
Responses to public consultation on the Part 2 Local Plan for Corby – Emerging Draft Options

SYNOPSIS

To update members of the progress of the Part 2 Local Plan for Corby by providing an overview of the results of public consultation that took place between 2nd July and 28th August 2018.

1. Background

- 1.1 Work is continuing on the preparation of the Part 2 Local Plan for Corby. It will include locally specific policies and site allocations that will guide the future of the Borough up until 2031 and will complement the strategic policies set out in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy 2011-2031 (JCS).

2. Consultation

- 2.1 Local Plan Committee agreed the Part 2 Local Plan - Emerging Draft Options for public consultation on 20th June 2018 under Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning Regulations. The eight week consultation started on 2nd July 2018 and ended on 28th August 2018. It was carried out in compliance with the North Northamptonshire Statement of Community Involvement. The consultation included contacting individuals and organisations on the Local Plan database, staffed pop-up exhibitions, and information provided via conventional and social media.
- 2.2 A total of 38 responses were received during the consultation providing approximately 215 individual comments. In conjunction with this report all representations received will be published online via the Council's dedicated consultation portal.
- 2.3 The summary table below shows the breakdown of individual responses received in relation to each chapter of the Part 2 Local Plan – Emerging Draft Options¹.

Chapter	Comments Received
Introduction	3
Vision and Outcomes	8
Securing Infrastructure and Services	33
Green Infrastructure Framework	27
Delivering Economic Prosperity	17
Delivering Housing	45
Villages and Rural Areas	16
Town Centres and Town Centre Uses	22
Monitoring	0
Appendices	2

¹ This does not include any comments which related to the whole document or the supporting environmental assessment as they are categorised separately.

- 2.4 The following provides an overview of the consultation responses by document and by each chapter.

Vision and Outcomes

- 2.5 Respondents supported the proposed Local Outcomes that will complement the Strategic Outcomes of the JCS. Public Health England provided support for a number of outcomes which relate to green infrastructure, sustainable transport infrastructure, reducing air pollution and promoting healthy lifestyles. In addition, Public Health England put forward some further considerations when considering design of new developments; this includes the provision of shade from sunlight, provision of open space and interesting/engaging urban design. Sustrans provided specific support for the local outcomes relating to green infrastructure and improving walking/cycling routes.

Securing Infrastructure and Services

- 2.6 In terms of transport, Gretton and Cottingham Parish Councils raised concern that walking and cycling connections to Corby are not sufficient or safe and that rural bus services are not sustainable. Middleton Parish Council considered the traffic modelling and trunk road improvements for West Corby Sustainable Urban Extension (SUE) to be inadequate. Sustrans supported the walking and cycling improvements for the borough included within the Northamptonshire Transportation Plan and encouraged the early inclusion of sustainable (green) networks connecting the SUEs to create good travel habits. They recognised there is a need to provide green infrastructure links to Tresham Garden Village. Northamptonshire County Council (NCC) (Highways) supported the Council's preferred option to not include additional local policy regarding transport, but also supported keeping this option under review subject to forthcoming funding announcements and updates to local evidence.
- 2.7 In terms of education and training, Gretton Parish Council raised concern that there is a lack of education provision and Cottingham and Middleton Parish Councils raised concern that there is a lack of training and skills provision within the Plan. The landowners for West Corby SUE requested clarity on the education requirements for this site in the Pre-Submission version of the document. NCC (Development Management team) commented that new education provision will meet the demand generated by new housing delivery coming forward throughout the plan period; however, there is an urgent identified need to provide additional secondary school places to meet the existing demand in the borough. As such the County Council recommended the inclusion of site specific allocations for education infrastructure to plan for new and expanding schools and education facilities. NCC also emphasised the need to regularly review and refresh the infrastructure requirements set out in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, to ensure the most up-to-date evidence is used.
- 2.8 In terms of social and cultural infrastructure, there was general support for the proposed 'Open Space, Sport and Recreation' policy from Sport England, NCC, Cottingham Parish Council and Urban & Civic. Sport England supported the updated evidence on Open Space, Sport and Recreation, which they comment was out of date during the Issues and Options consultation; however, they question whether the latest Infrastructure Delivery Plan is up-to-date and seek clarification of the evidence base. This is echoed by Urban & Civic. NCC (Public Health) would like to see a requirement for new developments to provide informal opportunities for physical activity and recreation, in addition to traditional sports and recreation facilities. The Environment Agency request changes to the proposed policy to include wording to utilise proposed open spaces (alongside watercourses) as additional flood storage

