

Appendix 14: Responses Received to Public Consultation on Draft Masterplan November 2011

Reference Number	Name	Comment	Changes to Masterplan
2040/11/01	Jonathan Over	<p>The plan for 2040 is admirable in many ways but seems to be a plan that has already been decided.</p> <p>Intelligent input from Daventry and District people is very important.</p> <p>Broadly the concept of regeneration of the town housing stock will be an excellent starting point, there is a need in Daventry for a quality housing project allowing self build and the removal of some parts of the current housing estates and replacing with better quality eco homes.</p> <p>At the moment the job arena is centered on warehousing and suchlike, though this may satisfy some, the need for new business where technology and manufacturing are at the forefront is required, the eco park that you suggest is great but the opportunity would be turn Daventry into the first totally green town, this should not be missed as the effect and knowledge that will be gained will set Daventry aside from other towns and boost opportunities, jobs and careers. So vision is required.</p> <p>The thought of a technical college within the town is very progressive let us hope this will also mean that Daventry will have a Sixth Form College included within the plans, another much needed building block in the chain of opportunities for Daventry and District.</p> <p>Another wonderful resource in Daventry is the Country Park and have often thought some time that effort in developing much needed facilities for camping, dog walking and grooming, fitness, water based sports, horse riding etc should be at the forefront. There is a need to expand the boundaries of the Country Park to allow new eco business to be part of this excellent park arena.</p> <p>Having been the MD of a number of successful companies and spent some time addressing other people's business problems, there is a requirement in Daventry for a person to act in the role in new business development. This needs some vision as it applies not only to new but also established business where is every company in Daventry District employed an extra half a person it would generate significant</p>	No change.

		<p>revenues and address a number of issues. The lack of certain resources in smaller companies is always a bane, but can be sorted, as these are usually Sales and Marketing or of a Technical nature. Again we lead into the eco arena.</p> <p>As for the Pod network, I think I would give it a miss and stick to the basic format of buses, bicycles, walking and taxis, there is a need for all of us to keep fit, the cost involved to build, maintain, and the continual expansion of such a system would require a town of some 150,000+ persons to be viable.</p> <p>Just a thought about previous Vision of Daventry, in the 1960's Birmingham took a considerable interest in its town, the Vision was a population of 65000, the legacy of a very intrusive road network that was built at the time, Southbrook was an award winning development as was the Grange, the towns shops circa 1960 were far more diverse, 26+ public houses, what more could one want.</p> <p>Vision is always very necessary but when making these decisions think about what sort of legacy you visionaries are going to leave for our grandchildren. Remember cause and effect, most business fails to observe this rule.</p> <p>Generally the DDC Vision is good but hope this helps to illuminate.</p>	
2040/11/02 ⊗	Anonymous	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes 2. Development planned in areas adjacent to Daventry District 3. (a) Yes (b) Full employment; regeneration: "Green" environment 4. Yes Regeneration of Southbrook, Eco Park 5. Little reference to the wider District of Daventry. Poor evidence base so far. The workshop I attended was attended by about 5 others and the process seemed rushed and superficial. 	No change.
2040/11/03 ⊗	Anonymous	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No the plan is too vague 2. The promised Millennium park 3. No – the ring of trees 4. No – Town centre developments 5. The canal space is unsustainable, expensive maintenance and unpopular 6. Pod Transport system not appropriate for Daventry 	No change.
2040/11/04	J M John	<p>Daventry Masterplan 2040 is as interesting for what it does not say, as for what it does say.</p> <p>For example it leaves the passages on the countryside so vague that any developer could circumvent them and legally do so.</p>	<p>The comments regarding development on Greenfield sites are noted. Whilst government policy encourages the use of brownfield sites, it does not preclude greenfield development where this is appropriate.</p>

		<p>So let us rectify the weaknesses.</p> <p>The officials who drafted the plan must be <u>fully</u> aware of the absolute necessity <u>not</u> to build on agricultural land, and this includes of course road and railway construction. The vision of 2040 is an uncertain one, but what is certain about 2040 and the years between and thereafter – there will be a growing and serious shortage of land to produce our food on. The population of the world and that includes us in this country, is growing rapidly and has now reached 7 billion souls. Each of those mouths will have to be fed now and in the future. The way to cope with the problem should not be by letting hunger, famine, disease and the British social situation involved take their savage course, a course which is closely tied in with these policies of land use.</p> <p>It is complete folly to build on food supplying land. You can imagine the developer’s brochures:- “Lovely new homes, shops, leisure centres, schools, shopping malls, entertainment halls and, oh! You will starve because we have built on land we should have been growing your food on! Of course the second part of this quote will not be included in the developer’s message. Better still to seek other solutions. For example, development of empty properties, there are one million empty properties in the country today; use of brown field and derelict sites to build on not with large profit enhancing executive homes, as favoured by opportunistic developers, but homes that we can all afford; listen to the wise advice of two institutions with more experience than we have, the National Trust and the Council for the Preservation of Rural England.</p> <p>Global warming is ensuring the shrinkage of fertile land. We, in Britain, will not be able to turn, as now, to the rest of the world to feed us; agricultural land is disappearing world-wide; for example in places like the Mekong Delta in Asia where the vast rice-growing areas which feed millions world wide, are being rendered infertile by the incursion of rising salt sea levels.</p> <p>Food scarcity puts up food prices and leads to greedy speculation by financiers on food prices, so that even now as I write, ordinary people cannot afford the big food price hikes and are being forced to turn to free food centres to feed their families. Not to mention the plight of the poor. Destroying food producing land by building on it is unsustainable.</p> <p>Yes, more homes, but <u>not</u> built on agricultural land.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
--	--	--	-------------------

<p>2040/11/05</p>	<p>Joint Response from Northants Police and Northants Fire & Rescue Service</p>	<p>So, a big thumbs down to the Daventry Masterplan. Back to the drawing board, Daventry.</p> <p>Thank you for giving Northamptonshire Police (the Force) and Northamptonshire Fire and Rescue Service (NFRS) the opportunity to respond to this consultation. Please find detailed below our comments.</p> <p>We acknowledge that the Daventry 2040 Masterplan is a very high level aspirational document for the future development of the town and surrounding area, and is not designed to include specific details as these will be included within more detailed planning policy documents.</p> <p>However, we are disappointed that there is no mention in the vision of Daventry in 2040 being a “safe place”, even though as part of the consultation document safety and security are highlighted as being of increasing importance in terms of housing, and of high importance in travel and transportation. We also note that there is no general reference to community safety within the Masterplan.</p> <p>We therefore strongly encourage that this is revisited, ensuring that “security and community safety” are incorporated into the final vision of the Daventry 2040 Masterplan. It is vital that future development within Daventry and the surrounding area creates places where people feel safe and secure to both live and work.</p> <p>Enhancing community safety, through the incorporation of various design measures including crime prevention and fire safety measures, will go a long way to securing this, and should be key references within the Masterplan.</p> <p>Although the specific detail around such design measures is not appropriate for this strategic document, it is vital that reference to creating safe places is made within the document. In doing so it will clearly demonstrate to planners, developers and stakeholders, and indeed to the existing and future communities of Daventry, that safety is a key design consideration for Daventry for the lifespan of the Masterplan.</p> <p>We welcome the clear references within the Masterplan which promotes future regeneration, both within the town centre and outlying areas. Not only does regeneration utilise space which may not have been previously used to its full potential, regeneration can improve the quality of an area, and can also reduce the opportunity for incidences of crime or arson occurring where previous derelict areas become vibrant with legitimate usage.</p>	<p>Comments regarding community safety to be added to the finalised Masterplan document which will pick up on these comments and include community safety and security as a running theme through the document.</p>
-------------------	---	---	---

		<p>New development and any redevelopments should be designed within the principles of “Secured by Design”. This is proven to be effective in cutting crime (particularly burglary) and anti-social behaviour. Meeting “Secured by Design” standards helps to reduce the carbon cost of crime through reducing both the cost of investigation and the cost of replacing goods for the victims of crime.</p> <p>We note the four themes in which the framework is structured; <i>A Green Town, East of Movement, A strong vibrant Community and A Place to be Proud</i>. The document outlines the short, medium and long term strategies which are advocated within the Masterplan as a means to achieve the vision of these 4 themes. We are disappointed to see that community safety does not feature within the strategies and feel that the document can be further enhanced by adding such references.</p> <p>In addition we would strongly encourage that theme 3 is updated to become “a safe, strong and vibrant community, again with references to community safety and designing out crime.</p> <p>We hope you find the above comments useful. If you require any further information on any of the points raised in this response then please do not hesitate to contact us. We look forward to being involved in further discussions as the Masterplan and associated infrastructure plans develop.</p>	
2040/11/06	Flore Parish Council	<p>The above document has been circulated amongst the Parish Councillors and, following discussion at our recent meeting, the only comment the Council wish to submit is that it seems to be an ineffective use of resources.</p>	No change.
2040/11/07 ⊗	Anonymous	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No – Unlikely to be sufficient funds or political control to carry out such plans. 2. (a) Possible shortage of water supplies. (b) Proximity of County Boundary 3. (a) More housing to get population up to 30K. (b) A45 Weedon/Flore Bypass to M1. 4. No – Housing & A45 as above. Not much else though. 5. Comments on Daventry 2040 Masterplan below. <p>There have been some welcome signs of realism breaking through in recent items in the Daventry Express; quite hopeful in fact.</p> <p>(2) More housing is the key. The aim must be to get the population up to about 30,000; this is a good size for a healthy market town and should give enough footfall for a reasonable retail. As many people shop by catalogues or responding to</p>	No change.

	<p>advertisements in newspapers or magazines or circulars already and the number buying online increases the actual number of shops needed for a given population will be less than used to be the case.</p> <p>This should not prevent developments in villages, particularly where they are wanted because young couples cannot find anywhere to live or because more houses are needed to support facilities such as a post office or village shop or primary school or bus service, etc.</p> <p>The planned growth of population to about 40,000 can be taken more slowly. There are some constraints.</p> <p>The location of Daventry, roughly midway between the Midlands and the M25, makes it very suitable for light assembly or warehousing or distribution purposes. In fact if one looks at a demographic map which shows where the voters are in the UK it will be found that Daventry is pretty central.</p> <p>Such companies need good access to the motorway network and so an improved A45, by-passing Weedon and Flore and Upper Heyford, should have high priority. Further road improvements are desirable but they will have to take their place in the queue.</p> <p>The Canal Arm and Waterspace schemes should be scrapped. It is not only people in Daventry who do not want it; there are others elsewhere in the D.D.C. area including me. It made no economic sense when first suggested in 1793 and it never has and never will. I know several towns which used to have a canal arm; all are long abandoned and filled in. Stafford and Wantage come to mind. I would object if any of my council tax were spent on such a scheme.</p> <p>This should resolve the dispute between Daventry Town Council and the D.D.C. over this matter and avoid any more legal fees.</p> <p>The other impracticable and unwanted scheme, the "Advanced Passenger Transport System", should also be scrapped before any more time and money is wasted on plans for it. The present system, using diesel-engines buses, works well enough and is more flexible.</p> <p>The "green aspirations" and ideas of an EcoPark sound all very well, but to me rather smack of scientific illiteracy. Planting of trees to absorb CO₂ is an excellent</p>	
--	--	--

		<p>idea, but they do not have to be planted on the outskirts of Daventry to do that job. They could be miles away. I would suggest that they might be planted along the line of the proposed High Speed 2 rail line, where they would have the additional advantage of provide audible and visual screening.</p> <p>Talk of creating a network of paths to link public green spaces is also something that sounds good. It may get a bit of a hollow laugh in this area. There have been calls for at least the last ten years for there to be improvements to the road between the village of Byfield and Woodford Halse, involving modest widening and the provision alongside it of a CYCLEWAY AND FOOTPATH. The progress achieved by our local councillors in that time seems to be precisely zero, citing difficulty in getting the land. Have they never heard of Compulsory Purchase Orders?</p> <p>There would seem to be little point, also, in development an “Ecopark” which may merely duplicate work which was already being done elsewhere.</p> <p>Regeneration of the town centre to attract tourists? What tourists? And attract shoppers? Read Section (2) above again.</p> <p>Regeneration of employment areas? Why not let developers do this? Perhaps encourage them a bit.</p> <p>The development of what sounds like little more than a sixth-form college is fine, but to try to glorify it with the name “University” or even “University Technical College” is merely to further devalue the word university. Is there any way of bringing D.D.C. councillors back to earth and getting them to re-engage with reality?</p> <p>These comments may not be taken well by those who welcomed this “Masterplan” with its “green aspirations” and “Vision”. But the first casualty of any plan is usually its collision with reality. I am not a politician, I am a scientist and engineer with an M.Sc. and I do not see “visions”.</p> <p>As any logistics company will confirm, one great advantage of Daventry is that the vast majority of the population of England and Wales live within 150 miles of it. That is why the BBC put aerials on Borough Hill. Drivers of lorries and vans make use of this fact every day. D.D.C. should remember this and try to make use of it.</p> <p>There are various companies which might have a branch in Daventry but in fact do not. Examples are Sainsbury’s Supermarkets and Santander Bank. In both case the</p>
--	--	---

2040/11/08	James Fanshawe	<p>reason is the same; not enough population.</p> <p>I have read your Masterplan with interest.</p> <p>Whilst the plan might be good for Daventry town and its immediate environs Daventry is a much larger district and it's from this much larger district that it draws its revenue as a Council.</p> <p>As a rate payer who lives outside the area covered by your Masterplan I would like to know how my rates are protected from the costs of a study which does not cover where I live.</p> <p>I am staggered that you can ignore the wider needs of the total community covered by the Council. It is time you realised that there is more to the district than Daventry town.</p>	<p>A separate plan is being prepared for the rural areas- the Settlement and Countryside Local plan – which will set out policies for all of the District.</p> <p>No change.</p>
2040/11/09	Chris Myers	<p>While I have been involved in producing responses from Long Buckby Parish Council and from Daventry Villages Together, I would like to add some comments of my own.</p> <p>Having contributed to one of the workshops (for parish councilors), I feel that the exercise ended up being rather superficial. In quite a short space of time, with an unfamiliar aerial map of the area and a lack of information about constraints, a small number of people were playing at making largely arbitrary decisions as to where development and infrastructure might go in the future. In collating the information from various stakeholders – maybe 50 altogether? – you seem to have deduced that there was support or even strong support for particular features. Hopefully, your responses to the current consultation will reflect the opinions of hundreds of people and be a truer indication of what the community favours. I would support Paul Whiffin in requesting “consultation on the separate elements of development a vision, issues and options for delivering the vision, identification of suitable sites – all leading to development of a draft plan”. I hope that the next draft of the Masterplan will accommodate the many detailed and relevant concerns and recommendations that I believe will come forward.</p> <p>The following more specific comments relate to particular pages in the draft Masterplan.</p> <p>Page 15 The list of Previous Studies does not include the Rural Revival Strategy 2003/2004. While I have a copy of this document, I fear that it is an information</p>	<p>No change other than as indicated below.</p>

		<p>Planning Document which has been lost or buried.</p> <p>Page 24 Mentioned a couple of times in the document, working from home is generally acknowledged to be an increasingly significant factor in employment. This ought to be mentioned in the summary on page 24. It ought to be mentioned in each of the scenarios. What are the implications of more home working for social and business facilities, housing provision, transport etc?</p> <p>Page 31 I am skeptical about the use of the terms “strong support” and “widespread support”. In my home village of Long Buckby, for example, I am not aware of “widespread support for new, small-scale, housing development”.</p> <p>Page 32 Where is your evidence for “new, small-scale, office development in many of the surrounding villages, especially in Long Buckby”? I suspect it comes from developers and planning consultants rather than from local village people.</p> <p>Page 38 I would welcome an explanation of why “the importance of employment development might decrease by 2040”. Another factor to take into consideration is that part of the predicted ageing population will want to stay in full or part time employment.</p> <p>Page 43 I agree that it is desirable to have a balance of employment across the different sections. I do not agree that this will necessarily address the problem of the perceived lack of employment overall.</p> <p>Page 49 Time, as an aspect of travel, increased in importance for some people. Others might be happy to pay less for slower journeys. An example is the significant proportion of people who use the London Midland service between Birmingham and London in order to pay less than for the faster Virgin service.</p> <p>Page 53 Can transport systems in other towns serve as models for either the “enhanced bus-based transport network” or the Advance Public Transport System?</p> <p>i. The Masterplan is specified as Daventry but is restricted to a 7 mile radius from the town centre. The plan strategically is too narrow because: It does not provide any link with other town, district or county developments (e.g. Rugby) It does not address affordable housing shortages in village locations e.g. Gulsborough, West Haddon etc.</p>	<p>Agree that reference be made to working from home. However the summary on page 24 is a note of the workshops. A more appropriate place for reference to this issue is in the employment section on page 69.</p> <p>Noted – this is a note of the views of those at the workshops – not necessarily of the wider population. This text will be moved from the main body of the report and just included in the Engagement report to make it’s status clearer.</p>
2040/11/10 ⊗	Nick Kent		<p>No change.</p> <p>A separate plan is being prepared for the rural areas- the Settlement and Countryside local plan – which will set out policies for all of the District</p>

