Estate	Table 6.2 identifies the Proposed Corby Western SUE at HA29, which we support. However, the table indicates an overall minimum density of 35 units per hectare. We believe that it is inappropriate to dictate minimum densities above those set out in national guidance i.e. PPS3 - Housing
20	Smiths Gore on behalf of Great Oakley Estate and Rockingham Castle Estate	Comment that 30 dwellings per hectare, as set out in PPS3, is an indicative minimum target and are not prescriptive. Paragraph 47 of PPS3 states that Local Planning Authorities may wish to set out a range of densities across the plan area rather than one broad density range although 30 dwellings per hectare net should be used as a national indicative minimum to guide policy development and decision-making, until local density policies are in place. This paragraph continues by stating where Local Planning Authorities wish to plan for, or agree to, densities below this minimum, this will need to be justified, having regard to paragraph 46 i.e. design-led considerations
20	Smiths Gore on behalf of Great Oakley Estate and Rockingham Castle Estate	Comment on that Table 6.4 can only be a general guide. Sustainable Urban Extensions are likely to have a greater variety of housing types than those listed in the table including, for example, 1 bed units, 5 bed units, sheltered housing, care homes, live/work units and so forth. We are uncertain how the 15 unit threshold might be applied to a 4,000 unit Sustainable Urban Extension to the west of Corby
20	Smiths Gore on	The basis of the policy is not understood. It does not appear to be a planning policy relevant to a Site Allocations DPD. It

	behalf of Great Oakley Estate and Rockingham Castle Estate	appears to refer to the controls imposed on RSLs in procuring grant-aided affordable housing. The policy should be deleted from this DPD
20	Smiths Gore on behalf of Great Oakley Estate and Rockingham Castle Estate	Support policy concerning the longer term housing requirements for the post 2021 period. Our own master planning work has revealed capacity for an additional 2,000 dwellings over and above the current proposals for 4,000 dwelling at Corby Western SUE. The design of West Corby, in terms of highways, infrastructure provision and site requirements, will take account of the possibility of longer term expansion
21	Corby Old Village Residents Association	Object very strongly to the sale of the land for development. The field has been an integral part of our village for centuries; back in 1905 it was the football pitch for the village. Children still today play in the field and residents walk the field daily. The field is home to Hedgehogs, Badgers, Crested Newt's, Deer and Foxes to name a few, where are they going to go, we are supposed to protect our wild life
21	Corby Old Village Residents Association	The field is the most serious flood plain in the area, it floods several times a year, residents at the bottom of Bessemer Grove have to install sand bags at there doors to stop the water entering there property. The houses in Stanion Lane were built 4 metres above ground level because of the flood risk and the road floods several times a year. The Environmental Agency has cleared the brook to help the situation but this has made no different to the flooding problem. We have under ground streams in Stanion Lane and the fields which make the problem even worse
21	Corby Old Village Residents Association	The lane at the back of the houses in Stanion Lane & Bessemer Grove which the farmers use to take there sheep, horses and cows into the field is a private road owned by the residents of Stanion Lane and as such cannot be used as an entry point to the field
21	Corby Old Village Residents Association	Nobody objected to the allocation of this site in the 2006 Preferred Options consultation document because nobody in the village was notified
21	Corby Old Village Residents Association	Question the integrity of the Council, including a site that has already been marked out in the field for housing going from a electrical pylon in the middle of the field to Stanion Lane. Furthermore the site was also visited by a Council Planning Engineer which tells the residents that a planning application is in the pipe line. We had the destruction of Stanion Plantation thanks to this Council and we were promised an alternative site on the Bulwick estate and nothing happened, we are still waiting
21	Corby Old Village Residents Association	NCC in a meeting yesterday rejected the Governments plan for 60,000 more houses in Northamptonshire issuing a statement that the infrastructure could not cope, we would not be able to generate enough employment and that we should not build on greenland and floodplains by villages. If CBC had done a survey, consulted the residents and the EA they would not have made such a fundamental mistake and would have reached the same conclusion as NCC
23	Friends, Families and Travellers Planning	Welcome the attention being given to gypsy and traveller accommodation needs

23	Friends, Families and Travellers Planning	The Site Allocations DPD para 1.3 states that the DPD will provide details of how Corby will be developed to 2021 and will look forward to 2026. The Gypsy and Traveller Sites section limits itself to the period to 2012. Policy 16 of the East Midlands Plan states that: 'Local Development Frameworks should make provision for the minimum additional pitch requirements set out in Appendix 2, taking into account of the need arising from future growth beyond 2012 as set out in paragraph 3.1.18.'. Hence there is a need for this to be done on Corby which may well imply the development of a further site or sites. This issue will need to be given due consideration in the next iteration of the Sites Allocation DPD.
23	Friends, Families and Travellers Planning	Agree that existing sites should be preserved.
23	Friends, Families and Travellers Planning	Confused by the apparent contradiction between the information in para 6.111 which indicates that planning permission has been given for two sites and the information contained in the CLG Caravan Count Statistics for Jan 2009 which indicate that there is only one caravan on a site with planning permission (authorised private site). It would be useful if this contradiction can be clarified
24	Barton Willmore on behalf of Persimmon Homes	The Core Strategy proposes that 16,800 dwellings will be provided in Corby between 2001 and 2021. We note that this is a very short time horizon, and that when the document was adopted in June 2008 it had less than 15 years to run. The Council should therefore be considering whether to extend the life of this current document to consider development over a longer time horizon to 2026. The strategic context exists to do this. With this caveat we consider that the provision of 16,800 new homes adequately reflects the Core Strategy and we note that it is a backloaded trajectory that implies a substantial increase in completion rates from those seen between 2001 and 2006. We therefore have no further comment to make on housing provision.
24	Barton Willmore on behalf of Persimmon Homes	Welcome the fact that land for 1,000 houses is proposed for allocation at Weldon. This development is subject to a current planning application and we hope that this will be in a position to start delivering much needed houses for the community in the next few years. Confirm that the start date for the development of soon after 2011 implied in the Table 6.2 is realistic
24	Barton Willmore on behalf of Persimmon Homes	Note that Table 6.2 and Table 6.3 contradict each other regarding the mid-plan cut-off date of 2014/2015
24	Barton Willmore on behalf of Persimmon Homes	Note that it is anticipated that 550 dwellings can be completed by 2015 with 450 completions between 2015 and 2021 indicating completion before the end of the plan period. The average completion rate in the 2011 to 2015 period which must be taken as the Council's assessment of peak levels of development, is at least 137.5 dwellings a year assuming development is spread over the whole of the four year period. At that rate some 1,375 dwellings could be delivered by 2021 quite comfortably. It is entirely plausible to envisage a development at Weldon with three outlets delivering 50 dwellings each a year which, combined with an early start, could see 1,500 dwellings delivered by 2021
24	Barton Willmore	Land to the south and east of the Weldon application site could deliver a further 1,000 houses, giving a total of about 2,000

	on behalf of Persimmon Homes	houses. Development of this level, as opposed to the 1,000 houses currently proposed, will bring sustainability benefits through greater self containment and improved critical mass. The majority of this development can be completed before 2021, at least 1,375 homes are indicated by the Council's own phasing plan and it could be 1,500 homes or more
24	Barton Willmore on behalf of Persimmon Homes	In the last line the reference to 1,000 dwellings east of Weldon should be changed to 2,000 dwellings east of Weldon. A Consequent amendment to the Key Diagram is also required
24	Barton Willmore on behalf of Persimmon Homes	The phasing proposed for the West SUE is unrealistic and the full 4,000 houses proposed will not be delivered within the plan period. The main reason for this is the likely start date for the development. The policy for the area says that development should not start before 2011, but the phasing in Table 6.2 expects that only 100 houses will be completed before 2015 with the remaining 3,900 houses expected to be built between 2015 and 2021. This is assumed to reflect aspirations that the West SUE will come forward once the North East SUE is established. This is a realistic lead time for a development of this size which has not yet proceeded very far through the planning process. This contrasts with the North Eastern SUE which already has planning permission, and where an early start is therefore more realistic. The phasing in Table 6.2 requires 3,900 houses to be built in six years at an average of 650 houses a year. As an average build rate over a sustained period this is not achievable. The upper limit is likely to be about 500 houses a year on average. Assuming first completions in 2014-15, which is only 4½ years away, then 3,100 houses would be the maximum completed. While 4½ years may seem a long time, by then masterplans have to be produced, outline and reserved matters approved, options exercised and site infrastructure provided before houses can be constructed, and it may in practice be difficult to deliver first completions in this time scale. It is our view that the plan should recognise this and that the site will not be completed within the plan period, though it could be substantially complete. This would be entirely consistent with paragraph 3.66 of the Core Strategy and the need expressed in WUE01 for the proposals to take account of additional growth in regional housing targets after 2021. Given that forward forecasting of housing delivery is an imprecise process, that we have allowed an optimistic start date for the Western SUE and that 2021 is an arbitrary cut-off date then we consider that there should be no impediment to allocating a larger development at Weldon within this plan
24	Barton Willmore on behalf of Persimmon Homes	Policy appears very prescriptive. In particular viability is an important consideration as indicated by Paragraph 29 of PPS3. Welcome the fact that this is recognised in the second paragraph of the policy. However, Paragraph 29 requires authorities to go further than this and set their targets for affordable housing in the light of an assessment of the likely economic viability of land. There is no evidence that such an assessment has been carried out in the DPD. Failure to do so not only contravenes paragraph 29 but means that claims for an exemption to the provision of affordable housing could become the norm, rather than the exception they are intended to be, particularly in the current housing market. The policy would be improved by the inclusion of the word "normally" in the first sentence of the second paragraph, which would then read: "The housing split and tenure shall normally be in accordance with the table below..."
24	Barton Willmore on behalf of	East of Weldon should be included in the locations where land requirements beyond 2021 are sought, as well as the west of the town, unless the council makes a commitment in a revised Policy HO7 to allocate the full 2,000 houses we are requesting

	Persimmon Homes	
25	SSR Planning on behalf of Buccleuch Property	In line with PPS3, it is essential that the DPD should look forward for the next 15 years and in so doing reflect the amended housing figures, contained in the emerging review of the Core Strategy, which will cover the period to 2026. The DPD currently fails to do this and only plans for the next 10 years, not 15 years as it should. In accommodating the delivery of further housing and employment growth to 2026 the DPD will need to identify additional sites at Corby, in sustainable locations adjoining the town. It is therefore requested that in revising the DPD to reflect the amended housing figures contained in the emerging Core Strategy, development for the period to 2026 is facilitated even where it entails cross boundary considerations
25	SSR Planning on behalf of Buccleuch Property	It is essential that the DPD is prepared in accordance with PPS3 and plans for the delivery of further housing growth at Corby up to the period to 2026, and thus reflects the amended housing figures contained in the revised Core Strategy. It is noted that the DPD identifies a continued supply of housing for the periods 2011-2015 and 2015-2021. However, in planning for the next 15 years, and reflecting the amended housing figures contained in the emerging revised Core Strategy, it will it will be necessary for the DPD to identify additional housing sites for the period 2021-2026
25	SSR Planning on behalf of Buccleuch Property	It is essential that the DPD is prepared following guidance contained in PPS3 and therefore reflects the emerging Core Strategy which will cover the period to 2026. The DPD currently only plans for the period to 2021, as reflected in Policy H 01 and Table 6.1. It is requested that the DPD is amended to cover the period to 2026 and accommodate the revised housing figures contained in the emerging reviewed Core Strategy. In so doing it will be necessary for the DPD to identify additional sites within and adjoining Corby capable of accommodating growth beyond 2021
25	SSR Planning on behalf of Buccleuch Property	PPS3 expects the identification of sites to enable a continuous delivery of housing for at least 15 years. It is noted that Table 6.3 contained in Policy H 05 identifies an over provision of approximately 388 units to 2021. However, it is considered essential that the period to 2026 is properly planned for and that the DPD reflects the amended housing figures contained in the emerging revised Core Strategy; identifying sites which will enable the delivery of housing for this period
25	SSR Planning on behalf of Buccleuch Property	The Regional Plan refers to the importance of the relationships across the district boundaries in North Northamptonshire. There is concern that in assessing the 'Other Options Considered' for the North East Corby and Corby Western Urban Extensions the Council concludes that "The alternative to the provision of SUEs is to identify a larger number of smaller sites for housing, including some that may lie outside the Corby Borough boundary, or in less sustainable locations. Such an option would not be compatible with the adopted NNCSS". Cross boundary solutions are acceptable in principle as reflected in MKSM SRS Northamptonshire 1 and where they would provide sustainable urban extensions with excellent access to Corby's town centre and existing urban area, as at Corby South East and Storefield, should be favourably considered in order that post 2021 options are not inappropriately curtailed. It is critical that the Council works with the Joint Planning Unit during the review of the Core Strategy and in developing the further stages of its DPD in order to ensure that cross boundary issues are properly addressed
27	John Martin & Associates on behalf of	Support proposed 4,000 dwellings at the Western SUE. This description is lightly different to others within the DPD; there should be consistency of reference.

	Rockingham Estates	
27	John Martin & Associates on behalf of Rockingham Estates	Support HA29. However, the table indicates an overall minimum density of 35dph. It is inappropriate to dictate minimum densities above those set out in national guidance e.g. PPS3
27	John Martin & Associates on behalf of Rockingham Estates	Do not understand the basis of Policy H10 which does not appear to be a planning policy relevant to a Site Allocations DPD. It appears to refer to the controls imposed on RSLs in procuring grant-aided affordable housing. The policy should be deleted from this DPD
27	John Martin & Associates on behalf of Rockingham Estates	Table 6.2 identifies the Proposed Corby Western Sustainable Urban Extension at HA29, which we support. However, the table indicates an overall minimum density of 35 units per hectare. We believe that it is inappropriate to dictate minimum densities above those set out in national guidance i.e. PPS3
27	John Martin & Associates on behalf of Rockingham Estates	Comment that 30 dwellings per hectare, as set out in PPS3, is an <i>indicative</i> minimum target and are not prescriptive. Paragraph 47 of PPS3 states <i>that Local Planning Authorities may wish to set out a range of densities across the plan area rather than one broad density range although 30 dwellings per hectare net should be used as a national indicative minimum to guide policy development and decision-making, until local density policies are in place.</i> This paragraph continues by stating <i>where Local Planning Authorities wish to plan for, or agree to, densities below this minimum, this will need to be justified, having regard to paragraph 46</i> i.e. design-led considerations
28	Weldon Parish Council	The Parish Council believes that there is currently a political acceptance that the extensive housing development proposed in recent years, in particular the MKSM study, should now be viewed with caution and LDF should be produced with this in mind
28	Weldon Parish Council	Housing targets should be treated with caution and Weldon Park should not be a foregone conclusion and that the approved Priors Hall development is likely to meet housing demand within the plan period.
28	Weldon Parish Council	The Parish Council acknowledge that (R17 existing football field) is carried forward from the 1997 adopted Local Plan
28	Weldon Parish Council	The Parish Council acknowledge that Part R16 (Dash Farm Close) is carried forward from the 1997 adopted Local Plan
28	Weldon Parish Council	There is some confusion regarding HA34 which cites SHLAA 0182 Site Reference. The area of land in Larratt Road identified in the SHLAA is shown as Site Reference 337 – land west of allotments Larratt Road. It is assumed that the two references are in fact the same piece of land and it is surprising to see this now included as a potential site in the LDF consultation document. The SHLAA identified this site as a Category 3 greenfield site and development would further “enclose” the existing village