areas. Gladman Developments and the Home Builders Federation request clarity in the proposed policy that the requirement to provide new or enhanced facilities only applies to meeting needs arising from new development.

- 2.9 Cottingham and Middleton Parish Councils raise concerns over the lack of police and fire and rescue presence in the rural areas.
- 2.10 In terms of health and wellbeing, Sport England promote the use of 'Active Design', a document prepared in conjunction with Public Health England, which is a guide to planning new developments that encourage people to get more active more often. Gretton, Cottingham and Middleton Parish Councils share concern that the health needs of the community are not being met and support the inclusion of a locally specific policy. NCC (Public Health) echoes this concern given the major health and wellbeing issues in Corby Borough; however, NCC notes the preparation of the Place Shaping SPD and the desire to not duplicate policy.
- 2.11 In terms of utility services, the Environment Agency recommends that flood risk (both fluvial and surface water) be separated from and not combined with the utilities section within the document, to avoid the issues being overlooked. The Environment Agency is satisfied the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment has been satisfactorily updated and approved. Cottingham Parish Council accepts the Council's preferred option to not include a locally specific utilities policy in the Part 2 Local Plan.
- 2.12 Cottingham Parish Council supports the principles of the proposed telecommunications policy. Middleton Parish Council would like to see the proposed policy amended to include a requirement for all new developments in Corby to provide a fibre broadband connection, with a programme to connect the rural areas within a five year time frame in order to support small businesses and home working.

Green Infrastructure Framework

- 2.13 General support for the Council's preferred option to include locally designated nature conservation sites on the Policies Map, from Natural England, Cottingham and Middleton Parish Councils and a local resident. Middleton Parish Council requests the inclusion of the Middleton Community Orchard. Natural England suggest consideration be given to including Biodiversity Action Plan priority habitats, areas of deciduous woodland (in addition to ancient woodland) and other priority habitats such as grazing marsh.
- 2.14 General support for the proposed 'Local Green Space' policy, from Sport England, NCC (Public Health), Cottingham and Middleton Parish Councils and a local resident. Anglian Water request that any designated Local Green Spaces in Corby Borough exclude land in Anglian Water ownership to prevent any necessary operational improvements being made. Gladman Developments stress the need for Local Green Space designations to meet the required national criteria. Home Builders Federation suggests the policy could be deleted as they believe it simply repeats national policy. Middleton Parish Council welcome the invitation to nominate its Community Orchard included as a Local Green Space but no supporting evidence was provided against the standard criteria. Gretton Parish Council state that the Neighbourhood Plan, which is currently being prepared, will produce areas for consideration as Local Green Spaces.
- 2.15 General support for the proposed 'Green Corridors' policy, from Sport England, NCC (Public Health), Urban & Civic, Cottingham Parish Council, Sustrans, Natural England and a local resident. Urban & Civic request greater clarity as to the exact routes and nature of the refined corridors and suggest it would be helpful if the policy could also set out the Council's spatial/design aspirations for the corridors along with

performance criteria against which planning applications would be judged. More comprehensive mapping is also requested. Natural England suggests identifying additional corridors in the Rockingham Forest area where there can be increased tree and hedgerow planting. West Corby landowners and site promoters request minor wording changes to convey the identified corridors at West Corby are only indicative at this stage.

- 2.16 Cottingham Parish Council and Gladman Developments support the preferred option to rely on existing policies in place to protect valued landscapes and prevent coalescence.
- 2.17 In terms of tranquillity areas, Gladman Developments support the Council's preferred option to not identify additional areas of tranquillity; however, Cottingham Parish Council suggests the policy needs further consideration.

