

Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004

**Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 -
Regulation 19**

Site 4a Land North of Abbey Street, Daventry

At its meeting on 24th February 2005 Daventry District Council resolved to adopt the Concept Statement for Site 4a at Land North of High Street, Daventry.

Any person aggrieved by the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) may apply to the High Court for permission to apply for judicial review of the decision to adopt the SPD.

Any such application for leave must be made promptly and in any event not later than 3 months after the date on which the SPD was adopted.

Ossie Williams
Corporate Manager - Policy
February 2005

Daventry District Council
Lodge Road
Daventry
Northamptonshire
NN11 4FP



Daventry District Council

Planning Policy

Lodge Road

DAVENTRY

NN11 4FP

planningpolicy@daventrydc.gov.uk

Site 4a Land North of Abbey Street, Daventry Concept Statement

Adopted as a Supplementary Planning
Document

February 2005

REPORT ON CONSULTATION AND PUBLICITY

RESPONSES TO REPRESENTATIONS

CHANGES TO DRAFT

Site 4a Land North of Abbey Street, Daventry

Introduction

The Concept Statement provides guidance for future development in Daventry Town Centre.

At its meeting on 17th September 2004 the Council's Strategy Group approved the draft Concept Statement for the purposes of consultation.

Consultation

During the week commencing 25 October 2004 over 700 letters and emails were sent to organisations, town and parish councils and individuals who were listed on the Council's database. In addition, nearby dwellings on the Southbrook residential area were informed by letter of the consultation.

Publicity

The draft Concept Statement was posted on the planning consultation section of the Council's website.

The Council placed advertisements in the Daventry Express, The Northampton Chronicle and Echo and the London Gazette. A copy of the advertisement is included at Appendix A.

Consultation Period

The consultation period ended at 5pm on Friday 10th December 2004.

Comments received.

14 organisations and individuals responded to the consultation. Appendix B contains a summary of all the representations. Copies of the full representations can be viewed at the Council's offices by prior appointment.

Consideration of Responses

The representations were reported to the Council's Strategy Group at its meeting on 13th January 2005 and Full Council on 24 February 2005. The Council agreed a response to each of the comments and agreed, where appropriate, changes to the document in response to the comments.

Advertisement

DAVENTRY DISTRICT COUNCIL

Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004)

Site 4 Land North of Abbey Street, Daventry

**Concept Statement (Consultation Draft) (September 2004)
and
Sustainability Appraisal (Consultation Draft) (October 2004)**

At the meeting of the Council's Strategy Group on 17th September 2004 it was resolved that the Site 4 Concept Statement and Sustainability Appraisal be published for consultation.

The Concept Statement sets out how the Council expects to see the site developed for retail and other uses.

The accompanying Sustainability Appraisal provides an analysis of sustainability issues relevant to the Site.

The Council welcomes comments from any interested party on the documents. The documents are available for inspection at Planning Reception, Daventry District Council, Lodge Road, Daventry. Daventry, Moulton, Kingsthorpe, Long Buckby, Woodford Halse and Brixworth Libraries and the Information Service Offices at Woodford Halse and Brixworth during normal opening hours.

A copy is also available on the Council's website (www.daventrydc.gov.uk/planningconsultation).

Comments in writing should be forwarded to Karen Britton, Senior Planning Officer, Daventry District Council, Lodge Road, Daventry, Northamptonshire, NN11 4PF or e-mailed to kbritton@daventrydc.gov.uk by **5pm on Friday 10th December 2004** at the latest. Please note that comments received after this date cannot be accepted.

Simon Bovey
Director of Public Protection.

Site 4a Land North of Abbey Street, Daventry

RESPONSES TO CONCEPT STATEMENT (CONSULTATION DRAFT)

The table below sets out a summary of all responses received. “No comments and General points” are followed by responses to the specific questions in the consultation document. Respondees are listed by name to the left of their response, with the full list of respondees given below. Short-hand for terms is also used within the text i.e

DDC = Daventry District Council

CS = Concept Statement

TCV = Daventry Town Centre Vision

SPG = Supplementary Planning Guidance

SUDS = Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems

NCC = Northamptonshire County Council

Respondees List

1. National Trust
2. Easynet Telecom
3. The Health and Safety Executive
4. Mrs S Adam
5. English Heritage
6. Northamptonshire Heritage
7. Mr R Sharp
8. The Daventry and District Civic Society
9. Daventry Town Council
10. Norton Parish Council
11. Charles Planning Associates
12. Weedon Bec Parish Council with Daventry Villages Together
13. Chesterhouse Properties
14. Sport England

No Comment

A reply of "No Comment" was received from:

**The National Trust
Sport England**

Respondee	Summary of Comment	Response	Changes to CS
	General Comments		
Easynet Telecom	Easynet Telecom will not be affected by these works.	<u>Point noted</u>	None
Health and Safety Executive	This is not within consultation distance of any hazardous installation and HSE does not have any comments to make on grounds of health and safety.	<u>Point noted</u>	None
English Heritage	The Site is not within the Conservation Area and EH remit is therefore limited – do not wish to make formal comments, however any development should enhance the setting of the Conservation Area and try and restore a sense of enclosure and street frontage that once existed, as well as views/greenspace identified. It is important that development is sympathetic and compatible.	<u>Points noted and support for CS content/objectives welcomed</u>	None
Northamptonshire Heritage	The building has been substantially altered and there would be little gain from recording it – we have no concerns.	<u>Point noted</u>	None
Mrs S Adam	Before the site is committed to development, different sites should be investigated e.g run down industrial areas, which do not border housing. It is	Current national planning policy on town centres and retail development promotes development, which reduces	None