		<p>There is no strategic link with British waterways plans It concentrates on urban rather rural sustainability.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. There is mention of stakeholders but it does not mention that key stakeholders (Council tax payers) held a referendum in 2009 and voted by a majority of 75% objecting to the waterspace proposal. 3. Different options for the future use of Eastern Avenue playing have not been offered to the general public. For instance the development of a West Northants county showground to draw visitors into the town. 4. I cannot find any mention of the risk from drought conditions that affect west Northamptonshire impacting on the Waterway basin. 5. The waterway development will polarise the town with new shops and restaurants drawing people away from existing businesses in the High Street. The focus for new generation should be closer to the town centre with redevelopment of the police station and magistrate's court. 	
<p>2040/11/1</p>	<p>Long Buckby Parish Council</p>	<p>Long Buckby Parish Council supports three of the objectives set out in the Masterplan: the aspiration to achieve full employment; improvement to transport links, and its emphasis on protecting and improving the environment.</p> <p>With regard to employment, page 43, we would welcome statements that Daventry provides jobs for people in the area surrounding Daventry (not just "its residents") and an acknowledgment that this surrounding area also has potential for providing jobs.</p> <p>With regard to transport, page 49, we would wish for the documents to point out the key role Daventry plays as a service centre for communities such as ours and the implications for appropriate car parking and a well appointed bus station cum public transport centre.</p> <p>With regard to the environment, we would point out that the proposed green infrastructure looks better from the point of view of the town than from our point of view. No only the housing growth of Daventry, but also the Eco Park and the Multimodal Interchange set the alarm bells ringing about encroachment on the countryside and the strain on the road running through Long Buckby Wharf to the</p>	<p>No change other than as indicated below.</p> <p>Agree that this would be a helpful statement. Include text to this effect</p> <p>Agree that this would be a helpful statement. Include text to this effect</p>

		<p>station and then on through the narrow twisty main road through the village of Long Buckby.</p> <p>We would also like to raise the following specific points.</p> <p>Page 31 we are surprised about the statement that there is “widespread support for new, small-scale, housing development” in Long Buckby. The Parish Council view is that there should be no development outside the currently valid village confines and very little development within those confines. At a recent public meeting, there as unanimous opposition to a proposed development of 133 houses.</p> <p>Page 32 we are equally surprised at your statement that there is support for “new, small-scale, office development in many of the surrounding villages, especially in Long Buckby”.</p> <p>Page 33 The suggestion that environmental infrastructure and employment development could be provided alongside the A5/M1/Railway between Daventry and Long Buckby does not consider the impact on east-west routes. Long Buckby already suffers from an excessive volume of private and commercial traffic.</p> <p>Page 40 We are very sensitive to the fact that Long Buckby is surrounded by Greenfield sites which have been attracting the interest of developers. An outline planning application for over 100 houses has been submitted for such a site on the western side of Station Hill, and another developer is seeking to make an application for a development of similar size on the eastern side of Station Hill. We are concerned that in mentioning Greenfield sites, the draft Masterplan tacitly accepts the requirement for Greenfield development. Surely, a visionary Masterplan should be aiming at a greener solution for the future of our district.</p> <p>Page 64 Definition of the Long Buckby Multimodal Interchange is needed. Do you mean more buses and a bus bay at the railway station? Or do you mean an integrated service of buses and trains in a station with disable access, toilets, a protected waiting area, a booking area, secure cycle racks, real time information about buses as well as trains? We hope that the Masterplan will be clear on what is proposed. We view the establishment of such a facility with mixed feelings and cannot support it unless the road access and environmental issues are satisfactorily addressed.</p> <p>We support the Parish Councillor who represents Long Buckby Wharf in insisting</p>	<p>Noted – this is a note of the views of those at the workshops – not necessarily of the wider populace. This text will be moved from the main body of the report and just included in the Engagement report to make it’s status clearer.</p>
--	--	--	--

2040/11/12 ⊗	Anonymous	<p>that any development on the Long Buckby side of Daventry will have a detrimental effect on the Wharf. "Employment development" alongside the A5/M1/Railway is quite inappropriate. "We already have DIRFT with its connections to the railway and M1 junction 18, why consider something that could never have a rail connection and is midway between 2 motorway junctions." The development would lead to an increase in traffic volumes which would only add to the severe problems in Long Buckby Wharf of pollution and damage to the road and properties. The unique canal-side character of the hamlet is under threat from what is proposed.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes 2. The support of the populace 3. Yes – The canal arm and waterpark 4. Yes – The canal arm and waterpark 5. Try to limit the expression "vagaries of the future" in the final version!! 	No change.
2040/11/13 ⊗	Anonymous	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No – total waste of time, money and energy 5. Without the Flore & Weedon Bypass any decisions made would be a waste of time. 	No change.
2040/11/14 ⊗	Weedon Parish Council	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No – It was a costly exercise in terms of officer and consultancy time and the many who attended the consultation groups felt that it bore little relation to reality. The results could be summarised succinctly in a document half the length of the booklet produced and at lower cost to the ratepayer and environment. 2. Confining our answer to environmental constraints, p's 16 and 17, the vision only recognises "currently designated" land to the south and west as "high quality landscape" thus relegating all the villages from Watford to Weedon to second class status. Of course such assumptions fit nicely DDC's plans for expansion. More account should be taken of the views of those living in villages with the 7km surround. 3. No 4. No – The Weedon PC the suggestion for improvement of the A545 and for a Flore/Weedon Bypass but does not want this to be interpreted as encouragement for increased house building in or in the direction of the parish. However in the present economic climate it seems unlikely that the bypass is anything but a paper exercise. The PC is not confident that the Northants CC places sufficient importance on the project for it to progress. DDC demonstrably cannot rely at the present time on support and investment by NCC in essential infrastructure needed to support current projects e.g. for schools and bus services. Whether or not this relationship improves should there be an economic up turn is highly debatable. 	No change.

<p>2040/11/15</p>	<p>Sheila Baker</p>	<p>No – It is a costly and technically unsound project as opposition from Long Buckby will demonstrate. If the town or Daventry wishes to explore such a technical project it could and should do so within industrial sites within the built up area of the town and not spoil the countryside. It is not a plan but an unwanted and unrealistic vision. Comments could be many but none of them positive and we note that your feedback questionnaire does not invite negativity. DDC should take more notice of the views of villages who do not wish to be considered to be part of a “greater Daventry”. DDC should also act on the views of existing residents of the town who made very sensible suggestions at the presentation for example about cycle ways and improving local buses before considering something so ridiculous and costly as an APTS which is unproven and which “new” towns much more successful and economically sound than Daventry (e.g. Milton Keynes) have yet to make a priority.</p> <p>5.</p>	<p>The Masterplan proposes regeneration for central areas of the town for a range of uses and does not advocate the redevelopment of any specific sites.</p> <p>No change.</p>
		<p>I have read the draft Masterplan 2040 and I am particularly concerned for certain proposals in this document, notably:</p> <p>Regeneration of the central area of the town for housing development</p> <p>I do not accept the potential loss of the town’s green open spaces in the proposals for regeneration and development in this new Masterplan, especially the central area including Eastern Way and Ashby Road Playing Fields. I note that Policy RC2 in the current Daventry District Plan and National Planning policy guidance protects these areas of existing open spaces:</p> <p>I also note the commentary in the <u>current</u> Daventry District plan:</p> <p><i>“These areas are important environmentally, as well as for the recreational facilities they offer; and the further loss of these facilities will be resisted by the District Council”.</i></p> <p>I do not support or accept the regeneration and development proposals for the central areas outlined in the Masterplan 2040 on the basis that it will undermine current local and national policy and become a green light for concreting over our remaining green open spaced in the town.</p> <p>Please acknowledge my objection to this draft document and advise me of the outcome of this public consultation, and further developments on the Masterplan</p>	

2040/11/16	M R Baker	<p>2040.</p> <p>I have read the draft Masterplan 2040 and I am particularly concerned for certain proposals in this document, notably:</p> <p>Regeneration of the central area of the town for housing development</p> <p>I do not accept the potential loss of the town's green open spaces in the proposals for regeneration and development in this new Masterplan, especially the central area including Eastern Way and Ashby Road Playing Fields. I note that Policy RC2 in the <u>current</u> Daventry District Plan and National Planning policy guidance protects these areas of existing open spaces:</p> <p>I also note the commentary in the <u>current</u> Daventry District plan:</p> <p><i>"These areas are important environmentally, as well as for the recreational facilities they offer, and the further loss of these facilities will be resisted by the District Council".</i></p> <p>I do not support or accept the regeneration and development proposals for the central areas outlined in the Masterplan 2040 on the basis that it will undermine <u>current</u> local and national policy and become a green light for concreting over our remaining green open spaced in the town.</p> <p>Please acknowledge my objection to this draft document and advise me of the outcome of this public consultation, and further developments on the Masterplan 2040.</p>	<p>As above.</p> <p>No change.</p>
2040/11/17	Oliver Roper – Portfutures	<p>INTRODUCTION</p> <p>These representations consolidate and include the following:</p> <p>NLP representations to the Emergent Core Strategy Plan August 2009 (EMJCS): Copy available on request</p> <p>UKSL representations to the Pre Submission Draft Plan (PDSP) submitted to the West Northamptonshire Joint Planning Unit (JPU) in March 2011. Copy available http://portfutures.com/portfutures/news.html</p> <p>Marches Regeneration: Plan - Daventry Town Centre Link Road, Public Transport, Walking and Cycling Corridor Appendix 1</p> <p>Burnt Walls: Historic and Business Assets: Key Components of a Daventry South Sustainable Urban Expansion (SUE) – December 2011 – Appendix 2</p> <p>Northamptonshire Waste and Minerals Plan 2011: Dodford – Inset Plan and proposed Haul Road: Danetree Minerals Plan - Appendix 3</p>	<p>No change.</p>

		<p>UKSL Representations to the NPPF: October 2011 – Copy available http://portfutures.com/portfutures/news.html Northamptonshire Arc: Prosperity Plan for Northamptonshire: July 2011. Copy available on request. Laying the Foundations: A Housing Strategy for England: November 2011. Household Projections 2008 to 2033 England: DCLG 2010 – Households will grow by 232,000 per year (average annual figure until 2033): Copy available on request REPRESENTATIONS</p> <p>These representations fully support the aspirations of Daventry District Council (DDC) contained in its Daventry 2040 Master Plan (2040 Plan) in particular: 'A sustainable Location' - This Masterplan advocates predominantly residential development (the South East SUE), on the south eastern periphery of Daventry around the A45, and thus in a highly accessible location, in a manner similar to that proposed in the Interim Draft Master Plan (MCA 2006)': page 65 (2040 Plan) 'A Strong and Vibrant Community': Strategy – The heading on page 70 of the (2040 Plan) states: – 'This Masterplan advocates: 'Short-Term': Planning and preparatory work for the North East and South East SUE's. Regeneration of The Marches employment area.' 'Medium-Term': Commencement of the North-East and South-East SUE's. Completion of initial regeneration measures within the Marches employment areas and long term intensification measures.' 'Long-Term': Completion of the North East and South East SUE's. Ongoing intensification of The Marches and the Western Employment Areas.' the engagement and consultation methodology used in the production of the Daventry 2040 Masterplan. This provides a robust template for any future consultation by DDC and/or UKSL.</p> <p>The six bullet points within point 2.1 are the basis of establishing common ground with DDC in terms of its planning strategy and it the enhancement of its corporate assets in particular the DDC land and property in The Marches.</p> <p>There is support for 'very low density housing to the east of Borough Hill' Page 31 of the (2040 Plan). This very low density housing could become the enabling development for an 18 hole Golf Course to the east of Borough Hill centred on Borough Hill Farm comprising circa 200 acres. The creation of a Golf Course in this location is consistent with the aspirations contained in the iterations of the Interim Draft Master Plan 2006 (MCA)</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>The (2040 Plan) does not reference the adopted Statutory NCC Minerals and Waste Plan in particular the extraction of 2.5m tonnes of mineral (sand and gravel) from the Dodford Minerals Location (see plan in appendix 5). This is a significant factor that will enable the aspirations contained in 5.6 The Framework-Summary page 78 (2040 Plan) to be achieved:</p> <p>The Framework Strategy on page 78 states: 'If the vision is achieved by 2040 Daventry will become: Environmentally sustainable and self sufficient;' To achieve the levels of sustainability and self sufficiency the (2040Plan) aspires to then the extraction of minerals and its restoration proposals at Dodford must be included in the as one of the key objectives outlined on page 70 of the (2040 Plan) in terms of short, medium and long term objectives.</p> <p>The (2040 Plan) should also recognise the opportunity as part of the restoration proposals for the mineral extraction to establish a Wild Life and EcoPark as a high quality holiday and tourist destination enabled by low density housing. The Cotswold Wild Life Park and Lower Mill Estate sets the standard to adopt and enhance. See www.lowermillestate.com</p> <p>The Representations in summary take the form of a draft framework brief that would form the basis of the engagement and discussion with DDC, other public sector stakeholders and the local community to progress the short, medium and long term (2040 Plan) objectives contained in its page 70 as a 'Housing Led Strategy'</p> <p>South East SUE 250 houses – brownfield</p> <p>South east SUE 750 houses – green field</p> <p>South East SUE – Enhancement of Business and Historic Assets: Burnt Walls SAM and Marches Regeneration</p> <p>Borough Hill Farm: 500 houses: Golf Course- very low density housing (200acres)</p> <p>Dodford Minerals Restoration 350 houses Wild Life and Eco Park (circa 250acres)</p> <p>PHASING: South East 1,000 houses – Phases 1a (400 units) and 1b (600 units), incorporating the enhancement of existing Historic, and Business Assets together with initial zones of Marches Regeneration</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>Phase 2 - Borough Hill Farm 500 houses and Golf Course.</p> <p>Phase 3 - Dodford Wild Life Park: 350 houses.</p> <p>In summary a South East SUE, Golf Course and Wild Life Park could deliver 1,850 houses in the period up to 2040.</p> <p>The land ownership and control of DDC and UKSL is also a 'USP' in particular the brownfield component to jointly bid for funding opportunities contained within the UK Government's Housing Strategy – Laying the foundations. There needs to be an MOU between DDC and UKSL to progress these opportunities where common ground exists and land, property and planning interests can be 'aligned'.</p> <p>The proposal for 1850 houses broadly accords with the allocation of 2,000 houses to a Daventry SUE in the August 2009 EMCJS. Therefore a robust evidence base already exists for the provision of 1,850 houses to the South East of Daventry that is further underpinned by the CLG 2010 household projections to 2033.</p> <p>The DCLG (2010) Household Projections from 2008 to 2033 provide the logical evidence base on which to create a plan period to 2033 for the Emerging West Northamptonshire LDF. The key policy objective is for all stakeholders (private and public sector) to agree that: the policy context for the (2040 Plan) should be an LDF that adopts a plan period to 2033.</p> <p>LAYING THE FOUNDATIONS: A HOUSING STRATEGY FOR ENGLAND – NOVEMBER 2011.</p> <p>This Government Document sets out the Government's key objective to create: 'The case for change - A thriving, active, but stable housing market that offers choice, flexibility, and affordable housing is critical to our economic wellbeing'. The document is therefore very relevant to the content and delivery of the 2040 Plan.</p> <p>The Document outlines opportunities for both the private and public sector to bid for Government Funding. It is therefore essential that there is collaborative working between DDC and the promoters of both the South East, North East SUE's and Daventry Town Centre to jointly explore the funding opportunities in the document and other related funding options such as the £500m Growing Places</p>
--	--	---