Delivering Economic Prosperity

- 2.18 Respondents generally support the proposed 'Established Industrial Estates' policy, with a number of amendments or suggestions to strengthen the policy provided. Cottingham Parish Council agrees with the inclusion of a local policy. The Environment Agency state that a number of sites should be subjected to a sequential test carried out in accordance with the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment prior to allocation and that cross reference should be made to the Sustainability Appraisal which states these sites are partially within a flood zone. They suggest the Part 2 Local Plan should refer to the policy to be used as a baseline for necessary mitigation. Anglian Water also comment on the policy, namely suggesting consideration be given to including criteria relating to water and water recycling infrastructure, including Anglian Water's existing assets where relevant; suggested additional policy and supporting text put forward by Anglian Water is aimed at ensuring continued access to existing sewers for maintenance purposes. Gladman Developments note the flexibility afforded by identifying a long-term land reserve in addition to a small suite of 'non-strategic site allocations'. Notwithstanding this - referring to the NPPF - they suggest that in order to support economic growth and productivity, it will be necessary to provide further flexibility through the wording of the policy to enable employment development to come forward where need can be demonstrated (subject to wider sustainability considerations). Highways England note the recommendation as set out in the Employment Land Review to deliver 11.4 hectares of employment land and request that proposed new sites where impacts on the operation of the A14 are anticipated be subject to consultation with Highways England and appropriately assessed in order to determine the extent of the potential impacts.
- 2.19 The regeneration principles established by the proposed 'Established Industrial Estates' policy are supported by Cottingham Parish Council and the Environment Agency. The Agency note that some areas may be located within areas which may be at flood risk and recommend that any regeneration should aim to provide betterment to mitigate against this risk.
- 2.20 The proposed 'Non Employment Uses in Established Industrial Estates' policy is largely supported. NCC welcomes the proposal to support the provision of ancillary services on industrial sites as a means of contributing to the health and wellbeing and thus quality of life of employees. Cottingham Parish Council is of the view that allowing other uses if there is no possibility of increased industrial or commercial activity is the only reasonable option. In their response, BOC note they are a major employer in the town, and whilst supporting the policy have requested that boundaries of Phoenix Parkway Industrial Estate be extended to include BOC's

premises on Weldon Road to afford these the protection that the policy offers, particularly in regard to residential development that could potentially conflict with BOC's operations.

- 2.21 With regard to the proposed 'Bad Neighbour Uses' policy, respondents suggest expanding the scope of the policy and additional wording. Cottingham Parish Council and Middleton Parish Council are of the view that all Sewage Treatment Works (and not just the Corby Works) should be considered 'bad neighbours' and requested that the policy be revised to reflect this. In addition Cottingham Parish Council suggest that in addition to a 400m exclusion zone there should also be a requirement that such operations should improve the effects of their activities. Anglian Water welcome the reference to applicants being required to consider any amenity impacts where developments are located within close proximity to Corby Water Recycling Centre (formerly sewage treatment works) and in addition note a number of other existing WRCs which serve settlements in the Corby Borough area – Cottingham/East Carlton, Gretton, Rockingham and Stanion. They suggest additional wording to the policy would ensure relevant proposals are accompanied by an odour assessment report and proposals for development adjacent to, or in the vicinity of a WRC would need to demonstrate that both the continued use of the WRC site is not compromised, and that the amenity of occupiers of new development will be satisfactory with the ongoing normal use of the WRC site.