	unrealistic to expect the shopping public will park this far from the town centre to use the town centre, or those in the town centre will walk this far out of town. Bulky goods retail area, to which people would drive, could more easily be situated on industrial land...	car use and where all people have access to services. Sequential tests are carried out to determine location – this means that central town centre locations must be provided for retail use first, followed by those on edge of town centre areas and finally those out of town. This site provides the most central site to the town centre for this scale of retail use, as highlighted in the Daventry Town Centre Vision 2021 (July 2004)	
The Daventry and District Civic Society	Concern that a full traffic survey of the Town should be undertaken before development plans are drawn up.	DDC Engineers are currently considering this.	None
Charles Planning Associates	<p>The CS states the Town Centre Vision was adopted in April 2004, however the TCV Report is dated July 2004. In the interests of consistency the CS should clarify the correct date.</p> <p>The CS does not clearly set out the expected developer contributions....needs to cross reference to the SPD Infrastructure.</p>	<p>The Vision was adopted by Daventry District Council in April 2004, however the document was not published until July 2004, hence the July 2004 date on the document. CS will clarify this.</p> <p>A CS is a design document, which sets out the expected design layout – it is not the role of a CS to set out the detailed contribution requirements. These will be drawn up through the planning process. However, cross-reference can be made to Infrastructure Interim SPD.</p>	<p>Amend CS</p> <p>None</p>

	<p>The CS does not include a constraints map, which would help illustrate internal and external issues.</p> <p>The CS should illustrate the need to create appropriate pedestrian and cyclist routes.</p>	<p>The CS contains a plan showing constraints e.g TPOs, Conservation Area. This is adequate for the purposes of producing a design layout.</p> <p>CS plan to be amended to highlight more clearly desire to improve routes.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Amend CS</p>
	Q1 Does this accurately reflect the Site's Character ?		
Mrs S Adam	No, there is no mention of views from residential areas close to the proposed development.	Point noted – CS to be amended	Amend CS
Weedon Bec Parish Council with Daventry Villages Together	No – only reflects part of the whole site of Site 4...	Confirm Site 4 CS reflects a smaller area of the Site 4 than is identified in the TCV – CS will be re-named as Site 4a to distinguish it from any other site 4 areas of the TCV produced in the future through CSs and additional text will be included in the policy section on page 2 to reflect this.	Amend CS
Mr R Sharp The Daventry and District Civic Society Daventry Town Council	Yes, General agreement.	<u>Point noted</u>	None
Chesterhouse Properties	Add text - The two dwellings are not of any architectural significance, nor do they form any cohesive part of the urban street edge.	<u>Amend CS to reflect the architectural quality</u>	Amend CS

	Q2 Do you agree with these objectives ?		
Chesterhouse Properties	<p>Suggest “Provides for undercroft and decked public parking”</p> <p>Also..</p> <p>“Provides a definitive visible edge to the town centre and therefore the connection to existing retail provisions within the town without dominating the important conservation area views”.</p> <p>“Provides a strong frontage onto Abbey Street and with entrances on Abbey Street and Welton Road to encourage shoppers from the High Street.</p>	<p>Amend CS to reflect this</p> <p>The suggested text “definitive visible edge” could be mis-interpreted i.e development should be visible from the town centre, however visibility into the site from beyond the site to the north and east should be of a green canopy effect, not dominated by development.</p> <p>Amend CS to reflect this – but emphasis on “pedestrian” entrances</p>	<p>Amend CS</p> <p>None</p> <p>Amend CS</p>
Charles Planning Associates	<p>Support that the site is in need of regeneration and provides an opportunity for a landmark building. Support bulky goods given lack of such provision in Daventry. The CS should define the term bulky goods.</p>	<p>CS to be amended to give examples of Bulky Goods</p>	<p>Amend CS</p>
Norton Parish Council	<p>Accept need for bulky goods, but this site is too small to provide adequate choice and selection of retailers or product ranges. Suggest a larger site, on the edge of town, which would also be appropriate for delivery vehicles and keep them away from the town centre. Understand the case for location within town centre, however feel</p>	<p>As per response to Mrs Adam - current national planning policy on town centres and retail development promotes development, which reduces car use and where <u>all</u> people have access to services. Sequential tests are carried out</p>	<p>None</p>

	<p>few people would walk from the site to the bus station and travel on public transport carrying their bulky goods with them; shoppers will opt for an area which gives them the opportunity to visit several stores during one trip. This site cannot accommodate car park and level of choice shoppers expect, as a result will suffer poor foot-fall and usage, which will lead to poor service and reputation.</p> <p>As Daventry is a market town serving rural hinterlands, we would stress parking remain free, otherwise shoppers would be even more likely to use others towns which have better shopping/parking e.g Northampton.</p>	<p>to determine location – this means that central town centre locations must be provided for retail use first, followed by those on edge of town centre areas and finally those out of town. This site provides the most central site to the town centre for this scale of retail use, as highlighted in the Daventry Town Centre Vision 2021 (July 2004). Retail requires servicing by delivery vehicles and this is unlikely to change. The points are noted re- shoppers preferences. Provision of a bulky goods store in the town centre will enable an element of choice to the town, which has been very limited to date. Parking fees are not relevant to this CS. These comments will be passed to DDC Engineers who are responsible for this.</p>	
<p>Daventry Town Council</p>	<p>Would advocate a limit of 2 storeys on Abbey Street to avoid overbearing frontage.</p>	<p>The CS specifies 2 storeys, in order to fit into the setting, however it is recognised that there may be opportunities to provide 2.5/3 storey as landmark features, depending upon setting/topography. This would provide variety in design, in order to enhance the attractiveness of the site as a</p>	<p>None</p>

