

4.571 OBJECTION by :

2381 Mr and Mrs Whitfield

**SUMMARY OF OBJECTION**

4.572 The absence of a policy allocating land for residential development on land adjacent to Westhorp House, Byfield. Residential development is concentrated in the urban areas to the exclusion of the rural villages. Byfield is a village capable of providing affordable housing and access to employment without too much travel.

**THE ISSUE**

1. Whether, in the light of the overall provision of allocated residential land and the recommendations contained in this report, there are overriding objections to the development of the site proposed at Westhorp House, Byfield either in substitution for or in addition to land allocated under the policies of the Local Plan ?

**ASSESSMENT**

4.573 As with all other objections relating to the non-allocation of residential land for development, my assessment is on the basis that additional land for a further 1570 houses is required. I therefore set aside the Council's argument that the Local Plan meets the strategic requirements of the Structure Plan and I consider this proposal on its planning merits and in the light of the extant and proposed policies of the Development Plan.

4.574 The objection site, however, is clearly beyond the 'confines' of Byfield which is designated a Restricted Infill Village, a designation I support. The fact that the site abuts some development and would incorporate redundant railway land is not sufficient to regard it otherwise. Development on the site would therefore be contrary to the policies relating to that designation and would be an intrusion into the open countryside. Notwithstanding the shortfall in housing land in the District, it is not a site I can commend to the Council.

**RECOMMENDATIONS.**

4.575 That no modification be made to the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

4.576 **OBJECTION** by :

2174 DG Staverton Ltd.

**SUMMARY OF OBJECTION**

4.577 The absence of a policy allocating land for residential development at Church Street, Byfield as part of a larger scheme for expanding the village by involving land to the north and south and thereby providing developer funding for a Byfield Bypass

**THE ISSUE**

1. Whether, in the light of the overall provision of allocated residential land and the recommendations contained in this report, there are overriding objections to the development of the site proposed at Church Street, Byfield either in substitution for, or in addition to land allocated under the policies of the Local Plan ?

**ASSESSMENT**

4.578 As with all other objections relating to the non-allocation of residential land for development, my assessment is on the basis that additional land for a further 1570 houses is required. I therefore set aside the Council's argument that the Local Plan meets the strategic requirements of the Structure Plan and I consider this proposal on its planning merits and in the light of the extant and proposed policies of the Development Plan.

4.579 The objection site, however, is clearly beyond the 'confines' of Byfield which is designated a Restricted Infill Village, a designation I support. The fact that the site abuts some development is not sufficient to regard it otherwise. Development on the site would therefore be contrary to the policies relating to that designation and would be an intrusion into the open countryside. Notwithstanding the shortfall in housing land in the District, and the suggestion that in some unexplained manner development could lead to a developer-funded bypass of the village, it is not a site I can commend to the Council.

**RECOMMENDATIONS.**

4.580 That no modification be made to the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

- - - 0 - - -

4.581 **OBJECTION** by :

396 EW & RW Watts

**SUMMARY OF OBJECTION**

4.582 The absence of a policy allocating land at Manor Farm, off Woodford Road, Byfield for residential development on the basis that its development would conform with the Council's criteria for development in the Restricted Infill Villages outlined in paragraphs 4.101 - 4.104.

**THE ISSUE**

1. Whether, in the light of the overall provision of allocated residential land and the recommendations contained in this report, there are overriding objections to the development of the site proposed at Manor Farm, Byfield either in substitution for, or in addition to land allocated under the policies of the Local Plan.

**ASSESSMENT**

4.583 As with all other objections relating to the non-allocation of residential land for development, my assessment is on the basis that additional land for a further 1570 houses is required. I therefore set aside the Council's argument that the Local Plan meets the strategic requirements of the Structure Plan and I consider this proposal on its planning merits and in the light of the extant and proposed policies of the Development Plan.

4.584 The objection site, however, is clearly beyond the 'confines' of Byfield which is designated a Restricted Infill Village, a designation I support. The site surrounds a small pocket of development but for all practical purposes it is removed and some distance from the centre of the village. Development on the site would therefore be contrary to the policies relating to Restricted Infill Villages and would be an intrusion into the open countryside. Notwithstanding the shortfall in housing land in the District, it is not a site I can commend to the Council.

**RECOMMENDATIONS.**

4.585 That no modification be made to the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

0 - -

4.586 **OBJECTION by :**

916 The Trustees of WL Wakefield

**SUMMARY OF OBJECTION.**

4.587 The absence of a policy allocating land for residential development adjacent to Hall Lane Farm, Welford. The site abuts existing development. Following the construction of the A1 - M1 link, development in Welford should be considered more favourably and should not be restricted to within the confines of the village.