<p>2040/11/18 ⊗</p>	<p>Martin Harrop Croudace</p>	<p>Fund</p> <p>In particular Portfutures see the 'Brownfield USP' that the Marches, Burnt Walls SAM, Burnt Walls Farm House, Buildings, Motor Cross Track and Disused Rail Corridor Offer to become the key component of the South East SUE and also the Marches Regeneration in terms of having a robust case to secure Government Funding from the evolving initiatives outlined in the Housing Strategy for England document.</p> <p>The funding case would be further enhanced if DDC committed its land and property assets to some form of MOU with UKSL so that there could be a joint public – private sector bid for funding. UKSL is not committed to any joint arrangement with house builders or commercial developers so that there is a great deal of flexibility - The Land Auction approach as outlined on page 10 of the Housing Strategy for England is a real funding possibility – 'The land auction approach seeks to enable local communities to capture a greater share of the land value uplift created by the grant of planning permission than is currently the case'</p> <p>A combined Brownfield and Green Field Phase 1a for the South East SUE could deliver circa 400 houses assuming the employment provision would be in the form of ongoing employment regeneration in The Marches. This could form an 'early win' in terms of securing Government Funding to enable early delivery of housing without any significant impact on increased impact on the A45.</p> <p>3.6 The commitment to the delivery to a phase 1a would enhance investor confidence in the (2040 Plan) and be the catalyst for significant employment generation and sustainable economic growth.</p> <p>WAY FORWARD</p> <p>DDC, and Portfutures on behalf of UKSL establish a discussion agenda that can be progressed by dialogue to establish common ground and create an agreed action plan for the delivery of the Marches Regeneration and a South East SUE – Phase 1a 400 houses and Phase 1b 600 houses</p> <p>Also acknowledging and incorporating the benefits and opportunities of Mineral Extraction at Dodford to ensure that Daventry by 2040 is: 'Environmentally sustainable and self sufficient'</p>	<p>No change.</p>
---------------------	-----------------------------------	---	-------------------

		<p>4. Yes – North east side 5. Yes – No</p>	
<p>2040/11/19</p>	<p>Roger Haines (via Daventry 2040 site)</p>	<p>I currently live at Wharf Farm, Welton Lane, Daventry NN11 2JE right beside the canal on the north side. I have studied the maps and it is not clear whether the public open space and boundary park/woodland will be on the north or south side of the canal due to the line running right through my property on the map and drawings, with green space shown on either side of the water. I am concerned about the impact this will have on my property and adjacent land. Please clarify how this would affect me. Thank you.</p>	<p>No change. The Masterplan is indicative and conceptual and detailed studies would be required to take proposals forward</p>
<p>2040/11/20</p>	<p>gcspullin</p>	<p>If the constraint of producing this on 2 sides of A4 had been made, the material might be readable and appropriate. The presentation is far too long winded – too much white and lacking in much that is new and spinning out the results of some small research a very long way – not a good omen for the town? Never mind the car, which will remain essential despite increasing fuel costs (log it out of retail areas and the business will follow the best parking however far away it is), HGVs will get bigger to be more green and efficient, so our roads, as shown, need developing, widening, straightening plus an A361 around the west of the town by Boundary Park pretty soon otherwise we shall lose what industry we have already. There is not much detail about where houses should go, or whether there will be a policy of mixing business, commerce, industry and residential across the town. Nothing about making cycleways alongside country and town roads that are safe and attractive to potential users. Nothing about how to make small retail development in villages and district centres viable.</p>	<p>The Strategy for Ease of Movement on page 66 sets out the importance of a good cycleway network.</p>
<p>2040/11/21</p>	<p>M Chippington</p>	<p>The proposal for development along the A5/M1 corridor, particularly Daventry Ecopark seems to completely ignore the presence of the existing community of Buckley Wharf. As a principle, will safeguards be in place to protect existing communities from any negative effects arising from the implementation of the Masterplan?</p>	<p>Comments noted. The proposals for the Ecopark in the Masterplan have been amended, including its location. At this stage the eco park is only at the conceptual stage. Much more detailed work will need to be undertaken in due course and this work will need to take into account the potential impacts of this development on nearby properties.</p>
<p>2040/11/22</p>	<p>Daventry Villages Together</p>	<p>Page 14. We are concerned about the designation of the Masterplan as an “informal planning document”. We fear that as time progresses there will be every more reason for planners and officers apply the Masterplan selectively and to justify overruling many of its provisions. Meanwhile, developers will have considerable</p>	<p>The purpose of SPGs is to supplement existing policies. As the masterplan is proposing new policies, for example the</p>

	<p>slope to interpret it in any way that suits them. We recommend that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Masterplan is developed into Supplementary Planning Guidance; The Masterplan is adapted to become compatible with the Joint Core Strategy when this comes into force; The Masterplan is cross-referenced with the Localism Act. <p>Page 16. Another key constraint is surely the extent to which development and associated infrastructure takes place in areas adjacent to Daventry District.</p> <p>Page 26. Other aspects of housing are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Working from home Different types of home ownership (e.g. renting and shared ownership) More equitable use of existing housing (e.g. multiple occupancy; one or two people living in a large house) <p>Pages 27 and 28 and 48 to 53 Transport</p> <p>General point: Can we learn from other comparable towns (in the UK and abroad) what is the most effective and sustainable system of public transport?</p> <p>Road transport: The vision for 2040 and the interim period must accept the necessity of significant improvements to the A45 between Daventry and Northampton, including its junction with the A5 at Weedon. The extent of the implementation of these improvements is stipulated in the decisions of the Planning Inspectorate on the 2010 appeals which relate to the planning applications for Sustainable Urban Extensions to Daventry.</p> <p>The junction of the A5 with the B4036 and the C road to Long Buckby should be identified on the Masterplan as requiring a roundabout or traffic controls and other improvements. Four serious accidents occurred there in November 2011, and it has been described as one of the most dangerous road junctions in the country. Improvements to this junction are even more pressing as and when the Eco Park and the Long Buckby Multimodal Interchange are implemented.</p> <p>Public Transport: In recent months, rural communities have benefited from changes in bus services and the introduction of the Demand Responsive Transport service known as County Connect. The Masterplan's vision for improved public transport should include recognition of the needs of rural communities. Many people in rural areas look to Daventry as a Local Service Centre and would benefit from a reliable and reasonably frequent bus service alongside a flexible DRT. But</p>	<p>Eco park, it cannot be an SPG. However the work and research undertaken as part of the masterplanning exercise can inform policy development in future formal plans.</p> <p>Comments regarding community which are to be added to the finalised Masterplan document will include comments regarding different types of home ownership.</p>
--	--	---

		<p>many of these people will still feel the need to use their cars. It is equally imperative that the Masterplan should acknowledge the need for adequate car parking in a growing town.</p> <p>Specific to Page 28: Constraints on travel include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Road congestion • Access to public transport for the disabled and the encumbered (luggage, pushchairs, shopping etc.) • Availability of information on routes and timetables • Convenient location of bus stops • Length of journey • Cost of fares <p>Page 29 Plans for use of energy should be in tune with national policy and on widely accepted prognostications of energy supply over the next three decades.</p> <p>Page 33 The suggestion that environmental infrastructure and employment development could be provided alongside the A5/M1/Railway between Daventry and Long Buckby does not consider the impact on east-west routes. Villages like Flore, Weedon, Long Buckby and Welford already suffer from excessive volume of private and commercial traffic.</p> <p>Page 40 Greenfield sites seem to be the order of the day for Daventry and the surrounding areas. I request that the rationale for this be included in the document.</p> <p>Page 43 The document states that “Contrary to many assertions, Daventry provides a large number of jobs for its residents”. There needs to be clarity about how much this applies to the rural hinterland of Daventry in which resides more than half of the population of Daventry District.</p> <p>Page 68 Consideration needs to be given to a strong and vibrant community within each housing estate. For retail this could be more than small-scale local convenience provision, e.g. hairdressing, a takeaway and a pub. A multi-purpose community centre would play its part. There could be a facility for home-working business people with IT facilities and a meeting space.</p> <p>Page 69 a) Can you be clear about whether Daventry has one, two or three Country</p>	
--	--	---	--

<p>2040/11/23</p>	<p>David Raven</p>	<p>Parks? Equal consideration should be given provision for the Arts (e.g. cinema, exhibition and performance space) and for indoor sports as to outdoor recreation.</p> <p>b) Page 75 What is your evidence base for a University of Daventry? How will you achieve a University which will not require a substantial individual site or substantial buildings? Would the University not require:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An administration centre • A students' centre • Accommodation blocks • Lecture hall(s) and seminar rooms with high quality facilities. • Minimal travel of staff and students across the town 	<p>No change.</p>
		<p>My contribution here is to ask why are we only considering expanding the area of Daventry by infilling the countryside with more houses and having to overcome all of the obstacles you mentioned. I appreciate this is the way to meet the target of 40,000 population but then we are in control and don't have to do that.</p> <p>Here is another way:</p> <p>In the near 40 years I have lived here Daventry has been very dynamic in attracting high quality business, new education infrastructure and real plans to provide canals, shops and valuable new leisure features.</p> <p>Instead of the focus being all on building on the landscape why not continue to major on developing the existing infrastructure – A45 improvements links to the M1 – canal. Invest in marketing to attract quality international business, skill based companies, research and development. Make Daventry a town with say 30,000 population at the heart but serving a region as the HQ for workers living in towns totalling 100,000 population. Let the other areas in Northants and Warwickshire expand their housing and Daventry becomes the centre of control and excellence at the heart of a region many times its population. We should aim to have the power and influence next to Northampton through the size of revenue derived from businesses wanting to come here and people to be educated.</p>	

		<p>The objective should be for a high quality of life by working smart – not hard. Using our skills and building on our assets. This may be harder to do but it will make this town a very attractive place to live in.</p> <p>A different view perhaps but just as achievable.</p> <p>I thought the Masterplan an impressive document – well done the authors.</p> <p>Incidentally you may wish to see my ideas in action at the new look www.idaventry.com The objective of this website is to build Daventry as the news centre at the heart of the region. I am also thinking ten year plan so if it looks ambitious now check back in a decade!</p>	
<p>2040/11/24</p>	<p>Keith Brown</p>	<p>Very exciting indeed, looking forward to it all including the water space.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing – The document refers to 7200 and 4000 households. It also states that the population of Daventry should be at least 40,000 by 2040. For local residents to be able to comment constructively the document then the plan should clearly state when and how many houses are planned to be built. Is it 4000 as a maximum number of increased households, but that does not lift the population to 40,000 so how can it be correct and where will any additional houses be built? 4000 houses is a lot of development but if it is to be sustainable that needs to be a maximum. Do not mislead us, just inform! I would strongly object to more than 4000 new homes. • If most of the development on new houses is to in the Eastern S.U.E. then that development should not exceed the natural contours of that area so that with a wooded boundary only the trees would be visible from Norton. If that is the case then that would achieve the Masterplan ambition to maintain a good views from surrounding communities. Ideally there should be at least a 1 kilometre gap between Norton and Whilton villages. • Transport – There should be a change to the junction by the golf club to divert traffic away from Norton towards the A5 in the direction of Long Buckby. • There needs to be a true regular bus service from Norton to Daventry and will allow young and other people to continue to live in the village, but work locally in Daventry to earn an income that will sustain that 	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>
<p>2040/11/25</p>	<p>Roland Puleston Jones</p>		

		<p>lifestyle and contribute to making villages true communities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leisure and Green Space – The Daventry and District Golf club is an important leisure asset and should be maintained both as leisure feature and as a green space to maintain the environment. <p>Please ensure that I am kept aware of plans as they develop in more detail so that I may provide further feedback.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> No – It is too conceptual for most people to understand. They only want to know when it is going to affect them. Yes: Here is an identified mineral reserve at Long Buckley Wharf – see attached report. Yes and No. Eco Park is supported Yes – The regeneration of the Southbrook housing estate; the regeneration of the central area of the town; the creation of an EcoPark including a Renewables Farm; The regeneration of existing employment areas; the creation of a connected network of public open and accessible greenspace; Significant tree planting around the town. Yes <p>An additional report regarding mineral reserves was submitted as part of this representation</p>	<p>The mentioned identified minerals reserve at Long Buckley Wharf is not identified in the Minerals and Waste LDF.</p> <p>No change.</p>
<p>2040/11/26</p>	<p>Anonymous</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> No – Long Buckley Wharf has been conveniently left off your map and been flooded with improper and oversized projected development. No No <p>No – MOST DEFINITELY NOT – too big, too close to canal, too close to local housing. The authors of these plans have blighted Long Buckley Wharf by aiming for developments in this area which would certainly not be acceptable in the centre of town.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The principle of the Eco-park is still considered to be appropriate, however taking account of comments received it is proposed to adjust the location of the proposal</p> <p>At this stage the eco park is only at the conceptual stage. Much more detailed work will need to be undertaken in due course and this work will need to take into account the potential impacts of this development on nearby properties.</p>
<p>2040/11/27</p>	<p>Anonymous</p>	<p>I fear that the Masterplan (at what cost?) is little more than an excuse to build a recycling works at Long Buckley Wharf and to hide it in a green fog of words and blurred maps. Say green and eco enough times and it starts to sound real.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The proposals for the Eco-park in the Masterplan have been amended, including its location.</p>

		<p>Set some trees near the Country Park, people will like that as it sounds green and looks nice, so the people of Daventry will go for it.</p> <p>Planning for hundreds of houses along Long Buckby Road will please the builders and give the Council more Council Tax and a bigger "empire", but will be a blot on the landscape for miles around being on high ground.</p> <p>Throw in a Science Park for "class" even if it is hiding behind all this is the recycling plant and power station, (refuse burner) at an ecopark, once the gravel has been removed and sold at great profit.</p> <p>Make it big enough to justify cost and refuse can be bought in from a large area in "green" painted lorries.</p> <p>The idea put forward at Long Buckby Library display was to use the canal. Clearly no one has realized the bottom is so near the top that loaded boats could not use it, and the cost to BW to dredge and dispose of the dredgings would be so great they could not do it over the distances involved.</p> <p>Again, the canal has water shortages already, so increased use would not be possible and the canal closes for the month in winter for maintenance plus any closure due to ice.</p> <p>Once this plan was passed, developers could choose the profitable parts for their own gain and none for local residents.</p> <p>This is all far enough away from Daventry that most of the folk who live there would not be concerned, meanwhile the people of Long Buckby Wharf have their properties blighted, while a few people make great profit from the land here.</p> <p>As the plan has little to do with Daventry, why not be honest and call it the Long Buckby Wharf Recycling Tip and Refuse Burner Plant.</p> <p>The Masterplan says "the long term view", I suspect the high profit bits are very short term and should be decided by proper Planning Permission rather than sneaking through on a biased plan and loaded questions on a response form.</p> <p>Daventry Labour Party supports three of the objectives set out in the Masterplan: the aspiration to achieve –</p>	
2040/11/29	Daventry Labour Constituency		Comments regarding community to be added to the finalised Masterplan document.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full employment with more emphasis on skilled work; • Improvement to transport links; • Emphasis on protecting and improving the environment. <p>Members expressed anxiety about several aspects of the Masterplan consultation, principally statements claiming “broad support” for many of the ideas. This broad support appears to refer to the opinions of the stakeholders invited to consultations and should not be taken to mean and a majority of Daventry and District residents are in support. The consultation methodology is presented separately therefore unavailable to readers of the 2040 consultation document.</p> <p>“while supporting the aspiration for green spaces encircling the town of Daventry and in other locations, we believe that it would be sensible and economically sound to protect existing green spaces such as Fish Ponds, Eastern Way, The Hollows and Daneholm. The Masterplan should not seem to endorse the building of houses on these invaluable existing green sites”.</p> <p>The principal concerns raised by members around amenity issues and arise from broken promises made during previous developments for example provision of a school for Middlemore residents whose children are scattered throughout schools in Daventry making it difficult for friendship groups to form and having implications for safety on the roads.</p> <p>The importance of community is not acknowledged when large quantities of housing is planned and built without provision of community centres, schools, shops and play areas. It will be essential that the planned additional housing is accompanied by good amenity which encourages community cohesion.</p> <p>Other concerns centre on the unique nature of Daventry’s town centre, with the hope that whilst big names shops are desirable they need to be incorporated in a way that preserves the character of the town.</p> <p>Likewise, as acknowledged in the Masterplan consultation document, Daventry has many valuable green areas prized not only by residents but also by visitors from surrounding towns and villages. Labour Party members expressed unhappiness with the proposed canal arm stating a preference for community and family areas to include play facilities, a band stand, a boating pond, crazy or mini golf or even a pitch and putt. A pond or small lake with fountains could be a much more appropriate water space in terms of accessibility and utilization by the local community –</p>	
--	---	--