Delivering Housing

- 2.22 Site promoters for Land off Corby Road, Gretton claim the Council has failed to provide suitable housing land supply updates on an annual basis and that if the Council is unable to deliver housing at a sufficient rate to meet the approved housing requirements then alternative development opportunities should be considered. The site promoters for Land south of Middleton object to the Council's approach to 'Delivering Housing' on the basis that the potential allocation options do not fulfil the Council's growth aspirations in line with the JCS strategic opportunity, but rather allocate to meet the housing requirement.
- 2.23 The Winchilsea Settled Estates believe too much housing is being concentrated in and around Corby and too little in the other settlements such as Gretton, and have promoted three areas of land around Gretton for residential development. The site owners at Little Stanion (JME Civils Ltd) request the allocation of the 'Tata land' to the east of Little Stanion for residential uses, which is linked to the revised legal agreements for the Little Stanion development.
- 2.24 Cottingham Parish Council supports the approach to 'Delivering Housing'. Highways England note the housing requirement remains the same at 9,200 dwellings, the strategic opportunity has decreased and that some sites have been identified to deliver up to 160 dwellings.
- 2.25 Gladman Developments comment on the Council's reliance on the delivery of the large scale SUEs in meeting our housing land supply requirements and identify a number of reasons the delivery of these types of development can be delayed. As such Gladman recommend a wide supply of individual small and medium scale sites be made available to provide choice and competition in the market; with the suggested allocation of sites to provide at least 20% headroom against the minimum local plan requirement to respond to changing circumstances. The Home Builders Federation echo the issues raised by Gladman, suggesting that in order to maximise housing supply, the widest possible range of sites, by size and market location, are required so that house builders of all types and sizes have access to suitable land in order to offer the widest possible range of products.

2.26 Harworth Group plc and Davidsons Developments disagree with the Council's view that there are not enough suitable and deliverable non-strategic development sites available to accommodate the whole of the strategic opportunity, and promote land at Weldon Park, Phase 2 for 475 dwellings as part of a wider scale strategic development.

2.27 Tata Steel (UK) Limited objects to the Council's approach to housing in meeting the strategic objectives in the JCS. Comments suggest that economic and retail growth in the borough have progressed in line with the JCS, therefore the level of housing provision in the Part 2 Local Plan should reflect the Strategic Opportunity target rather than simply meeting the requirement. It is suggested that the planned delivery at West Corby SUE is being used to disguise a shortfall of supply against the housing requirement. Additional comments highlight the need for the Plan to include a five year supply assessment and the application of a 20% buffer to provide choice and competition is supported.

2.28 A number of sites have been promoted for residential development, these include the following:

- Land south of Middleton, Middleton: An area of land (6ha) has been promoted on behalf of the landowners for 150 dwellings towards the south of Middleton village
- Red line plans for large areas of the Winchilsea Settled Estates near Gretton are promoted for residential development. No additional information has been provided at this stage
- Land to the east of Little Stanion: Tata land, which has been promoted by the site owners at Little Stanion for 125 dwellings.
- Land off Corby Road, Gretton
- Land at Weldon Park, Phase 2: Harworth Group plc and Davidsons Developments promote this site for 475 dwellings
- Land off Main Street Middleton: promoted for 1 dwelling.
- Land south of Stamford Road, Weldon: 25 dwellings, 1.1ha
- Land north of Stamford Road, Weldon: 4 dwellings, 0.16ha.
- Land west of Kettering Road, Weldon: 60 dwellings, 2.5ha
- Old Road, Stanion: 15 dwellings, 0.9ha.
- Land between Ashley Road and Glover Court, Middleton: promoted for up to 30 dwellings, 1.8ha.
- Land to the east of Ashley Road, Middleton: promoted for 10 dwellings, 0.5ha.
- Land off Southfield Road, Gretton: promoted and recently subject to planning application for 120 dwellings.
- Four sites have been promoted on behalf of Tata Steel (UK) Limited during this consultation:
 - Land south of Stamford Road, Weldon
 - Land north of Stamford Road, Weldon
 - Land west of Kettering Road, Weldon
 - Old Road, Stanion

2.29 In terms of site specific allocations, the Environment Agency support the policy requirement for a site specific flood risk assessment for Western Land at Pen Green, but recommend making reference to the Sustainability Appraisal. Homes England, as partial landowner, supports the allocation of Land off Elizabeth Street for housing.

Anglian Water have carried out initial assessments on all draft allocation sites relating to water supply and foul and surface water sewerage, and provide updated policy wording to include within revised site design principles. Councillor Watt objects to the proposed allocation of Western Land at Pen Green, due to highway access and highway capacity constraints.