**THE ISSUE**

1. Whether, in the light of the overall provision of allocated residential land and the recommendations contained in this report, there are overriding objections to the development of the site adjacent to Hall Lane Farm, Welford either in substitution for, or in addition to land allocated under the policies of the Local Plan ?

**ASSESSMENT**

4.588 As with all other objections relating to the non-allocation of residential land for development, my assessment is on the basis that additional land for a further 1570 houses is required. I therefore set aside the Council's argument that the Local Plan meets the strategic requirements of the Structure Plan and I consider this proposal on its planning merits and in the light of the extant and proposed policies of the Development Plan.

4.589 The objection site, however, is clearly beyond the 'confines' of Welford which is designated a Restricted Infill Village, a designation I support. The fact that the site is contained by development and the village cemetery is not sufficient to regard it otherwise. Development on the site would therefore be contrary to the policies relating to that designation and would be an intrusion into the open countryside. Notwithstanding the shortfall in housing land in the District, it is not a site I can commend to the Council.

**RECOMMENDATIONS.**

4.590 That no modification be made to the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

4.591 OBJECTION by :

1136 J Marshall

**SUMMARY OF OBJECTION**

4.592 The absence of a policy allocating land for residential development at Newlands Farm, Welford. The site presently contains buildings which are redundant.

**THE ISSUE**

1. Whether, in the light of the overall provision of allocated residential land and the recommendations contained in this report, there are overriding objections to the development of the site proposed at Newlands Farm, Welford either in substitution for, or in addition to land allocated under the policies of the Local Plan ?

**ASSESSMENT**

4.593 As with all other objections relating to the non-allocation of residential land for development, my assessment is on the basis that additional land for a further 1570 houses is required. I therefore set aside the Council's argument that the Local Plan meets the strategic requirements of the Structure Plan and I consider this proposal on its planning merits and in the light of the extant and proposed policies of the Development Plan.

4.594 The objection site, however, is clearly beyond the 'confines' of Welford which is designated a Restricted Infill Village, a designation I support. The fact that the site is adjacent to a sports field and contains redundant buildings is not sufficient to regard it otherwise. Development on the site would therefore be contrary to the policies relating to that designation and would be an intrusion into the open countryside. Notwithstanding the shortfall in housing land in the District, it is not a site I can commend to the Council.

**RECOMMENDATIONS.**

4.595 That no modification be made to the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

- - - 0 - - -

4.596 **OBJECTION** by :

949 Mrs JL Mercer et al

**SUMMARY OF OBJECTION**

4.597 The absence of a policy allocating land for residential development south of Newlands Road, Welford. The site relates well to the existing residential development and would be in keeping with the character and quality of this village environment.

**THE ISSUE**

1. Whether, in the light of the overall provision of allocated residential land and the recommendations contained in this report, there are overriding objections to the development of the site proposed at Newlands Road, Welford either in substitution for or in addition to land allocated under the policies of the Local Plan ?

**ASSESSMENT**

4.598 As with all other objections relating to the non-allocation of residential land for development, my assessment is on the basis that additional land for a further 1570 houses is required. I therefore set aside the Council's argument that the Local Plan meets the strategic requirements of the Structure Plan and I consider this proposal on its planning merits and in the light of the extant and proposed policies of the Development Plan.

4.599 The objection site, however, is clearly beyond the 'confines' of Welford which is designated a Restricted Infill Village, a designation I support. The fact that the site is adjacent to a sports field and opposite residential development is not sufficient to regard it otherwise. Development on the site would therefore be contrary to the policies relating to that designation and would be an intrusion into the open countryside. Notwithstanding the shortfall in housing land in the District, it is not a site I can commend to the Council.

**RECOMMENDATIONS.**

4.600 That no modification be made to the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

- - - 0 - - -

4.601 OBJECTION by :

980 Lousada plc.

**SUMMARY OF OBJECTION**

4.602 The absence of a policy allocating land for residential development of Sheldon's Lane, Walgrave. The site relates well to the existing residential development and would be in keeping with the character and quality of this village environment.

**THE ISSUE**

1. Whether, in the light of the overall provision of allocated residential land and the recommendations contained in this report, there are overriding objections to the development of the site proposed at Sheldon's Lane, Walgrave either in substitution for or in addition to land allocated under the policies of the Local Plan ?

**ASSESSMENT**

4.603 As with all other objections relating to the non-allocation of residential land for development, my assessment is on the basis that additional land for a further 1570 houses is required. I therefore set aside the Council's argument that the Local Plan meets the strategic requirements of the Structure Plan and I consider this proposal on its planning merits and in the light of the extant and proposed policies of the Development Plan.