		<p>providing it is well maintained.</p> <p>This would also be more environmentally sustainable than a canal arm with attendant diesel fumes and more easily maintained than the machinery to turn canal boats around.</p> <p>SPECIFIC COMMENTS</p> <p>Page 14 We are worried about the status of the document. While it is left deliberately vague the best parts can easily be ignored. It would be more difficult to ignore if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Masterplan is developed into Supplementary Planning Guidance • The Masterplan is made compatible with the the Joint Core Strategy when this comes into force • The Masterplan is cross-referenced with the Localism Act <p>Page 15. Another key constraint is development and infrastructure being planned or undertaken in adjacent areas. For example Daventry International Rail freight Terminal must have had and will continue to have influence on Daventry even if only because many Daventry people work there. Proposed extensive housing East of Rugby may also affect Daventry.</p> <p>Page 23. What is meant by community development? It is essential that this is not just a concept to which developers simply pay “lip service”. It must be a strong part of any plan.</p> <p>Page 24. Education must surely be of high importance in any scenario! – but it needs to be appropriate types of education. The fact that the document reports education as of decreasing value says a lot about low aspiration within the town perhaps because of the predominance of low skill employment.</p> <p>In considering a possible increase in working from home, planners need to think about housing and community facility provision, transport issues.</p> <p>Page 25. What is the link between increased home working and reduced usage of the town centre? Will home workers need to go out of town for a break? Or will increased numbers of home workers mean more use of the town centre shops and entertainment [a cinema?].</p>	
--	--	---	--

	<p>Page 26. Access to housing with sufficient space both inside and out, good security, good public transport, and sustainably affordable seems to us always to be of supreme importance.</p> <p>Pages 27, 28 and 48 to 53 Transport</p> <p>General Point: Can we learn from other comparable towns (in the UK and abroad) what is the most effective and sustainable system of public transport?</p> <p>Road Transport: The vision for 2040 and the interim period must accept the necessity of significant improvements to the A45 between Daventry and Northampton, including its junction with the A5 at Weedon.</p> <p>The junction of the A5 with the B4036 and the C road to Long Buckby are severely stressed and will become dangerous if traffic increases especially if an EcoPark and Long Buckby Multimodal Interchange are implemented. Some serious though needs to be put towards improving the roads here.</p> <p>Public Transport. There have been improvements in the rural bus service recently making travel into Daventry easier – essential for the survival of the market and shops.</p> <p>The Masterplan needs to be careful to ensure access to public transport for disable people, elderly people and parents with pushchairs – or just people with a lot to carry. Transport stops need to be conveniently placed.</p> <p>INFORMATION needs to be reliable, accurate, easily available with regard to travel times, length of journey and prices.</p> <p>Accessible free, plentiful car parking is a good attraction to outside shoppers and should be retained.</p> <p>Page 31. Why develop more Greenfield sites industrially even if it is for eco industry? Why not continue development at DIRFT instead? Facilities already existing including a relatively infrequent – if improved – bus service. The road to Daventry is better but would still need improved.</p> <p>It is important to make clear that the support for development in villages refers to support expressed by a small number of “stakeholders” rather than by residents</p>	
--	--	--

		<p>whose opinion has not been ascertained.</p> <p>Page 33. Again does development along the A5/railway refer to Greenfield development?</p> <p>Page 34. Surely the big idea expressed in this document is that Daventry will become a sustainable energy, waste neutral town with zero air pollution? Hopefully there will be tangible support for a major branch of Friends of the Earth?</p> <p>Page 40. Are there many brownfield sites around Daventry. It would be good if as much development as possible avoids Greenfield sites.</p> <p>Pages 44 – 47. The concept of an EcoPark and a hub of environmental engineering excellence implies an increase in highly skilled as well as low skill jobs and will require the education sector to meet new needs.</p> <p>Pages 50 – 55. What is meant by a University of Daventry? Even if the population reaches 40000, will there be demand for this? Linking the idea to eco industry and engineering is a good, but will it not really be a branch of another university such as Northampton or Warwick?</p> <p>Would the University not require:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An administration centre • A students' centre • Accommodation blocks • Lecture hall(s) and seminar rooms with high quality facilities. <p>Page 58. There needs to be real control over what developers do to promote a <i>strong and vibrant community</i>. Each housing estate needs to have good facilities such as a play area, community centre, shop, hairdresser, takeaway and pub – maybe some of these can be combined to make them viable. There needs to be local schooling so that resident children can be educated together.</p> <p>Daventry is a <i>place to be proud of</i> but to help people feel this the town needs to be self-sufficient in high quality education at primary, secondary and tertiary levels so that young people no longer feel the need to leave the town to do ‘A levels or apprenticeships. Education within the town needs to be highly valued.</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>Also as said above, there needs to be a much wider range of employment opportunities actively encouraged by the town and district councils.</p> <p>Pages 59/60. This really would make Daventry a town to be proud of if it were implemented.</p> <p>Page 62. Why only 50% of new housing to be carbon neutral? Surely 100% would be more appropriate? And there should be a rolling plan to render older housing carbon neutral too.</p> <p>There some exciting ideas in the Masterplan 2040, but enough uncertainty to make respondents worry that the better parts of the plan will be ignored in favour of ever more boring housing estates with minimal facilities. We see this as an opportunity to build strong sustainable communities in a town that is progressive and looking to the future because of its green credentials.</p>	
<p>2040/11/30</p>	<p>Howkins and Harrison – Jeff Paybody</p>	<p>I write further to receipt of the Masterplan to make representations regarding the suitability of the above land for future residential/commercial development.</p> <p>Ownership The land is in the ownership of a number of landowners as follows</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mr Paul Hillier, Autogreen Ltd (automotive recycling site) edged black on the plan 2. Daventry District Council – edged blue on the plan 3. Mrs Barbara and Mr Rod Clutton – edged red on the plan 4. The Dennett Family, Dennett’s Nurseries Limited – edged green on the plan <p>Site Description The land comprised mixed use commercial, retail and agricultural property, comprising a former scrap yard, nursery and garden centre, agricultural and scrub land.</p> <p>Suitability for Development The land lies on the edge of the south eastern tip of Daventry, close to existing commercial and residential development. Although on the south side of the Daventry Road it is predominantly developed land.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The masterplan already recognizes the development potential in this location (referred to as the South East SUE). Revise text to recognize that development in this location will need to create an attractive gateway feature for the town.</p> <p>No change.</p>

		<p>Communications The land has access to the A45 Daventry to London Road which provides immediate access to the M1 junction 16 at Nether Heyford approximately 5 miles distant to the east, continuing on the A45 access is also gained to the A425 Daventry to Southam Road providing access to the M40 and via the A361 Daventry to Banbury Road also providing access to the M40.</p> <p>Sustainability Being on the edge of the existing developed part of Daventry, the land is considered to be sustainable location for future residential or commercial development in terms of both its physical relationship to the existing settlement, accessibility and the opportunity for transport choices other than by means of the private car.</p> <p>Flooding According to the Environment Agency's floodplain maps, the site is not located within either Flood Zone 3 or Flood Zone 3 i.e. it is located within Zone 1 which represents to lowest probability of flooding at a 1:1000 annual probability.</p> <p>I trust this sets out clearly the reasons why we consider this site as suitable for future development but if you have any queries do not hesitate to contact me.</p>	
2040/11/31	Newnham Parish Council	<p>Newnham Parish Council supports the comments put forward by DVT and at this stage does not have any further points to make with specific regard to Newnham.</p> <p>We request please that Newnham PC is kept on the circulation list for the purpose of future information/consultations/comments.</p> <p>Our response to the Draft Masterplan framework is set out below.</p>	No change.
2040/11/32	Emily Hale, David Wilson Homes	<p>David Wilson Homes South Midlands broadly support the long-term conceptual approach of this document. The Company supports its flexibility, however further clarification is sought in terms of the allocation of strategic residential development through the plan.</p> <p>The Masterplan provides a strategy to 2040, which is accepted as a long term vision of growth at Daventry. David Wilson Homes would wish to see a more detailed strategy which sets out how issues such as residential land allocation to provide for the targeted growth aspirations will actually be delivered.</p> <p>Although the plan provides a strategy for the longer term, clarity is sought in terms</p>	No change.

		<p>of how it complements the Core Strategy which plans to 2026. it is not identified what the weighting of an Informal Planning Document is in the Planning Policy Context section, nor is it set out how this document will be used (if at all) in the determination of planning applications upon adoption.</p> <p>Given the ongoing changes to the planning system, and the level of uncertainty that this inevitably brings, the Masterplan will require regular monitoring and updating. It has not been identified or made clear in the document how and when this will be undertaken. For example, will the document be reviewed at the same time as the Core Strategy for consistency purposes? Further detail on this is required in terms of how the document will consider changing circumstances, whilst remaining deliverable.</p> <p>David Wilson Homes strongly supports the requirement for significant new housing development to the town, including the delivery of SUE's and residential development to the settlements of Long Buckby and Weedon. Further consideration should be given to the provision of residential development in rural locations, in order to support the Council's 5 year housing land supply and to provide for a more diversified approach, thus meeting local need. With this in mind, provision should be set out for the delivery of smaller scale residential allocations, which are often more achievable and reliable in the shorter term.</p> <p>The requirement for significant residential development should be addressed directly in the Masterplan Vision, in order for Daventry to continue to be self sustaining. If sufficient housing is not provided then the town and surrounding settlements will see people commuting in from wider areas, thus disturbing the sustainable balance of the District.</p> <p>We would be grateful if you could continue to keep us information of the progress of the Masterplan 2040, along with other planning policy documents.</p>	
2040/11/33	West Northants JPU Officer Response	<p>1. The West Northamptonshire Joint Planning Unit (JPU) agrees that the Masterplan takes a long-term strategic approach for Daventry town which looks further into the future than the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy. The Daventry 2040 Masterplan aligns with and is complementary to the vision for Daventry town set out in the West Northamptonshire Pre-Submission Joint Core Strategy (PSJCS). The Daventry 2040 Masterplan clearly extends beyond the time horizon envisaged in the (PSJCS) and includes conceptual development which</p>	<p>Suggested re-wording on page 53 of the Masterplan document to be incorporated.</p> <p>Clarification regarding potential uses to be incorporated into the proposed EcoPark to be included within finalised Masterplan document.</p>

		<p>extends beyond the vision for Daventry as set out in the PSJCS within the context of an informal forward planning document. As an Informal Planning Document (IPD) the Masterplan can remain flexible to changing circumstances over its 30 year time horizon. As the Masterplan has an indicative start date of 2011 and it includes within its frame of reference strategic development as proposed in the PSJCS.</p> <p>2. The Masterplan identifies the physical environmental constraints of topography, waterways and areas of identified landscape quality that would be sensitive to visual impact of new development. Existing land uses and their potential impact on cohesive integration for new development such as large employment areas and the physical barriers presented by the A45 and A425 are noted. Environmental designations such as wildlife areas, country part designations, green spaces and archaeological areas area also recognized.</p> <p>The environment and countryside setting around the villages encircling Daventry may also be seen as a constraint if these village environments are to be protected.</p> <p>Although the Masterplan identifies constraints at a strategic level there may also be constraints at a more specific level in terms of the identification of a site for Daventry EcoPark.</p> <p>3. Whilst there have been a number of visions for Daventry over the years the vision expressed in the Masterplan encompasses these and rolls them forward to a longer term, 30 year vision. The PSJCS contains a vision for the West Northamptonshire Area for which Daventry is a part. This vision supports the growth of Daventry whilst retaining its historic character with the focus of the community and civic pride being on the town centre. The PSJCS sees the town at 2016 moving toward a more robust commercial offer based on engineering and sustainable construction.</p> <p>The Masterplan vision aligns with the PSJCS vision of Daventry. The PSJCS vision is in effect a stage on the way to Daventry having a greater economically self-sufficient town with reduced out-commuting and achieving that by around 2040. Both the PSJCS and the Masterplan vision see the development of sustainable technologies as an important part of</p>	<p>The comments regarding timescales are noted, however it is considered beneficial to indicate ,albeit in very broad terms, how the masterplan would be implemented.</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>Daventry's future distinguishing it from other similar sized market towns.</p> <p>The Vision encompasses Daventry as a self-sufficient town as regards water, waste and energy. With the need to consider future climate change, water resources and potential for increased runoff, a whole town approach to sustainable drainage systems could be supported through the vision, for example by the creation of temporary and permanent water space, ponds and winter wetlands. The whole town sustainable drainage systems could further link into the creation of recreation and wildlife area.</p> <p>4. The aspiration to support an enhanced low-carbon bus-based public transport system for Daventry is supported as the most achievable option to improve the public transport system within the town, certainly for the short to medium term.</p> <p><i>(Suggested rewording for A 2nd Century Transport System is to substitute the word "benefiting" for "suffering.")</i></p> <p>As regards the creation of jobs for Daventry residents the Masterplan appears to rely largely on the existing elements of the Vision for Daventry such as the provision of office floorspace of the town centre and the regeneration of the existing employment parks. The additional element that takes the Masterplan beyond 2026 is the creation of an ecopark alongside the M1 and the potential for an exclusively out of centre office park development at the B4036/A5 junction. It should be noted that these developments located alongside the strategic highway network could be considered to encourage in-commuting from outside the area. The office park could adversely affect the opportunity to attract office development at a more sustainable location in the town centre or through redevelopment and regeneration of the existing employment parks. Sustainable transport links between the town and new ecopark is worthy of emphasis within the overall vision.</p> <p>The Masterplan supports a whole town approach to carbon reduction committing to energy generation from renewable sources, conserving water and recycling. As a 30 year plan the Masterplan could give further emphasis to the type of heating and the amount of renewable energy and use of micro renewables likely to be in use by 2040. Cooling will be a major issue for buildings and people in how they use public spaces in the</p>
--	--	---

		<p>town. There may be an opportunity for generating town wide income from excess energy into a new smart grid and installation for combined heat and power to cover the town centre.</p> <p>5. Any other Comments The Masterplan is envisaged as a long term and flexible strategy to guide the town over the next 30 years as an informal planning document. The Masterplan notes that strategic spatial planning policy is emerging to cover the development of the town for the next 15 years to 2026 through the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy</p> <p>In some instances within the Masterplan document timescales for the delivery of the Masterplan vision and strategy are indicated. In this respect it may be considered premature to suggest short term and in some cases medium term timelines to the delivery of the Masterplan strategy where this does not align with the emerging strategic spatial policy framework, in particular the delivery of the ecopark and the south-east Sustainable Urban Extension.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Daventry Masterplan 2040. The JPU is supportive of the general approach and the forward thinking nature and flexibility within the informal planning document.</p>	
<p>2040/11/34</p>	<p>Daventry Town Council</p>	<p>Following a Special meeting of Daventry Town Council on 14th December 2011, there was broad consensus on the following comments relating to the Daventry 2040 Masterplan.</p> <p>In brief the document is vague and its integrity flawed by virtue of the lack of detail on known aspects of current and future planning for Daventry.</p> <p>The Masterplan, although created with a view to flexibility and a vision for the future development of Daventry, it clearly states that it will be regarded as an informal planning document. The Town Council. Therefore, asks that as this document is a material consideration in determining planning applications that the District Council provides as explanation as to where it sits in the hierarchy of relevant planning documents and how it will be used within local planning guidance as a material consideration for future development in Daventry.</p> <p>The Council is particularly concerned that detail relating to proposed development</p>	<p>Comments regarding community to be added to the finalised Masterplan document.</p>

		<p>is located on a high percentage of the open green space in Daventry. This is not a visionary plan, this is a proposal for significant development on key sites and under the planning principles of transparency, openness and fairness, it is not acceptable that such significant developments be permitted to proceed without scrutiny and assessment via the planning process.</p> <p>The existing local plan does not include plans for development and this document has been created to address this issue and allow for development in the centre of town.</p> <p>In brief, this document would appear to permit future development on all open green spaces in Daventry, a significant consideration that Daventry Town Council fiercely challenges.</p> <p>The Town Council is also concerned at the omission of the opportunities a long term place could present i.e. the provision of amenities to promote community cohesion, community centres, are and culture centres, leisure facilities – tourism is notable in its absence.</p> <p>The Town Council respects the concept of a vision and supports the creation of an “environmentally friendly” town with new footpaths and cycleways, but on reviewing the content members of Daventry Town Council found it to be flawed and lacking in its detail and contradictory in its content. For example the document would indicate:</p> <p>Local Strategy Service</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A town offering employment for all but no detail has been provided on how this will be achieved. • The inability to develop to the south of the Town due to publically accessible open space, but no detail is available on the location of this publically accessible open space. • Three country parks but only two country parks can be identified. • The creation of footpaths and cycle ways to the west of Daventry, but on further investigation it would appear that this should read to be east of Daventry.
--	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No reference has been made to the Daventry Strategic Development Option Study – April 2005, as when read in conjunction with Daventry 2040 Masterplan they would appear to be contradictory in content. <p>It was noted that the authors of the document lacked local knowledge of the Town and made statements that were detrimental and discourteous to the residents of the town. Comments like “Daventry has little self worth” and “Daventry as not identify” are not planning considerations and no evidence is provided to support these statements.</p> <p>The 2040 Plan would appear to be commercially driven to satisfy housing, environmental and transportation targets that Daventry District Council has signed up to e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Masterplan identifies a 21st Century transport system but does not provide any detail on how this will be achieved. In fact the item concludes by identifying what is essentially a bus service. <p>This is evidence of the insufficient emphasis on the development of the infrastructure to support the proposed development detailed in the vision.</p> <p>Daventry Town Council would also like to point out the lack of integrity in relation to the consultation process. The Council questions the exclusion of the requirement for consultees to record their name and address, thus promoting anonymity and highlighting the District Councils apathetic attitude to the consultation process. It is evident that questions contained in the consultation are composed to generate a positive response thereby influencing the final conclusions.</p> <p>In conclusion Daventry 2040 Masterplan is based on assumptions and its lack of detail does not give the Council confidence in the credibility of the document.</p>	
2040/11/35	DDC EMS	<p>Comments directly related to the 2040 Daventry Masterplan Draft Version 3 text.</p> <p>Rail EMS would agree (with the Masterplan) that a rail link between Long Buckby and Daventry is unlikely to be viable due to the cost/benefit ratio that would result from any formal appraisal. A sustainable public transport link is however important and alternative methods of providing this link should be explored once the potential</p>	No change.