- 2.30 Eight responses to the consultation were received in respect to the proposed policy on specialist housing and older people's accommodation. The public health department and adult social services department within the County Council welcomes policy that delivers housing suitable for the needs of older people. However both strongly feel that the provisions to include a proportion of housing to meet the needs of older households should be a requirement rather than encouraged. The adult social services department encourage a policy framework that delivers extra care accommodation but suggest that this does not have stringent age exclusion limits. The Planning Bureau on behalf of McCarthy and Stone welcomes policy that delivers housing suitable for the needs of older people. However they suggest that specific targets for specialist accommodation would be useful as would the identification of suitable sites, outside of the SUEs Extension's which have been required to make specific provision in this policy. Cottingham Parish Council supports the inclusion of policy to deliver specialist housing. David Lock Associates on behalf of Urban and Civic Corby Ltd does not object to the policy and are pleased to see a pragmatic approach in accordance with local need, location and viability. However they question reference to the North Northamptonshire Place Shaping SPD on the basis that it has not yet been published. Persimmon Homes object to the policy and want it deleted. They suggest that the policy is ambiguously worded and defers important issues to the planning application stage and therefore has the potential to stall housing delivery through prolonged negotiations. They refer to the Study of Housing and Support Needs of Older People across Northamptonshire and suggest alternative measures are an appropriate and proportionate way for increasing older persons housing, including the allocation of suitable sites. They consider that there is no clear evidence or assessment to show that the policy is proportionate to local need or the wider needs of Northamptonshire and how it will impact on the delivery of affordable housing. The HBF consider the policy unnecessary given the existing provisions set out in Policy 30 of the adopted JCS and that the Council should allocate appropriate sites to meet people's housing needs.
- 2.31 Six written responses were received in relation to the proposed policy on self build and custom housing. Most of these objects to policy that requires a proportion of self or custom build properties within major housing development proposals. Persimmon Homes suggest that the provision of land for self-build plots on major development sites obstructs the timely delivery of housing and reduces the funds available for infrastructure and affordable housing. They suggest that the need for self or custom build housing would be best served through the allocation of suitable sites for custom and self build. They consider that there is insufficient evidence to justify the proposed policy requirements or show that allocated sites cannot be identified for custom and self build. Similarly, Gladman Developments consider that the evidence does not provide the justification for the policy requirements and other reasonable alternatives should be explored to meet the demand for self and custom build, such as the use of exception site policy. David Lock Associates on behalf of Urban and Civic Corby Ltd object to the policy on the basis that provision would exceed demand and the loss of funding for physical and social infrastructure would undermine the success of strategic developments or inflate the cost of individual plots. The HBF are supportive

of proposals to encourage custom and self build, however they are not supportive of the policy requirement for a proportion of self or custom build properties within major development proposals. They suggest that support for custom and self build should be based on evidence of need and consideration should be given to the practicalities of building, viability and reduced funding for physical and social infrastructure. They suggest an alternative approach would be self or custom build exceptions sites in the rural area. Barton Wilmore on behalf of stakeholders delivering the West Corby SUE question the level of demand for self or custom build and suggest that the proposed policy requirements would deliver in excess of currently identified demand. They suggest changes are made to the policy which seeks a more appropriate negotiated approach taking account of need, deliverability and viability. Cottingham Parish Council question how support for custom and self build will affect overall housing requirements.

2.32 Gretton Parish Council raise concern that there is not sufficient transit pitches in the borough to deter unauthorised encampments. Cottingham Parish Council support the Council's approach to not allocate any new gypsy and traveller sites in the borough. Middleton Parish Council highlights the importance of planning for gypsy and traveller sites to ensure these are in the right location. Middleton Parish Council also request further information as to what updating the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment will entail.

2.33 Cottingham Parish Council request clarification over the definition of "built-up areas" in applying Draft Policy 12 'Residential Gardens'.

Villages and Rural Areas

2.34 Cottingham Parish Council support the restrictions associated with 'Restraint Villages', but comment that the Council's preferred approach prevents other villages from also being designated.