28	Weldon Parish Council	Review of housing needs and market assessment is due and that it would be anachronistic to adopt a LDF that is based on statistics and forecasts already proving to be flawed in the current economic climate. The Parish Council welcomes the commitment to stakeholder engagement both at the current stage and in future reviews. It is imperative that Parish Councils are seen as major stakeholders (compare this to the SHLAA which excluded local opinion)
28	Weldon Parish Council	Housing targets should be treated with caution and Weldon Park should not be a foregone conclusion and that the approved Priors Hall development is likely to meet housing demand within the plan period
28	Weldon Parish Council	Welcomes the commitment to genuine "affordable" housing provision. Houses that young local people who wish to remain in the village they grew up in can afford are rare
29	Alan Gunne-Jones	There should be some provision for housing in the rural settlements and in particular in Middleton / Cottingham
29	Alan Gunne-Jones	Question whether provision for Corby Rural is sufficient to sustain village communities
29	Alan Gunne-Jones	The commitment to dialogue with key stakeholders is welcomed in an effort to establish alternatives for improving supply. This should however include landowners who have land that could contribute to housing delivery
30		Strongly protest to the proposed building of houses on the site HA26 off Stanion Lane. There are a number of reasons that the site is not suitable for houses; there are a number of natural springs on the site; flood water has reached the back doors of the houses at the bottom of Bessemer in recent years. Houses being built on land used for natural drainage must not be allowed, it would mean the new houses would be flooded and the increase in buildings would mean risk of water flooding higher up the road passed the banks it currently reaches. The Ponds (Clay pits) are a Health and Safety issue which would not be a safe environment for young families to live near. The Pylons which run along the site are another risk, although there is no current evidence but it is believed that the static from the Electricity is not healthy and can cause headaches and worst case Leukaemia. It would be wrong to put people in housing which is in an area with potential for health risks from Pylons. The site has for many years been a place for recreation for family walks. The fields are known by the locals as the Cow fields where many have walked their dogs and gone blackberry picking with young children. It is a site considered by the local community as a site of heritage, of how a village should be, surrounded by fields. The old Village and Toll Gate place has a place in the history of Corby and should not be obliterated by houses. There are concerns that the Council has not taken advice from the Environmental Agency and considered measurements of water levels in the winter months when the rains and snow cause the most flooding. At the resident meeting on 14th October 2009 in the Old Village someone voiced concern that what readings of the water levels that were taken were in the

		the Council are not in possession of the full facts it cannot make the correct decision. I have heard that the Council must request the reports from the Environmental Agency. I am not clear what reports have been done and if this information is made public. Also, at the residents meeting it was said the land has been Marked out by Surveyors. I am shocked that the surveyors are planning the housing plots. The risk factors are evident that this site is not suitable for housing and should be blocked by the Corby Council members and the planning department should take steps to stop this building on this site
31	Councillor Chris Stanbra	Not all of the area to south of Copenhagen Road should be designated for housing. Local residents would prefer it if that part known locally as "The Orchard" and the part which is bounded by The Orchard, the former SIAS Foods factory, Torksey Close, Bede Close and Bamburg Close were to be designated as Green Infrastructure, Open Space, Sport and Recreation. This is in order to retain some part of the land to the south of Copenhagen Road for this purpose. The part that lies between OUP and Bamburg Close is acceptable as a Housing designation
33	Environment Agency	HA1 Priors Hall is partially within Flood Zones 2 and 3. Site already enjoys outline planning permission. Further planning applications should be accompanied by a FRA which should be consistent with the approved FRAs for Zones 1 and 2 and the principles set out in PPS25, as appropriate. The design of the development should take a sequential approach aiming to locate development within Flood Zone 1. Flood Defence Consent required under the Water Resources Act 1991, and the Land Drainage Byelaws 1981. The prior written consent of the Environment Agency is required for any proposed works or structures, in, under, over or within 9.0 metres of the top of the bank of the Willow Brook North designated a 'main river'. The site includes a culverted section of the Willow Brook North - no development should be proposed over the culvert or within 9.0 metres. Opportunities to increase the access and easement corridor adjacent to the Willow Brook South should be incorporated into the development layout and landscaping proposals as part of a strategic measure(s) to reduce flood risk from the watercourse. The Environment Agency requires a byelaw distance of 9.0 metres to remain clear to enable it to carry out its functions. Under the terms of the Land Drainage Act 1991, any culvert or works that may impede the flow of water on any ordinary watercourse will require prior written Flood Defence Consent from the Environment Agency.
33	Environment Agency	HA2 Priors Hall is partially within Flood Zones 2 and 3. This northern part of the site has been the subject of an as yet undetermined outline application since 2004. Should outline permission be granted, any future planning application should be accompanied by a FRA which should be consistent with the principles set out in PPS25. The design should take a sequential approach aiming to locate development within Flood Zone 1. Flood Defence Consent required under the Water Resources Act 1991, and the Land Drainage Byelaws 1981. The prior written consent of the Environment Agency is required for any proposed works or structures, in, under, over or within 9.0 metres of the top of the bank of the Willow Brook North designated a 'main river'. The site includes a culverted section of the Willow Brook North - no development should be proposed over the culvert or within 9.0 metres. Opportunities to increase the access and easement corridor adjacent to the Willow Brook South should be incorporated into the development layout and landscaping proposals as part of a strategic measure(s) to reduce flood risk from the watercourse. The Environment Agency requires a byelaw distance of 9.0 metres to remain clear to enable it to carry out its functions. Under the terms of the Land Drainage Act 1991, any culvert or works that may impede the flow of water on any ordinary watercourse will require prior written Flood Defence Consent from the Environment Agency.
33	Environment	HA3 Land East of Weldon is partially within Flood Zones 2 and 3 and therefore subject to the PPS25 Sequential Test and (if

	Agency	necessary) the Exception Test. The test(s) must be satisfied in accordance with PPS25 prior to any grant of planning permission. Subject to PPS 25 requirement to take into account all sources of flooding by implementation of the “Sequential Approach”. Planning applications to be accompanied by a FRA which should be undertaken in accordance with PPS25. The design should take a sequential approach aiming to locate built development within Flood Zone 1. The allocation raises issues in relation to the means of access which may need to cross a floodplain. The issues are currently being pursued with the Council and the Local Highway Authority in relation to a planning application on the allocation area. They involve evaluating whether the means of access would constitute Essential Transport Infrastructure that may be acceptable in flood risk terms. Any other application involving the same or similar means of access would raise the same issues. Flood Defence Consent required under the Water Resources Act 1991, and the Land Drainage Byelaws 1981. The prior written consent of the Environment Agency is required for any proposed works or structures, in, under, over or within 9.0 metres of the top of the bank of the Willow Brook designated a ‘main river’. Opportunities to increase the access and easement corridor adjacent to the Willow Brook should be incorporated into the development layout and landscaping proposals as part of a strategic measure(s) to reduce flood risk from the watercourse. The Environment Agency requires a byelaw distance of 9.0 metres to remain clear to enable it to carry out its functions. Under the terms of the Land Drainage Act 1991, any culvert or works that may impede the flow of water on any ordinary watercourse will require prior written Flood Defence Consent from the Environment Agency.
33	Environment Agency	HA4 Kingswood Phase 1b is within Flood Zone 1. Subject to PPS 25 requirement to take into account all sources of flooding by implementation of the “Sequential Approach”. Greater than 1 ha. Any planning application to be accompanied by a FRA primarily focusing on surface water management.
33	Environment Agency	HA5 Weldon Road garage is within Flood Zone 1. Subject to PPS 25 requirement to take into account all sources of flooding by implementation of the “Sequential Approach”. Less than 1 ha. Corby Borough Council should consider flood risk issues using Environment Agency Standing Advice.
33	Environment Agency	HA6 North of Cottingham Road is partially within Flood Zones 2 and 3 and therefore subject to the PPS25 Sequential Test and (if necessary) the Exception Test. The test(s) must be satisfied in accordance with PPS25 prior to any grant of planning permission. The allocation raises issues in relation to the means of access which needs to cross a floodplain. The issues are being pursued with the Council in respect of a current planning application and resolution will be influenced by the findings of the forthcoming revised SFRA for Corby. Subject to PPS 25 requirement to take into account all sources of flooding by implementation of the “Sequential Approach”. Any future planning application to be accompanied by a FRA which should be undertaken in accordance with PPS25. The design should take a sequential approach aiming to locate built development within Flood Zone 1. Flood Defence Consent required. Under the terms of the Land Drainage Act 1991, any culvert or works that may impede the flow of water on any ordinary watercourse will require prior written Flood Defence Consent permission from the Environment Agency Opportunities to increase the access and easement corridor adjacent to the watercourse should be incorporated into the development layout and landscaping proposals as part of a strategic measure(s) to reduce flood risk.
33	Environment Agency	HA7 Former Beanfield Secondary School is within Flood Zone 1. Subject to PPS 25 requirement to take into account all sources of flooding by implementation of the “Sequential Approach”. Greater than 1 ha. Any planning application to be accompanied by a FRA primarily focusing on surface water management.

33	Environment Agency	HA8 Former Sports Ground off Rockingham Road is within Flood Zone 1. Subject to PPS 25 requirement to take into account all sources of flooding by implementation of the "Sequential Approach". Greater than 1 ha. Any planning application to be accompanied by a FRA primarily focusing on surface water management.
33	Environment Agency	HA9 Lindisfarne Road is within Flood Zone 1. Corby Borough Council should consider flood risk issues using Environment Agency Standing Advice.
33	Environment Agency	HA10 Kingswood Phase 1a is within Flood Zone 1. Subject to PPS 25 requirement to take into account all sources of flooding by implementation of the "Sequential Approach". Greater than 1 ha. Any planning application to be accompanied by a FRA primarily focusing on surface water management.
33	Environment Agency	HA11 Stephenson Way is within Flood Zone 1. Corby Borough Council should consider flood risk issues using Environment Agency Standing Advice.
33	Environment Agency	HA12 Shire Lodge Auto Repairs is within Flood Zone 1. Corby Borough Council should consider flood risk issues using Environment Agency Standing Advice.
33	Environment Agency	HA13 Oakley Road Garage Ltd is partially within Flood Zones 2 and therefore subject to the PPS25 Sequential Test and (if necessary) the Exception Test. The test(s) must be satisfied in accordance with PPS25 prior to any grant of planning permission. Subject to PPS 25 requirement to take into account all sources of flooding by implementation of the "Sequential Approach". Any planning applications to be accompanied by a FRA which should be undertaken in accordance with PPS25.
33	Environment Agency	HA14 Blenheim Walk is within Flood Zone 1. Corby Borough Council should consider flood risk issues using Environment Agency Standing Advice.
33	Environment Agency	HA15 255 Rockingham Road is within Flood Zone 1. Subject to PPS 25 requirement to take into account all sources of flooding by implementation of the "Sequential Approach". Greater than 1 ha. Any planning application to be accompanied by a FRA primarily focusing on surface water management.
33	Environment Agency	HA16 Evolution Corby is within Flood Zone 1. Subject to PPS 25 requirement to take into account all sources of flooding by implementation of the "Sequential Approach". Greater than 1 ha. Any planning application to be accompanied by a FRA primarily focusing on surface water management.
33	Environment Agency	HA17 Central Corby is within Flood Zone 1. Subject to PPS 25 requirement to take into account all sources of flooding by implementation of the "Sequential Approach". Greater than 1 ha. Any planning application to be accompanied by a FRA primarily focusing on surface water management.
33	Environment Agency	HA18 Builders Yard off Rockingham Road is within Flood Zone 1. Subject to PPS 25 requirement to take into account all sources of flooding by implementation of the "Sequential Approach". Greater than 1 ha. Any planning application to be accompanied by a FRA primarily focusing on surface water management.
33	Environment Agency	HA19 Parkland Gateway is within Flood Zone 1. Subject to PPS 25 requirement to take into account all sources of flooding by implementation of the "Sequential Approach". Greater than 1 ha. Any planning application to be accompanied by a FRA primarily focusing on surface water management.
33	Environment Agency	HA20 Kingswood School is within Flood Zone 1. Subject to PPS 25 requirement to take into account all sources of flooding by implementation of the "Sequential Approach". Greater than 1 ha. Any planning application to be accompanied by a FRA

		primarily focusing on surface water management. Under the terms of the Land Drainage Act 1991, any culvert or works that may impede the flow of water on any ordinary watercourse will require prior written Flood Defence Consent from the Environment Agency. A culverted stretch of watercourse runs through/close to the site – no development should be proposed over or within 9metres of the culvert.
33	Environment Agency	HA21 Pytchley Court is within Flood Zone 1. Less than 1ha. Corby Borough Council should consider flood risk issues using Environment Agency Standing Advice.
33	Environment Agency	HA22 Danesholme Regeneration Area is within Flood Zones 2 and 3. and therefore subject to the PPS25 Sequential Test and (if necessary) the Exception Test. The test(s) must be satisfied in accordance with PPS25 prior to any grant of planning permission. Subject to PPS 25 requirement to take into account all sources of flooding by implementation of the “Sequential Approach”. Any planning applications to be accompanied by a FRA which should be undertaken in accordance with PPS25. Should it be possible to satisfy the Sequential/Exception Tests the design should take a sequential approach aiming to locate built development within those parts of the site at least risk of flooding.
33	Environment Agency	HA23 Neighbourhood Centre, Oakley Vale is within Flood Zone 1. Less than 1ha. Corby Borough Council should consider flood risk issues using Environment Agency Standing Advice.
33	Environment Agency	HA24 Flensburg Close is within Flood Zones 2 and 3. and therefore subject to the PPS25 Sequential Test and (if necessary) the Exception Test. The test(s) must be satisfied in accordance with PPS25 prior to any grant of planning permission. Subject to PPS 25 requirement to take into account all sources of flooding by implementation of the “Sequential Approach”. Any planning applications to be accompanied by a FRA which should be undertaken in accordance with PPS25. Should it be possible to satisfy the Sequential/Exception Tests the design should take a sequential approach aiming to locate built development within those parts of the site at least risk of flooding.
33	Environment Agency	HA25 Pen Green Lane is partially within Flood Zones 2 and 3, and therefore subject to the PPS25 Sequential Test and (if necessary) the Exception Test. The test(s) must be satisfied in accordance with PPS25 prior to any grant of planning permission. Subject to PPS 25 requirement to take into account all sources of flooding by implementation of the “Sequential Approach”. Any planning applications to be accompanied by a FRA which should be undertaken in accordance with PPS25. Should it be possible to satisfy the Sequential/Exception Tests the design should take a sequential approach aiming to locate built development within Flood Zone 1. Flood Defence Consent required under the Water Resources Act 1991, and the Land Drainage Byelaws 1981. The prior written consent of the Environment Agency is required for any proposed works or structures, in, under, over or within 9.0 metres of the top of the bank of the Willow Brook designated a ‘main river’. Opportunities to increase the access and easement corridor adjacent to the Willow Brook should be incorporated into the development layout and landscaping proposals as part of a strategic measure(s) to reduce flood risk from the watercourse. The Environment Agency requires a byelaw distance of 9.0 metres to remain clear to enable it to carry out its functions.
33	Environment Agency	HA26 Off Stanion Lane is within Flood Zones 2 and 3 and therefore subject to the PPS25 Sequential Test and (if necessary) the Exception Test. The test(s) must be satisfied in accordance with PPS25 prior to any grant of planning permission. Subject to PPS 25 requirement to take into account all sources of flooding by implementation of the “Sequential Approach”. Any planning applications to be accompanied by a FRA which should be undertaken in accordance with PPS25. Should it be

		possible to satisfy the Sequential/Exception Tests the design should take a sequential approach aiming to locate built development within those parts of the site at least risk of flooding. Flood Defence Consent required under the Water Resources Act 1991, and the Land Drainage Byelaws 1981. The prior written consent of the Environment Agency is required for any proposed works or structures, in, under, over or within 9.0 metres of the top of the bank of the Willow Brook South designated a 'main river'. Opportunities to increase the access and easement corridor adjacent to the Willow Brook South should be incorporated into the development layout and landscaping proposals as part of a strategic measure(s) to reduce flood risk from the watercourse. The Environment Agency requires a byelaw distance of 9.0 metres to remain clear to enable it to carry out its functions.
33	Environment Agency	A small part of HA27 Oakley Vale (former site park allocation) is within Flood Zone 2 and therefore subject to the PPS25 Sequential Test and (if necessary) the Exception Test. The test(s) must be satisfied in accordance with PPS25 prior to any grant of planning permission. Subject to PPS 25 requirement to take into account all sources of flooding by implementation of the "Sequential Approach". Any planning applications to be accompanied by a FRA which should be undertaken in accordance with PPS25. Should it be possible to satisfy the Sequential/Exception Tests the design should take a sequential approach aiming to locate built development within those parts of the site at least risk of flooding. Flood Defence Consent required under the Water Resources Act 1991, and the Land Drainage Byelaws 1981. The prior written consent of the Environment Agency is required for any proposed works or structures, in, under, over or within 9.0 metres of the top of the bank of the Harpers Brook designated a 'main river'. Opportunities to increase the access and easement corridor adjacent to Harpers Brook should be incorporated into the development layout and landscaping proposals as part of a strategic measure(s) to reduce flood risk from the watercourse. The Environment Agency requires a byelaw distance of 9.0 metres to remain clear to enable it to carry out its functions.
33	Environment Agency	HA28 South of Copenhagen Road is within Flood Zone 1. Subject to PPS 25 requirement to take into account all sources of flooding by implementation of the "Sequential Approach". Greater than 1 ha. Any planning application to be accompanied by a FRA primarily focusing on surface water management.
33	Environment Agency	HA29 Corby SUE is within Flood Zone 1, but adjacent to the start of a number of culverted rivers which may pose a flood risk to this site. The forthcoming revised SFRA for Corby is intended consider the possibility and impact of any water backing up within this drainage system and causing flooding on the site. Planning permission should be granted only where development proposals observe the findings of the forthcoming revised SFRA for Corby. Subject to PPS 25 requirement to take into account all sources of flooding by implementation of the "Sequential Approach". Any planning application to be accompanied by a FRA primarily focusing on surface water management. Under the terms of the Land Drainage Act 1991, any culvert or works that may impede the flow of water on any ordinary watercourse will require prior written Flood Defence Consent from the Environment Agency.
33	Environment Agency	HA30 Off Corby Road, Gretton is within Flood Zone 1. Subject to PPS 25 requirement to take into account all sources of flooding by implementation of the "Sequential Approach". Greater than 1 ha. Any planning application to be accompanied by a FRA primarily focusing on surface water management.
33	Environment	HA31 Avenue Farm, Gretton is within Flood Zone 1. Less than 1ha. Corby Borough Council should consider flood risk issues