		gateway to the town.	
The Daventry and District Civic Society	With a reservation - decked parking will be less attractive than current car parks.	Well-designed decked parking should however be as attractive as surface parking.	None
Weedon Bec Parish Council with Daventry Villages Together	In part – gives no indication as to concentration, size or number of units required to achieve floor space determined in Retail Capacity Study. Does not indicate type of bulky goods.	CS provides height/layout guidance. It is not for the CS to specify how to achieve the requirements. It is the architect's job to design their development to meet requirements. As per Charles Planning Associates – CS to be amended to provide clarity	None Amend CS
	Q3 Can you suggest any others?		
The Daventry and District Civic Society	No		
Daventry Town Council	The developer should be encouraged to provide public conveniences	Developers will have to ensure they meet Disability Discrimination Act/ Building Regulation requirements.	None
Norton Parish Council	More appropriate for leisure use –cinema, restaurants, fitness facilities provided under one roof: - enliven town centre; ease of access via public transport; ensure greater use of decked parking; currently no cinema therefore reduce trips to surrounding towns.	The TCV work identified this site as suitable for bulky goods, while it highlights a larger Leisure Quarter in the vicinity of the Outdoor Pool to cater for leisure use.	None
Chesterhouse Properties	Uses Suggested new wording underlined - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is envisaged that the primary land use for Site 4 shall be bulky goods retail, associated parking and public car parking 	The use section already highlights the primary uses required – how these uses might be provided are not appropriate to this section.	None

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The retail parking and servicing configuration will need to address the needs of bulky goods occupiers • The public car parking will be within a combination of undercroft, where part of the retail and possibly multi level decked parking • The phased provision of these uses will be acceptable • The Local Planning Authority will also consider complementary uses, which may include residential accommodation above retail, financial and professional services, or other town centre uses subject to addressing the main design requirements to attract bulky goods occupiers. 		
Weedon Bec Parish Council with Daventry Villages Together	On site frontage parking for the disabled and maybe mother's and toddlers	This is identified to the developer through SPG Parking, which is referred to in the CS, however this could also be highlighted more specifically under the parking point p7 of the draft CS – CS to be amended to reflect this	Amend CS
	Q4 Do you agree with these uses?		
Norton Parish Council	As question 3 above		
Mr R Sharp	<p>The earlier Georgian stonework of the Working Men's Club should be kept as a feature in the area – storage facilities could be an addition to the rear.</p> <p>Accept that the lower levels could be used for low-level decked car parking. Agree,</p>	Advice from Northamptonshire Heritage is that the current building is not of significant value to warrant retention. Based on this advice, retention is therefore not proposed.	None

	<p>should not be higher than 3 storeys.</p> <p>Accept very useful to have some retail units down Abbey Street.</p>		
The Daventry and District Civic Society	<p>Vague – If the whole site is not intended for the primary use, then how much? Are the complementary uses all, or mainly envisaged as being above retail.</p>	<p>The main use will be bulky retails and decked parking. However, a developer might put forward a layout that includes e.g flat above the retail or small frontage development on Abbey Street consisting of some commercial/office use. This will be considered, however the developer must be able to meet the bulky good/ parking targets.</p>	None
Chesterhouse Properties	<p>Suggested new wording</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “The WMC currently requires to be relocated on site, preferably on the corner of Abbey Street and Welton Road. The developer will need to work with the WMC to fully assess their requirements but provide assistance in identifying alternative locations either on or off site if this is acceptable to them”. 	<p>The CS is concerned with the future layout/design of the area. The developer will have to meet these terms. The future of the WMC is a matter for them to decide, however if they wish to remain on site, their relocation must fit in with the objectives of this CS in terms of design/layout. Relocation is not the responsibility of this CS.</p>	None
Weedon Bec Parish Council with Daventry Villages Together	<p>No – area could be better used as a “performance space” (Peabody Trust) development in London – theatre, museum, cultural and sporting venues – could encompass existing Leisure Centre and be added enhancement to the new Leisure/Office Complex proposed - Eastern Way.</p>	<p>The CS picks up on work undertaken by TCV and Retail Capacity Study on deficit of bulky goods retail in Daventry, hence this is seen as a suitable location that meets PPG6 requirements.</p>	None

	<p>Addition of smaller retail/residential units along Abbey St/ Welton Rd could provide footfall and single persons accommodation, which would fit well with Conservation Area and create visually pleasing western gateway to town.</p> <p>Plan 1 Agree</p> <p>Plan 2 Conceptual idea of car park (the photo) is best solution to prevent eyesore – concern re- criminal activities, crime and design issues; Also, hope materials used in photo are not used here; agree with location to blend into height levels.</p> <p>Flats/offices over retail – good idea. Need to be restricted to retain views/roofscape. Might be prudent to mix use for security purposes on the site. If cultural concept is considered, flats would be more suitable over small retail units.</p> <p>Site would encourage some small interest from “larger named stores” – consider also expanding where Focus is. – greater scope for “big named” retailers; encourage non-essential use of motor vehicles to town to collect goods (includes vans); compliment</p>	<p>CS provides scope for this as an option</p> <p>Point noted.</p> <p>CS provides reference to crime/security measures and reference to SPG Planning out Crime. CS shows photo with primary aim of showing an example of how planting can soften such development. It does not specify that the materials in the photo should be used here. CS provides guidance. Point noted re-levels.</p> <p>CS covers views etc. Developer may choose to provide mix. As per comments above re- cultural area.</p> <p>Larger sites may well attract “larger names”. Development near Focus, as per Mrs Adam and Norton PC response - current national planning policy on town centres and retail</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p>
--	---	--	---

