

**Second Issue : The Suitability of the Objection Site**

7.5 As to the objection site, there would appear to be little between the Council and the objector regarding the factual aspects. Indeed, the latter is quite prepared to accept the Council's assessment of developable area and the relative uncertainty concerning the precise line of the Bypass and its impact on the surrounding area. Neither party could be sure about the likely impact resulting from the development of the objection site given the difficulty in assessing the impact of the Bypass itself. Both agreed that when the Bypass was built the objection site would be isolated and as a consequence of little value and use for agricultural purposes.

7.6 I find the site specific arguments to be unhelpful. They do not address the central issue of Policy TRANS 15, ie. the meeting of needs, except in the planning sense which is based on yardstick judgments of traffic flows and distances between facilities. The Council's and the objector's arguments rotate in a vacuum of information. There is no commercial judgement of this site offered in evidence and I find the lack of a known interest by the major oil companies to be significant and sufficient to withhold any judgment about allocation of the site in the Local Plan.

7.7 To attempt to do so on the basis provided by the objector would be to accept a theoretical judgement in a climate of change in the provision of roadside service facilities where far more consideration is given to the selection of sites than has been possible in this case. It would be wrong for me to attempt such a judgement. I therefore come to the conclusion that the interests of the objector and the Council would be best served by the inclusion of a criteria based policy. The details of this I leave to the Council; the objector provides examples from neighbouring Councils' Local Plans and there should be no lack of useful guidance in that respect.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

7.8 That the Local Plan be modified by the inclusion of a criteria based policy relating to the site specific requirements of roadside service areas.

- - - 0 - - -

## 7.9 OBJECTIONS by :

13 British Waterways 2144 Abbcott Investments Ltd.

**SUMMARY OF OBJECTIONS**

7.10 The absence of any reference to water borne transport in general, and the absence of a policy promoting that mode of transportation. PPG13 covers the issues of water borne transport; the Local Plan should include a policy, viz :

'The Council will encourage the transfer, where appropriate, from road to water transport. It will also support applications for Government grants towards the construction of facilities for freight haulage by canal'.

7.11 The absence of a policy referring to the provision of the DIRFT facilities proposed in Policy EM20. The following should appear under the heading Rail Freight, viz :

'The opportunity to assist in the overall national policy of diverting freight from road to rail will be a consideration in the granting of planning permission for new development'.

The supporting text to this new policy should refer to the DIRFT proposals.

**THE ISSUE**

1. Whether the Local Plan is deficient in not acknowledging the opportunities that exist for the transfer of freight from road to canal and rail in the District ?

**ASSESSMENT**

7.12 I am with the Council in considering that expressions of support do not warrant policy status but I am also in agreement that reference should be made in the Plan where these are genuine and when investment in alternative forms of transportation is practicable. Since the Local Plan was drafted, planning permission has been granted for the Daventry International Rail Freight Terminal, (DIRFT), and it has been recognised that grant aid is available for the construction of canal facilities. I am content, therefore, to recommend the Council's suggested change as a modification to the Local Plan.

RECOMMENDATIONS

7.13 That the Local Plan be modified by the addition of the following to the Communications Chapter, viz :

'TRANSFER OF FREIGHT FROM THE ROADS.'

Rail

The District Council supports the national policy of diverting freight from road to rail. Specific proposals for a rail freight terminal are made in this Local Plan under Policy EM20.

The Canal System

The District Council will also encourage the transfer, where appropriate, of freight from road to water transport. It will also support applications for Government grant aid towards the construction of facilities for freight haulage by canal'.

- - - 0 - - -

7.14 **OBJECTIONS** by :

281	Mercury Personal Communications Ltd.	527	British Telecommunications Ltd.
-----	---	-----	------------------------------------

**SUMMARY OF OBJECTIONS**

7.15 The absence of a policy dealing with telecommunications development contrary to the advice in PPG8 which advises Local Planning Authorities to respond positively to such proposals, viz :

'Planning permission will normally be granted for telecommunications development where;

1. There is a need for the development.
2. There are no satisfactory alternative sites for telecommunications available.
3. There is no reasonable possibility of shared existing facilities.
4. In the case of radio masts there is no reasonable possibility of erecting antenna on an existing building, or other tall structure.

Any development should be sited and designed so as to minimise its visual impact'.

7.16 The Council's suggested change is contrary to Government guidance, it is flawed and inflexible in its approach to the development it seeks to control.

**THE ISSUES**

1. Whether the Local Plan is deficient in not including a policy setting out its approach to telecommunication development and whether, in making good this omission, its suggested change is flawed ?

**ASSESSMENT**

7.17 By its suggested change the Council acknowledge the need for guidance to this rapidly expanding industry and the additional policy it proposes echoes the recommendations of British Telecommunications Ltd. In that respect it meets one of the objections but not that of the counter-objector, Mercury PC Ltd. I understand the pressures which the licencing requirements place on cellular telephone operators and I have no evidence to suggest that their selection of sites has been other than meticulous. But their past record is not a sufficiently strong foundation to base the argument that this will continue to be the case and, therefore, that operators should have 'carte blanche' to develop their industry without regard or reference to the Local Planning Authorities. That would be wrong, and if a Council were to acquiesce to such an arrangement it would represent a neglect of its responsibilities.