4.604 The objection site, however, is clearly beyond the 'confines' of Walgrave which is designated a Restricted Infill Village, a designation I am content to support. The fact that the site is adjacent to residential development is not sufficient to regard it otherwise. Development on the site would therefore be contrary to the policies relating to that designation and would be an intrusion into the open countryside. Notwithstanding the shortfall in housing land in the District, it is not a site I can commend to the Council.

**RECOMMENDATIONS.**

4.605 That no modification be made to the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

- - - 0 - - -

4.606 **OBJECTION** by :

1260 Woolwich Property Services

**SUMMARY OF OBJECTION**

4.607 The absence of a policy allocating land for residential development in the form of a new free-standing settlement on land adjacent to the A45 about 5 miles to the east of Northampton to meet the housing needs associated with the growth of that town.

**THE ISSUE**

1. Whether, in the light of the overall provision of allocated residential land and the recommendations contained in this report, there are overriding objections to the development of the site proposed either in substitution for or in addition to land allocated under the policies of the Local Plan ?

**ASSESSMENT**

4.608 The proposed development would be contrary to Policy HS13 which does find some justification in the Council's claim that there is no strategic requirement for development of this nature given the allocations in the Local Plan. In that respect, I have concluded that that is an argument which is not sustainable but there are other considerations. Housing land identified as being associated with the growth of Northampton has been identified through the Local Plan process and my colleague's recommendations. Other sites have also been identified in the course of this report. Moreover, the concept of a new settlement is one which the DoE cautions should only be contemplated where the alternative of expanding existing towns and settlements would be less satisfactory. That is not the case, as yet, in the District where it has been possible to identify suitable sites which can be accommodated within the existing infrastructure or where this can be provided without undue expense and disruption.

**RECOMMENDATIONS.**

4.609 That no modification be made to the Local Plan in respect of this objection.

- - - 0 - - -



FOOTNOTE.

4.610 I have not attempted to make good the shortfall in housing land that I have identified in precise terms; my recommendations thus far may not cover the figure of 1570 dwellings. But in making these recommendations I have applied the principles of PPG13 and concentrated on the opportunities that have been promoted within the urban areas and the Limited Development Villages. However, there is one site in Daventry which has not been promoted as such and only mentioned in the context of another objection. In my view it is one which seems to be ripe for reappraisal; I refer to the Heartlands Business Park.

4.611 This site seems to be notable only for its lack of success in attracting businesses worthy of its location and facilities. It is adjacent to one of the most prestigious residential sites in Daventry and has the potential to emulate that or to provide a range of housing which would attract a wide spectrum of residents. It is well located for the proposed retail park and its population would provide added support to the Council's Town Centre development proposals. I commend this site to the Council for reappraisal.

4.612 As to the Business Park: the Council would wish to consider its future in the employment framework of Daventry and in the light of the employment land available in the District, (including the new opportunities presented by the DIRFT proposals). The lack of success thus far reflects the over-endowment of employment land and suggests that the fundamental requirements to make it successful may be missing. If the Council were to continue seeking this type of development, a new and prestigious site would be required. There would be none better than Burnt Walls Park, in my opinion. It would provide a park land site for a prestigious development which would create a far better first impression of Daventry than the present industrial estate or the housing proposed under Policy HS7.

- - - 0 - - -

CHAPTER 5.

5.0 INDUSTRIAL AND COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT.

5.1 OBJECTIONS by :

75 Leicestershire CC. 2353 Northamptonshire CC.

**SUMMARY OF OBJECTIONS.**

5.2 There is an imbalance between the employment and housing land allocations; the employment land allocation at Junction 18 of the M1 is excessive and will lead to pressure for residential development in the southern part of Leicestershire. The employment land allocation should be reduced.

5.3 The absence of a policy identifying the amount of industrial land that will be developed over the Plan period; the Structure Plan identifies the amount in Daventry; PPG12 indicates that that target should be 'clearly stated'.

**THE ISSUES**

1. Whether the balance of housing and employment land in the Local Plan has been upset by the planning permission granted for development under the aegis of Policies EM19 and EM20 ?
2. Whether the Local Plan is deficient in the manner in which employment land availability is presented ?

**ASSESSMENT**

**First Issue : Balance**

5.4 The Council is correct to point out that the planning permission granted for development on 121.00 ha. of land at Junction 18 of the M1 is in conformity with the Structure Plan Policy EMP 4 which provides for exceptional development of that nature. This extra provision takes the District-wide availability of employment land for the period 1988 - 2006 to approximately 320.0 ha., (as against the Structure Plan requirement of 80.0 ha.), although I share the Northamptonshire County Council's view that these details are not 'clearly stated and that figure may be a misrepresentation of the true picture. Nevertheless, the conclusion that the District is overly endowed with employment land is inescapable although that abundance may be reduced if the Council were to accept my recommendation regarding the Daventry Business Park, (See Footnote to the Housing Chapter).