2.35 The Winchilea Settled Estates request the settlement boundary for Gretton be amended to include their promoted sites. Cottingham Parish Council believe the criteria for defining villages boundaries is open to interpretation and could allow for development to occur outside the settlement boundary. Site promoters for land off Corby Road, Gretton object to the proposed 'Settlement Boundaries' policy believing the definition of open countryside to be incorrect. Gladman Developments do not support the Council's preferred option to identify settlement boundaries as they consider these to be too restrictive and inflexible to cope with changing circumstances across the plan period. They suggest that criteria based policy would be more flexible, against which proposals for development adjacent to the existing built up area of settlements could be assessed. The Home Builders Federation advocate a more permissive approach to development adjoining as well as within settlement boundaries to provide flexibility to the housing land supply, given the housing supply and affordability issues facing rural communities. Middleton Parish Council support the Council's preferred option to identify settlement boundaries, to prevent coalescence and retain the distinctive local character of the rural areas. Tata Steel (UK) Limited objects to the proposed settlement boundary for Weldon and request their promoted site north of Stamford Road be included within the settlement boundary. West Corby SUE landowners and site promoters request boundary amendments to incorporate the full extent of the northern road corridor in line with the latest proposals for the site.

2.36 Landowners promoting land south of Middleton comment that the urban areas cannot meet the housing growth needs in the borough in full and that the Council's preferred option not to allocate sites for housing in the rural area does not meet the

Council's aspiration to deliver the JCS strategic opportunity and is contrary to the NPPF. Support from Gretton Parish Council to the Council's approach to planning for the rural areas, recognising that development should be responsive to local circumstances and reflective of local needs. The Environment Agency comment that subject to the Council reviewing the decision not to allocate sites for housing in the rural area; any potential development sites would need to be subject to appropriate sequential tests as set out in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. Cottingham Parish Council agrees that the rural housing needs surveys should guide future development in the rural area. Site promoters for Land off Corby Road, Gretton suggest the housing market needs within the rural areas need to be reviewed as there is potential for small and medium sized developments to come forward. Comments question the validity of the housing needs surveys already undertaken and suggest 'Parish Health Checks' should be undertaken for the villages. Site promoters for both sites off Ashley Road, Middleton re-iterate the availability of both sites for development. Promoters for the site off Ashley Road question the robustness of the housing needs surveys undertaken, suggesting they underestimate the true position because additional local housing needs will be generated over the whole plan period up to 2031. Gladman Developments re-iterate the availability of land at Southfield Road, Gretton, which has recently been the subject of an outline planning application (18/0021/OUT) for 120 dwellings. Support from Middleton Parish Council to the Council's approach not to allocate further sites for housing development in the rural areas, agreeing that sufficient sites have been given planning permission to meet the need for market housing. Comments also note that the majority of West Corby falls within Middleton Parish boundary, which could assist in meeting the housing needs of the village.

- 2.37 Under other matters, Cottingham Parish Council comment that controlled farm diversification is necessary, and that the development of West Corby will increase traffic through and around Cottingham.

Town Centre and Town Centre Uses

- 2.38 Respondents generally support the proposed regeneration and spatial strategies for Corby Town Centre and the issues that they are seeking to address. Cottingham Parish Council suggest that the market evidence underpinning the regeneration strategy might now be considered out of date and that implementing it through the Part 2 Local Plan may prove challenging. They also stress that the application of principles regarding the protection of woodland at Hazelwood will be important when determining proposals for Parkland Gateway.
- 2.39 Homes England state that the opportunity site at Everest Lane has potential to deliver housing, possibly as part of a residential led, mixed use scheme. They suggest that the site specific principles should be altered to reflect this and raise the opportunity of preparing a development brief with the Council.
- 2.40 The Forestry Commission provides a specific request to amend site design principles for Parkland Gateway opportunity site.
- 2.41 Cushman and Wakefield on behalf of Sovereign Centros and Corby Town Centre SARL support the strategy of continued growth and regeneration of Corby Town Centre and support the identification of primary and secondary shopping frontages. They request further clarity on what uses would be permitted on upper floors above shops and reiterate their position that town centre uses should be directed to Corby Town Centre first.