	Agency	using Environment Agency Standing Advice.
33	Environment Agency	HA32 Oundle Road, Weldon is within Flood Zone 1. Subject to PPS 25 requirement to take into account all sources of flooding by implementation of the "Sequential Approach". Greater than 1 ha. Any planning application to be accompanied by a FRA primarily focusing on surface water management.
33	Environment Agency	HA33 Chapel Road, Weldon is largely within Flood Zones 2 and 3 and therefore subject to the PPS25 Sequential Test and (if necessary) the Exception Test. The test(s) must be satisfied in accordance with PPS25 prior to any grant of planning permission. Subject to PPS 25 requirement to take into account all sources of flooding by implementation of the "Sequential Approach". Any planning applications to be accompanied by a FRA which should be undertaken in accordance with PPS25. Should it be possible to satisfy the Sequential/Exception Tests the design should take a sequential approach aiming to locate built development within Flood Zone 1. Flood Defence Consent required under the Water Resources Act 1991, and the Land Drainage Byelaws 1981. The prior written consent of the Environment Agency is required for any proposed works or structures, in, under, over or within 9.0 metres of the top of the bank of the Harpers Brook designated a 'main river'. Opportunities to increase the access and easement corridor adjacent to Harpers Brook should be incorporated into the development layout and landscaping proposals as part of a strategic measure(s) to reduce flood risk from the watercourse. The Environment Agency requires a byelaw distance of 9.0 metres to remain clear to enable it to carry out its functions.
34	Environment Agency	HA34 Larratt Road, Weldon is within Flood Zone 1. Subject to PPS 25 requirement to take into account all sources of flooding by implementation of the "Sequential Approach". Greater than 1 ha. Any planning application to be accompanied by a FRA primarily focusing on surface water management.
36	DIALOG	Disagree with the recommendation (as outlined in Site assessments within SA Appendices, CBC 0053). As argued via previous input to consultation (re: maps made available by Mr. Hill) we believe that this open space is positively used to the benefit of the local community. It also supports good quality landscaping - whether looking into or out of the estate.
36	DIALOG	Endorse recommendation and comments (as outlined in Site assessments within SA Appendices, CBC0118)
36	DIALOG	Disagree with the recommendation, in respect of the extent allocated thus. It will be recalled from the time of determination of the planning application, that it was agreed by the developers, ourselves, and the elected members of the Development Control Committee, that the 'eastern limb' of this tract of land would not be developed, but would be maintained (nay, enhanced) as Public Open Space, including additional orchard and children's play equipment. Our understanding was that this was to be confirmed by appropriate Condition attached to the planning approval. For this portion of the site to now be formally recognised as part of the land allocation for Housing, would wrongly encourage future planning applications for its development
37	DIALOG	Recommendation (as outlined in Site assessments within SA Appendices, CBC0020) is endorsed: examination earlier this year at time of partial clearance works) revealed significant representation of Ancient Woodland within this tract, which complements the historical ecology of King's Wood (LNR).
37	DIALOG	Corus are in possession of Report which identified established biodiversity value and corresponding constraint upon development, within part of this land plot. Its position alongside CBC0017 (housing site assessment within SA Appendices) also has implications for undesirable impact upon the latter, were it to be scheduled thus.
39	SSR Planning on	Object to the figure for new allocations to 2021, this figure should be increased to reflect an end date of the plan to 2026 in

	behalf of Park Lodge Farms LLP and Corus	order to conform to the Regional Plan. It is acknowledged the Regional Plan does not specify a figure for Corby for the period 2021-2026 but as a minimum the same rate of provision per annum (1,060 dwellings) should be used. If the DPD does not amend the end date and increase provision by 5 years it would be contrary to PPS3. The Plan as drafted is unsound unless it is altered to conform to the Regional Plan and PPS3.
39	SSR Planning on behalf of Park Lodge Farms LLP and Corus	The figure for new allocations (2,007 dwellings), does not include our clients' site off Southfield Road in Gretton. This site should be included because it is sustainable and deliverable within the Plan period. The site is also available immediately and can provide 100 dwellings. It is a site that can contribute to the housing provision for the plan period, especially in the event that other allocated sites may not be delivered. In the short term it would help the Council meet its five year housing land supply targets (which is deficient minus the large SUE allocations).
40	Bidwells on behalf of Land Securities	Site reference HA16 comprises the residential element of Evolution Corby which has yet to receive planning permission. The economic recession and its impact on mortgage availability and the housing market have presented obstacles to the delivery of circa 350 dwellings in the town centre over the stated time period. In the absence of a planning permission it is requested that the entry for HA16 is clarified as an aspiration rather than a commitment
40	Bidwells on behalf of Land Securities	In the absence of a planning permission for the circa 350 dwellings in the town centre for delivery in the time period covered by Policy H 05 and Table 6.3, it is requested that the housing build rate for the town centre is clarified as an aspiration rather than a commitment.
40	Bidwells on behalf of Land Securities	Policy 12 of the Core Strategy states that the town centres of Kettering, Corby and Wellingborough will be strengthened and regenerated as the focus of sustainable communities. Policy 16 of the Core Strategy states that master plans for sustainable urban extensions should make provision for an appropriate level of retail, leisure, social, cultural, community and health facilities that meet local needs but do not compete with the town centre. Clarification is sought that the retail element(s) of the North East Corby Sustainable Urban Extension will need to comply with PPS6 and Core Strategy. In particular, that the designation of new centres such as a district centre and/or a local centre(s) will need to be based on identified need and the scale and function respond accordingly
44	CPRE	Do not allow new sites to commence until the completion of previous sites and for which their infrastructure is complete, to ensure whole areas aren't deficient of infrastructure, roads, schools and medical facilities for many years. If developers default, the local community will foot the bill and suffer lack of infrastructure. This refers to HA3 and the HA29, which should be out of the immediate programme
44	CPRE	Unless a tight hold is kept upon the release of land, particularly housing, developers will not only pick and choose, but also walk away in difficult times with incomplete infrastructure
45	Lambert Smith Hampton	The overall proposal for the wider site, including the adjacent land in other ownerships, is welcomed and it is confirmed that NCC will work with the relevant authorities to bring forward a suitable scheme based upon the current draft masterplan. In terms of the Corby Walk this an important element of the site and whilst NCC recognise the importance of this link and will as far as possible facilitate its development, there are important issues concerning design, cost and land take which have not been resolved and which will need to be taken into account in considering what, if any other contributions and/or benefits are to be sought from the wider site.

45	Lambert Hampton	Smith	There has been a recent application for redevelopment of a replacement Maplefield school utilising a site of some 3ha. Residual land totals circa 3.9ha which will be available for residential development, and it is intended to progress an application for this residual land as soon as possible.
45	Lambert Hampton	Smith	Proposals show two areas of land. The NCC land currently forming the Kingswood School buildings extends 3.5ha and therefore it is unclear where the site area identified in the document has been derived and the overall number of dwellings from this site would therefore be higher. It is noticed that on the site of the former Kingswood school an area in front of the site appears to be excluded
45	Lambert Hampton	Smith on behalf of Northamptonshire County Council	The site appears to include land currently forming part of Kingswood Primary School which as yet has not been declared surplus to requirement. Whilst some discussion has been held between the County Council and developers, at this time the future of this land is unclear although the County will continue to work with developers and the Borough council.
46			Object to HA26, Off Stanion Lane. The redevelopment of Corby Old Village was designed to maximize the space available, since then new developments have been built on old sites. If the village is to keep its traditional concept it should be allowed to keep some of its rural character. This remaining remnant of the South Field is now the only part of the village remained undisturbed traditionally used for grazing. This land acts as a green buffer between the housing and industrial sites that surround it and is used as park land. The loss of this land for such a small scheme especially when there are ongoing major house building projects, as well as taking into consideration brown field sites doesn't justify the means
47	Pegasus Planning Group on behalf of Greatline Developments Ltd		It is noted that the requirement is for 16,800 net additional dwellings to be provided between 2001 and 2021. This equates to an annual requirement of 840 dwellings over the 20 year period. However, the actual rate of delivery achieved over the period 2001-2009 was only 2,870 dwellings, representing an annual average of 359 dwellings, less than half that required. Even allowing for an initial lower rate of delivery in the first 5 year period from 2001-2006, the target for this 7 year period would have been 3,348 dwellings. Table 6.2 proposes a total provision slightly in excess of the 16,800 requirement at 17,080 dwellings, but this overprovision of 280 units is only 1.67% above. Given the failure to achieve past completion requirements (which were significantly lower), and the need to secure a step change in delivery rates over the subsequent 5 year periods as set out in the Core Strategy, it is the case that a greater flexibility allowance for non-implementation of residential allocations should be included. One of the tests of soundness for a development plan document is that it should be sufficiently flexible to account for changing circumstances. A typical flexibility allowance of 10% should be included to allow for unforeseen circumstances; therefore an additional 1,680 dwellings should be included. Allowing for the planned overprovision of 280 units, a further 1,400 residential units need to be allocated in this DPD document. For the strategic housing and local site circumstances described above, 3.7 hectares of land West of St Marks Road should be included a new allocation in Policy H2, Table 6.2 for up to 165 dwellings
47	Pegasus Planning Group on behalf of		Site E15 be retained as an allocation of 4.9ha, but that 3.7ha be included in Table 6.2 as a proposed housing site. Applying a density of 40-45 dwellings per hectare, this site has the potential to yield between 150-165 dwellings

	Greatline Developments Ltd	
43	The Ramblers Association	A shortcut is needed to go to the north-west corner of HA2 to exit closer to Gretton football GN13 at the junction of Kirby Lane and Gretton Road. This will greatly reduce road walking.
43	The Ramblers Association	Through pedestrian routes /cycleways are needed to connect Weldon and this area to Upper Laundimer & Harry's Park Woods, Brigstock, Benefield and the surrounding countryside via Bear Lane, to reduce road walking and open up the countryside without the need for car use. The footway on the Oundle Road should be extended out from Weldon
43	The Ramblers Association	Development here should keep well clear of the Harpers Brook area with its balancing lake and potentially excellent public open space
43	The Ramblers Association	This area needs its current bridleway and footpath access to Middleton, Cottingham, East Carlton and the Welland Valley to be retained and improved on. This includes routes from Tower Hill area as well as Danesholme and Oakley Hay
51	Northamptonshire Countywide Traveller Unit	I would comment and make the following changes firstly to the above statement; Corby is a member of the Northamptonshire Countywide Traveller Unit Consortium (CTU) comprising six Housing and Local Planning Authorities the County Council Northamptonshire Police and the Northamptonshire Provider Services (NHS). The CTU identified the requirement for a Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) to be carried out and for the identification of suitable sites to meet the recommendations of the GTAA.
58	Montagu Evans LLP on behalf of the Diocese of Northampton	Supports the allocation for residential development. The site is presently leased to the Education Authority who are in the process of building a new school in the vicinity. Once the new school is built the pupils will be transferred to the new premises and the existing school will be vacant and surplus to requirements. The estimated date for completion of the new school is September 2010. Thereafter the land will be available for redevelopment. Note that the capacity of the two sites is estimated to be 200 dwellings, it would be more appropriate to specify a figure for both the northern and southern sites allocated under HA20
59	John Martin & Associates on behalf of Rockingham Estates and Great Oakley Estates	Support proposed 4,000 dwellings at the Western SUE. This description is lightly different to others within the DPD; there should be consistency of reference.
59	John Martin & Associates on behalf of Rockingham Estates and	Support HA29. However, the table indicates an overall minimum density of 35dph. It is inappropriate to dictate minimum densities above those set out in national guidance e.g. PPS3

	Great Oakley Estates	
59	John Martin & Associates on behalf of Rockingham Estates and Great Oakley Estates	Do not understand the basis of Policy H10 which does not appear to be a planning policy relevant to a Site Allocations DPD. It appears to refer to the controls imposed on RSLs in procuring grant-aided affordable housing. The policy should be deleted from this DPD
59	John Martin & Associates on behalf of Rockingham Estates and Great Oakley Estates	Table 6.2 identifies the Proposed Corby Western Sustainable Urban Extension at HA29, which we support. However, the table indicates an overall minimum density of 35 units per hectare. We believe that it is inappropriate to dictate minimum densities above those set out in national guidance i.e. PPS3
59	John Martin & Associates on behalf of Rockingham Estates and Great Oakley Estates	Comment that 30 dwellings per hectare, as set out in PPS3, is an <i>indicative</i> minimum target and are not prescriptive. Paragraph 47 of PPS3 states <i>that Local Planning Authorities may wish to set out a range of densities across the plan area rather than one broad density range although 30 dwellings per hectare net should be used as a national indicative minimum to guide policy development and decision-making, until local density policies are in place.</i> This paragraph continues by stating <i>where Local Planning Authorities wish to plan for, or agree to, densities below this minimum, this will need to be justified, having regard to paragraph 46</i> i.e. design-led considerations

Villages and Rural Area

2	Harrington Parish Council	Pleased to see that village identities are being retained
15	Northamptonshire Police	Policy is welcomed. It is particular welcome to see that shared office space in community facilities will be promoted. This could be used to aid the emergency services out reach into the rural communities by providing a space that could be used for surgeries or to drop into
15	Northamptonshire Police	While we support the need for farm diversification, it is important that community safety issues are taken into account. These locations are often remote and therefore there is little or no natural surveillance of the area meaning careful design is needed to help prevent opportunities for crime and arson. The need for this may be increased if the standards within urban areas are improved as displacement of crime may occur