	<p>patronage of any link has been modeled. Synchronising train and bus service timetables should be the start point for improving integration.</p> <p>Light Rail/Tram EMS would agree that Light Rail/Tram is unlikely to be viable within Daventry particularly due to the high cost of installation, and that the level of potential patronage and revenue income in Daventry is unlikely to make the operation sustainable without considerable ongoing subsidy. The significant scale of infrastructure installation required does not appear to complement the geographic spread or population size of the town.</p> <p>PRT (Personal Rapid Transit) EMS agree with the Masterplan statement that “PRT is unlikely to be a viable or practicable solution for Daventry”. Previous studies, public feedback, NICHES+ feedback and public consultation including through the PRT Public Advisory Panel has identified a number of significant issues which support this. These issues include severance, cost to build and operate, CO₂ expended to construct, visual impact (majority would be elevated), maintenance cost, security cost, and the fact that PRT is still unproven in the open public realm. During the final NICHES+ EVENT (March 2011) PRT was voted the least implementable public transport innovation by a significant number of attendees (industry and public sector professionals) from across Europe, the feeling being that it is far better suited to integration in new towns (i.e. not retro-fitted), transport hubs, or in large “exhibition centre”-type environments.</p> <p>GRT (Group Rapid Transport) EMS consider that GRT has more potential for limited implementation in Daventry compared to PRT given that it operates on a far more restricted network and is simply an automated bus running in corridors. However, compared to traditional bus operation, the vehicles require separated “highway” space and would require remote monitoring due to the vehicle and infrastructure vulnerability for anti social behaviour. GRT may be best suited for linking more remote estates to the town centre within an expanded Daventry. However, achieving segregated corridors that reach termini sufficiently close to the town centre, and not creating significant severance, appears very difficult to achieve. If GRT is to be considered as a partial solution for Daventry’s future transport needs, it should be seen as one element of a wider transport and mobility package working alongside the modes set out in the Summary below.</p>	
--	---	--

		<p><i>Capture of transport patronage heading into Daventry</i></p> <p>Given the substantial retail-focused redevelopment proposals for the Town (e.g. sites 1 and 4) there is potential for increased incoming traffic from beyond the town boundaries. Consideration is being given with the Daventry Town Transport Strategy (NCC led) for improved town-to-town public transport links (e.g. Northampton to Daventry and vice versa) and EMS group believe thought should be given to the integration of these enhanced public transport links with edge of town “Park and Ride” facilities capturing car drivers incoming to the town. Clearly such facilities would need to be justified by modeling the potential uplift in visitors to Daventry once the retail/leisure development has occurred, and would need to be implemented alongside measures to dissuade drivers from accessing town car parks (i.e. car park charging).</p> <p>Summary of response:</p> <p>It is the opinion of the EMS group that Daventry should exhaust the promotion and improvement of existing cycling, walking, and public transport facilities/opportunities before considering the addition of a new form of public transport with associated infrastructure build (Light Rail, Tram, PRT, GRT etc). The group does consider that limited incorporation of GRT routes through significant corridors has the possibility to be beneficial. However, the economic climate for the next decade at least is unlikely to be conducive to huge levels of investment for alternative transport systems in towns such as Daventry where the congestion is not (and if managed effectively, will not be) a problem, even looking forward with the envisaged growth. Highways are already a significant revenue burden to the taxpayer, they should be utilized as effectively as possible before further (potential) revenue drains are created.</p> <p>The level of cycling, walking and public transport promotion appears very low at present and possibly has been for a number of years. This lack of information and education of the public should be addressed urgently to benefit the current restrained finances that many families are experiencing, with many seeking cheaper ways to travel effectively. During the NICHES+ project examples of public transport promotion and education (particularly targeting senior citizens and the young) were seen to increase public transport use significantly.</p> <p>Additionally, once the Daventry town centre “offer” is improved (Sites 1, 5 etc) payment for parking may be introduced which should encourage the use of “non car” modes to access the town. This will only occur if the above described</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>promotion and improvement of cycling, walking and public transport takes place and is sustained.</p> <p><i>Electric Cars</i></p> <p>Daventry should support the practicality of owning and driving Electric Vehicles (EV's) through the installation of electric charging points. Whilst a significant reduction of car ownership and use should be aspired to, the practicality of using cars for most leisure, business and social activities means that the public's attraction to car use is highly unlikely to reduce. Hence, to directly encourage the use of environmentally cleaner vehicles, the uptake of electric vehicles should be promoted by the supply of supporting infrastructure (i.e. public charge points). Car manufacturers are investing heavily in electric car development (approx 9 new models due 2012) and with the increasing carbon shortage and related fuel cost increases, EMS believe that electric vehicles will become significantly more attractive to run and operate. Support for electrical vehicle usage is not noted in the 2040 Masterplan document.</p> <p>EMS supports the Masterplan "transport" summary (page 53) which encourages the development of an "enhanced bus" based public transport network with new local carbon vehicles, ease-of-access facilities, and reliable real-time information displays as the best available option in the short to medium term, along with the walking and cycling promotion and improvements described above.</p> <p>Note: Within the "Daventry Development Transport Study 2007" and summarized in the "Daventry PRT Scoping Study 2008" (point 12, Executive Summary), enhancement of bus network and standard of buses ("High Quality bus" scenario) achieved closed BCR's** compared to proposed PRT implementation (PRT 1.9-2.9 depending upon level of demand and revenue, High Quality Bus 1.7).</p> <p>**Benefit Cost Ratio</p>	
2040/11/36	Paul Whiffen	<p>1.1 The area identified in the Masterplan for an ecopark, energy infrastructure and waste treatment is excessively large for the projected 40,000 population of the town. Comparison with the size of current environmental and energy infrastructure across the IK emphasizes the hugely disproportionate scale of the 150 hectare area outlined in the</p>	<p>Comments noted. The proposals for the Ecopark in the Masterplan have been amended, including its location.</p>

	<p>Masterplan as the following examples demonstrate:</p> <p>a) Power generation Dundee Renewable Energy Plant – 100MW of electricity (plus 30MW of heating capacity) from a biomass fuelled power station on a dockside site of no more than 6 hectares, capable of supplying 86% of the electricity demand of Dundee – population approximately 130,000 (www.forthenergy.co.uk)</p> <p>Lakeside Energy from Waste Plant – 34MW of electricity generated (plus heating capacity) from residual domestic, commercial and industrial waste on just over 2 hectares adjacent to the M25. Site also includes space for materials recovery (www.lakesideefw.co.uk)</p> <p>Both sites are located in industrial areas.</p> <p>b) Ecopark and Renewable Energy Plant Loganswell Lifetime Recycling Village – a proposed scheme south west of Glasgow to handle 1.5 million tones of unprocessed waste a year incorporating recycling, recovery and generation of up to 100MW of electricity on a single site of approximately 30 hectares (www.lifetime recyclingvillage.com)</p> <p>(c) Foul water/sewage treatment The present Whitton sewage plant is sited on approximately 9 hectares, an area which is understood to have been planned to accommodate the treatment of waste from a population of 36,000 – projected in previous Birmingham “overspill” plans</p> <p>Relating the above examples to the waste treatment, sewage and energy requirements for a town of 40,000 people suggests that this infrastructure would need less than 30 hectares – 20% of the area outlined in the Masterplan. If the present Whitton sewage plant could be developed to increase capacity then an efficient recycling and energy from waste plant would require less than 10 hectares.</p> <p>1.2 Location and Land Use The Masterplan provides no justification for designating 150 hectares of open countryside for an ecopark and renewable energy infrastructure. The large hill and associated sloping ground that form the area present significant constraints to any built development. Furthermore assessment</p>
--	---

		<p>of alternatives related to existing infrastructure and industrial sites has not been provided. For example:</p> <p>The Masterplan makes no reference to the established and expanding commercial and industrial area of DIRFT, less than 10 km from the town. Director motorway access, rail connection and a National grid link make this location ideal for energy production and waste management with additional advantages of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -bulk delivery of “fuel” from other sources if Daventry could not produce enough locally (either intermittently or in the long term) or if/when more effective/competitive “fuels” from other sources/locations become available – see comments on self sufficiency below. -an existing market for heat produced in generating electricity. <p>In the case of sewage treatment, if more land is needed then expansion of the present Wilton site should be fully considered first.</p> <p>1.3 Northamptonshire Minerals and Waste Strategy</p> <p>Waste management issues to 2026 and beyond, including the projected expansion of Daventry, are covered in detail by the Core Strategy DPD adopted in March 2011.</p> <p>Permission for an energy park and has entered into a partnership with Cranfield University to establish a Renewable Energy R & D Centre training up to 300 postgraduate students a year.</p> <p>As well as the need for a far broader base for employment and university ambitions, there is the fundamental question – does a town of 40,000 people have the capacity to accommodate a viable size university?</p> <p>4. Office development – A5/Daventry-Long Buckby Road Junction</p> <p>This outlined area for office development represents further linear expansion away from the town centre and corresponding loss of more open countryside. Disadvantages of this location are:</p>
--	--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - too far for convenient access to shops, banks and other facilities located in the town centre - add to existing high volumes of east-west traffic through Long Buckby and Wharf - the scale and proximity of office development added to the impact of the ecopark and renewables farm would overwhelm Long Buckby Wharf. <p>5. Landscape and Canal Conservation Corridor issues</p> <p>Development adjacent to the canal on the scale outlined in the Masterplan will have a significant impact on the Canal Conservation Corridor over a continuous distance of more than 5 kilometres extending from just south of Watford Gap past Norton Junction and also through Long Buckby Wharf.</p> <p>The unique character of the canal in the landscape was recognized when DDC designated the Conservation Corridor many years ago. The proposed creation of extensive woodland, a canal park and new areas of public open and accessible green space will increase the impact on the traditional canal setting as such “improvements” – particularly attempts at merging established and “new” - typically have the opposite effect.</p> <p>More broadly, the proposed Northeast Sustainable Urban Extension and adjacent office development to the east are hill top/ridge locations which are very visible over a wide range of distance from an arc stretching from north to east. For the same reason the ecopark and renewable energy sites are very visible in the opposite direction. The issue of extensive visibility across these areas was a significant factor identified in previous landscape assessment carried out for Northamptonshire Minerals and Waste plans.</p> <p>6. Buffer Zones</p> <p>In the completely unsatisfactory event that renewables energy production, an ecopark or office development around the A5/Daventry-Long Buckby road junction remain in the Masterplan, substantial and effective buffer zones would be essential to prevent Long Buckby Wharf being overwhelmed by the adverse effects of the extensive development</p>	
--	---	--

		<p>outlined.</p> <p>7. Summary</p> <p>The examples quoted above are by no means exclusive but clearly demonstrate that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">-the development of an ecopark incorporating the production of renewable energy to support a sustainable community is not unique – a scheme in Peterborough already has planning permission and an agreed link to provide university courses, whilst similar combined technology is also emerging elsewhere.-the area outlined for an ecopark, environmental infrastructure and renewable energy is out of all proportion to the projected size of the town- the allocation of excessive areas for specific directly opens up the entire area for general industrial development.- the areas outlined for the North East Urban extension, ecopark, environmental and energy infrastructure are all highly visible from any perspectives and would have substantial adverse impact on the landscape and in particularly the Canal Conservation Corridor.-the vision of local development of significant energy and waste infrastructure in isolation risks a high cost to the environment, uncertain long term value and conflict with the development of broader schemes for waste management and sustainable energy production. <p>Please do not hesitate to contact me if you require further detail on any of the above points.</p> <p>Further to the above which set out my comments on the 2040 Masterplan, I have subsequently referred to the Engagement Report. This has revealed that the stated “notable stakeholder consensus” for location of industrial, environmental and renewable energy development north of Long Buckby Wharf is not valid – the analysis of information from the mapping sessions is seriously skewed by the capitalization map produced in session 4.</p> <p>Based on the number of blocks shown on the maps, the views of session 4 represented 83% of the overall support for industrial development and 60% of the support for environmental and energy development. Of equal concern, the location north of Long Buckby Wharf was only identified in 2 of the 20 maps representing</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>the views on the 4 future scenarios covered in the 6 sessions.</p> <p>Extending analysis of the maps to include adjacent areas shows support in 6 of the 20 maps with the extent of support still heavily skewed by the session 4 capitalisation map. The output from session 4 is so extreme that it raises the questions about the make-up and dynamics of this group.</p> <p>This major flaw in the analysis of stakeholder opinions totally invalidates the argument for location of an ecopark, environmental and renewable energy development in the area outlined north of Long Buckby Wharf. In act, based on the mapping sessions the consensus view was one of no development in the outlined area as reflected by 18 of the 20 maps.</p> <p>The Masterplan requires revision to reflect the lack of any valid consensus on the location of an ecopark, environmental and renewable energy infrastructure affected by similarly flawed analysis.</p> <p>I would be grateful if you could respond to these points as a matter of urgency, as they raise serious questions about the location of development presented in the Masterplan.</p>	
<p>2040/11/37 ⊗</p>	<p>Peter Noden, Sworders</p>	<p>I. No – Whilst we agree with the need to develop a long terms strategy for the development of Daventry, we welcome the recognition that the Masterplan must be flexible in order to respond to changing circumstances, in particular changes to the planning policy context, over the 30 year time horizon of the document.</p> <p>We note that the Masterplan is only to be adopted as an Informal Planning Document with weight to be afforded in planning decisions dependent on the prevailing town planning system and the judgment of those making decisions. We do not believe that such a document can carry any weight in the decision making process unless it is subject to examination in public.</p> <p>There is no guidance as to the weight the Masterplan would carry in the</p>	<p>The Masterplan does not allocate any specific sites for specific uses and the decision making body would be at liberty to take decisions which are contrary to the Masterplan should they have a good reason for doing so.</p> <p>The Masterplan takes its starting point from work done to date by all organisations and bodies and has not sought to revisit this.</p> <p>It is considered necessary to note that it is not necessary for an informal planning</p>