	<p>other towns in the country; bulky goods retail is not suited to the concept of a market town – the scale would not be able to be developed on this site.</p>	<p>development promotes development, which reduces car use and where <u>all</u> people have access to services. Sequential tests are carried out to determine location – this means that central town centre locations must be provided for retail use first, followed by those on edge of town centre areas and finally those out of town. This site provides the most central site to the town centre for this scale of retail use. The town currently provides limited choice in terms of bulky retail, hence by providing more choice, the aim is to prevent shoppers travelling to other towns to purchase these types of goods i.e reducing traffic and providing a local retail service.</p>	
	<p>Q5 Do you agree with the issues raised under landscape and views?</p>		
<p>Chesterhouse Properties</p>	<p>Suggested new wording – “green edge character”</p> <p>“Views to be retained/ respected..”</p>	<p>However, it is not just the edges of the site that are green</p> <p>Point noted – Amend CS</p>	<p>None</p> <p>Amend CS</p>
<p>Norton Parish Council Charles Planning Associates The Daventry and District Civic</p>	<p>Yes</p>		<p>None</p>

Society Daventry Town Council			
Mr R Sharp	Any good distance view lines should be maintained wherever possible, especially to any green areas of town.	Contained in CS already	None
Mrs S Adam	Proposals suggest soft edge should be retained, yet diagram shows existing green borders built over. Limits have been suggested for height of development, in terms of storeys and roofline. However, these would be considerably higher than the existing skyline of the area. Considerable area of shrubs and trees, which are presently an attractive site from surrounding residential areas, do not appear in the proposals.	CS plan to be amended It is the intention that the height would be sympathetic to its surroundings and would sit at a lower level than the Civic Offices, in order to blend in. The CS strongly highlights the need to retain a green character to the area, however the CS will be amended emphasis view from residential areas	Amend CS
Daventry Town Council	Consider providing wide verge, as a strong feature to eastern way frontage...	Amend CS to reflect verges	Amend CS
Weedon Bec Parish Council with Daventry Villages Together	Not entirely – encourage retention of WMC and remaining Georgian features; disgraceful to demolish non-listed buildings, where there is a deemed need; have lost too many borderline historical buildings... TPO should be well preserved; semi-mature trees should be managed	Advice from Northamptonshire Heritage is that the current building is not of significant value to warrant retention. Based on this advice, retention is therefore not proposed. TPOs are highlighted in CS. CS to be amended to suggest re-	None Amend CS

	appropriately – where need arises trees/low-level planting to be re-planted elsewhere in town or offered to public; mature hedgerows abutting road should be retained and protected as form large part of wildlife ecosystem of the town. Replacements should be wildlife-friendly.	use where on site retention cannot take place. Additional survey work has taken place on the vegetation since the consultation draft was circulated and the CS will be amended to reflect more retention. Wildlife-friendly planting is highlighted already in the CS.	
	Q6 Do you agree with these layout and design principles?		
Norton Parish Council	Yes, especially minimising visual impact of parking.	Point noted	None
Chesterhouse Properties	Delete point 4 under Layout and Design i.e “The Developer is encouraged to consider incorporating this layout effect”. New text suggested <i>“The developer will address the need to address pedestrian connectivity from the existing high street through the use of Welton Road and Abbey Street as an ‘entrance’ through the most effective use of built form and open vistas to ensure the draw to the retail units”.</i> Point 9 new text suggested – “If phased the earlier phases should consider the pedestrian linkage with this second phased parking”. Point 10 – “The scheme will be designed to	However, this is considered an issue that the developer is not required to do, but as it says needs to consider. Amend CS to reflect this, however “open vistas” is not appropriate /clears enough terminology in terms of providing clarity. CS is concerned with design, not phasing therefore not relevant to the CS CS already specifies	None Amend CS None None

	<p>minimise the effect of the ‘bulky’ nature of the retail box through the effective use of layout, materials, roofscape etc whilst providing large and uniform enough footprints to ensure a high standard of operator is secured”.</p> <p>Point 16 - new text underlined - Visible flat roofs will not be <u>avoided</u>. Roofscapes shall not obscure key views identified on Plan 1 and identified in the “Views” section above.</p>	<p>development, which appears to look like one large “box-like building” will be unacceptable. It is for the developer to creatively design their development to meet the objectives.</p> <p>Good architects should have the ability to design a building(s) that fit comfortably within the site setting, meeting the design objectives.</p>	None
Daventry Town Council	Support inspirational design and variety, but protect church, churchyard, Conservation Area, Market Street, Abbey Street.	Points noted	None
Mrs S Adam	Underpass at South Way described as attractive – this is laughable. It has been improved from downright awful to just about tolerable, but is not irreplaceable.	Controlled surface or bridge crossings are preferable to underpasses. They are not a desirable design option e.g in terms of general attractiveness to users, misuse i.e graffiti, and fear of crime etc. However, as underpasses go, this one has CCTV, is straight and has clear exit and entrance points and therefore is not unusable. The change in levels in the area make the underpass a convenient way for people to access the town centre, however people have the option to alternatively use the crossing if they prefer.	None