15	Northamptonshire Police	It is encouraging that the link to the North Northamptonshire Sustainable Design SPD has been made within this section
16	East Midlands Regional Assembly	As well as rural exception sites, Paragraph 3.1.14 of the RSS sets out a wide range of other policy mechanisms to consider in planning for the delivery of affordable housing
18		Parcel of land lying between Ashley Road and Glover Court at Middleton could be released for residential development if the settlement envelope is amended to include this land
19	Smiths Gore on behalf of Great Oakley Estate	Support policy in respect of the conversion of farm buildings to alternative use
19	Smiths Gore on behalf of Great Oakley Estate	Support policy concerning farm diversification
26	Gretton Parish Council	Support the objective to preserve the rural character of the Borough and to retain the existing boundaries of the village
26	Gretton Parish Council	Support the conversion of buildings for employment and tourism purposes provided developments are sympathetic and there are no significant adverse impacts on the village or in the rural area
26	Gretton Parish Council	Support provided that developments are sympathetic and there are no significant adverse impacts on the village or in the rural area. The re-use of existing buildings would be encouraged unless new building would facilitate the clearance and replacement of unsightly structures having a detrimental effect on the landscape
26	Gretton Parish Council	The Parish Council considers that there is a local need for affordable housing within the village although this may be met by the provision within the allocated development site HA30 on Corby Road
26	Gretton Parish Council	Pleased to note the Council's continued recognition of the importance of Parish Plans and their role within the planning consultation process
27	John Martin & Associates on behalf of Rockingham Estates	Object to policy, which is an arbitrary and unreasonable policy imposition within an overall spatial plan, which seeks to balance the need to control development in rural areas against the need for local development
27	John Martin & Associates on behalf of Rockingham Estates	In respect of Rockingham, the general thrust of the approach is that the village is of "outstanding conservation importance". However, this approach is unnecessary given that Local Planning Authorities already have sufficient powers and duties contained within the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to control development in the interests of the valued historic assets within the settlement. Conservation is not mean to be preservation and the fossilisation and stagnation of potential development opportunities within rural villages must not be allowed. Rural communities have a vital role in supporting the higher tier settlements, and by constraining development opportunity to this level would only result in the creation and long

		term maintenance of a dormant settlement. In addition, PPG15 states that conservation and sustainable economic growth are complimentary objectives, and should not be seen in opposition to each one another. PPS1 advocates community involvement in delivering sustainable development and creating sustainable and safe communities. In this regard, a Parish Plan is under preparation. It is intended that this shall play a key role in developing full and active community involvement. This Parish Plan will evolve over time and will provide a flexible approach to the delivery of community aspirations. Policy V&R02 does not allow for any flexibility in the delivery of opportunity within the settlement; flexibility is essential to allow for changing demography, aspirations and circumstances, particularly as the plan period extends up to 2021. This policy requires modifications to provide for a more pragmatic and flexible approach to sustain the vital community at Rockingham
28	Weldon Parish Council	The Parish Council welcomes the retention of existing village confines lines and agrees with the reasoned justification. However it is felt that this is somewhat disingenuous as, although the boundaries will protect the immediate village area, plans have been approved (Priors Hall) and may be approved (Weldon Park) for major development that are within the parish and in close proximity to the village boundaries. Should this continue remaining open countryside would be lost and Weldon could become completely encapsulated by urban sprawl. It is considered therefore that Planning Policies should take account of the impact of nearby developments on rural communities and not just rely on compliance with village confines
28	Weldon Parish Council	Welcomed – there has been little evidence to date that the planning authority has taken any note of the community-led Parish Plan
29		Village confine for Middleton is drawn too tightly and restricts the ability of the village to grow naturally and sustain itself. Two extensions to the village confines are promoted, which were promoted through earlier work on the LDF. However, there is insufficient evidence to confirm why these representations have been ignored or rebutted. Concerned about the soundness of the evidence base that has been used to formulate the housing strategy for the Borough, given that our various reports and representations submitted since 2000 have not been addressed or responded to in any formal and open way in framing the currently proposed draft strategy. We propose therefore that an adjustment if made to the village confines for Middleton by incorporating the two sites in question
29		Evidence of local need may not always exist via a local housing needs survey. For example, there may be evidence of need from other forms and the policy needs to acknowledge this. The important point is that local people may reside away from the settlement because the lack of housing deprives them from residing in the village. The policy needs to be more flexible in its reference to local need. Secondly, we consider that the reference to ‘a basic range of services’ is too vague for sensible interpretation. It may be that a village needs additional housing to bring back local services. Also what constitutes a basic range appropriate to the form? The primary motive for creating rural exception sites is to allow local people access to local housing. It is not the range of services that should dictate the provision of exception housing. We recommend either that the basic range of services are spelt out or that this clause is deleted
39	SSR Planning on behalf of Park Lodge Farms LLP and Corus	Object, particularly in relation to the village confine for Gretton. The village confine excludes our site to the north-east of the village which is able to accommodate 100 dwellings. The site can be developed immediately and it is in a sustainable location. The site currently has planning permission for mineral extraction. If Planning permission is granted, the owners will give up the rights to mine the land which will last 15-20 years if implemented. This will alleviate the possibility of any quarrying on the land

		adjacent to the village which immediately borders the permitted extraction site.
44	CPRE	It would be interesting to research the areas now requesting affordable houses against the local record of retained Council Housing. Without employment in the countryside and reduced levels of farming labour, its difficult to justify in 'green' terms the need as opposed to desire. Particularly as the low broadband speeds in rural areas inhibits home working. It is a fact that housing provision of all kinds in the Corby Rural District is already 17% over target.

Town Centre and Retail

8	Lockhart Garratt	These figures show a significant area of Hazel Wood to be lost to development, as well as likely degradation of the ancient woodland habitat as a result of the “new park edge”. This is likely to raise significant concerns with the partners currently engaged with CBC in the woodland management project, including the Woodland Trust, Wildlife Trust and RSPB, as well as the Friends of Hazel and Thoroughsale Woods. Given the residential and business uses of the proposed development, it is also not likely to meet the requirements of Paragraph 10 of PPS9 to justify the loss of ancient woodland (an irreplaceable habitat and the UK’s richest wildlife habitat).
8	Lockhart Garratt	These figures show a significant area of Hazel Wood to be lost to development, as well as likely degradation of the ancient woodland habitat as a result of the “new park edge”. This is likely to raise significant concerns with the partners currently engaged with CBC in the woodland management project, including the Woodland Trust, Wildlife Trust and RSPB, as well as the Friends of Hazel and Thoroughsale Woods. Given the residential and business uses of the proposed development, it is also not likely to meet the requirements of Paragraph 10 of PPS9 to justify the loss of ancient woodland (an irreplaceable habitat and the UK’s richest wildlife habitat).
15	Northamptonshire Police	The town centre boundary includes the current police station within it. The Force is currently producing an Estates Strategy from an Estates Vision approved by the Police Authority in December 2008. This includes the provision of a new Criminal Justice Centre for the north of the county, a new Incident Resolution Team base for Corby and a ‘One Stop Shop’ as part of the Civic Hub. If these all occur then the police station site will be redeveloped to help support the regeneration of the town centre
15	Northamptonshire Police	The town centre first approach is supported and it is pleasing that the importance of local and district centres has been picked up through the document. These provided hubs for the communities they serve and should include a range of services to ensure people’s quality of life is high. Providing these hubs also helps to provide a sense of community and therefore reduce fear of crime. These centres should have high design standards to reduce the incidences of anti-social behaviour in these locations particularly with the design of the night time economy in Corby town centre
15	Northamptonshire Police	Policy is welcomed. The CPDA should be involved to help ensure that crime and anti-social behaviour are designed out through this process to help create a town centre that people want to spend time in
15	Northamptonshire Police	The aspirations for the retail core to provide a diverse mix of uses is supported. This helps to ensure there is activity in the area both during the day and in the evening and night. This provides for active surveillance, which is increased through the commitment to improving the public realm and active frontages. However, the ambition for good permeability needs further

		defining. Permeability can be an issue for crime and fear of crime over somewhere is over permeable and the routes for pedestrians are not overlooked or are isolated from other means of transport. The routes should be open enough to ensure fear of crime can be reduced. The Crime Prevention Design Advisor should be involved on the detail of the routes. In addition, the Northamptonshire Place and Movement Guide should be considered
15	Northamptonshire Police	The Parkland Gateway is also supported for the commitment to diversity of uses to drive the evening economy and the creation of the 'Civic Hub'. The Hub provides the opportunity for the one stop shop, incorporating the emergency services with other public services in the town
15	Northamptonshire Police	The concept of activity hubs is supported. It is important that not only are these spaces attractively designed but that they are also designed with community safety to the fore. The Council should be at the forefront of designing out crime
15	Northamptonshire Police	It is pleasing that there is a policy to ensure that where there is persistent vacancies within the town centre that there is a mechanism to allow different types of premises to be permitted in the town centre (ie diversify away from retail to other uses). This helps to avoid the 'broken windows' syndrome of a town appearing uncared for where large proportions of it are unoccupied and therefore increasing the prevalence of people committing crime or anti-social behaviour
15	Northamptonshire Police	When considering the detail of proposals to reduce traffic in the town centre it is important that emergency service access is considered. Building Regulations state fire service vehicular access requirements. NFRS operate fire appliances that are outside of the ranges stated in the Building Regulations and therefore it is important that consultation occurs on the detailed design of schemes to ensure that emergency services access is not compromised. In addition, if the pedestrianisation of any areas is proposed, it is important to consider how these areas will be controlled, for example will it be via bollards, and if so will these be automatically controlled or manually controlled, via keys. Consultation with the emergency services on these issues is key
15	Northamptonshire Police	It is important that any new parking provision in the town centre is provided in a safe environment. The quality of parking within the town centre will directly affect the economic growth the town can expect as people are more likely to come to a parking area where they feel safe. ParkMark, the national safer parking award endorsed by the Association of Chief Police Officers, should be adopted for any new parking scheme.
16	East Midlands Regional Assembly	The supporting text to Policy 22 of the RSS says that Corby, as a growth town, requires support to develop complimentary roles consistent with planned levels of development. The Core Strategy also states that the scale of retail development should be appropriate to the role and function of the centre where it is to be located. Accordingly, proposals for major retail development and their phasing will be assessed to ensure that they do not have an adverse impact on the long term vitality and viability of other town centres or the ability of North Northamptonshire to retain expenditure. Although Policy TC & R 03 only sets out a minimum requirement for additional comparison retail floorspace of 15,500m ² within the town centre by 2021, which is line with the Core Strategy, paragraph 8.27 refers to a much higher minimum of 29,000m ² , which is considerably above the top end of the range suggested by the North Northamptonshire Town Centres Study. This much higher figure will clearly therefore need to be justified in terms of the relationship with the development of other town centres in the North Northamptonshire area
19	Smiths Gore on	Support the concept of a new District Centre to serve West Corby SUE as set out in Table 8.1 although we note that the

	behalf of Great Oakley Estate	DPD gives no indication of the scale (i.e. retail floorspace) which would constitute a district centre. We particularly support the concept of a superstore for West Corby
19	Smiths Gore on behalf of Great Oakley Estate	Support Policy TC&R11 but wish to comment that the policy as drafted gives locational guidance for local centres but not for the proposed district centres. The reasoned justification set out at paragraph 8.91 refers only to local and neighbourhood centres so there appears to be an inconsistency in terminology which should be corrected
20	Smiths Gore on behalf of Great Oakley Estate and Rockingham Castle Estate	Support the concept of a new District Centre to serve Corby Western Urban Extension as set out in Table 8.1 although we note that the DPD gives no indication of the scale (i.e. retail floorspace) which would constitute a district centre. We particularly support the concept of a superstore for West Corby
20	Smiths Gore on behalf of Great Oakley Estate and Rockingham Castle Estate	Support policy but comment that the policy as drafted gives locational guidance for local centres but not for the proposed district centres. The reasoned justification set out at paragraph 8.91 refers only to local and neighbourhood centres so there appears to be an inconsistency in terminology which should be corrected
27	John Martin & Associates on behalf of Rockingham Estates	Support the concept of a new District Centre to serve West Corby SUE as set out in Table 8.1 although we note that the DPD gives no indication of the scale (i.e. retail floorspace) which would constitute a district centre. We particularly support the concept of a superstore for West Corby
27	John Martin & Associates on behalf of Rockingham Estates	Support Policy TC&R11 but wish to comment that the policy as drafted gives locational guidance for local centres but not for the proposed district centres. The reasoned justification set out at paragraph 8.91 refers only to local and neighbourhood centres so there appears to be an inconsistency in terminology which should be corrected
40	Bidwells on behalf of Land Securities	PPS6 indicates that the extent of the town centre should be defined on the Proposals Map. The defined area will include primary shopping area and areas of predominantly leisure, business and other main town centre uses within or adjacent to the primary shopping area. Main town centre uses are defined in PPS6 at paragraph 1.8 including offices. Policy EC5 of the consultation paper of the new PPS4 states that the vision and strategy within LDF Core Strategies should define the extent of the primary shopping area and the town centre on proposals map. The main uses to which town centre policies in the consultation paper apply are listed at paragraph 4. The noticeable difference between this list and paragraph 1.8 of PPS6 is the omission of the explanation of offices in the consultation paper. It is requested that the implication of this on the Council's proposed alternative for the town centre boundary in particular the inclusion of land east of Elizabeth Street is explained
40	Bidwells on behalf of Land Securities	The mix of primarily residential and non-intensive sport and recreation uses found at Coronation Park and Richmond Road do not sit readily within the definition of main town centre uses within PPS6 and therefore it is requested that the town centre boundary as shown in Figure 8.1 is reconsidered and stakeholder engagement entered into in respect of the options

		for alternatives to the current consultation boundary which excludes Coronation Park and Richmond Road and possibly excludes land east of Elizabeth Street. Paragraph 2.16 of PPS6 states that local planning authorities should work in conjunction with stakeholders and the community to define the extent of the primary shopping area and the town centre.
40	Bidwells on behalf of Land Securities	It is requested that the sequential approach to site selection in respect of main town centres uses as defined by paragraph 1.8 of PPS6 is explicitly stated in the proposed policy. There is an error under the first bullet point because local centres are covered under Policy TC&R11 and not TC&R12 as stated. There is an error under the third bullet point because retail warehousing is covered under Policy TC&R12 and not TC&R13 as stated. An objection is raised to the third bullet point which states limited bulky goods/retail warehousing as an exception to the town centre approach. This does not comply with PPS6 and should be excised from the policy. There is an error under the fourth bullet point because Table 8.1 lists the centres and not Table 8.10 as stated. An objection is raised to the fourth bullet point because this exception to the town centre first approach does not comply with PPS6. Paragraph 2.56 refers to the need to identify opportunities to remedy poor access to local shops and services in deprived areas and that this is best achieved through strengthening existing centres or, where appropriate, proposing new centres. Therefore, the consultation draft DPD should describe any examples where new centres are required to remedy poor access to local shops and services in deprived areas and clearly define the proposed new centres for consultation. If this is not possible then it is requested that the fourth bullet point be excised from the policy
40	Bidwells on behalf of Land Securities	In the absence of a planning permission for Evolution Corby it is requested that the first bullet point ends after the first sentence. No evidence has been presented in support of the limit placed upon convenience shopping in the town centre to 2021. The limit within the second bullet point arises from the reference to a supermarket in the town centre which under the PPS6 definition at Table 3: Descriptions of Types of Development, states that a supermarket comprises trading floorspace less than 2,500 square metres. To provide flexibility in view of the economic recession it is requested that the reference to supermarket be replaced by superstore as per the definition in PPS6.
40	Bidwells on behalf of Land Securities	The spatial strategy in Figure 8.2 does not provide enough flexibility to respond to changing socio and economic circumstances. In particular the activity hubs immediately to the west of Elizabeth Street are overly prescriptive and give little to no room for adaptation to changing circumstances by key stakeholders including Land Securities and the Council. It need not make specific reference to pedestrian routes or specific uses. The strategy diagram needs to provide a framework for proposals to come forward based upon principles of good urban design and sound economic assessment and the details of used should be assessed on a site by site basis not ensure they comply with policy in the round. Whilst it is important to show the context of the spatial vision through inclusion of land surrounding the town centre it is requested that the town centre boundary as agreed upon following consultation is identified
40	Bidwells on behalf of Land Securities	The town centre masterplan at Figure 8.3 does not provide enough flexibility to respond to changing socio and economic circumstances. This is particularly relevant to the area identified as the Revised Primary Shopping Area at Figure 8.4. In the absence of planning permission there can be no absolute certainty that the north eastern gateway and south-eastern gateway will be developed as illustrated in Figure 8.3. Therefore it is requested that the policy includes wording to the