- 2.42 Cottingham Parish Council supports the rejection of the NPPF default 2,500m² (floorspace-based) retail impact thresholds. However, NJL Consulting on behalf of Peel Investment Property objects to the proposed local impact thresholds and the evidence informing these thresholds. In their response, they suggest that a separate impact threshold of around 2,000m² be applied to development at Corby Retail Park.
- 2.43 Respondents support the inclusion of the retail hierarchy. NJL Consulting on behalf of Peel Investment Property suggest that the Corby Retail Park (Phoenix Parkway) should be included in the retail hierarchy. Cottingham Parish Council provides support for policy coverage of neighbourhood and village centres outside of the retail hierarchy.
- 2.44 Cottingham Parish Council express concern in relation to the lack of policies managing A5 uses (A5 use covers hot food takeaways), despite the currently low proliferation of these uses across the Borough.
- 2.45 Barton Wilmore on behalf of the stakeholders delivering the West Corby SUE provides further details on the proposed district centre at West Corby SUE and request that these details are embedded within the Part 2 Local Plan.

Sustainability Appraisal

- 2.46 Two respondents provide comments on the Sustainability Appraisal. Harris Lamb on behalf of Tata Steel do not feel that the Sustainability Appraisal explores the negative impact of Corby West SUE not delivering at the planned rate nor explores the alternatives to meeting the strategic opportunity for delivering homes as set out in the JCS. The Environment Agency comments are referenced under 'Delivering Economic Prosperity'.

Habitats Regulation Assessment

- 2.47 There were no comments received on the Habitats Regulations Assessment.

Appendices

- 2.48 Only one comment was received which covered the Appendices. David Lock Associates on behalf of Urban & Civic Corby Ltd. note the inclusion of Priors Hall Park within the housing trajectory table (Appendix 1) and request to provide the Council with more accurate projections of annual completions.

3. Next Steps for the preparation of the Pre-Submission Plan

- 3.1 Following consideration and further analysis of the comments received in response to the Part 2 Local Plan - Emerging Draft Options consultation, the next stage will be to prepare a plan for publication and to publish it under Regulation 19. This will be the document that the Council considers is ready for examination. The Publication Plan must be published together with other 'proposed submission documents', for a six-week period to seek stakeholder representations as to the soundness and legal compliance of the Plan before it can be submitted to the Planning Inspectorate for examination. However, should any significant alterations be made to the strategy and approach set out within the Part 2 Local Plan - Emerging Draft Options consultation, the Council may first be required to undertake additional consultation under the Regulation 18 stage.
- 3.2 In order to maintain progress it is clear, from the consultation responses that we need to continue to strengthen our evidence base to address the issues raised through consultation as well as ensure that any outstanding gaps in the evidence are filled, whilst preparing the final draft version of the plan over the next four months.

4. Options to be considered (if any)

Not to advise members of the results of consultation on the Part 2 Local Plan - Emerging Draft Options and implications for the next stages of plan preparation.

5. Issues to be taken into account:-

Policy Priorities

The Part 2 Local Plan supports the current priorities set out in the Corporate Plan 2015-2020, but to some extent will also help frame future priorities beyond the current Corporate Plan period.

Financial

Budget to support the preparation of the Part 2 Local Plan for Corby agreed at One Corby Policy Committee on 29th November 2016.

Legal

The consultation undertaken accords with Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012

Human Rights, Community Safety, Equalities and Sustainability

The Local Plan draws together policies and proposals which are fundamental to achieving sustainable development, promoting community safety and making a positive contribution to human rights, equality and diversity.

Performance Information

None directly linked to this report.

Best Value

None directly linked to this report.

Risk Management

There are no specific risks arising from this information report.

6. Recommendation

- 6.1 To note the content of the report

Background Papers

[North Northamptonshire Statement of Community Involvement](#), January 2014

[One Corby Policy Committee](#), 29th November 2016

[Local Plan Committee](#), 20th June 2018

Officer to Contact

Terry Begley
Principal Planner
01536 463185