		<p>Plan making process and similarly, we believe that it should carry no weight. It is assumed that the Masterplan is intended to guide the development of the Core Strategy through the plan making process; however, there is no clarity regarding on what justification or statutory basis this Masterplan is being produced.</p> <p>If the document is to be afforded any weight in planning decisions or the plan making process it should be subject to independent examination. The intention to adopt the Masterplan as an Informal Planning Document and the supporting material to the Masterplan suggests an examination in public will not occur. Following the current consultation a revised version of the Masterplan will be prepared taking account of the comments received and the revised Masterplan will be considered by Daventry District Council's Strategy Group and then at a meeting of Full Council in early 2012.</p> <p>PPS12 is very clear that planning authorities may prepare Supplementary Planning Documents to provide greater detail on the policies in its DPDs. SPDs should not be prepared with the aim of avoiding the need for the examination of policy which should be examined. The LPA cannot avoid this requirement simply by referring to the document is an Informal Planning Document. If such a document is produced then it should carry no weight in the decision making or plan making process:</p> <p><i>“District/borough/cit councils should not produce planning guidance other than SPD where the guidance is intended to be used in decision making or the coordination of development. This could be construed as wishing to circumvent the provisions for consultation and sustainability appraisal which SPDs have”.</i></p> <p>PPS12 and the Planning Advisory Service offer no guidance for planning documents made ahead of the Core Strategy; current guidance states that to carry any weight in planning decisions DPD's and SPD's should be consistent with national planning policies and the development plan documents contained in the local development framework.</p> <p>If the Masterplan is to have DPD status then in order to pass the test of examination in public and be declared sound it must be justified, effective and consistent with national policy. In order to be effective it must be</p>	<p>document to assess alternatives in the manner that a development plan document would.</p>
--	--	---	--

	<p>deliverable. For examine, as significant areas to the north of Daventry has been identified as Danetree Wood with no indication that the landowners would make this area available or that the LPA have the funds to make a Compulsory Purchase Order.</p> <p>Furthermore, the evidence on which it is based should be robust. The supporting material to the Masterplan suggests that it draws on evidence produced for another purpose (namely the West Northants Joint Planning Unit Core Strategy) and a limited public engagement exercise.</p> <p>The supporting information to the Masterplan states that the Masterplan draws on the evidence base used in preparing the Core Strategy. It then states that the Masterplan covers a much longer timeframe than the other documents it therefore has “a freer hand to consider what should happen in the longer term”. This raises considerable concerns regarding the robustness of the Masterplan.</p> <p>Whilst the evidence base may be robust for the purposes of preparing the Core Strategy, it has not been produced with the focus on Daventry Town or the time horizon including in the Masterplan. Extending the timeframe does not equate to free rein to produce an additional document containing alternative proposals which will not be scrutinized by independent examination.</p> <p>There is insufficient background provided to accompany the Masterplan to suggest which reasonable alternatives have been considered, which have been dismissed and why.</p> <p>Whilst we support the principle of a Vision for the development of Daventry, we believe the Masterplan document is too prescriptive for this purpose. The Masterplan itself acknowledges that it must be flexible to respond to changing circumstances yet still produces a detailed Framework Plan allocating areas for housing, open space, extensive woodland planting etc with an evidence base which has been produced for a different planning body (the JPU) for an entirely different document covering a larger area and a shorter time horizon. This evidence as is therefore not robust for this purpose.</p> <p>2. The list of key constraints suggests that the north of Daventry is the least constrained direction, particularly in relation to the non-environmental</p>
--	--

		<p>constraints; however, this has not been reflected in the proposals. Nor north of Daventry has not been identified as having any “other” constraints; the east, west and south are all identified as being highly visually sensitive, the south and west as high quality landscape and the Borough Hill to the east, the employment areas to the west plus the A45 to the west and south and A425 to the east all act as barriers to further development. No such constraints exist to the north.</p> <p>Danetree Wood has been planned for the north in the least constrained area/ there is no indication in the document to demonstrate whether reasonable alternative locations have been considered. The engagement sessions indicated that the preferred locations for woodland were to the north-west and on and around Borough Hill with the Masterplan containing a clear commitment to better utilize Borough Hill. Yet it has been proposed for the boundary and north-west area only.</p> <p>The Environmental Constraints map appears to show Greenspace and inaccessible gradients to the north. However, there is no explanation as to what the “Greenspace” refers to; there is no such allocation in the Local Plan and this area is active farmland. The gradients to the north are shallow in comparison with those to the east and south.</p> <p>3. Yes.</p> <p>Whilst we broadly support the Vision to create a self sufficient, bustling town with good accessibility and excellent education provision, this Vision should be subject to robust examination to ensure that it is justified, effective, in accordance with national policy and deliverable.</p> <p>It should also maintain flexibility to respond to changing circumstances if it is to endure for the full 30 year time horizon of the Masterplan. The vision should not be embodied in a prescriptive framework regulating its delivery.</p> <p>4. No</p> <p>We do not support such a comprehensive and long term Masterplan for Daventry which will not be subject to Examination in Public. Whilst the Vision itself is admirable we believe there are genuine deliverability</p>
--	--	---

		<p>and flexibility issues associated with the proposed Masterplan and in branding it as an informal Planning Document the Council are attempting to circumvent the provisions for consultation and sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>In particular we do not support the allocation of the urban extensions to the north east and south east. These allocations are pre-empting the outcome of the West Northamptonshire Joint Planning Unit Core Strategy process which is currently ongoing and will be subject to Examination in Public. The most recent version of the document, the Pre-Submission Core Strategy, contained an allocation for an urban extension to the north-east only, and not the south-east. The adoption of the 2040 Masterplan as an Informal Planning Document, no subject to Examination in Public, could have the effect of steering the Core Strategy, or future revisions of the Core Strategy towards the Southeast grown location, without considering the reasonable alternative to the north. This would be exacerbated by the allocation of Danetree Wood which is another element of the Masterplan we particularly disagree with.</p> <p>Such a prescriptive framework would also significantly constraint the flexibility of the Vision. In particular, the Boundary Wood and Danetree Wood would have the effect of preventing further development and expansion of Daventry beyond the 2040 time horizon. A restrictive belt of trees and a considerable area of woodland to the least constrained direction would effectively stifle any further expansion of the town.</p> <p>4. The area to the north of Daventry is a reasonable alternative/additional location for growth. This area was identified in the Emergent Joint Core Strategy (July 2009) as one of three “<i>Preferred Locations for Growth</i>”. The area is suitable, available, achievable and therefore deliverable. Flooding, landscape, transport, ecological and archaeological and assessments have been undertaken which demonstrate no significant constraints to development of the site and accompany this representation.</p> <p>The north of Daventry is a realistic alternative which is suitable, available and deliverable.</p> <p>Highways</p> <p>The northern growth area identified within the 2009 Core Strategy</p>
--	--	--

		<p>consultation document is located alongside a high capacity A class primary distributor road. The north east area is situated alongside a lower grade/capacity carriageway (B4036).</p> <p>The A45 has been identified by the County Highway Authority as being in serious need of improvement which would be essential to allow growth to the north east.</p> <p>The northern growth area would be less reliant on A45 improvements than the other potential development sites, the north east in particular. North east and south east sites would be primarily accessed from junction 16 of the M1 via the A45. The northern growth area, however, can also be accessed from junction 18 of the M1 via Kilsby and the Daventry International Rail Freight Terminal via the A361, which has not been identified as being in serious need of improvements.</p> <p>The northern growth area is situated next to a main shared use footway/cycle and bridleway (which cyclists can use) which offers high quality linkages to and from the town centre. This is illustrated within the Daventry Cycle and Pedestrian Network Guide available from Daventry District Council. Furthermore, Sustrans National Cycle Network Route 70 is located approximately 800 metres from the site which also provides high quality corridors to Welton, Naseby, Rugby, Leicester and Derby. It is also well related to the town centre and development would provide for public transport and encourage the use of sustainable pedestrian and cycle networks, which will in turn reduce the need to travel by car. The north east growth area is approximately 2.4 km from town centre, the northern growth area is approximately 2.9 km (measurements taken from Foundry Place shopping area to centre of development site) therefore there is only a nominal difference between the two sites in terms of distance from the town centre.</p> <p>Flooding</p> <p>The north east growth area is at risk of flooding from the Daventry reservoir and other sources. As part of the evidence base for the Joint Core Strategy, level 1 and level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessments (SFRA) were undertaken in Daventry District. These identified, in relation to the north east growth area that the site boundary should be</p>
--	--	--

		<p>trimmed to the modeled reservoir breach outline in order to remove any residual risk to the development from reservoir failure and would locate the area for development outside of the floodplain of the main river within the breach outline. It also recommended a site specific FRA would be required to assess the nature and extent of flood risk posed by a minor agricultural drain in the centre of the site, by determining the extent of Flood Zone 3 plus an allowance for climate change. The site specific FRA should also consider the residual risk of blockage of the siphon under the Grand Union Canal, or failure of the canal itself. Anglian Water DG5 date provided in the Level 1 SFRA broadly shows that historical instances of flooding have occurred from sewers in Daventry.</p> <p>Significantly, the SFRA identified that the access point between the north east growth area and the town centre of Daventry is within Flood Zone 3 meaning the development could be cut off from the town centre during floor events.</p> <p>Conversely, there is no significant risk of flooding at the northern growth area. Environment Agency maps demonstrate that the northern growth area is located outside of the flood plain. The level 2 SFRA did not identify any significant risk from flooding at or in the vicinity of the northern growth area. The level 2 SFRA refers to an area covering the southern part of the northern growth area found that there is no identified flood risk from the Grand Union Canal which is conveyed by the Braunston Tunnel beneath the site.</p> <p>Coalescence</p> <p>Development to the north east will be extremely visible from Norton with no natural boundary between the development and the village. The development area already leapfrogs the B4036 and without a defensible boundary there is considerable risk that development will be allowed in the future to fill in the entire triangle area formed by the B4036 (Long Bucky Road, North Way and the A5, coalescing with North village. The proposed structural green space does little to ensure the long term protection of this area from further sprawl.</p> <p>No such risks exist in relation to the development of the northern</p>	
--	--	---	--

growth area. Whilst the development area is located between the Daventry and the village of Welton there is less risk of coalescence in the future due to natural defensible boundaries. It is bounded to the south by the Grand Union Canal which passes through the Braunston Tunnel at this point. It is bounded to the west by a mature tree lined hedgerow and the A361 and to the north and east by a mature tree lined hedgerows.

Landscape and Heritage

Development to the north east presents significant risks to the strong landscape feature of Thrupp Cover, the Grand Union Canal Conservation Area and the protection of the Borough Hill Scheduled Ancient Monument. Development in this area would also have the effect of changing the character of Daventry Country Park. This is currently publically accessible green space which acts as a logical transition between the build-up area of Daventry and the open countryside beyond. There are currently open views across the reservoir to the open countryside giving the park the feeling of a much larger, more rural space than it in reality is. Development to the north east would see this change to a green island within the main developed area of Daventry and take on the character of an urban park. Only a very slim strip of green space is proposed to the eastern edge of the reservoir and with Monksmoor developed along its northern boundary the reservoir will be tightly constrained within development.

The northern growth area would be entirely acceptable for development in landscape terms and pose no risks to scheduled ancient monuments or landscape features. Whilst it is adjacent to the Grand Union Canal it is underground, through the Braunston Tunnel, at this point, therefore development poses no risk to its setting.

The undulating topography, spatial opportunities to integrate into the landscape, and the setting relative to the existing roads, settlements and tree lined hedgerows, coupled with additional screening, would enable northern development to sit well within the landscape. Development would not cause unacceptable landscape and visual.

<p>2040/11/38 -323 and 333 - 334</p>	<p>Various</p>	<p>Additional material was submitted with this response</p>	<p>The Masterplan proposes regeneration for central areas of the town for a range of uses and does not advocate the redevelopment of any specific sites.</p> <p>No change.</p>
<p>I have read the draft Masterplan 2040 and I am particularly concerned for certain proposals in this document, notably:</p> <p>Regeneration of the central area of the town for housing development.</p> <p>I do not accept the potential loss of the town's green open spaces in the proposals for regeneration and development in this new Masterplan, especially the central area including Eastern Way and Ashby Road Playing Fields. I note that policy RC2 in the current Daventry District Plan and National Planning policy guidance protects these areas of existing open spaces:</p> <p>“Planning permission will not be granted for development that causes the loss of existing areas of open space and other recreation or amenity areas including school playing fields and well-used allotments.”</p> <p>I also note the commentary in the current Daventry District Plan:</p> <p><i>“These areas are important environmentally, as well as for the recreational facilities they offer, and the further loss of these facilities will be restricted by the District Council”</i></p> <p>I do not support or accept the regeneration and development proposals for the central areas outlined in the Masterplan 2040 on the basis that it will undermine current local and national policy and become a green light for concreting over our remaining green open spaces in the town.</p> <p>Please acknowledge my objection to this draft document and advise me of the outcome of this public consultation, and further developments on the Masterplan 2040.</p> <p>A new Masterplan for Daventry. Why now?</p> <p>DDC is failing to meet housing targets, sites have to be found that are available, suitable and achievable, and here lies the problem – most of the rural area is out of bounds to developers and policy RC2 in the current Daventry District Plan identifies existing areas of urban open space and other recreational land for special protection from development.</p>			<p>No change.</p>

		<p>Naturally, the Planning Authority (WNDC) has picked up on this, which has put a bit of a damper on the DCC's development plans for Eastern Way and Ashby Road Playing Fields. However, we only have to read the summary in the new Masterplan 2040 to find the DDC's answer – change the goalposts! We now have a new policy being proposed – “<i>Regeneration of the central areas of the town for housing development.</i>”</p> <p>This is now putting at risk all our green open spaces in Daventry. A draft report on the new Masterplan 2040 was out to the District Councils Strategy Group – 13th October 2011. It came with a caution on page 7 – “if adopted as corporate policy by DCC it could be regarded as a material consideration by the Council when considering planning applications or indeed by developers submitting proposals or planning inspectors determining an appeal. The District Council therefore need to be mindful of its potential significance when adopting the document.”</p> <p>It's a pity a similar warning label is not attached to their public consultation feedback form!</p> <p>Replying to the consultation on these plans is very important; if you want to help in getting the community message across then please fill in your name and address and sign the letter, it will be collected later. Thank you.</p>	
<p>2040/11/324</p>	<p>Anonymous</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes – Concepts should not be so futuristic – build on what we've already go – Icon building needs functions, leisure centre. 2. Needs stable management, more emphasis on community allotments etc. Believe there is a large pipe under dyke beside reservoir – might be an engineering nightmare making canal arm? 3. Yes – Creation of EcoPark including Renewable Farm 4. Yes – Do not support canal arm or CRAZY new railtrack/no driver transport idea – vandalism? 5. Yes – Generate skating ramp/play equipment near police stations, new outdoor pool off road cycle course before new trees etc. Priority should be given to <u>regeneration</u> of Southbrook housing estate, securing good leisure centre, providing new 	<p>No change.</p>
<p>2040/11/325 ⊗</p>	<p>Environment Agency</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We consider the quest for 'carbon neutrality' (within the context of renewable energy) would suffice for a 20 year strategy. We would fine the Masterplan more bold in ambition if it sought to go the extra mile and embraced the concept of carbon capture (i.e. reducing it for good). This is particularly apposite with reference to the industrial Eco Park proposed, which we consider eco-park will 	<p>Points noted. Whilst the concerns raised in the response are valid, many of them are more appropriately dealt with in a formal planning document than the masterplan which takes a conceptual</p>

	<p>provide an opportunity to showcase innovative provisions for waste management and sustainable communities.</p> <p>2. Climate Change – Climate change is the most significant environmental challenge facing society this century and concerted action is needed by us all to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases. The UK needs to start adapting to climate change now in a pragmatic and precautionary way. Daventry is within the driest region of the country, making it particularly susceptible to climate change.</p> <p>Key facts – By 2080 if we continue to discharge high amounts of greenhouse gases into the atmosphere it is predicted that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Temperatures will rise by between 3 and 5 degrees Celsius; • Winter rainfall will increase by up to 30%; • Summer rainfall will decrease by 45-60% compared with current patterns; • Sea levels will rise by between 22 and 82cm; and • Winters will be wetter and stormier thereby increasing flood risk. <p>Summers will be drier with implications for water resources and all that depends on water including the environment.</p> <p>Not only do we advise that climate change is acknowledged within 'Future World Scenarios' on page 22 but that further recognition of this is included within Section 4.5 'The Vision' page 56.</p> <p>Water Infrastructure – No mention appears to have been made in the Masterplan with regard to ensuring infrastructure for the disposal of sewerage effluent and treatment is timed with development. More houses and commercial properties are needed to meet the needs of a growing population, changing lifestyles, and to enable economic growth. However, houses and offices should not be built until the water and sewerage infrastructure serving the development is sufficient to ensure the environment is not placed at risk. Partners collectively have a duty to ensure that suitable infrastructure planning takes place to serve sustainable development within environmental limits. As lead competent authority for carrying out the Water Framework Directive (WFD) in England and Wales, the Environment Agency's aims are to prevent deterioration in the water status; promote the sustainable use of water; and help reduce the effects of flood and droughts. In addition to no deterioration, there must be progress towards an improved water status.</p> <p>Pressure on water resources will increase over the next 40 years as a result of</p>	<p>approach.</p>
--	---	------------------