Mr R Sharp	Plans should not allow any developer to construct any high buildings, which could infringe on the skyline and cause a blot on the roofscape.	Point noted – CS objectives cover this	None
Daventry Town Council	Access of revised South Way to be key determination of layout of site. It may be advantageous to separate car access from HGV – visibility for drivers should not be impeded along the highway routes to service roads and car parking entrances/exits.	Highway access will play an important role for this site and proposals will need to take on board a holistic approach to this. Highway issues e.g visibility for drivers will be picked up as a matter of course through the planning process.	None
The Daventry and District Civic Society	<p>No, Query - can the developer use Whelton Road as he likes?</p> <p>Lodge Rd and Abbey Street are the only obvious routes and will need considerable re-vamping, if there is to be a realistic “Knitting-in” to the town centre.</p> <p>The visual stop raises the question what sort of entrance is there to be? Plan 2 shows it as a key entrance, but does not explain whether for vehicles or pedestrians.</p>	<p>Developer can consider what layout they feel is workable – as with all development this will then be a matter of consideration and negotiation, as to what might best be achieved for the benefit in this case to the town centre area.</p> <p>Point noted</p> <p>A visual stop is highlighted with the aim of attracting shoppers from the town centre i.e pedestrians. Vehicular access on a corner into the site is not appropriate. Welton Road is a key pedestrian/ vehicular route i.e entrance into the site, with the visual stop providing a key gateway feature to the site. CS</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>Amend CS</p>

	<p>Concerned about buildings of up to 3 storeys backing onto South Way and Eastern Way. There seems to be no definition of the verges, or treatment of the road frontages. If 3 storey development is envisaged right up against these roads, it would ruin an important entry to the Town Centre.</p> <p>We think the document must first decide the area for development, then indicate a reasonable building line, to preserve current levels of safety and amenity and also say something about preserving the leafy appearance of these important approach roads.</p> <p>The enhancement of pedestrian approaches must include complete re-planning of the Council Car park Area (with its narrow brick steps) and upgrading the two sub-ways and approaches. Also Lodge Rd and Abbey St, which are not part of the Site, but are crucial to its success.</p>	<p>to be amended to provide further clarity.</p> <p>The CS will be amended to refer more to the importance of verge character. Good quality design will be required, in order to respect the local environment/setting. The Civic Offices are 4 storey and a lower development is therefore envisaged.</p> <p>CS will be amended to refer to verges. Highway safety issues will be picked up when any proposals are submitted. It is not for the CS to determine precise layouts – a developer/architect need to be given the necessary scope to work up options for potential layouts.</p> <p>Issue of the steps is recognised and these have been included within the CS area. Roads etc are also recognised and these will be picked up via developer's Travel Plan and planning process. A CS provides the core design elements expected for a given area – any development obviously impacts upon its surroundings and this is picked</p>	<p>Amend CS</p> <p>Amend CS</p> <p>None</p>
--	--	--	---

		up through e.g a developer's Travel Plan, discussions/negotiations with developers and Planning Applications/Conditions required. It is not necessary therefore for a CS to pick up and expand on every off site impact.	
Weedon Bec Parish Council with Daventry Villages Together	Yes, apart from the following: Visual Stop should soften road layout into Welton Road without detracting from TPOs/War Memorial; question 10% renewable energy production; landmark buildings should not compete with buildings in the Conservation Area; concern re-advertising signs; it should be all flat surface hard landscaping; short stay loading time limit suggested. SUDS should be actively promoted as a necessity.	A Visual stop by its nature provides a strong focal point. CS calls for respect of setting. The Energy Advice Officer has set this as a target for this site, based on the feasibility/likely ability of a developer to meet this target. Landmark buildings should enhance the Conservation Area – CS to be amended. CS to be amended to clarify that it is both types of advert that shall be colour co-ordinated. The levels of the development site make it quite possible that landscape works will not all be on the one level, although this is desirable in terms of those areas offering pedestrian access. Loading limits are not an issue for the CS. This point will be passed to DDC Engineers. SUDS are a standard planning requirement, which all developers have to consider, in line with guidance	None Amend CS None

		from the Environment Agency. However, engineers have advised that the geology within the town centre makes SUDS unworkable in certain areas – the developer will need to consider this issue seriously and mitigate against any development impact.	
	Q7 Do you agree with the access/parking arrangements?		
Chesterhouse Properties	<p>New text underlined suggested – <u>The scheme will be sensitive to generating additional customer vehicular traffic along Welton Road. Welton Road will not be used to service the retail accommodation.</u> Primary vehicular <u>service</u> access ...</p> <p>New para. Suggested re- parking type i.e short term parking provision etc.</p> <p>New para. suggested re- parking phasing.</p>	<p>Amend CS to reflect that service use is not appropriate on Welton Rd.</p> <p>This is not a relevant issue to the CS, but will be passed to DDC Engineers for their consideration</p> <p>This is not a relevant issue to the CS, but will be passed to DDC Engineers for their consideration</p>	<p>Amend CS</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p>
Charles Planning Associates	<p>Transport Assessment is required.</p> <p>Should also consider cumulative impact of proposed development/ projected expansion of Daventry, in particular reference to land north east of Daventry.</p>	<p>CS to be amended to refer to Travel Plan.</p> <p>It is unrealistic to expect a developer on this site to carry out an assessment for development unrelated to their development i.e north-east</p>	<p>Amend CS</p> <p>None</p>