		effect that appropriate alternative development which is retained will be considered. It is also requested that the revised indicative masterplan following consultation and stakeholder engagement clearly identifies the town centre boundary
40	Bidwells on behalf of Land Securities	The proposed revised primary shopping area as shown in Figure 8.4 is supported. The identification of the primary shopping area as being bounded by Westcott Way to the south, Elizabeth Street to the east, Alexandra Road to the north and George Street to the west is considered to comply with the definition of a primary shopping area within Table 2: Types of Location in PPS6. This approach was supported by the Council's Retail Background Paper and recognises that it is appropriate to include the future phases of the town centre redevelopment within the primary shopping area
40	Bidwells on behalf of Land Securities	As described in the response dated 23 March 2009 to the Council's Retail Background Paper it is considered that the primary shopping frontages should reflect the current position in the town centre and not predict where the primary shopping frontages will be in future
40	Bidwells on behalf of Land Securities	Whilst is favour of enhanced permeability, accessibility and connectivity and accepting the principle of improved access and movement within and outside of the town centre, the movement strategy plan at Figure 8.6 identifies development at various areas of land which leaves little flexibility for manoeuvre. The Figure should not rule out other forms of acceptable development over and above that approved as part of the Evolution scheme.
40	Bidwells on behalf of Land Securities	The out-of-centre retail park at Phoenix Parkway should not be afforded a position in the retail hierarchy. PPS6 does not include out-of-centre retail parks as a type of centre.
40	Bidwells on behalf of Land Securities	The policy should explicitly stated the need for compliance with NN CSS Policy 16 which makes reference to meeting local needs but not competing with the town centre.
40	Bidwells on behalf of Land Securities	Out of town is defined by PPS6 Table 2: Types of Location as "An out-of-centre development outside the existing urban area." Such a location for retail warehousing will not comply with PPS6 and hence the out of town reference should be deleted. Retail warehousing are large stores specialising in certain goods and new provision in out-of centre locations would exceed the identified need and hence no further developments should be supported or promoted.
40	Bidwells on behalf of Land Securities	The policy does not sufficiently explain the types of retailing meant by the term 'general retailing' and hence is open to confusion and concerns that this policy might mistakenly be viewed as lending support for out of centre retailing. Some of the examples provided in the explanatory text to the policy are better described as ancillary uses e.g. petrol filling stations. Overall, it is considered that these ancillary types of retailing are better dealt with under other sections of the DPD such as the economy and employment.
41	Roger Tym & Partners on behalf of Off Developments Ltd	There is a strong case to recognise The Rockingham Park site and adjoining facilities within the Borough's identified hierarchy of centres. The existing range of services provided at this location is similar to those described for the district and local centres identified under the policy and there is scope to extend the range of services through the take-up of the remaining vacant units at the scheme. The existing retail and leisure services provided at the site accord with the definition of a local centre in annex A of PPS6.
42	Indigo on behalf of Peel Investments UK Ltd	Supports need to accommodate retail warehouse development outside the town centre. It is however felt that the final sentence of the policy is unnecessary through reference to guidance within both PPS6 and PPS12. The sentence states that: 'All proposed development will have to demonstrate how the sequential test (as set out in PPS6) has been applied to

		site selection'. The sequential test has already been applied through focussing new development on the town centre subject to a series of exceptions. PPS12 states DPDs shouldn't repeat national and regional policy.
42	Indigo on behalf of Peel Investments UK Ltd	With regards to the requirement to demonstrate how a sequential test has been applied, it is argued this is unnecessary as these further considerations are the standard retail policy tests set out at paragraph 2.28 of PPS6. Corby has clearly adopted a thorough and diligent approach to these considerations in identifying the need for new retail floorspace and a retail hierarchy, in arriving at this consideration has already been given to the sequential approach, retail impact and accessibility of locations
42	Indigo on behalf of Peel Investments UK Ltd	Welcomes inclusion of Phoenix Parkway retail park table 8.1 and sentence '..all levels of the retail hierarchy serve an essential function for the community'. However recommends the final sentence on the sequential test should be removed

Environment and Heritage

6	Wildlife Trust	Paragraph 9.38 states that there is a need to identify how linkages can be achieved along each of the GI corridors. In order to do this a GI strategy should be produced, based on accurate baseline data. The strategy should clearly identify areas for enhancement of GI corridors, in more detail than is currently available, and set out how these could be achieved. The need for a GI strategy was also recognised within the Sustainability Appraisal, paragraph 6.30.
8	Lockhart Garratt	<p>There are a number of issues arising from the draft in relation to green infrastructure which have the potential to create barriers to CBC's positive vision for the future development of the town and surrounding borough. Green infrastructure is a strategic "umbrella" that encompasses all open space types (including open water) and links to all environmental disciplines. This is made reference to in the quotes made in the early part of Section 9 but not carried forward through the document.</p> <p>To refer to "Green infrastructure, open space, sport and recreation facilities" as the header for Section 9 is fundamentally incorrect because, as the document states in Paragraph 9.19, these land use types are all included under the banner of green infrastructure. Also included are the "biodiversity, nature conservation and geological features" and many of the heritage features addressed in Section 11. This will cause confusion when trying to marry it with the other elements of green infrastructure policy referred to in the document.</p> <p>It is recommended that the document be restructured to remove green infrastructure from Section 9 and to present it as a separate chapter which draws together the environmental information from the other chapters and connects it, and the development agenda, with the Northamptonshire Strategic Green Infrastructure Framework and Spatial Theme C of the NN CSS. This will ensure that the connected approach which underlies green infrastructure is taken forward spatially and between scales, to deliver the maximum benefit for Corby and avoid confusion for both developers and development control officers. This is particularly important for Corby, which has a strong vision of positive development of the town</p>

		through regeneration and expansion, to ensure that all new development is required to deliver its share of high quality green infrastructure and to enable CBC to robustly enforce this requirement to secure the best possible result for the town
8	Lockhart Garratt	I am concerned that this statement fails to capture the essence, scope and level of support for this highly significant project and significantly undersells all the work that CBC has put into the project, from OCPC and the Elected Members downwards
8	Lockhart Garratt	Document should be restructured so as to provide clarity and certainty in the way that existing and emerging green infrastructure policy is included and addressed at the local and site specific levels.
15	Northamptonshire Police	It is pleasing that the main reason for not using open spaces has been recognised to be that of personal safety and anti-social behaviour. However, the document does not then address how this can be prevented in any provision in the future. There is a need to ensure that any new or existing spaces are made safer through designing the area well (for which the Crime Prevention Design Advisor and Fire Protection Officer should be involved) and ensuring that there is on going management and maintenance of the space. This latter point is key to ensure that any new facilities are maintained to high standards to ensure people feel a sense of ownership of the spaces
19	Smiths Gore on behalf of Great Oakley Estate	This chapter could make reference to the opportunities for Green Infrastructure links through the SUE west of Corby such as a Corby-Cottingham link and a 'green travel' link from West Corby towards Corby town centre via Kingswood School. We have previously advocated such a link at Kingswood School to the Borough and County Councils and feel this would be of major benefit to both existing residents of Corby and to residents of the SUE
19	Smiths Gore on behalf of Great Oakley Estate	Object to the reference in part 1 of Policy GS02 to the payment of monies for future maintenance obligations. It is clearly set out in paragraph B19 of Circular 05/2005 that 'As a general rule, however, where an asset is intended for wider public use, the costs of subsequent maintenance and other recurrent expenditure associated with the developers' contributions should normally be borne by the body or authority in which the asset is to be vested.'
20	Smiths Gore on behalf of Great Oakley Estate and Rockingham Castle Estate	This chapter could make reference to the opportunities for Green Infrastructure links through the Corby Western Urban Extension such as a Corby-Cottingham link and a 'green travel' link from West Corby towards Corby town centre via Kingswood School. We have previously advocated such a link at Kingswood School to the Borough and County Councils and feel this would be of major benefit to both existing residents of Corby, and to residents of the Corby Western Urban Extension
20	Smiths Gore on behalf of Great Oakley Estate and Rockingham Castle Estate	Object to the reference in part 1 of the policy to the payment of monies for future maintenance obligations. It is clearly set out in paragraph B19 of Circular 05/2005 that 'As a general rule, however, where an asset is intended for wider public use, the costs of subsequent maintenance and other recurrent expenditure associated with the developers' contributions should normally be borne by the body or authority in which the asset is to be vested.'
27	John Martin & Associates on behalf of Rockingham Estates	Object to the reference in part 1 of Policy GS02 to the payment of monies for future maintenance obligations. It is clearly set out in paragraph B19 of Circular 05/2005 that 'As a general rule, however, where an asset is intended for wider public use, the costs of subsequent maintenance and other recurrent expenditure associated with the developers' contributions should normally be borne by the body or authority in which the asset is to be vested.'
27	John Martin &	There should be reference to the opportunities for Green Infrastructure links through the Corby Western Urban Extension

	Associates on behalf of Rockingham Estates	such as a Corby-Cottingham link and a 'green travel' link from West Corby towards Corby town centre via Kingswood School. We have previously advocated such a link at Kingswood School to the Borough and County Councils, which would be of major benefit to both existing residents of Corby, and to residents of the Corby Western Urban Extension
28	Weldon Parish Council	Welcomes the commitment to protect and enhance green infrastructure, open space, sports and recreation sites and asks that this commitment be applied equally to existing rural areas and not more favourably to areas with the urban boundary
31	Councillor Chris Stanbra	There are several areas on Oakley Vale which currently have no designation and which should be designated in some way so as to give certainty to the residents of the area. In particular the open space opposite the pub and shops on Butland Road which should perhaps be designated for some sort of development or as open space. There is also the open space that lies between Dumble Close and the rear of houses on Merestone Road and Keld, Bourne and Forstal Closes which should be appropriately designated. There are other areas which have planning permission for residential development and should be designated as such and further areas (e.g. off Lyveden Way between Oakley Road and Boughton Road) which are currently laid out as public open space and should be designated as Green Infrastructure, Open Space, Sport and Recreation to inhibit future development. There is an area off Butland Road where it is planned to build a community centre and which should be appropriately designated
31	Councillor Chris Stanbra	At Barth Close, Great Oakley there is a small area of open space which should be designated as Green Infrastructure, Open Space, Sport and Recreation and on the corner of Lewin Road and Greeve Close, Great Oakley there is a larger area which should be similarly designated. Again in both cases to give certainty to the residents of the area and to inhibit future development
31	Councillor Chris Stanbra	There is an area adjacent to HA7 designated as Green Infrastructure, Open Space, Sport and Recreation. The County Council has planning permission to build a school on this site so perhaps it should be redesignated accordingly
35	Sport England	It is significant that sport has been identified as playing an important role in contributing to sustainable communities, reducing the need to travel and benefiting access by disadvantaged groups. Sport and active recreation have also been proved to be important contributors to national, regional and local economic health. Sport can lead regeneration by engaging the communities in the improvement of their area, creating employment and training opportunities
35	Sport England	Sport England has provided consultation comments on a previous version of the Corby Site Specific Allocations DPD. We raised concerns with regard to the integration of open space, sports and recreation facilities and Community facilities. We remain of the view that the integration of these aspects is not fully covered. Section 9 refers to built facilities such as the Corby pool, sports facilities appears in paragraph 9.30 but there is no specific section on sports facilities provision
35	Sport England	Paragraph 9.2 appears to fail to recognise that an important function of open spaces in the provision of locations for formal sports and active recreation.
35	Sport England	Background work, particularly the FIS work should be completed to establish the needs and evidence base before proceeding with the DPD. Indeed the Open Space Sport Recreation Strategy (2002) along with green infrastructure studies in 2005 are used as the evidence base for the DPD, we are concerned that the OSSR strategy is becoming outdated particularly with the new facilities and housing growth which has already taken place since the strategy was adopted and the growth which is planned for the Borough. We are also aware that the existing Playing Pitch Strategy is

			also dated and does not follow Sport England Guidance on the production of such strategies
35	Sport England		There is the need for a indoor sports facilities strategy. Whilst it is appreciated that the new 50m pool appears to answers all the requirements for swimming in Corby other facility needs should be understood and a strategy developed for replacement or refurbishment. It is advised that, the previous National Sports Strategy, 'Game Plan', the Government's strategy for delivering sport and physical activity, has been replaced by Sport England's Strategy 2008-2011. The East Midlands Sports Strategy has also been replaced by the new national strategy and will not be updated.
43	The Ramblers Association	Ramblers	A footpath route connecting Weldon and Stanion is needed in this void area.
43	The Ramblers Association	Ramblers	Support a general aim to maintain and create good green public open space, green corridors, buffer zones plus maintain, improve and extend paths and cycleways.
43	The Ramblers Association	Ramblers	The old mineral line railway going through Cowthick Plantation at Stanion then under the A43 and alongside southern side Stanion lane, should be utilised at least as a footpath.
55			Pleased to read of the awareness of the Council of the benefits of the protection of the green areas for all of Corby. Also delighted to see that the plans to build houses on the small piece of land which is bordered by Colyers Avenue and Dunedin Road have now been dropped. This green area is much loved by Kingswood residents and we hope that no development will take place there in the future

Community Facilities and Infrastructure

2	Harrington Council	Parish	Surprised that health care provision was not being persued at this time
10	Rutland Council	County	Welcome the reference to neighbouring local authorities being parties in the securing of contribution agreements with developers.
10	Rutland Council	County	The Council would wish to be party to any agreements with developers of major developments around Corby in order to ensure that suitable contributions towards necessary infrastructure in Rutland are secured.
10	Rutland Council	County	The Council considers that improvements to the A43 should be phased early in the plan period in order to reduce the impact of the additional traffic on Rutland's villages and highway network. This will also be important to ensure that the A6003 through Rutland does not become established as a main route for traffic from Corby to the north and vice versa.
11	Highways Agency		Welcomes the commitment to progressing a developer contribution strategy for North Northamptonshire which seeks to ensure that all relevant and necessary facilities are provided alongside development – including highways infrastructure and sustainable transport provision
11	Highways Agency		Welcomes the clear emphasis on the need to improve and sustain both bus and rail services in conjunction with planned new infrastructure. This section could be broadened however to also encompass a commitment from the Council to the provision of safe walking and cycle routes as an integral component of future development. In accordance with DfT guidance, the emphasis on softer transport measures could be even stronger by stating that, when considering new

		development proposals, sustainable transport solutions will need to be sought prior to consideration of any new highway capacity enhancements – as a means of reducing reliance on the car, maximise public transport use and thereby minimising additional pressure upon the trunk road network. The specific improvements should be identified through robust transport assessments to be undertaken into all the proposed land allocations, as they are taken forward
11	Highways Agency	The document provides an update on the main transport interventions which are expected to impact on Corby during the plan period. With regard to the A14, the Agency's programme of improvements consists of: A14 Junction 7-9 Online Widening, A14 Technology Improvements, and A14 around Kettering – ramp metering
15	Northamptonshire Police	There is no mention of facilities within this section for the emergency services. Both the Force and NFRS are working with NNDC on the development of the Programme of Development for use as the infrastructure plan for PPS12 requirements.
15	Northamptonshire Police	For the Force, this includes the requirement for a Criminal Justice Centre for the whole of North Northamptonshire, an Incident Resolution Team base on the strategic road network for Corby, a One Stop Shop at the Civic Hub and Safer Community Team bases within the district centres in Corby. The first of these (at Prior's Hall) is already secured through the Section 106 agreement for the development.
15	Northamptonshire Police	For NFRS detailed risk modelling of operational response has been undertaken. This indicates that for the planned growth, there is the potential need for a second fire station in Corby. It is anticipated that this would not be needed until at least 2017. Although the preferred location of any potential station would need to be identified through further detailed risk modelling, initial modelling indicates that this is likely to be required to the south of the town, on or near the A6003.
15	Northamptonshire Police	The potential provision of a second station would not only allow NFRS to maintain local standards of operational response within Corby, but also to maintain strategic capability against development led growth across the County. NFRS would be seeking developer contributions to fund the provision of any second station at Corby. NFRS would welcome the opportunity to undertake discussions with Corby Borough Council to identify any potential available sites for any new fire station.
15	Northamptonshire Police	Pleased that CCTV and ANPR are listed within the types of facilities that developer funding should be used for. It is to be assumed that community facilities is intended to be a catch all term incorporating the emergency services requirements. Both the Force and NFRS have in place formulae for requirements from developers and are producing infrastructure plans as mentioned above. As such, there is a need to ensure that the emergency services requirements are captured in policy CFS&I 01. Although the list is not intended to be exclusive, by creating the list there would appear to be a prioritisation of these items over others. A specific mention of emergency services within this policy should be made.
15	Northamptonshire Police	A specific example for NFRS is the need for fire hydrants within new developments. On average, 1 fire hydrant is needed for every 50 properties. The capital contribution towards this could be captured through developer contributions but it is the preference of NFRS that hydrants are secured by way of planning condition. NFRS will need to be involved in the siting of the hydrants on a case by case basis
15	Northamptonshire Police	It is pleasing to note that the deficiency in facilities for young people is recognised through the Community Plan and this will look to be addressed through the plan. This is important to reduce the likelihood of anti-social behaviour and the fear of crime caused by young people having no facilities that interest them.