	<p>climate change and population growth, however effectively we manage demand. Without action there is a risk that some part of the country could be facing more frequent reduced water availability as early as the 2030s, with the supply-demand gap becoming more acute by 2050.</p> <p>Water supply and sewerage infrastructure is nationally critical infrastructure. Climate change, population growth and associated development and urban creep are all putting pressure on our infrastructure. Our sewerage network is ageing and deteriorating. Extreme rainfall levels already cause a problem for some of our drainage networks. Keeping surface water out of sewers is a key aim. The Masterplan should support this approach by stating that new development should not discharge surface water to the sewer network, until alternative options have been considered.</p> <p>Specifically the Masterplan should recognize the ambition to achieve 'Good Ecological Status or Potential' by 2015 on all waterbodies.</p> <p>Flood Risk – We are keen to ensure that flood risk is not increased as a result of any new development. We therefore advise including reference to the requirement for all new development in the Upper Nene catchment to be designed for a flood with a 0.5% probability (1 in 200 chances) occurring in any year, including an appropriate allowance for climate change. This includes design of mitigation for main river flooding and any surface water attenuation.</p> <p>The use of sustainable drainage systems to manage surface water is an approach we are keen to promote. This can help ensure water is controlled at source and is therefore of benefit to conserving water resources, but also help manage the issue of not increasing the off site flood risk as well as offering aesthetic and ecological benefits. CIRIA document C687 'Planning for SuDS making it happen' would also be a useful reference document for this 2040 Masterplan.</p> <p>It must be determined whether or not the increase in wastewater discharged from wastewater treatment works as a result of future development, or any necessary upgrades, is likely to impact on flood risk downstream. One of the recommendations of the West Northamptonshire Water Cycle Study – Detailed WCS Final Report (September 2011) is for further work to address the potential flood risk associated with increased discharge from sewerage treatment works. In order to ensure that this matter is suitably resolved, we recommend that Daventry Masterplan recognise that any flood risks associated with increased discharge from</p>	
--	---	--

		<p>sewerage treatment works are identified and mitigated.</p> <p>The Key Environmental Constraints map in section 2.4 does not include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The dam break for the Drayton Reservoir; and • Flood zones to the north of Watford or south at Everdon. <p>3. Generally the vision seems aspirational and that its delivery will be a challenge. Taking our lead from the Government's strategy for sustainable development, we have also set our long-term sights on a future in which everyone will be able to enjoy the benefit of a clean, safe and healthy environment. We hope for a future where a spirit of innovation and entrepreneurship can keep pace with as yet unknown demands for resources and products without taking us to environmental limits. We look forward to continuing work in partnership to help deliver sustainable development within Daventry in accordance with our aligned visions.</p> <p>4. We are pleased that the Masterplan advocates water conservation.</p> <p>There must be no detriment to the environment as a result of the proposed development. Biodiversity enhancement, alongside improved access to the river and green space should be sought wherever possible and opportunities should be taken to improve the landscape, visual amenity and ecology and wildlife value for the benefit of the existing and proposed communities. We broadly welcome the Green Town Framework and the creation of extensive semi-natural and open space areas in and around the town. There are significant opportunities in incorporating multiple green infrastructure features into these open spaces if they are correctly designed and in the right locations. For example there will be significant opportunities for incorporating flood alleviation or drought management measures within these areas and at the same time create attractive wetland features which benefit wildlife, waterways and people, as well as improving water quality in receiving watercourses. This can help to deliver WFD objectives. This will also provide particular opportunities for the retro-fitting of multi-benefit sustainable drainage solutions.</p> <p>There will also be opportunities for restoring watercourses which are currently culverted or otherwise constrained in and around Daventry, for example the historic maps indicate that there is currently a culverted watercourse under the playing field to the north of the town centre as well as extensive culverting of a watercourse in the Southbrook area, and area identified for regeneration. Watercourses provide particularly valuable wildlife corridors and act as flood storage areas, reducing the risk of flooding elsewhere, if properly designed.</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>5. Groundwater & contaminated land – Regeneration presents an excellent opportunity to deal with land contamination. However this also comes with costs and the risk of lengthy [but necessary] remediation processes. We advise that the strategy emphasizes the need for early dialogue with the Environment Agency to identify what needs to be done and how this can be done. This is especially important when funding is being sought because of the implications for timescales and hidden costs.</p> <p>Waste – As part of a holistic approach to waste/resource management the Masterplan should seek to integrate waste/resource management into other spatial planning concerns such as transport, housing, economic growth, natural resources and regeneration; carefully considering novel ‘in house’ systems for segregation (an collection) of materials, and giving thought to spatial issues for waste collection.</p> <p>The design of buildings and supporting infrastructure should consider their future repair and eventual demolition in the selection of construction mechanisms and materials (‘cradle-to-cradle design’).</p> <p>The design of communities and supporting services should encourage and enable communities to follow the waste hierarchy – reduce, re-use, recycle, recover, with landfill as a last resort. The Masterplan should seek to move towards a zero waste economy and should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Define the objectives that should guide decisions, including the goal of zero waste; and • Set out a route map outlining how zero waste objectives will be achieved including timeframes. <p>Water resources – Within the ecopark section geothermal energy is mentioned. Ground source heat pump systems can be used for heating or cooling and are in principle energy and CO2 efficient. However, unless they are managed carefully there is the potential that the ground and groundwater can eventually warm of cool to a point where the system cannot continue to operate efficiently, or at all. Adjacent systems may also interfere with each other. The system operator should also consider potential loss or damage to third parties. We strongly encourage GSHP systems to be operated sustainably. In most cases this means there should be a balance between demand across a year for schemes using heating and cooling. This will avoid unacceptable heating or cooling of the ground and groundwater. We expect developers to undertake appropriate prior investigations for these systems.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>This should include environmental risk assessment and method statements for the construction and operation of the systems. These may be provided as part of the planning process.</p> <p><u>Flood risk ambitions for Daventry</u></p> <p>As part of any strategic proposals/policies formed by the 2010 Draft Masterplan the opportunity should be taken to ensure that existing surface water run-off draining to the River Leam catchment on the west side of Daventry is preserved, and that wherever possible the opportunity is taken to re-direct flows previously taken out of this catchment (such as the large Tesco's warehouse) back to their natural drainage path. This will help to ensure that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No increase, and in the case of the later, a reduction in the current flood risk (surface water sewer under capacity) is achieved. 2. The existing flora and fauna of Boundary Park on the western boundary of Daventry is conserved. <p>The west side of Daventry falls within the Severn River Basin management Plan area, which includes the River Leam catchment. This catchment is currently depleted, and any further reduction in flow volumes as a result of development in the Royal Oak area of Daventry would have a detrimental impact on this watercourse.</p> <p>Boundary Park (Kettle Wood), a minimum 40 metre wide landscape buffer strip also currently exists on the western side of Daventry, between the Royal Oak commercial sites and the agricultural land, and this includes a group of large mature trees, screening block tree planting, open grassland, a seating bench and footpaths. To divert surface water run-off from the commercial sites away from this green area/the natural drainage route and into the public surface water drainage system will deplete/has depleted this area and the crops beyond of it's water source, and may result in damage to this habitat. We would therefore recommend that working in partnership with the landowner of the Park (Wood)/buffer strip with the potential of preserving the existing flora and fauna and increasing that habitat diversity by e.g. the addition of surface water balancing pond/s or swale/s, taking flows from any existing/proposed commercial development back into the River Leam Catchment is investigated</p>	
2040/11/326 ⊗	Daventry Canal Association	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes – The Masterplan will need to be reviewed as adapted over time, to keep it relevant to changing circumstances. 2. As the recent drought has shown, water supply to a significantly enlarged community will be critical. Water conservation on its own will not be sufficient. New sources of water will need to be obtained. The existing reservoirs and the 	No change.

<p>2040/11/327</p>	<p>Northamptonshire ACRE</p>	<p>canal could be developed with this in mind. 3. Yes – The integration of the planned canal into the Masterplan. 4. Yes – Retention of existing open spaces and expansion of the country park alongside the canal and creation of a canal park. 5. Leisure and (particularly) tourism could be given more prominence. Tourism could increase as a result of the proposals for the canal and expansion of leisure facilities. Industrial development alongside the canal should be discouraged as this could damage any tourism potential. I am writing to express the support of Northamptonshire ACRE for the strategic visioning set out in the Masterplan.</p> <p>The ideas in it can clearly play an important part in the future development of Daventry District and I congratulate you on the document generally, the joint work of the consultants with yourselves and also on the way you have combined a great deal of content into a manageable and readable document. Having been involved with the consultation process from the early days we are pleased that it has been conducted in a variety of methods with fresh approaches and these are evidenced in the final document.</p> <p>Northamptonshire ACRE, the countryside rural specialist organization, is an dependant charity and part of the Rural Community Action Network, supporting community-led planning and rural initiatives around transport, housing, shops & services, community safety, health, the economy and environment. It helps Northamptonshire's rural communities to help themselves, to value diversity and to work to create a vibrant, sustainable future.</p> <p>I set out a few specific points which I hope are helpful:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Group Rapid Transport idea of APTS is particularly interesting and worthy of further development. It must offer benefits to ease the overarching issue of accessibility in an eco-friendly way to help achieve an integrated transport system for the area (a system which has direct links to green corridors eg walking and cycling as well as bus and rail options). • We also welcome the priority shown in the Framework for all sections of the 'Green Town' (as explained below surly 'Green District' would be better?) especially the Ecopark. • We endorse the comments made by others at recent consultation meetings that the Plan appears to concentrate on the Town whereas for a plan like this to work the District needs to be seen as a whole with each and every part inter-dependant on every other part and more so as time 	<p>No change.</p>
--------------------	------------------------------	---	-------------------

		<p>goes on. We fully appreciate that the main growth by 2040 is to be concentrated on the town and rightly so but in most cases I think the work 'town' could properly be replaced by 'district' and add not detract from the import of what is the Vision and the whole document. There is no reason why even with the maximum growth envisaged the town cannot retain its character as a market town as the hub of a rural district so the all-embracing word 'District' fits.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To underline the above point the self-sufficiency aspect can be applied to the district as a whole not just the town such as a reduction of commuter journeys as well as shopping journeys and a zero carbon strategy for the natural assets of the district. • While welcoming the references to renewable energy aspirations we feel these could usefully be developed further. • Some of the items on the wish list, often around leisure and culture, which are inevitable and welcome in such a consultation, may well be impractical in to short to medium term but in the later stages of the period of the Plan may be achievable with the critical mass of population of all ages to support them. Whether from commercial interests or community initiatives there is almost a 'barometer' at which these are deemed achievable. Cultural features can be a key part of regeneration. • There is ample evidence in other parts of the country of the benefits to the whole population of the enjoyment of natural and heritage space so the link being made to the new SUEs is appropriate. • To add to the above the potential of 'local tourisms' as well as external tourism must be worth expanding and including in future strategies. • Housing will need to show a mix of types so that a proportion of affordable housing is 'given' and to show changing demographics of for an example a larger proportion of older people. The same approach of using flexibility and adaptability shown in the Plan as the way for it to remain relevant and meaningful as a strategic plan needs to be adopted in future housing provision and construction to facilitate the creation of truly sustainable communities. • Finally can we make a general place that the Masterplan remains a 'living document' with mutual referencing not only in the wide range of future planning policy developments to which the document refers but also in continuing community engagement in areas of the town and the villages of all sorts including any Neighborhood Plans or Orders and other initiatives of the Localism Act including Assets of Community Value? 		
--	--	--	--	--

2040/11/328	District Councillor Chris Over	<p>We are happy to support the progress of the Plan and look forward to the implementation of the concepts set out.</p> <p>You will no doubt recall my comments, with regard to development and our role as a local planning authority, we need, for rather obvious reasons, to promote and persuade the industry to deliver eco-friendly, energy efficient homes, not simply tack on a few solar panels. The Eastern Way development area could provide the window of opportunity, if the industry can be persuaded to buy in.</p> <p>Recent discussions with the development industry has shown there is still a reluctance to embrace this technology, talk about subsidies, or want to offset costs against land value.</p> <p>The District Council's has used its to enabling role with some success, encourages investment in the leading edge technologies, illustrated by the proposed Eco and Technology Parks, these are essential elements of the Council's regeneration agenda and designed to secure the future prosperity and well being of our community.</p>	No change.
2040/11/329 ☒	Anonymous	<p>1. No – Should be through the strategic planning framework. 2. The long standing policy of a ring of open space around the town centre. 3. Yes and No – Proper sensible public transport, use of Long Buckley station. 4. No – It is so vague that it is difficult to support. 5. No – I do not understand its purpose or how it fits into the statutory planning framework. Just a wish list of generalized schemes.</p> <p>This feedback form fails in any test of bias. Where are the opportunities to say what you don't agree with? It just asks what you support. I would suggest that is set up to get the answers you want. I had basic training in writing questionnaires many years ago, this fails in every respect!</p> <p>The constraints echo time in the background papers to the Local Plan and I support them. However it's a huge leap to identify the "ecopark" near Buckley Wharf. I can recall that Heartlands was to be an up market business and science park but resulted in the same big warehouses.</p> <p>Please make any transport system sensible, practical and useable and make the most of Long Buckley station.</p> <p>I consider that developer contributions for the canal are a wasted opportunity that should go into other needed infrastructure projects not this "white elephant".</p>	No change.

<p>2040/11/330</p>	<p>Daventry Team Ministry</p>	<p>The plan's glaring omission: A social infrastructure for voluntary and community action</p> <p>The churches of Daventry and surrounding villages would like to congratulate DDC and its consultants upon a vision for Daventry that is ambitious, innovative and forward-looking in its scope. Whilst fully appreciating that it is a top line vision and not a detailed operational specification we would nonetheless draw planners' attention to what we consider to be a dangerous and glaring omission at this strategic level.</p> <p>There is more to what the draft plan call "<i>strong and vibrant community</i>" than just housing, retail employment, leisure, open spaces and tourism. These are the easy bits to deliver assuming that the will and the financial resources can be founds. But civic buildings, state of the art waste management, shops and even an ecopark do not make a community. This can only be hoped for with careful planning fo a social infrastructure and voluntary and community action.</p> <p>Churches are not simply about worship. We are concerned with the safety, health and peace of communities we serve. We believe that all people are neighbors and responsible for the wellbeing of each other. We have a particular care for the most vulnerable in society and we have a strong sense of what real community can and should be. This is common-sense, intrinsically political in its implications, and above all, practical. We believe that many of our values for community have much in common with those of other faith groups and also with government agencies – if not invariably with commercial interests.</p> <p>A community is about people and the way they live together and relate to one another. What the plan calls "<i>A place to be proud in</i>" is a place where people work together on things that they care about collectively to do things to build their own community. (Danetre Hospital is a glorious example of something that contributes positively to the town and of which people can be proud. Its quality of care is superb and the human relationships in the provision of the care are truly community enhancing.) The current situation in Daventry, particularly on the estates, old and new is surely a clear illustration that building lots of houses close to each other without any genuine social infrastructure just leads to lots of people living next to each other in isolation with little or no knowledge or solidarity with the neighbours they rarely meet. The fact that in Daventry of 2040 they might have more places to spend their money, see a film or gear a concert will create no more of a strong and vibrant community than exists today.</p>	<p>Comments regarding community to be added to the finalised Masterplan document</p>
--------------------	-------------------------------	--	--