		area.	
Norton Parish Council	Yes	Point noted	None
Daventry Town Council	Query –will the proposed parking compensate for the loss of the three existing car parks on page 3? Disabled parking bays to be pepper potted to provide unproblematic accessibility to retail outlets.	Yes – and disabled parking will be a requirement of any new parking.	None
The Daventry and District Civic Society	No, Vehicular access must surely be better defined – there must be clearer direction given for car entry and exit. Glad that some indication is given to parking spaces required. It seems that the developer is to make his own calculation of the parking required for his own development, but also the needs of Council employees, Leisure Centre Users etc – is this how it should be? The grouping together of Welton Rd and Abbey Street is not understood – Abbey St - it will be up to the road planner, rather than the developer, to keep pedestrians and cyclists safe. Welton Rd – could become busy or disappear as part of the retail development – if it remains, the developer will have a problem in terms of motor vehicle domination.	This will be a matter for discussion with engineers and NCC Highways. Parking requirements are highlighted in the CS and the developer is referred to SPG Parking, which sets out requirements for different types of development. The CS cannot predict the type/size of development that a developer may propose, therefore the CS cannot specify the exact parking required. The development will impact upon Abbey Street, hence the developer will need to mitigate against this through making improvements for cyclists/pedestrians e.g providing a safe crossing in the vicinity of their development across Abbey Street. Welton Road is highlighted in the CS as an important route and	None None None

		hence will not disappear under development – again the developer will need to ensure that pedestrians and cyclists can access the area with ease e.g through provision of crossing points.	
Mrs S Adam	There is no mention to impact of increasing traffic or measures to reduce impact of road traffic. Gives no acknowledgement to fact that since closure of Lodge Road, traffic has increased considerably up South Way and Abbey Street..nor to traffic and noise pollution.	The CS sets out an objective that motor vehicles should not dominate and that priority be given to pedestrians/cyclists through well-designed routes/layout. The Developer will be required to produce a Travel Plan as part of any application for planning permission on this site. This will identify the expected travel impact and ways to mitigate against any likely problems envisaged.	None
	Detailed issues then raised re-traffic including: No consideration of traffic noise pollution, especially in relation to nearby Southbrook; Speed hump problem in Abbey Street; No link with pedestrian crossing of South Way, or difficulty in crossing Vicar Lane; Giving priority to pedestrians/cyclists in Abbey Street conflicts with directing traffic into town and fronting of premises onto this road; reduce the level of South Way and Abbey Street; Alternative route onto the site from Eastern Way, to replace the route lost through closure of Lodge Rd; Alternative	These will be passed on to Daventry District Council Engineers and Northamptonshire County Council Highways for their information, as appropriate. CS to be amended to highlight that there will be a need for the Travel Plan to cover such issues, as identified above. Linkage to Vicar Lane and South Way to be referenced in CS.	None
		Accept Abbey Street is a main	Amend CS None

	<p>route into Vicar Lane – most probably from Station Close end; consideration of route from Tesco to Vicar Lane/Station Rd.</p>	<p>vehicle route into the town centre, however opportunities need to be made to ensure that pedestrians and cyclists feel they can use this area safely and that vehicle movement does not detract from their use of the area e.g better opportunities to cross the road. Premises fronting onto Abbey Street does not necessarily mean vehicles will be allowed to dominate.</p> <p>The Developer will be required to produce a Travel Plan, as identified above to highlight the impact and mitigation of traffic issues. CS to be amended to highlight this. Changing road levels would be impractical, as levels of the town centre are higher than certain surrounding areas, such as Southbrook. Hence, access to the town centre would always be at a higher level. Your concerns are noted though and the Developer will need to show noise mitigation evidence.</p> <p>Issues of road changes will be passed to Daventry District Council Engineers and Northamptonshire County Council Highways for their</p>	<p>Amend CS</p>
--	--	---	-----------------

		information, as appropriate. The later issue re-Tesco route was discussed through the TCV and was decided to be unfeasible, due to disruption to that area e.g would require substantial loss of land etc to the school, in particular.	
Weedon Bec Parish Council with Daventry Villages Together	<p>Yes, however TCV projects vehicular parking at lower level than to accommodate expected population growth to 2021. However, it would not be in the interests of the District's inhabitants to have lower level i.e 2 storey - planning for a shortfall. Should not be penalised by having the free parking removed.</p> <p>If SUDS provision is included within the site, it could be tied into fire hydrant system as an emergency back -up supply. Could become feature of landscaping...</p>	<p>Parking provision at the lower level takes in the anticipated growth to 2021 as highlighted in the TCV. Parking fees are not relevant to the CS. This point will be passed to DDC Engineers.</p> <p>SUDS as above Q6 response - the geology within the town centre makes SUDS unworkable in certain areas.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p>
	Q8 Do these security measures cover everything?		
Norton Parish Council	Must be adequate by day and after dusk	Point noted	None
The Daventry and District Civic Society	Yes – close attention needs to be paid to maintenance of car parks and subways – prominent notices should provide contact details to report problems.	Point noted – this will be passed to DDC Engineers	None
Daventry Town Council	Yes, but imaginative design required for attractive safe routes for cyclist and pedestrians, together with sufficient CCTV surveillance to discourage unsocial use.	Point noted	None
Weedon Bec Parish Council	The sentence re-security does not entirely give definite guidance. The SPG Crime	The CS makes reference for the need to provide security etc	None

<p>with Daventry Villages Together</p>	<p>does cover this more fully, but for those who have not had sight of this document it has no relevance to any considered response they can make. In addition suggest have no rear accesses where “group gatherings” can take place and have sufficient lighting.</p>	<p>and refers the developer to the SPG, which outlines the requirements to achieve this. The CS should not re-iterate policy held in other documents, but should cross-reference, as per planning procedures. Should a consultee wish to view the document, the website and producer i.e Northamptonshire County Council are already referenced on page 12 of the CS. The later points re- design/layout are covered through the SPG – detailed design aspects re-crime will also be picked up when the Crime Prevention Design Advisor is consulted during any proposed planning application on the site.</p>	
---	--	--	--

Sustainability Appraisal

For

Site 4a: Land North of Abbey Street, Daventry Concept Statement

Daventry District Council February 2005



This document is available in large print, Braille, or on tape by request.