15	Northamptonshire Police	Policy encouraging. It should be recognised that public art can also perform functions other than to be purely decorative. Public art can also help to design out crime and indeed help to prevent terrorist attacks (a requirement on the planning system through PPS1 and the companion guides). As such, the Crime Prevention Design Advisor should be involved in discussions on the design and siting of public art installations
19	Smiths Gore on behalf of Great Oakley Estate	Object to the detailed elements of the policy – i.e. some of the list of items that may be included within s106 Agreements. There are four principles here: i) Three elements refer to maintenance costs. It is clearly set out in paragraph B19 of Circular 05/2005 that ‘As a general rule, however, where an asset is intended for wider public use, the costs of subsequent maintenance and other recurrent expenditure associated with the developers’ contributions should normally be borne by the body or authority in which the asset is to be vested.’; ii) Improvements to utilities infrastructure are matters between a developer and individual utility providers. These do not need to be set out in s106 Agreements; iii) It is unclear why SUDS schemes might need to be included in a s106. Normally such matters would be proposed in a planning application, are therefore subject to approval by the EA at outline and reserved matters application stages and full details would be required by condition rather than s106; and iv) It is wholly unreasonable to expect contributions towards the appointment of staff responsible for identifying other sources of funding for public realm improvements. There is nothing whatsoever in Circular 05/2005 which supports this stance. The local authority’s employment of staff to undertake its functions is a matter for general funding by the authority not via s106 Agreements
19	Smiths Gore on behalf of Great Oakley Estate	The purpose of the policy is not understood. Is it necessary to state that such design ‘will continue to be supported’? If the design of SUDS schemes is covered by the Sustainable Design SPD then surely there is no need for this policy to duplicate the SPD. Incorporation of SUDS into development schemes is, nowadays, a normal planning requirement so there seems little need for this policy.
19	Smiths Gore on behalf of Great Oakley Estate	Paragraph 10.44 lists local road schemes including realignment and dualling of the A6003. Such a road scheme potentially has considerable implications for the West Corby SUE and we would expect such schemes to be shown on the Proposals Map in more detail and for their routes to be formally safeguarded. There is lack of detail on what is a potentially major highways scheme. The Proposals Map suggest this only applies to the A6003 between Harborough Road and the Oakley Hay Roundabout and we are unsure as to the basis of this. We would have thought that such proposals would form the basis of a specific policy
19	Smiths Gore on behalf of Great Oakley Estate	Policy is vague and offers no firm guidance at all on what future health care requirements might be even when there are proposals for significant growth of the town in terms of housing numbers. This represents a major omission from a Site Specific Allocations DPD and needs to be addressed as a priority. By this stage of the LDF there ought to be a clear view on the need for further health facilities and, if new facilities are required, then thought should have been given to their site requirements and locational issues. As drafted the policy is meaningless and simply sets out a vague intention to further investigate the matter
20	Smiths Gore on behalf of Great Oakley Estate and Rockingham	Object to the detailed elements of the policy – i.e. some of the list of items that may be included within s106 Agreements. There are four principles here: i) Three elements refer to maintenance costs. It is clearly set out in paragraph B19 of Circular 05/2005 that ‘As a general rule, however, where an asset is intended for wider public use, the costs of subsequent

	Castle Estate	maintenance and other recurrent expenditure associated with the developers' contributions should normally be borne by the body or authority in which the asset is to be vested.'; ii) Improvements to utilities infrastructure are matters between a developer and individual utility providers. These do not need to be set out in s106 Agreements; iii) It is unclear why SUDS schemes might need to be included in a s106. Normally such matters would be proposed in a planning application, are therefore subject to approval by the EA at outline and reserved matters application stages and full details would be required by condition rather than s106; and iv) It is wholly unreasonable to expect contributions towards the appointment of staff responsible for identifying other sources of funding for public realm improvements. There is nothing whatsoever in Circular 05/2005 which supports this stance. The local authority's employment of staff to undertake its functions is a matter for general funding by the authority not via s106 Agreements
20	Smiths Gore on behalf of Great Oakley Estate and Rockingham Castle Estate	The purpose of the policy is not understood. Is it necessary to state that such design 'will continue to be supported'? If the design of SUDS schemes is covered by the Sustainable Design SPD then surely there is no need for this policy to duplicate the SPD. Incorporation of SUDS into development schemes is, nowadays, a normal planning requirement so there seems little need for this policy.
20	Smiths Gore on behalf of Great Oakley Estate and Rockingham Castle Estate	Paragraph 10.44 lists local road schemes including realignment and dualling of the A6003. Such a road scheme potentially has considerable implications for the West Corby SUE and we would expect such schemes to be shown on the Proposals Map in more detail and for their routes to be formally safeguarded. There is lack of detail on what is a potentially major highways scheme. The Proposals Map suggest this only applies to the A6003 between Harborough Road and the Oakley Hay Roundabout and we are unsure as to the basis of this. We would have thought that such proposals would form the basis of a specific policy
20	Smiths Gore on behalf of Great Oakley Estate and Rockingham Castle Estate	Policy is vague and offers no firm guidance at all on what future health care requirements might be even when there are proposals for significant growth of the town in terms of housing numbers. This represents a major omission from a Site Specific Allocations DPD and needs to be addressed as a priority. By this stage of the LDF there ought to be a clear view on the need for further health facilities and, if new facilities are required, then thought should have been given to their site requirements and locational issues. As drafted the policy is meaningless and simply sets out a vague intention to further investigate the matter
22	Government Office for the East Midlands	Policy is merely a statements of intent which is not site specific and also appears to be covered by Core Strategy Policy 13
22	Government Office for the East Midlands	Policy already covered by the Core Strategy Policy 13 and should not be included in the DPD.
22	Government Office for the East Midlands	Policy already covered by the Core Strategy Policy 13 and should not be included in the DPD.
22	Government Office for the East Midlands	Policy is merely a statements of intent which is not site specific and also appears to be covered by Core Strategy Policy 13
27	John Martin & Associates on behalf	The purpose of the policy is not understood. Is it necessary to state that such design 'will continue to be supported'? If the design of SUDS schemes is covered by the Sustainable Design SPD then surely there is no need for this policy to

	of Rockingham Estates	duplicate the SPD. Incorporation of SUDS into development schemes is, nowadays, a normal planning requirement so there seems little need for this policy.
27	John Martin & Associates on behalf of Rockingham Estates	Policy is vague and offers no firm guidance at all on what future health care requirements might be even when there are proposals for significant growth of the town in terms of housing numbers. This represents a major omission from a Site Specific Allocations DPD and needs to be addressed as a priority. By this stage of the LDF there ought to be a clear view on the need for further health facilities and, if new facilities are required, then thought should have been given to their site requirements and locational issues. As drafted the policy is meaningless and simply sets out a vague intention to further investigate the matter
27	John Martin & Associates on behalf of Rockingham Estates	Object to the detailed elements of the policy – i.e. some of the list of items that may be included within s106 Agreements. There are four principles here: i) Three elements refer to maintenance costs. It is clearly set out in paragraph B19 of Circular 05/2005 that ‘As a general rule, however, where an asset is intended for wider public use, the costs of subsequent maintenance and other recurrent expenditure associated with the developers’ contributions should normally be borne by the body or authority in which the asset is to be vested.’; ii) Improvements to utilities infrastructure are matters between a developer and individual utility providers. These do not need to be set out in s106 Agreements; iii) It is unclear why SUDS schemes might need to be included in a s106. Normally such matters would be proposed in a planning application, are therefore subject to approval by the EA at outline and reserved matters application stages and full details would be required by condition rather than s106; and iv) It is wholly unreasonable to expect contributions towards the appointment of staff responsible for identifying other sources of funding for public realm improvements. There is nothing whatsoever in Circular 05/2005 which supports this stance. The local authority’s employment of staff to undertake its functions is a matter for general funding by the authority not via s106 Agreements
28	Weldon Parish Council	Welcomes the commitment to ensure that developers’ contributions are best used for local facilities to minimise impact and maximise benefit of developments. It is acknowledged that the existing S106 is generally confined to two main parties – the LPA and the developer – but it is considered that the emerging new regime (Community Infrastructure Levy) provides the opportunity for the local community, via Parish Councils, to have much closer involvement in the use of developers’ contributions
28	Weldon Parish Council	The Parish Council has made representations over recent years for the Local Plan Review to allow provision for the demonstrated need for additional burial facilities in Weldon and we are pleased to note that this requirement has been acknowledged. However, it was the Parish Council’s intention that the whole area of land at Haunt Hill be designated for this purpose. The Parish Council is extremely disappointed that only an approximate 20% of this area is shown on the proposals map. As already shown there is an immediate pressing need and further approved and proposed development will exacerbate this position. Paragraph 10.58 of the Consultation Document states “There is therefore a requirement to identify, and plan for future needs for such facilities arising from the proposed population growth” and the Proposed Alternative CFS&106 set out above acknowledged the need for long term burial capacity. The Parish Council requests that the plans be amended to show the whole approximate 7 acre area at Haunt Hill be shown for burial land purposes together with associated peace and tranquil gardens As an adjunct to this the Parish Council feel that it is essential that

		access to the site is provided from the existing Woodland Park car park
28	Weldon Parish Council	It is noted that Corby's nearby crematoria are cited as located in Northampton, Peterborough and Leicester. There is no mention of the nearest crematorium located in Kettering which places some doubts on the research applied in the production of the Consultation Document
33	Environment Agency	The Council are asked to replace the term "Sewerage Treatment Works" (or similar), throughout the document, with the current usage: "Waste Water Treatment Works" (WWTW).
33	Environment Agency	It is noted that the list of examples relevant to planning obligations at CFS&I 01 does not include reference to foul drainage infrastructure. The need for explicit reference to foul drainage infrastructure is exemplified by the current position at the Priors Hall SUE (allocated as sites E17/HA1/HA2 on Draft Proposals Map), where the known and currently unresolved difficulty in achieving agreeable terms relating to the provision of such infrastructure, could result in the potential for sewage pollution, or delay in implementing significant housing/industrial development proposals. The Environment Agency considers that an amendment to CFS&I 01, by inserting reference to foul drainage infrastructure, is therefore necessary. Such an amendment would be consistent with Policy 6 of the current adopted North Northants Core Spatial Strategy (CSS) which states: "...Developers will either make direct provision or will contribute towards the provision of local and strategic infrastructure required by the development either alone or cumulatively with other developments...", and consistent with para 10.13 of the SSA DPD which states: "The council will consider the use of developer contributions for the provision of.....strategic utility provision...". The Environment Agency accordingly OBJECTS to the wording of CFS&I 01 and asks that it be amended to include the following additional bullet point:- <i>Foul drainage infrastructure</i>
33	Environment Agency	The statements - " <i>Expanding the Priors Hall site was also considered</i> " and " <i>Option three is to extend Priors Hall</i> " – seem to suggest that there may be a WWTW at Priors Hall (sites E17/HA1/HA2). Having checked the position with Anglian Water Services it seems that no such facility exists (although the possibility of providing one has been considered by the Corby Water Cycle Strategy). The Council are therefore asked to amend the document to clarify the position.
33	Environment Agency	The statement – " <i>Planning permission has been granted for the upgrade of facilities at the sewerage treatment works at Oakley Vale</i> " - suggests that there is an existing WWTW at Oakley Vale. Having checked the position with Anglian Water Services it seems that no such facility exists, although there is a sewage pumping station at Oakley Vale. The Council are therefore asked to amend the document to clarify the position.
33	Environment Agency	The approach to infrastructure provision represented by the proposed wording of CFS&I 02 seems inconsistent with the strength of the approach at para 6.5 of the SSA DPD. In addition the CFS&I 02 wording is considered to be insufficiently rigorous in contrast with the wording of Policy 6 of the CSS. The Environment Agency considers that, rather than simply offering support for the implementation of infrastructure, CFS&I 02 should be amended to embody the CSS Policy 6 requirement for timely delivery of infrastructure, referring to foul drainage infrastructure and associated improvement/provision of WWTWs. This is needed in order to ensure that wherever land is allocated for additional large-scale development, such development would not progress ahead of infrastructure delivery thereby creating unacceptable potential for sewage pollution. Whilst the CSS may be under review, the Environment Agency nevertheless considers that its current approach to the timely delivery of infrastructure is likely to remain necessary, in view of the known difficulties in

		securing such provision for current major development proposals at allocation sites E17/HA1/HA2. The Environment Agency's position on this issue is supported by PPS1. The Environment Agency therefore OBJECTS to the current wording of CFS&I 02 and asks that it be amended to show consistency with the approach of PPS1 and Policy 6 of the CSS, by embodying strengthened wording as suggested below: <i>New development will be required to be supported by the timely delivery of utilities infrastructure including waste water collection, conveyance, treatment and disposal systems, in addition to other necessary services and facilities. Planning permission will only be granted for development where solutions to infrastructure delivery constraints have been resolved. Development will be phased in relation to the delivery of infrastructure and/or performance against targets to reduce demands on infrastructure.</i>
33	Environment Agency	In respect of surface water run-off, the Corby Water Cycle Strategy states that "major" development at Corby should, where possible, limit site run-off to 2 l/s/ha for all events. The Environment Agency is promoting that limit in the interests of minimising flood risk and contributing to the achievement of sustainable development at Corby. It is therefore considered that a requirement to achieve the 2l/s/ha discharge limit, where possible, should be clearly represented within the SSA DPD. The Environment Agency therefore OBJECTS to the current wording of CFS&I 03 pending amendment by adding to CFS&I 03 the following (or equivalent) wording: <i>In respect of sites for major development at Corby, developers are required at the planning application stage, to demonstrate within their Flood Risk Assessments that, wherever possible, surface water run-off from the site will be limited to a maximum of 2l/s/ha. Technical justification will be required where it is claimed that the 2l/s/ha limitation cannot be met.</i>
35	Sport England	Section 10 under CFS&I 01 deals with developer contributions and includes sports facilities, there is however little detail on sports facility requirements. Sports facilities should be considered as part of the wider development of community infrastructure including open space, sport and recreation.
45	Lambert Smith Hampton on behalf of Northamptonshire County Council	The proposed policy in relation to new education facilities is supported and it is confirmed that the county will continue to work with the borough Council to identify appropriate sites and/or new school provision. Clearly with the slow down in growth exact dates when such facilities might be brought forward is less certain, however there is likely to be a need for one and possibly two secondary school sites during the plan period.
45	Lambert Smith Hampton on behalf of Northamptonshire County Council	The document should correctly refer to provision of 5th and 6th schools.
56	Northamptonshire County Council	Shouldn't this be to support the development of the fifth and sixth secondary schools in Corby rather than the fourth and fifth. There are already four secondary schools in Corby Brooke Weston Academy Corby Business Academy Kingswood and Lodge Park
52	Northamptonshire County Council	The County Council is currently in the process of updating the Transport Strategy for Growth – Corby Town Strategy working towards insertion in the LTP3. As part of this work the junction improvements and highway schemes highlighted in the strategy will be revisited and revised based on the most recent growth figures. Alongside providing sufficient highway infrastructure the County Council is also in the process of undertaking a bus cycling and walking development plan for

		Corby to better serve the existing communities and facilitate the planned growth
59	John Martin & Associates on behalf of Rockingham Estates and Great Oakley Estates	The purpose of the policy is not understood. Is it necessary to state that such design 'will continue to be supported'? If the design of SUDS schemes is covered by the Sustainable Design SPD then surely there is no need for this policy to duplicate the SPD. Incorporation of SUDS into development schemes is, nowadays, a normal planning requirement so there seems little need for this policy.
59	John Martin & Associates on behalf of Rockingham Estates and Great Oakley Estates	Policy is vague and offers no firm guidance at all on what future health care requirements might be even when there are proposals for significant growth of the town in terms of housing numbers. This represents a major omission from a Site Specific Allocations DPD and needs to be addressed as a priority. By this stage of the LDF there ought to be a clear view on the need for further health facilities and, if new facilities are required, then thought should have been given to their site requirements and locational issues. As drafted the policy is meaningless and simply sets out a vague intention to further investigate the matter
59	John Martin & Associates on behalf of Rockingham Estates and Great Oakley Estates	Object to the detailed elements of the policy – i.e. some of the list of items that may be included within s106 Agreements. There are four principles here: i) Three elements refer to maintenance costs. It is clearly set out in paragraph B19 of Circular 05/2005 that 'As a general rule, however, where an asset is intended for wider public use, the costs of subsequent maintenance and other recurrent expenditure associated with the developers' contributions should normally be borne by the body or authority in which the asset is to be vested.'; ii) Improvements to utilities infrastructure are matters between a developer and individual utility providers. These do not need to be set out in s106 Agreements; iii) It is unclear why SUDS schemes might need to be included in a s106. Normally such matters would be proposed in a planning application, are therefore subject to approval by the EA at outline and reserved matters application stages and full details would be required by condition rather than s106; and iv) It is wholly unreasonable to expect contributions towards the appointment of staff responsible for identifying other sources of funding for public realm improvements. There is nothing whatsoever in Circular 05/2005 which supports this stance. The local authority's employment of staff to undertake its functions is a matter for general funding by the authority not via s106 Agreements