		<p>In Hill ward, Daventry contains one of the twenty per cent most deprived communities in the country. There are pockets of great poverty in this town (and indeed in our rural communities too) and far too many people who are isolated, hopeless and desperately lonely. Whilst there are of course some vibrant and energetic elements the general spirit of the town is not, as the master plan identifies, confident or happy. This is not a matter for blame. The churches are as guilty as any other agency in the town for not providing either worship space or social and pastoral facilities outside the immediate town centre when most of the population live a considerable distance from that centre. There is little connection between the town centre and the wider residential population. The current situation in Daventry is a direct result of planning for growth without planning for community.</p> <p>We would like to play a part with DDC in looking at how we might all work together to improve not only the material well-being of the people of Daventry (as the master plan does well), but also their emotional, physical and spiritual well-being and the way in which people work together to build a really vibrant community – whatever future scenario plays out. The real fruit of any master plan for Daventry will be the social relationships that it facilitates. This is because it is social engagement, a sense of belonging and community ownership that will be what future-proofs Daventry and make people want to come here and stay and believe in the town. If we fail to facilitate true community and relationship then a few developers and businesses will make money and the more affluent population will be kept busy shopping and consuming leisure but the self-esteem of the town will not improve, the plight of those in the most difficult circumstances will worsen and the spiritual condition of the town will continue to be unhealthy.</p> <p>We believe that the master plan would be considerably enhanced by a strategic commitment to develop well equipped community buildings in each housing area to provide leisure facilities, drop in centers, worship spaces and local support centers for the most vulnerable people in each community. These buildings could be maintained by volunteers, churches, support agencies and local groups to provide a real focus for community cohesion and support. They need to be financially sustainable and not subject to cuts in service provision. Thus the local community needs to contribute to the maintenance and sustainability of their local project and build something to be proud of that really matters to them rather than having a grand vision thrust upon them.</p> <p>We maintain that accessible and sustainable community provision is vital for the</p>	
--	--	---	--

	<p>future of Daventry if all the great ideas within the master plan are to bear fruit. We trust that our voice will be heard.</p> <p>I have read the draft Masterplan 2040 and I am particularly concerned for certain proposals in this document, notably:</p> <p>Regeneration of the central area of the town for housing development</p> <p>I do not accept the potential loss of the town's green open spaces in the proposals for regeneration and development in this new Masterplan, especially the central area including Eastern Way and Ashby Road Playing Fields. I note that Policy RC2 in the current Daventry District Plan and National Planning policy guidance protects these areas of existing open spaces:</p> <p>I also note the commentary in the current Daventry District plan:</p> <p><i>“These areas are important environmentally, as well as for the recreational facilities they offer, and the further loss of these facilities will be resisted by the District Council”.</i></p> <p>I do not support or accept the regeneration and development proposals for the central areas outlined in the Masterplan 2040 on the basis that it will undermine current local and national policy and become a green light for concreting over our remaining green open spaces in the town.</p> <p>Please acknowledge my objection to this draft document and advise me of the outcome of this public consultation, and further developments on the Masterplan 2040.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No 2. Green area to town centre. 3. No 4. No 5. No questions to disagree all either support or not. 	<p>The Masterplan proposes regeneration for central areas of the town for a range of uses and does not advocate the redevelopment or development of any specific sites.</p> <p>No change.</p>
2040/11/331 ☒	<p>Alan Reeves</p>	
2040/11/332	<p>Anglian Water</p>	<p>The study provides technical evidence to inform planning decisions and statutory plans</p> <p>No change.</p>
2040/11/335 ☒	<p>Anonymous</p>	<p>This consultation is very poor. Not having space for names and addresses. I think it is not a proper consultation of dubious legitimacy.</p>

		<p>1. No – Too rushed, woolley and vague. 2. Yes – Daventry has pathetic transport links for a development of this size in the town. 3. No – Because the vision does nothing to foster social cohesion or a sense of community. 4. No – Southborrk is not in need of regeneration anymore than other estates. We do not want Daventry towns green open spaces built on. 5. It is to justify cramming the town with houses etc and to build on our green open spaces. No mention of culture, leisure etc badly thought out for developers to make money.</p>	
2040/11/336 ☒	Anonymous	<p>This is the most appalling consultation document I have seen. There are leading questions and little room to make a considered response. There is no space for name and address and I think that the consultation process lacks legitimacy!</p> <p>1. No – Future residents of Daventry will have no say in any development as the response will be “it’s been in the plan since 2011”! 2. Daventry is a poor place to expand – there are only pathetic road links and no railway. Development should be centered on DRIFT. 3. No – There is nothing in the plan to support community cohesion – no community centres, cinema, art galleries etc. 4. No – None it mostly seems to be about building houses! No – This area should not be the centre of refuse from the rest of the county. 5. It is full of inaccuracies confuses east and west etc and as such cannot be considered a ...</p>	No change.
2040/11/337 ☒	Anonymous	<p>1. Yes – Broadly support a ‘vision’ – query growth projection. 2. 3. Yes 4. Yes – New housing and development regeneration of APTS network, connected public greenspace. 5. Yes – But not on greenfield site. Re Eco Park why on a Greenfield site? And not close to town – this would benefit those working within the park and spread money etc into Daventry.</p>	No change.
2040/11/338	Ruth Roll	<p>In response to Daventry 2040 Masterplan Consultation Draft 1, I am not responding on the feedback form itself because it is poorly designed and poorly written (like the Masterplan itself) for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It does not allow adequate space for responses (as it is only available on-line as a downloadable PDF) • Many of the questions do not reflect best practice in questionnaire design, the questions themselves are leading 	No change.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specifically the last question in Section 4, Do you broadly support the EcoPark. This is designed – in terms of both layout and the question it asks – to lead the reader into a specific response. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In principle there is nothing wrong with a well thought through, well written, easily understandable conceptual strategic approach. However, the approach followed by DDC and its advisers is none of these things – in places the Masterplan is so poorly written as to be incomprehensible. The art of the possible always needs to be rigorously evaluated against constraints. 2. The key constraints identified in the Masterplan exclude human behavior, the position of Daventry within its economic and social hinterland and more practical issues such as topographical constraints at the site identifies for the proposed Ecopark. 3. There is nothing wrong with the broad principles of The Vision but the way they have been interpreted and the proposed implementation and delivery mechanisms for the Ecopark are at the wrong scale (in relation to the population and the size of the site), on the wrong place (open countryside) and inappropriate in the context of emerging and agreed district, county and sub regional policies. 4. One of the key planks of the Framework, the EcoPark, makes claims for the uniqueness of its delivery mechanism which cannot be supported. It is out of context in to relation to DDC's (and indeed the county's) ware arising, it ignores Daventry's own policies, it would have a significant visual impact on the surrounding areas, in the wrong location to maximize the use of heat and would not deliver the sustainable solution it claims. 5. The Masterplan already appears to be a fait accompli as it was produced in its current form based on a review of the consultants' proposals by a narrow group of stakeholders, without any public meetings. The consultation materials were poorly presented (plans of the Ecopark area were unintelligible even to those who know the area well) and the Council representatives appeared unwilling – or unable – to answer even relatively simple questions. The Long Buckley exhibition was small and cramped – and in an area in general use for other purposes. None of the consultation sessions were held at evenings or weekends, effectively disenfranchising those people who were unable to attend during the working day. <p>The general public will not have any further opportunity to comment on the final</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>document which will go to the Strategy Group and Full Council in early 2012 – in direct contrast to multiple consultation and feedback stages which are an integral part of the debate into the county Minerals and Waste Framework documents.</p> <p>Everyone is entitled to their visions, but they need to be compared against the potential long term impact they can have on the environment, the community and people’s lives. When the stakes are this high, effective stakeholder consultation should do what it says on the tin – and not simply pay lip service to it. It should most certainly not use greenwash to present the significant component of the proposals in a less than honest fashion. It should also not be disingenuous in interpreting the feedback from the stakeholder workshop mapping exercises – which do not appear to support the claim in the Masterplan that there is consensus on the proposed location for the EcoPark and associated environmental infrastructure.</p> <p>The Daventry LSP were very interested to receive a presentation on the Daventry Masterplan at their meeting last December. There was a wide ranging discussion about the proposals within the plan and also the comments that had been raised at previous stakeholder events.</p> <p>At its meeting the LSP formally endorsed the Daventry Masterplan and commented that this document provides the framework to create a Daventry that we can all be proud of.</p>	
2040/11/338a	Daventry Local Strategic Partnership		Comments noted. No change
<p>Late Responses</p> <p>The following responses were received after the closing date</p>			
2040/11/339	Welton Parish Council	<p>1. We are generally supportive of the overall aims of creating a planning document that guides development over the next few years. We feel that a validity period of 20 would be better than 30 years.</p> <p>2. We find too many conflicts with the Core Strategy for this area that is currently in the Submission stage.</p> <p>3. This plan does nothing to address the housing or infrastructure shortage for Daventry.</p> <p>4. Danetree Wood is a contentious proposal having a significant and negative impact</p>	

	<p>upon our community.</p> <p>5. Daventry Energy Park sounds good but lacks proper forethought, we make a counter proposal.</p> <p>6. We do not believe the issues discussed on transport reflect the true situation and they focus too much on town to the detriment of the rural hinterland.</p> <p>7. The question of education ignores (perhaps conveniently) the building blocks of a strong education offering – the desperate need for two good to outstanding secondary schools (rising to three as the town grows).</p> <p>8. These proposals are very weak in their protection of green space and green infrastructure.</p> <p>9. In what may become a “game of top trumps”, we believe this document will be challenged and over-ridden by new Neighbourhood Plans.</p> <p>10. In general terms, the Parish of Welton endorses the comments submitted by Daventry Villages Together. We would point out that the reference to Welford within that document is an error and should read Welton.</p> <p>From our Parish’s perspective, we support the concept of a framework in which development can be considered and we equally recognise that development must take place in order for communities to renew and survive.</p> <p>Issue 1 – The Joint Core Strategy</p> <p>We find the timing and positioning of this document somewhat at odds with the plans laid out in the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) for the area covered by this Masterplan. It is clearly stated within the JCS that subsequent documents will follow to eventually replace Local and County Saved Policies.</p> <p>Whilst we accept that these subsequent documents should be produced at a local level, we feel the Daventry 2040 strategy is somewhat too nebulous simply because its focus is on where</p>
--	---

Daventry and its immediate hinterlands are projected to be in 2040 and that it lacks any key milestones to be achieved on the way.

Issue 2 – Housing Shortage & Infrastructure
 We have already seen a huge shortfall in the rate of house building within the district since 2005, leading to a major issue for those requiring affordable housing, first time buyers and those wishing to downsize as their circumstances change. There is nothing within the Masterplan that specifically addresses these issues and we believe that, following the basic premise that “Infrastructure must come first”, the plan lacks any coordinated vision of how this is to be achieved and within what time-scale.

Issue 3 – The Danetree Wood Implications
 The proposed Danetree Wood, covering the area between our village and Braunston, creates another problem. There is a local charity – The Welton Town Lands Trust – that generates its income from the rent paid to farm a number of fields that would become woodland under this proposal. Without some recompense to provide a long term replacement income stream for this charity, our community will suffer and we cannot support this part of the proposal for that reason. Equally, such a significant woodland will change the balance of eco-systems in our parish and will remove much of the Grade 3 agricultural land so necessary to make us more self-sustaining for our food.

Issue 4 – Daventry Energy Park Location Issues
 We recognise the national requirement to deal with waste. We similarly believe that waste handling can result in power and heat generation (CHP technologies). Whilst the indicated Energy Park is not specified as, but almost certainly aimed at, that sort of development it is wrongly located for the following reasons:

	<p>Waste Volumes. In order to process efficiently, any such plant needs a significant feed of raw material waste. Daventry and its immediate hinterland will not generate enough waste for that enterprise to flourish so more waste will need to be brought in from farther afield. The district's residents are unlikely to support such additional traffic causing further congestion on local roads that are already over design capacity. Access will only be via the A5. This road is already one in which traffic levels are at the limit for its size. One of the reasons for refusal given for the appeals into Danetre Village and Church Fields was the issue of the A5, the Highways Agency TR notice and a lack of funding. That situation remains unresolved. No Rail Links. There is no freight handling facility at the nearby Long Buckby railway station and the road between it and the A5 (through Buckby Wharf) cannot take such traffic without a significant increase in risk to other (and existing) road users. Lack of canal support infrastructure. There is insufficient reservoir capacity to support greater use of the canal network as a possible method to deliver waste to the site. Residential Impact. Within close (2Km) proximity of the location in a downwind direction is the sizeable and expanding community of Long Buckby (not to mention the small community of Buckby Wharf itself). Waste flue gas and particles will travel easily to that area and, with it being significantly higher than the site, such emissions would be expected to deposit either in the way to or actually there. Lack of consumers for waste heat. There is a significant distance between the site and any reasonably sized community that could benefit from the hot water generated in such a modern system. Piping and</p>
--	--

	<p>circulation costs would be too much. Rather than locate such a plant in the planned area, would it not be better located at Junction 16 of the M1, alongside a prime route to deliver feedstock and with commercial sites around to benefit from the heat and power generated, with relatively low infrastructure costs and without further overloading the A5 or its junctions or depositing flue products over a nearby residential area? Issue 5 – Commuting to work The texts suggest that there is no significant imbalance between number of residents in work and the number of local jobs. We believe that this is missing an issue that was documented (and we believe used in DDC's submissions to the public appeal in 2009) in the near past and has not changed in any real amount since then. Yes, Daventry Town (and even Daventry District) has a lower than average number of unemployed people but there is a significant number who have to commute to Northampton, Rugby, Coventry, Milton Keynes and further afield whilst there is a significant (and almost equal) number who travel into the area for their employment. This was also evidenced by traffic surveys conducted by numerous parties over the last few years on the A361, A425, A428 and the A5. We therefore challenge (because we cannot agree with) the statement and predictions / proposals that flow from it. In order to remain the location of choice for shoppers, particularly those from nearby rural communities, the availability of free parking and / or the issue of frequent and reliable public transport has to be addressed in this plan. Without the support of rural resident shoppers, Daventry Town cannot expect to attract sufficient footfall to attract or even retain a range of shops. This is exacerbated by the issue of how many people travel outside the town area to work. Issue 6 - Education</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>We very much welcome the recent announcement of the new University College for Daventry and we sincerely hope it will be a success. It cannot however accommodate all the students between 14 – 18 who currently attend our two secondary schools. With one of those on the verge of being placed in “special needs”, there is no doubt in our minds that there exists a radical need to reappraise and improve the whole of Daventry’s secondary (and non-existent tertiary) education provision else any new build houses will not attract people who wish to provide their children with the best tools for their future. We do not think it is acceptable for the District Council to avoid this issue by claiming it to be a “county” matter.</p> <p>Issue 7 - Green Infrastructure</p> <p>The document remains unclear about how many Country Parks Daventry actually has. We believe that Borough Hill, whilst classified as a SAM, is such a park and so is the Daventry Country Park.</p> <p>In our view, it is vital that both these are protected from development and that green corridors are preserved to allow access to these places. We would particularly support the expansion of Daventry Country Park to encompass the meadows to the west and northwest of the reservoir, whilst still allowing the proposed outline development of the Monkmoor site. This provision and protection of a corridor to the Daventry Country Park should take a higher priority than a somewhat selfish dead-end canal route that lacks a public majority in support that would place an unsustainable burden on the water infrastructure supporting the whole canal network in this area.</p> <p>Issue 8 – Neighbourhood Plans</p> <p>We understand that this consultation document would, when it is adopted, achieve the status of a Supplementary Planning Document. Similarly, we understand that accepted Neighbourhood Plans</p>	
--	--	--

		<p>achieve a higher level of importance in the planning system. If the wards of Abbey North or Hill or the Parishes of Braunston or Welton create Neighbourhood plans, could these not result in the demise of some or all of this plan? In its present form, we cannot see how this vision can be anything other than a guidance note. Thank you for the opportunity to comment upon these proposals,</p>	
<p>2040/11/340-349</p>	<p>These respondents signed a 'standard' letter as per respondents 2040/11/38-323 above</p>		
<p>2040/11/350</p>	<p>(former) District Councillor Colin Poole</p>	<p>The maps on pages 8, 17, 63, 67, 71, 77 and 79 are totally inadequate. To be understood they would need to be at least A3 size. The Key to each page needs to be readable without a magnifying glass.</p> <p>Miles are the statutory measurement of distance in this country therefore all reference to Kilometres throughout the document should be changed to Miles.</p> <p>Paragraphs Each paragraph starts with a blank (pretty picture) with the paragraph number, turn over to read the contents. The pretty picture side could be incorporated into the first page of the paragraph utilising the left hand column which predominately is only used for graphics. Would hopefully make the document more readable.</p> <p>At the bottom of page 22 it states, "See appendix 5 of appendix A to this Masterplan for a full description of each Future World Scenario". To date I have not found these appendices. Do they exist?</p> <p>There is too much emphasis on looking backwards not enough forward. Analyses graphs waste to much space and unnecessary.</p> <p>The idea of a Masterplan that could be used as planning guidance is laudable.</p>	