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This Sustainability Appraisal (SA) has been prepared by Daventry District Council. It has been produced as a Final Draft, following the production of a Consultation Draft in October 2004 and subsequent 6 week consultation period. Over 700 individuals and organisations held on the Planning Consultees Database were sent details of the consultation, along with local residents. This included consultation with the 4 Statutory Consultees of the Countryside Agency, English Heritage, English Nature and the Environment Agency, as per legislation. The consultation was reported back to Strategy Group on 13th January 2005.
- 1.2 This Report provides a brief background to Site 4a and contains an explanation of the nature of Sustainability Appraisal and its relationship to planning. It then appraises the objectives proposed for Supplementary Planning Document - Site 4a, Land North of Abbey Street, Daventry.

2. Background to Site 4

- 2.1 The Retail Capacity Study and the Town Centre Vision have both identified that there is a need for “bulky goods” retail floorspace within Daventry to meet the needs of the town up to 2021. By its very nature, it is difficult to provide for such buildings in town centre locations. The development could be located on the site of the existing Working Men’s Club building, with frontage onto Abbey Street

(Site 4). Decked parking is envisaged towards the north-west boundary i.e in close proximity to the Civic Offices. Any development proposals would be subject to the sequential test as set out in PPG6 and the Local Plan.

3. The Sustainability Appraisal and Planning

3.1 Local planning authorities must now comply with European Union Directive 2001/42/EC. This requires formal strategic environmental assessment of certain plans and programmes, which are likely to have significant effects on the environment. This applies to all local development documents. PPS 12: Local Development Frameworks (2004) also makes this a requirement.

3.2 Section 39 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires local development documents to be prepared with a view to contributing to the achievement of sustainable development. A widely used definition of this was drawn up by the World Commission on Environment and Development (1987) as: “development which meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs”.

3.3 The Government has set out four aims for Sustainable Development in “A Better Quality of Life, A Strategy for Sustainable Development in the UK”. These are:

- Social progress, which recognises the needs of everyone
- Effective protection of the environment
- The prudent use of natural resources; and
- Maintenance of high and stable levels of economic growth and employment.

3.4 Sustainability Appraisal (SA) is a systematic appraisal process aimed to appraise the social, environmental and economic effects of planning strategies and policies to ensure that decisions are made in accord with sustainable development.

3.5 The Government proposes to produce guidance for the preparation of a SA. A consultation draft was out for public consultation until 10 December 2004. The final guidance document is not expected until Spring 2005, hence this Sustainability Appraisal has been prepared in advance of any formal guidance having been produced.

3.6 Planning as a function seeks to determine what relationship should be sought and can be achieved between new and existing development, and between development and existing and proposed new infrastructure, and the environmental resources of the area, in order to provide a sustainable solution.

3.7 The Site 4a Concept Statement deals with development, which inevitably means there will be some negative impacts, for example increased use of natural resources, such as building materials and energy consumption. However, it also means that there is an opportunity to improve the quality of peoples’ lives, for example through job creation and providing more local retail choice. This

appraisal is concerned with how well the Concept Statement provides for what has to be done, and particularly with how well the opportunity is taken to use the change that is coming to further the aim of greater sustainability.

3.8 It is not for the Appraisal to promote a “policy for everything” within a planning document. It is for the planning document to take account of the ways that greater sustainability might be brought about.

3.9 Table 1 provides a summary of key issues for consideration, while Table 2 provides more detail about these issues and assesses the extent to which the Concept Statement has addressed them.

Table 1 Sustainability Framework

Sustainability Issue	Desirable direction of change
Accessibility Health and Safety Skills Biodiversity/ Fauna/ Flora Landscape Character Built Environment/ Cultural Heritage Air Water Soil Minerals Climatic Factors Energy Employment Wealth Creation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enable people all to have similar and sufficient levels of access to services, facilities and opportunities • Improve overall levels of health and reduce the fear of crime • Assist people in gaining the skills to fulfil their potential and increase their contribution to society • Maintain and enhance the diversity and abundance of species • Maintain and enhance the quality and character of the landscape, including its contribution to the setting and character of settlements • Maintain and enhance the quality and distinctiveness of the built environment and the cultural heritage • Reduce all forms of air pollution in the interests of local air quality and the integrity of the atmosphere • Maintain and improve the quality of ground and river waters • Maintain the resource of productive soil • Maintain the stock of minerals • Reduce climate change • Increase the opportunities for energy generation from renewable energy sources and maintain the stock of non-renewable energy sources • Maintain and enhance employment opportunities matched to skills, and reduce the disparities arising from unequal access to jobs • Retain and enhance the factors which are conducive to wealth creation, including personal creativity, infrastructure, and the local strengths and qualities that are attractive to visitors and investors

Table 2 Issues and Assessment

Sustainability Issue	Sustainability Objectives	Extent to which Concept Statement meets Objectives/ Mitigates Against These	Comment
Accessibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Channel new employment towards well served settlements and towards transport corridors 	Town centre location, accessible to users and close to public transport.	Site will meet this objective.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encourage a greater mix of uses 	Primarily retail use – bulky goods – currently limited provision of this in Daventry. Mix of other complementary town centre uses encouraged.	Site will meet this objective.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assist in the provision of better public transport services 	Not directly i.e on site, but indirectly potentially through increased customers wishing to visit the town.	Site does not directly influence this objective.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Help to create better conditions for cycling, walking and disabled access 	Incorporates these. Development will enable more goods to be sourced locally thus reducing the need to travel to other centres.	Site will meet this objective.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promote higher density development 	Makes more use of underused land in the central area of Daventry.	Site will meet this objective.