Urban Boundary

25	SSR Planning on behalf of Buccleuch Property	Note the reasoned justification for the identification of the urban boundary for Corby and notes that the urban boundary will be subject to future review. It is considered that the review of the urban boundary is essential if Corby is to meet growth targets to 2026
28	Weldon Parish Council	Pleased to note that Weldon is excluded from the urban boundary for Corby and notes the statement in paragraph 12.9: "Settlements which are defined as villages in the Local Plan that are distinct from the urban area are not proposed to be included." The statement could probably be further qualified by the definition of a village as "a small number of houses surrounded by open countryside". There are currently approximately 850 dwellings within Weldon and to the west there are industrial sewage works, to the south-west, landfill site and civic amenity site, to the north approved 5,100 dwellings

		urban extension and to the east potential 1000 dwellings urban extension. This leaves very little surrounding open countryside and it is essential that this is protected
38	SSR Planning on behalf of Sywell Land Ltd	The Urban Boundary should be redrawn to include Land at Fircroft Park, Corby

Kingswood

11	Highways Agency	Welcome the proposals for a re-vitalised local centre in Kingswood which will form a new mixed use development to serve the local community. The emphasis on the High Street having priority for sustainable modes of travel with easy access for pedestrians, cyclist and public transport is also commended
11	Highways Agency	For the area as a whole, there is also explicit reference embedded in the development principles which seek to ensure that sustainable modes of transport are encouraged where possible in order to reduce the need to use the private car, and ensuring pedestrian and cycle links. The Highway Agency welcomes these references
12		Supports policy which will improve the quality of local services in Kingswood
15	Northamptonshire Police	The proposals are very positive. The proposals for improving the movement network are welcome. There is a clear need to provide a new focus for the community in the High Street area which will help to provide sense of place and increase quality of life. The use of high quality design and the creation of design codes is a good step forward. The involvement of the CPDA on the proposals in detail is continually needed. Involving the community in the decisions is key to help provide a sense of ownership of the area and to discourage vandalism.
15	Northamptonshire Police	The proposals to make structural changes to the estate are welcome; it is particularly encouraging to note that the changes are in line with the requirements of Secured by Design. The proposals to rotate dwellings to address the Radburn layout and the creation of safe and secure defensible spaces in particular are vital in addressing the regeneration need on the estate. The closure of pedestrian alleyways is also an important step forward. Policy KASP 07 is vital to achieve and it is pleasing to note that there is a commitment to achieve designs that result in crime prevention in the policy. The CPDA (who will involve the NFRS as appropriate) should be involved at all stages of the redevelopment in the area to ensure this opportunity is taken to fully address the issues of the estate. The aim must be to ensure that that these places become safer and the quality of life of residences is improved through high quality design.
15	Northamptonshire Police	Policy is pleasing as this seeks to ensure that any new development in the area has regard to preventing crime and the fear of crime. This helps to address quality of life issues in a broader sense. The policy also mentions the need to ensure that carbon emissions are reduced. The reduction in both incidents of fire and crime that we can bring about through high quality design can help to address this.
44	CPRE	It is to be noted the need to refurbish much of Kingswood Estate.
52	Northamptonshire County Council	The County Council's 'Northamptonshire Place and Movement Guide' gives a local context to the 'Manual for Streets' guidelines and should also be referred to for new developments.

57	Peacock Smith on behalf of W.M. Morrisons	It is considered that the Kingswood Regeneration proposals could take advantage of the proximity of the existing Morrisons Supermarket store on the edge of the area and create improved linkages between the Kingswood area and the existing store. This would help to increase the attractiveness of the area to local people giving better accessibility to services. This would assist with the regeneration aims set out in this section of the plan.
----	---	--

Western SUE

6	Wildlife Trust	The Master Plan for the Western SUE should make provision for habitat connectivity between Great Cottage Wood and Ash Coppice/Swinawe Wood.
11	Highways Agency	The general requirements for the Master Plan are set out in the Core Strategy. The current document confirms that any extension will need to ensure that there is an integrated transport network focussed on sustainable transport modes and further that the proposal will need to be supported by a transport assessment which pays due regard to the North Northamptonshire Transport Model, or other accepted models and assessments. Any requirements for developer contributions to secure effective mitigation will also need to be identified
15	Northamptonshire Police	It is important that this extension is designed to avoid the issues that are facing Kingswood. The Radburn estates should not be repeated in this setting. The principles of Secured by Design should be adhered to in the development. The CPDA (who will involve NFRS as appropriate) should be involved in the masterplanning process
15	Northamptonshire Police	In terms of infrastructure requirements, the Force will require a Safer Community Team base as part of the district centre on the urban extension and this should be secured through developer contributions
19	Smiths Gore on behalf of Great Oakley Estate	Comment that it is not Corby BC that designated two sustainable urban extensions as they are designated in the Core Strategy
19	Smiths Gore on behalf of Great Oakley Estate	Note that this DPD refers to the 'Corby Western Urban Extension' and that the Core Strategy refers to the West of Corby SUE and suggest that some consistency would be desirable. We suggest reference is made to the West Corby SUE
19	Smiths Gore on behalf of Great Oakley Estate	With reference to paragraph 14.4 – it is stated that the Preferred Option consultation did not give details of the quantum of development or boundaries at that time. While this is correct in terms of boundaries it is also the case that the quantum of development has long been set out in the adopted Core Spatial Strategy
19	Smiths Gore on behalf of Great Oakley Estate	Whilst supporting the broad thrust of the policy, we object to the detailed wording of the first paragraph of the policy. Our objection is concerned with the vagueness of the policy test referring to the north east urban extension being 'successfully established'. What is meant by successfully established and how will the promoters know when this milestone has been reached? This is far too vague a criteria to be meaningfully applied.
19	Smiths Gore on behalf of Great Oakley Estate	Support the final paragraph of WUE01 which refers to the need for the SUE to take account of possible additional growth in the longer term

19	Smiths Gore on behalf of Great Oakley Estate	It should be clarified in the first paragraph that the 'maximum' boundary refers to development occurring to 2021
19	Smiths Gore on behalf of Great Oakley Estate	There appears to be an inconsistency between the retail element of the policy and the retail provision described in Table 8.1 which refers to a District Centre for West Corby (and which is supported). We therefore object to the wording of this policy
19	Smiths Gore on behalf of Great Oakley Estate	Object to the reference to 'high levels of open space provision' because it is a meaningless phrase. What is meant by 'high' levels? Surely open space should be provided in line with generally-accepted standards or any adopted policy guidelines
19	Smiths Gore on behalf of Great Oakley Estate	Reference could be included to a 'green link' (for cycling, pedestrians and public transport) from West Corby towards the town centre via Kingswood School
20	Smiths Gore on behalf of Great Oakley Estate and Rockingham Castle Estate	Comment that it is not Corby BC that designated two sustainable urban extensions as they are designated in the Core Strategy
20	Smiths Gore on behalf of Great Oakley Estate and Rockingham Castle Estate	Note that this DPD refers to the 'Corby Western Urban Extension' and that the Core Strategy refers to the West of Corby SUE and suggest that some consistency would be desirable. We suggest reference is made to the West Corby SUE
20	Smiths Gore on behalf of Great Oakley Estate and Rockingham Castle Estate	With reference to paragraph 14.4 – it is stated that the Preferred Option consultation did not give details of the quantum of development or boundaries at that time. While this is correct in terms of boundaries it is also the case that the quantum of development has long been set out in the adopted Core Spatial Strategy
20	Smiths Gore on behalf of Great Oakley Estate and Rockingham Castle Estate	Whilst supporting the broad thrust of the policy, we object to the detailed wording of the first paragraph of the policy. Our objection is concerned with the vagueness of the policy test referring to the north east urban extension being 'successfully established'. What is meant by successfully established and how will the promoters know when this milestone has been reached? This is far too vague a criteria to be meaningfully applied. We specifically support the final paragraph of WUE01 which refers to the need for the SUE to take account of possible additional growth in the longer term
20	Smiths Gore on behalf of Great Oakley Estate and	It should be clarified in the first paragraph that the 'maximum' boundary refers to development occurring to 2021

	Rockingham Castle Estate	
20	Smiths Gore on behalf of Great Oakley Estate and Rockingham Castle Estate	There appears to be an inconsistency between the retail element of the policy and the retail provision described in Table 8.1 which refers to a District Centre for West Corby (and which is supported). We therefore object to the wording of this policy
20	Smiths Gore on behalf of Great Oakley Estate and Rockingham Castle Estate	Object to the reference to 'high levels of open space provision' because it is a meaningless phrase. What is meant by 'high' levels? Surely open space should be provided in line with generally-accepted standards or any adopted policy guidelines
20	Smiths Gore on behalf of Great Oakley Estate and Rockingham Castle Estate	Reference could be included to a 'green link' (for cycling, pedestrians and public transport) from West Corby towards the town centre via Kingswood School
25	SSR Planning on behalf of Buccleuch Property	The Regional Plan refers to the importance of the relationships across the district boundaries in North Northamptonshire. There is concern that in assessing the 'Other Options Considered' for the North East Corby and Corby Western Urban Extensions the Council concludes that "The alternative to the provision of SUEs is to identify a larger number of smaller sites for housing, including some that may lie outside the Corby Borough boundary, or in less sustainable locations. Such an option would not be compatible with the adopted NNCSS". Cross boundary solutions are acceptable in principle as reflected in MKSM SRS Northamptonshire 1 and where they would provide sustainable urban extensions with excellent access to Corby's town centre and existing urban area, as at Corby South East and Storefield, should be favourably considered in order that post 2021 options are not inappropriately curtailed. It is critical that the Council works with the Joint Planning Unit during the review of the Core Strategy and in developing the further stages of its DPD in order to ensure that cross boundary issues are properly addressed
27	John Martin & Associates on behalf of Rockingham Estates	Whilst supporting the broad thrust of the policy, we object to the detailed wording of the first paragraph of the policy. Our objection is concerned with the vagueness of the policy test referring to the north east urban extension being 'successfully established'. What is meant by successfully established and how will the promoters know when this milestone has been reached? This is far too vague a criterion to be meaningfully applied.
27	John Martin & Associates on behalf of	Support the final paragraph of WUE01 which refers to the need for the SUE to take account of possible additional growth in the longer term

	Rockingham Estates	
27	John Martin & Associates on behalf of Rockingham Estates	It should be clarified in the first paragraph that the 'maximum' boundary refers to development occurring to 2021
27	John Martin & Associates on behalf of Rockingham Estates	There appears to be an inconsistency between the retail element of the policy and the retail provision described in Table 8.1 which refers to a District Centre for West Corby (and which is supported). We therefore object to the wording of this policy
27	John Martin & Associates on behalf of Rockingham Estates	Object to the reference to 'high levels of open space provision' because it is a meaningless phrase. What is meant by 'high' levels? Surely open space should be provided in line with generally-accepted standards or any adopted policy guidelines
27	John Martin & Associates on behalf of Rockingham Estates	Reference could be included to a 'green link' (for cycling, pedestrians and public transport) from West Corby towards the town centre via Kingswood School
27	John Martin & Associates on behalf of Rockingham Estates	Comment that it is not Corby BC that designated two sustainable urban extensions as they are designated in the Core Strategy
27	John Martin & Associates on behalf of Rockingham Estates	Note that this DPD refers to the 'Corby Western Urban Extension' and that the Core Strategy refers to the West of Corby SUE and suggest that some consistency would be desirable. We suggest reference is made to the West Corby SUE
27	John Martin & Associates on behalf of	With reference to paragraph 14.4 – it is stated that the Preferred Option consultation did not give details of the quantum of development or boundaries at that time. While this is correct in terms of boundaries it is also the case that the quantum of development has long been set out in the adopted Core Spatial Strategy

	Rockingham Estates	
40	Bidwells on behalf of Land Securities	Policy 12 of the Core Strategy states that the town centres of Kettering, Corby and Wellingborough will be strengthened and regenerated as the focus of sustainable communities. Limb d of Policy 16 of the Core Strategy states that master plans for sustainable urban extensions should make provision for an appropriate level of retail, leisure, social, cultural, community and health facilities that meet local needs but do not compete with the town centre. Clarification is sought that the retail element(s) of the Corby Western Sustainable Urban Extension will need to comply with PPS6 and Core Strategy
40	Bidwells on behalf of Land Securities	The reference to provision of a local centre(s) under the second bullet point should explicitly stated the need for compliance with Core Strategy Policy 16 which makes reference to meeting local needs which do not compete with the town centre
52	Northamptonshire County Council	The North Northamptonshire Transport Model is currently being joined to the West Northamptonshire Transport Model to create a county wide Transport Model. Any transport assessment of the Western Extension will be undertaken in this multi-modal model.
59	John Martin & Associates on behalf of Rockingham Estates and Great Oakley Estates	Whilst supporting the broad thrust of the policy, we object to the detailed wording of the first paragraph of the policy. Our objection is concerned with the vagueness of the policy test referring to the north east urban extension being 'successfully established'. What is meant by successfully established and how will the promoters know when this milestone has been reached? This is far too vague a criterion to be meaningfully applied.
59	John Martin & Associates on behalf of Rockingham Estates and Great Oakley Estates	Support the final paragraph of WUE01 which refers to the need for the SUE to take account of possible additional growth in the longer term
59	John Martin & Associates on behalf of Rockingham Estates and Great Oakley Estates	It should be clarified in the first paragraph that the 'maximum' boundary refers to development occurring to 2021
59	John Martin & Associates on behalf of Rockingham Estates and Great	There appears to be an inconsistency between the retail element of the policy and the retail provision described in Table 8.1 which refers to a District Centre for West Corby (and which is supported). We therefore object to the wording of this policy

	Oakley Estates	
59	John Martin & Associates on behalf of Rockingham Estates and Great Oakley Estates	Object to the reference to 'high levels of open space provision' because it is a meaningless phrase. What is meant by 'high' levels? Surely open space should be provided in line with generally-accepted standards or any adopted policy guidelines
59	John Martin & Associates on behalf of Rockingham Estates and Great Oakley Estates	Reference could be included to a 'green link' (for cycling, pedestrians and public transport) from West Corby towards the town centre via Kingswood School
59	John Martin & Associates on behalf of Rockingham Estates and Great Oakley Estates	Comment that it is not Corby BC that designated two sustainable urban extensions as they are designated in the Core Strategy
59	John Martin & Associates on behalf of Rockingham Estates and Great Oakley Estates	Note that this DPD refers to the 'Corby Western Urban Extension' and that the Core Strategy refers to the West of Corby SUE and suggest that some consistency would be desirable. We suggest reference is made to the West Corby SUE
59	John Martin & Associates on behalf of Rockingham Estates and Great Oakley Estates	With reference to paragraph 14.4 – it is stated that the Preferred Option consultation did not give details of the quantum of development or boundaries at that time. While this is correct in terms of boundaries it is also the case that the quantum of development has long been set out in the adopted Core Spatial Strategy

Appendices

15	Northamptonshire	In the list of documents that should be referred to, reference needs to be made to Secured by Design and to the
----	------------------	---

	Police	Northamptonshire Place and Movement Guide
22	Government Office for the East Midlands	Every DPD must include a list of the existing saved policies that will be superseded by policies in the DPD when adopted. Appendix D is intended to serve this purpose. However the contents of the Appendix are incorrect and confusing. By not being clear about which policies are to be replaced this could lead to an overlap or contradictions between policies. The DPD should include a list of those saved policies which are to be replaced by this DPD only. Of greater concern is the fact that Appendix D includes reference to policies which were not included in the Secretary of States Direction and were therefore not saved. At the publication stage it will be vital to include an accurate list of saved policies, in line with the Secretary of State's Direction, which are to be replaced by the DPD only. For ease of reference you could also consider the inclusion of a list of saved policies that remain extant
50	M3 Agency LLP	Site J20 Barn Close was allocated for employment purposes in the adopted Local Plan and proposed to be saved by the Secretary of State. The site is currently used for car storage purposes. In the consultation document the Council have concluded that the site is now to be discounted "...due to no realistic prospect of...coming forward for the development of B class uses". We are uncertain as to how the Council have arrived at this conclusion. Having regard to the existing lease arrangements for the property together with the current state of the UK car industry there is a possibility that this site will be available for employment uses within the period of the Plan. We would request that the employment allocation be reinstated for this site.