7.18 The suggested policy simply seeks to minimise the impact that radio masts would have on the countryside by requiring the examination of alternatives. It seems to me that in choosing sites the obligation is on the operator to demonstrate that less harmful alternatives have not been overlooked. That is what the additional policy requires. Given the development rights which the operators enjoy it is the most that the Planning Authorities can require and the least that operators would be obliged to do. I recommend accordingly.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

7.19 That the Local Plan be modified by the addition of the following policy, viz :

**NEW POLICY TELECOMMUNICATIONS MASTS, AERIALS AND SATELLITE ANTENNAE.**

**PLANNING PERMISSION WILL NORMALLY BE GRANTED FOR TELECOMMUNICATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROVIDED THAT:**

- A. IT IS SITED AND DESIGNED SO AS TO MINIMISE ITS VISUAL IMPACT.**
- B. THERE ARE NO SATISFACTORY ALTERNATIVE SITES AVAILABLE.**
- C. THERE IS NO REASONABLE POSSIBILITY OF SHARING EXISTING FACILITIES.**
- D. IN THE CASE OF RADIO MASTS THERE IS NO REASONABLE POSSIBILITY OF ERECTING ANTENNAE ON AN EXISTING BUILDING OR OTHER TALL STRUCTURE'**

7.20 **OBJECTIONS** by :

389 Harlestone Parish Council

1059 Woodford Parish Council

**SUMMARY OF OBJECTIONS**

7.21 The absence of a policy providing for parking space off the proposed Northampton North-West Bypass and the banning of roadside parking on the A428.

7.22 The absence of policy identifying parking sites in Woodford Halse.

**THE ISSUE**

1. Whether the Local Plan is the appropriate vehicle for identifying parking sites ?

**ASSESSMENT**

7.23 The Council is right to point out that the road to the provision of the facilities required is not necessarily through the Local Plan. Planning applications could be submitted at any time and determined in accordance with its policies.

**RECOMMENDATIONS.**

7.24 That no modification be made to the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

- - - 0 - - -

POLICY CMI

AS PART OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE NORTHERN AREA OF DAVENTRY, PLANNING PERMISSION WILL NORMALLY BE GRANTED FOR THE NEW LOCAL DISTRIBUTION ROADS TO BE CONSTRUCTED BETWEEN A361 (ASHBY ROAD) AND B4036 (WELTON ROAD) AND BETWEEN B4036 AND EASTERN WAY/SOUTH WAY ROUNDABOUT AS SHOWN ON THE PROPOSALS MAP (DAVENTRY INSET). CONDITIONS, AGREEMENTS OR FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTIONS WILL BE REQUIRED OF DEVELOPERS TO ENSURE THAT CONSTRUCTION OF THESE ROADS TAKES PLACE AS AN INTEGRAL PART OF THE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT IN THE NORTHERN AREA.

[Proposed Changes : See Core Document No.12]

7.25 OBJECTIONS by :

538 Mr Pinckheard

894 Mr BR McGowan

SUMMARY OF OBJECTIONS

7.26 The roads are unnecessary, unjustifiable and environmentally damaging.

THE ISSUE

- 1. Whether in the light of the construction of these roads there is evidence to sustain these objections ?

ASSESSMENT

7.27 In my view there is not. Roads Nos 13 and 14 complete a ring system which, for a town the size of Daventry, must be unique in the scale of investment involved and in the level of service provided for motorised transport. I am aware that Mr Pinckheard is not a supporter of that particular mode but the removal of through traffic from the town centre and the convenience the ring system provides for cross-town travel will have improved conditions immeasurably for those persons who favour other forms, ie. the pedestrians and cyclists in the town centre.

RECOMMENDATIONS

7.28 That no modification be made to the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

**POLICY CM2**

**PLANNING PERMISSION WILL NORMALLY BE GRANTED FOR LOCAL DISTRIBUTOR ROADS, RESIDENTIAL ESTATE ROADS AND ACCESS ROADS PROVIDED THAT THEY HAVE BEEN DESIGNED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE ADOPTION STANDARDS OF THE LOCAL HIGHWAY AUTHORITY.**

[Proposed Changes : See Core Document No.12]

**7.29 OBJECTIONS by :**

2105	CPRE (2106) (2109) (2110) (2111) (2113)	2308	DoE
		3002	Northamptonshire CC.

**SUMMARY OF OBJECTIONS**

7.30 A firmer and more positive application of the policy would result if the words, ' planning permission ... may be granted', were substituted for the words, 'planning permission ... will normally be granted'.

7.31 A policy cannot be dependent on the decision of another authority, the reference to the Local Highway Authority should be deleted.