Health and Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seek to reduce road transport • Encourage use of public transport and mixed use development, enabling more walking and cycling • Promote forms of development that reduce the opportunities for crime • Ensure that flood risk is not increased by development • Achieve strong and natural links between town and country • Maintain and increase open space and particularly open space with public access 	<p>Land use in town centre location, reducing need to travel by private transport. Encourages improved cycle/pedestrian links. Promotes bus stop adjacent to Site. Promotes good design to reduce crime and fear of crime. Flood risk assessment referred to. Strong importance of landscape/views for this Site highlighted i.e linking between town centre and countryside beyond. Open space provision not a requirement for this site - however landscape works are required to maintain “green effect” and TPOs to be retained, as well as existing vegetation, wherever possible.</p>	<p>Site meets some of these objectives. However, by promoting decked parking, private car travel is not discouraged. However, town centre location provides for nearby public transport provision via bus station. Also, open space is not required for this particular location, as the emphasis is on built development. Other town centre sites will provide for open space.</p>
Skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide opportunities to learn new skills/contribute more to society 	<p>New employment opportunities expected on site, which will enable new skills to be learnt.</p>	<p>Site is anticipated to assist in meeting this objective to a limited extent</p>
Biodiversity/ Fauna/ Flora	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify wildlife corridors (within green, water or possibly transport corridors) and use these as structural devices in developing settlements • Provide for habitat protection and encourage habitat creation in all new development 	<p>Encourages retention and alternatively replacement of existing landscape works. Requires new landscape works to continue “green canopy effect”. Promotes wildlife-friendly species. No specific habitat creation required or wildlife corridors identified – final CS to incorporate consideration of this issue further.</p>	<p>Site will assist in meeting this objective – final CS will consider wildlife/habitat issue further.</p>
Landscape Character	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use an understanding of landscape character as an important factor in determining the scale, location and form of development 	<p>Sensitivity of landscape fully considered.</p>	<p>Site will meet this objective.</p>

<p>Built Environment/ Cultural Heritage</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand the distinctive character of a settlement when determining the layout/design • Promote good design in new development • Channel new development to areas in need of investment • Provide for the protection and use of distinctive and valued buildings, features and townscapes 	<p>The area has already been identified as an area of archaeological potential by Northamptonshire County Council, archaeology assessment and evaluation will be required. The CS places great emphasis on the need for good quality design and materials, which compliment the site's location on the edge of the Conservation Area. The CS will help to deliver the town centre vision which channels new retail development on to appropriate sites within the central area. The CS identifies views of particular merit e.g the church, which need to be positively addressed in the development.</p>	<p>CS will meet this objective.</p>
<p>Air</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote settlement patterns and development form that reduces travel needs and provides for public transport, cycling and walking • Build in ways that conserve energy, in layout and structure • Protect and enhance trees 	<p>Incorporates these – however additional parking encourages private car travel. The CS requires retention of trees covered by TPOs and other important trees, where appropriate.</p>	<p>Site will assist with this objective, however additional parking will encourage car use. Nevertheless, by providing more retail choice, this Site aims to discourage people from travelling longer distances to other towns. The CS provides for safe and convenient pedestrian/cycle links to the site and safe cycle storage facilities.</p>
<p>Water</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote sustainable urban drainage • Seek water conservation measures in new developments • Ensure sufficient water, and waste water treatment to meet development demands 	<p>Incorporates these and water authorities consulted for their requirements.</p>	<p>Site will meet this objective.</p>
<p>Soil</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoid productive agricultural land when identifying development locations 	<p>Land is previously developed. Proposals aim to make more intensive use of land area.</p>	<p>Site will meet this objective.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use land efficiently 		
Minerals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make the best use of existing buildings and infrastructure • Promote the appropriate use of primary and secondary aggregates • Avoid the sterilisation of deposits through development 	Existing buildings are likely to be removed and replaced by the new development. Final CS will be amended to refer to after-use for any existing building materials on the Site. Good resource use is promoted. No minerals sites on Site.	Site will meet this objective – final CS will refer to re-use of materials.
Energy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop in ways, which reduce travel demands • Require local energy generation • Require high energy conservation and partial energy generation from new buildings 	Town centre location. Promotes renewable energy production, solar gain etc.	Site will meet this objective.
Employment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accommodate new economic development in accessible locations 	The provision of retail units will result in increased employment opportunities. It is accepted that many jobs in the retail sector are part-time and can be seasonal. However, part-time jobs can provide more people with opportunities to work, in particular around other family commitments etc.	Site will partially meet this objective.
Wealth Creation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that all forms of transport infrastructure provide the required links with sufficient capacity • Maintain and add to what is distinctive and valued about the environment 	Transport choice encouraged. Developer will be required to provide a Travel Plan, in order to provide an assessment of travel impacts of their development and mitigation proposals. Promotes enhancement of existing character. The CS sets out a requirement for good quality design. However, it has to be acknowledged that the new user of this development (bulky goods retail) does impose some limitations on the outcome. However,	Site will meet this objective.

		the content of the CS, makes it clear that the “boxlike” structures and poor quality materials seen on some retail parks will not be acceptable.	
--	--	--	--