General

1	East of England Regional Assembly	No comments
3	The Coal Authority	No specific comments to make on the document at this stage
4	CABE	Unable to comment due to limited resources
5	P.E Enterprises Ltd	The current Local Plan for Weldon has not run its full course. So why the need for bringing in new plans.
6	Wildlife Trust	As it stands this DPD does not go far enough towards helping to deliver objectives 1 and 2 of the CSS. This is mainly because it is weak on the ecological aspects and consequently does not accord them enough importance. According to the CSS the development in North Northants is aiming to be a bench mark for green living, but this document does not seem to aspire to that.
15	Northamptonshire Police	More generally on HGV issues, the document needs to consider the recently completed HGV Parking Study that looked at countywide issues.
16	East Midlands Regional	In terms of the 'chain' of conformity, your DPD confirms that it should reflect the policy content of the Core Strategy. However, as currently drafted it is not clear whether it is dealing with the period up to 2021 in line with the adopted Core Strategy or is

	Assembly	seeking to take on board the contents of the adopted Regional Plan and the emerging Core Strategy review which look to 2026
17	East Midlands Federation of Sport and Recreation	No comments
22	Government Office for the East Midlands	The consultation document is intended to meet one of the key features of the LDF system, that of 'front-loading' and this approach is welcomed. It is aimed at seeking ideas and responses from local people, groups and stakeholders, to inform the preparation of the Site Specific Allocations DPD. It would appear to facilitate early involvement and help to secure inputs from the community and all stakeholders, as required by national planning policy.
22	Government Office for the East Midlands	Although not confirmed within the document it is assumed that the appropriate DPD Bodies and general consultation bodies have been consulted
22	Government Office for the East Midlands	A number of the proposed policies concern development control issues (for example E&H02 and E&H04) which are not site specific but merely repeat national and regional policy. The inclusion of such policies could lead to the production of a DPD more in keeping with the old style local plan, rather than a focused and streamlined LDF. As a result of the inclusion of the latter sections, which are thematic rather than site specific, the consultation paper is too lengthy and does not adhere to the description within the LDS. The emerging DPD should focus on site allocations and the Core Strategy rather than re-invigorating old style plan policy
22	Government Office for the East Midlands	A number of policies are already covered by the Core Strategy and should not be included in the DPD. For example, CFS&I 03 and CFS&I 07 are both covered by Core Strategy Policy 13
28	Weldon Parish Council	Responding to the consultation was not an easy process for the following reasons: the online main document could only be reached after 6 clicks; the online response form was "unfriendly" requiring a lot of separate documents to be opened whilst also having the main consultation document open (or 222 pages printed) to cross-refer; and the word version of the response form could only be opened with a User Name and Password. The Parish Council requests ongoing meetings and discussions with officers throughout the review and implementation process
32	Cambridgeshire County Council	No comments
34	Anglian Water	No comments, other than to say that development of housing/employment sites should be delivered in accordance with the North Northamptonshire Water Cycle Strategy.
44	CPRE	The economy is unpredictable and the cyclic effect is evident throughout history
44	CPRE	Urban development must be good and sound and durable and visually pleasing for in this way pressure will be taken off the countryside
49	British Pipeline Agency	Interested in future consultations

Sustainability Appraisal Report

6	Wildlife Trust	The indicators identified for monitoring Environmental Objective 8 include one indicator that will be very difficult to report; this is the population of species. The indicator relating to the coverage and integration of GI will also be difficult to report, but may be possible. The remaining indicators seem appropriate and possible to report against, although some work will be needed in order to produce and maintain the required datasets, such as the area and condition of local priority habitats.
6	Wildlife Trust	The sustainability appraisal identifies that the biodiversity data required for site appraisals is currently missing. Therefore sites have not been assessed against their impacts on biodiversity. This is a significant omission, especially considering proposed policy E&H 05.
33	Environment Agency	<i>SA Theme 'Mitigate and manage the risk of flooding'</i> . The Environment Agency asks that this theme should refer to the Corby Water Cycle Strategy (CWCS) as a local source of information, partly on the basis that the CWCS seeks to ensure that surface water run-off from all "major" development sites should, where possible, be limited to 2 l/s/ha for all events.
33	Environment Agency	<i>Issue No. 13 – Rising Flood Risk</i> . This states that "surface water drainage is noted to be inadequate in Corby and there is considered to be a risk that increased flows from future development would be likely to exacerbate existing flooding problems downstream on the Willow and Gretton Brooks". The Environment Agency asks that the plan implications should therefore incorporate the CWCS surface water discharge limit of 2l/s/ha for Corby.
33	Environment Agency	<i>Issue No. 16 – To ensure adequate water supply, maximise water efficiency and reduce the risk of flooding</i> . The Environment Agency asks that consideration be given to adding a further detailed indicator relating to the number of major developments meeting the CWCS surface water run-off rate of 2 l/s/ha.
33	Environment Agency	GROUNDWATER & CONTAMINATED LAND RELATED COMMENTS. (i) Background information Area specific site sensitivity/vulnerability information: Geology of Corby Borough - Bedrock mainly comprises Lower Lincolnshire Limestone across central and western parts of the area, with Northampton Sands in eastern and northern areas. Patches of Rutland Formation (Sandstone and Limestone), Blisworth Limestone and Grantham Formation (Sandstone, Mudstone and Siltstone) are present in southern, eastern and north-eastern areas. Superficial deposits of Glacial Till Boulder Clay are present over central and south-western parts, also covering parts of the southern, eastern and north-eastern areas. Aquifer information: The limestone in the central and western parts of the area form a Principal Aquifer, however, much of this is overlain by the Glacial Till Boulder Clay, which is Unproductive. The bedrock in the eastern and northern parts of the area typically forms Secondary Aquifers. A number of main, secondary and tertiary rivers run through the area, including the River Welland to the north-west and Harpers Brook to the south of the area. There are no Source Protection Zones within the area. Whilst the overall vulnerability of controlled waters and groundwater in this area is relatively low, it is nevertheless site-dependent and can be high in some instances. This should be taken into account.
33	Environment Agency	<i>Table 3.1 - Derivation of Key Sustainability Themes</i> . The table does not consider groundwater and hydrogeological issues and the Environment Agency considers that it should be expanded to do so. Reference should also be made to the Water Framework Directive; PPS23 'Planning & Pollution Control'; and Groundwater Protection Policy and Practice (GP3). GP3 is an

		Environment Agency report highlighting the importance of safeguarding groundwater quality and encouraging industry and other organisations to act responsibly and improve their practices in relation to groundwater. It is considered that such inclusion would reflect the Key Sustainability Themes and Objective 15 of the Sustainability Appraisal Framework which seeks 'to maintain and improve the quality of ground and surface waters'.
33	Environment Agency	Table 3.3 – Key Sustainable Issues: Issue No. 17 – Contaminated Land. The table states that the Plan should pursue opportunities to encourage positive action to bring contaminated land forward for development. Although maximising the use of brownfield land for new development is a CSS Sustainability Objective (Objective 9 – Regeneration) it is not stated that this objective will be pursued in preference to development of greenfield sites - this should be a priority. In addition, this section should acknowledge that some land contamination can affect groundwater, and that depending on the underlying geology and groundwater vulnerability, this can have significant implications for the redevelopment of land affected by contamination. The Report states that Corby has one of the highest concentrations of vacant and derelict sites in the country, many of which will be contaminated. However, there is no indication as to whether the NLUD has been used to identify brownfield sites in the area. It should be borne in mind, however, that identification as "brownfield" does not automatically mean that sites will be contaminated.
36	DIALOG	Site Reference CBC0018 - Endorse recommendation and comments
36	DIALOG	Site Reference CBC0036 - Endorse recommendation and comments
36	DIALOG	Site Reference CBC0054 - Endorse recommendation and comments. N.B 5.3 Biodiversity: believed likely to contain potential for Biodiversity Gain <u>via</u> more sympathetic management
36	DIALOG	Site Reference CBC0070 - Endorse recommendations and comments
36	DIALOG	Site Reference CBC0089 - Endorse recommendations and comments
36	DIALOG	Site Reference CBC0112 - Appears to be accompanied by wrong map (see site reference CBC0118; HA22), so cannot comment further at this stage
37	DIALOG	Site Reference CBC0004 - Current use is surely Public Open Space / amenity, rather than Agricultural / Forestry, but comments are endorsed.
37	DIALOG	Site Reference CBC0005 - Current use (as comment above): should be Hazel rather than Thoroughsale: comments endorsed
37	DIALOG	Site Reference CBC0006 - Current use (as comment above): should be Hazel rather than Thoroughsale: comments endorsed
37	DIALOG	Site Reference CBC0017 - Recommendation is endorsed: Corus are in possession of a report concerning impact on biodiversity.
37	DIALOG	Site Reference CBC0051 - 5.2 was once part of King's Wood: close proximity to King's Wood means that there would be significant impacts upon biodiversity / integrity of the LNR were it to be allocated and developed for Housing. Comments endorsed.
37	DIALOG	Site Reference CBC0113 - Adjoins Hazel Wood, not Thoroughsale.
37	DIALOG	Endorse the comment regarding the desirability of use of ecological specialists <u>at all stages...</u> re: Biodiversity.
36	DIALOG	Disagree with recommendation (as outlined in Site assessment within SA Appendices, CBC020). Again, 5.3 Biodiversity:

	believed likely to contain potential for Biodiversity Gain via more sympathetic management. If allocated and developed for Employment use, would detract from value of housing site assessment CBC0054. The two plots should be recognised together, as open space / wildlife conservation
--	--

Proposals Map

6	Wildlife Trust	There are a number of errors, omissions, and incorrect inclusions on the Proposals Map compared to the latest maps for the sites of nature conservation value in Corby.
6	Wildlife Trust	It would be more useful to display the hierarchy of designated nature conservation sites rather than combining the hierarchy into a single layer so the distribution is clear
6	Wildlife Trust	Potential Wildlife Sites should be shown on the Proposals Map
19	Smiths Gore on behalf of Great Oakley Estate	Object to the proposed boundary of the West Corby SUE as shown on the Proposals Map and also in Appendix 2. The landowners promoting this scheme have undertaken a considerable amount of masterplanning work in order to assist in defining an appropriate boundary. The results of all that work have been explained and made available to the Borough Council. It is therefore disappointing that a different boundary has been included in the Site Allocations DPD and the difference lies on the north western edge. An alternative plan has been provided, which shows a definition of the north west boundary based on a strongly vegetated existing hedgeline which forms an obvious natural boundary. The DPD boundary appears to arbitrarily cut through open arable fields to the north of this hedgeline and we can see no justification for this
19	Smiths Gore on behalf of Great Oakley Estate	There is an inconsistency between the Proposals Map and the retail proposals presented in Table 8.1. Table 8.1 proposes a District Centre at West Corby while the Proposals Map shows only a local centre. The Proposals Map should therefore be amended
20	Smiths Gore on behalf of Great Oakley Estate and Rockingham Castle Estate	Object to the proposed boundary of the West Corby SUE as shown on the Proposals Map and also in Appendix 2. The landowners promoting this scheme have undertaken a considerable amount of masterplanning work in order to assist in defining an appropriate boundary. The results of all that work have been explained and made available to the Borough Council. It is therefore disappointing that a different boundary has been included in the Site Allocations DPD and the difference lies on the north western edge. An alternative plan has been provided, which shows a definition of the north west boundary based on a strongly vegetated existing hedgeline which forms an obvious natural boundary. The DPD boundary appears to arbitrarily cut through open arable fields to the north of this hedgeline and we can see no justification for this
20	Smiths Gore on behalf of Great Oakley Estate and Rockingham Castle Estate	There is an inconsistency between the Proposals Map and the retail proposals presented in Table 8.1. Table 8.1 proposes a District Centre at West Corby while the Proposals Map shows only a local centre. The Proposals Map should therefore be amended
26	Gretton Parish	The Pick Playing Field on Lyddington Road has not been marked and should be designated as open space although it appears

	Council	that the adjoining field has been identified as such
26	Gretton Parish Council	The cemetery on Station Road should be marked on the Map
26	Gretton Parish Council	The Village Green is part of the open space of the village and should be distinctly identified in the Map
27	John Martin & Associates on behalf of Rockingham Estates	Paragraph 10.44 lists local road schemes including realignment and dualling of the A6003. Such a road scheme potentially has considerable implications for the Corby West SUE and such schemes should be shown on the Proposals Map in more detail and for their routes to be formally safeguarded. There is a lack of detail on what is potentially major highways scheme. The Proposals Map suggests this only applies to the A6003 between Harborough Road and the Oakley Hay Roundabout and we are unsure as to the basis of this. We would have thought that such proposals would form the basis of a specific policy
27	John Martin & Associates on behalf of Rockingham Estates	Object to the proposed boundary of the West Corby SUE as shown on the Proposals Map and also in Appendix 2. The landowners promoting this scheme have undertaken a considerable amount of masterplanning work in order to assist in defining an appropriate boundary. The results of all that work have been explained and made available to the Borough Council. It is therefore disappointing that a different boundary has been included in the Site Allocations DPD and the difference lies on the north western edge. An alternative plan has been provided, which shows a definition of the north west boundary based on a strongly vegetated existing hedgeline which forms an obvious natural boundary. The DPD boundary appears to arbitrarily cut through open arable fields to the north of this hedgeline and we can see no justification for this
27	John Martin & Associates on behalf of Rockingham Estates	There is an inconsistency between the Proposals Map and the retail proposals presented in Table 8.1. Table 8.1 proposes a District Centre at West Corby while the Proposals Map shows only a local centre. The Draft Proposals Map should therefore be amended
28	Weldon Parish Council	The proposals map shows Weldon Football Club located within the Woodland Park. There have been extensive discussions with Council officers regarding this proposal which is now opposed by the Parish Council. The discussions have centred around the following alternatives: provision within Weldon Park if the current application is approved; or provision within Priors Hall, either as part of the CBA site or elsewhere within the development. The above will require a variation to the legal agreement imposed on Corus by the 1997 Local Plan and the Parish Council has, over a period of many months, emphasised that this be resolved as soon as possible
28	Weldon Parish Council	The proposals map shows Weldon Football Club located within the Woodland Park. There have been extensive discussions with Council officers regarding this proposal which is now opposed by the Parish Council. The discussions have centred around the following alternatives: provision within Weldon Park if the current application is approved; or provision within Priors Hall, either as part of the CBA site or elsewhere within the development. The above will require a variation to the legal agreement imposed on Corus by the 1997 Local Plan and the Parish Council has, over a period of many months, emphasised that this be resolved as soon as possible
38	SSR Planning	The Proposals map should identify the reserved matters permission for a Lorry Park at Land at Fircroft Park, Corby

	on behalf of Sywell Land Ltd	
59	John Martin & Associates on behalf of Rockingham Estates and Great Oakley Estates	Paragraph 10.44 lists local road schemes including realignment and dualling of the A6003. Such a road scheme potentially has considerable implications for the Corby West SUE and such schemes should be shown on the Proposals Map in more detail and for their routes to be formally safeguarded. There is a lack of detail on what is potentially major highways scheme. The Proposals Map suggests this only applies to the A6003 between Harborough Road and the Oakley Hay roundabout and we are unsure as to the basis of this. We would have thought that such proposals would form the basis of a specific policy
59	John Martin & Associates on behalf of Rockingham Estates and Great Oakley Estates	Object to the proposed boundary of the West Corby SUE as shown on the Proposals Map and also in Appendix 2. The landowners promoting this scheme have undertaken a considerable amount of masterplanning work in order to assist in defining an appropriate boundary. The results of all that work have been explained and made available to the Borough Council. It is therefore disappointing that a different boundary has been included in the Site Allocations DPD and the difference lies on the north western edge. An alternative plan has been provided, which shows a definition of the north west boundary based on a strongly vegetated existing hedgeline which forms an obvious natural boundary. The DPD boundary appears to arbitrarily cut through open arable fields to the north of this hedgeline and we can see no justification for this
59	John Martin & Associates on behalf of Rockingham Estates and Great Oakley Estates	There is an inconsistency between the Proposals Map and the retail proposals presented in Table 8.1. Table 8.1 proposes a District Centre at West Corby while the Draft Proposals Map shows only a local centre. The Proposals Map should therefore be amended