



South Kesteven District Council comments on the Draft Version of the Corby Glen Neighbourhood Plan

<u>Policy / Paragraph/ Section</u>	<u>Comment / Recommendation</u>
Page1.10	First paragraph - As a point of clarification, SKDC request that the paragraph be updated to reflect the new recently published Local Development Scheme timetable with examination of the Local Plan review taking place in Winter of 2024 /25 and adoption expected to be in 2026.
Policy CG1	SKDC supports the inclusion of a sustainable development policy within the Corby Glen Neighbourhood Plan. Although SKDC feel that some elements of the policy are repetitive. SKDC suggests the removal of the first part of the policy <i>“As appropriate to their scale, nature and location”</i> given scale and location are covered by Criteria A / B)
Policy CG1 – Explanation	Third Sentence – As a point of clarification, SKDC request that the sentence is updated to reflect the ‘Design Guidelines for Rutland and South Kesteven’ document has now been adopted.
Policy CG2	While SKDC understands that during the production stages of the Corby Glen Neighbourhood Plan allocated site LV-H5 was in the preliminary or early stages of the planning application process – However in the time between the draft consultation on the Neighbourhood Plan and formal submission to SKDC there has been full planning permission granted for 265 units under development codes S21/1841 and S19/2235 for 199 units and 66 units respectively. Both developments are under construction and as of 1 April 2023, 15 units have completed. There are no further applications and the site is expected to be completed within the next 5 years. SKDC questions the need for this policy to be included within the Corby Glen Neighbourhood Plan given the allocated site is already subject to two full approved planning applications and development is already underway.
Policy CG3	Criteria A – SKDC suggest the phrase <i>“(usually expected to be no more than 11 dwellings) as defined in the adopted Local Plan”</i> is moved into the explanatory text section given that adopted Local Plan Policy SP3 relating to infill development does not specifically define a set amount of development within the policy itself.
Policy CG6	First Paragraph – SKDC suggest that the phrase <i>“More detail, including maps and photographs are provided in the accompanying document entitled “Key Views”</i> is moved into the explanatory section of the text given that it is providing information and is not really adding anything to the overall policy.



Policy CG7	SKDC suggests that the third part of the policy “ <i>Development proposals should preserve or enhance the asset in question and contribute to the quality and character of its setting</i> ” is recast to form the opening element of the policy to ensure that it has the clarity required by the NPPF and flows in a more procedural way.
Policy CG8	Criteria C – SKDC have some concerns that the criterion does not meet the clarity standards required by the NPPF. This is as the phrase “ <i>central focus to the community</i> ” could be difficult to judge and implement from a decision making standpoint.
Policy CG9	Third Paragraph – SKDC has concerns over this paragraph as it is essentially rehashing the decision making element of the development management process and officers are expected to always use a ‘balanced judgement’ when assessing an application against the relevant policies. Fourth Paragraph – As a point of clarification, SKDC suggests the removal of this paragraph as it is a duplication of paragraph 2.
Policy CG10 – Explanation	As a point of clarification SKDC would highlight that the quote is now from paragraph 194 of the NPPF and not paragraph 189.
Policy CG11	SKDC suggest a recasting of the policy to have the second paragraph be moved to the opening part of the policy so that it flows in a more procedural way.
Policy CG12	LGS1 Mussons Close - SKDC are supportive of “ part ” of this LGS allocation and notes the extensive undertaking of work in the “The Compelling case for Local Green Space designation – Musson’s Close” as part of the evidence base document. Although, SKDC would like to note that the southern portion of the site has been subject to a number of recent planning applications over the years as follows. S20/1809 - Change of use of land to two Gypsy and Traveller pitches (refused) S19/1299 - Outline planning permission for the erection of one single storey dwelling (appeal dismissed) s16/1717 - Erection of two semi-detached bungalows (Refused) As Local Green Spaces effectively take on the same status as greenbelt land there is a requirement under paragraph 140 of the NPPF that they must endure beyond the plan period. SKDC therefore also have concerns that this specific area (the southern portion) of the LGS may not be suitable to endure for the length of the Plan period as while there is no current live application on the part of the LGS at the time of this repose development has actively been sought on the site in recent years.
Policy CG15	Second paragraph, second sentence – SKDC have concerns over the sentence as it is more of a statement than any relation to the policy. In order to meet the clarity required by the NPPF SKDC suggest this sentence is removed and a space is added between the first sentence and the third sentence in order to separate the different elements of the policy.



Policy CG16	Second paragraph, second sentence – SKDC have concerns over the sentence as it is more of a statement than any relation to the policy. In order to meet the clarity required by the NPPF SKDC suggest this sentence is removed and a space is added between the first sentence and the third sentence in order to separate the different elements of the policy.
Policy CG19	Second Paragraph – SKDC suggest that a space is added between the first and second sentence in order to separate the different elements of the policy.
General Clarification Point – Explanatory text	Throughout the explanatory text there are a number of the NPPF paragraph references made which relate to an older version of the NPPF. This therefore means there are contextual inaccuracies and quotes that no longer relate to their intended paragraph. SKDC therefore suggest that all of these references are reviewed to ensure they correspond with the most up to date version of the NPPF.