**THE ISSUES**

1. Whether the CPRE's suggested changes would more accurately reflect the aims and objectives of the Local Plan ?
2. Whether the reference to the Highway Authority invalidates Policy CM2 ?

**ASSESSMENT**

**First Issue : CPRE's Suggested Change**

7.32 I have dealt with similar objections from the CPRE in other sections of this report and I have come to the same conclusion that the suggested change would add an element of uncertainty into the policy and be contrary to the advice in paragraph 5.3 of PPG12 which advocates clear, succinct and easily understood Plans.

**Second Issue : Reference to The Highway Authority**

7.33 As to the DoE's objection, I detect an element of hair splitting in this and in the Council's suggested change. The 'adopted standards' of the changed policy would still be those of the Highway Authority and, if so, nothing of substance would result from the change. The reference to the Highway Authority in this context is surely adjectival and does not signify that that Authority would be involved in the application of this policy any



more or less than current practice. In any event, there are no alternative standards and I see no reason why they should not be accurately described. The phrase 'adoption standards' is to be preferred, therefore, as the Highway Authority points out.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

7.34 That no modification be made to the Local Plan in respect of these objections.

- - - 0 - - -

**POLICY CM3**

**PLANNING PERMISSION WILL NORMALLY BE GRANTED FOR DEVELOPMENT PROVIDED THAT ADEQUATE PARKING SPACE FOR VEHICLES IS PROVIDED CLEAR OF THE PUBLIC HIGHWAY. IN ASSESSING PROPOSALS FOR THE PURPOSE OF THIS POLICY REGARD WILL BE PAID TO THE COUNCIL'S ADOPTED PARKING STANDARDS SET OUT IN APPENDIX 1.**

[Proposed Changes : See Core Document No.12]

**7.35 OBJECTIONS by :**

939	Nationwide Building Society	1299	McCarthy and Stone Ltd.
2191	HBF		

**SUMMARY OF OBJECTIONS**

7.36 The status of the Appendix is not clear. Its introduction refers to a 'guide' but at item 5 reference is made to the imposition of a restriction on development rights. If the Appendix is mandatory it should be a specific policy within the Local Plan.

7.37 The standards for Sheltered Housing and Elderly Persons Dwellings are both onerous and unnecessary for these types of accommodation. There is also confusion in the description of these dwellings. Category 1, (Elderly Persons Dwellings), are usually regarded as for the active elderly whereas the residents of Category 2, (Sheltered Accommodation), are usually less so and have the need for communal facilities and a warden. As a consequence, the categories have different parking requirements, viz :

Category 1	1 space per dwelling.
Category 2	1 space per 3 apartments, and 2 spaces per warden's dwelling.

**THE ISSUES**

1. Whether the status of the Appendix requires clarification and, if so, in what respect ?
2. Whether the standards are too onerous ?

**ASSESSMENT**

**First Issue : Clarification**

7.38 It would seem as if the Appendix has been incorporated into the Local Plan in toto and without adaption. The introduction is superfluous in this context and its retention the cause of confusion and objection. Reference to it being a 'guide' is not appropriate nor the reference to the restriction of development rights. Many of the other references come into the category of 'material considerations' whereby these standards might be relaxed or strengthened depending on circumstance, these too would seem inappropriate in a document which sets out standards. Only the factual material contained in paragraphs 12 and 13 would seem to have place in the Appendix, other guidance could be incorporated in the supporting text of Policy CM2 if considered appropriate.

*Second Issue : Standards*

7.39 I am with the objectors in considering the description of the categories of sheltered housing and elderly persons dwellings to be unconventional and confusing and that the requirements of both appear to be based on a misconception of their function. It is unusual to have resident wardens in the case of the former while the average age of entry into the latter is usually such that many have discontinued the use of private motor vehicles; the requirement for parking spaces is therefore correspondingly less. I am of the view that the standards should be changed in both these cases.

7.40 The phraseology of this policy is not the subject of an objection but I cannot let it, and others in the Local Plan, pass without some comment. It is misleading in its implication that the granting of planning permission is dependent only on the provision of adequate parking space, (in the case of Policy CM3), or on some other sole proviso, (as in the case of other policies to which I draw attention). There are other ways of expressing the essential requirement without the ambiguity of the wording of this policy. I suggest an alternative wording below which draws on the Council's suggested change.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

7.41 That the Local Plan be modified by the adaption of Appendix 1 to the requirements of the Plan, ie. by the deletion of the Introduction, (other than the factual references in paragraphs 12 and 13), and the incorporation of any operational guidance contained therein in the supporting text of Policy CM2.

And that the categories ii) and iii) in section C3 DWELLINGHOUSES, be defined in the terms of paragraph 7.37 above and the parking requirements, insofar as they relate to the independent units and the warden in the case of the latter, be similarly defined.

7.42 That Policy CM3 be reworded, viz :

THE GRANTING OF PLANNING PERMISSION WILL NORMALLY BE DEPENDENT ON THE PROVISION OF ADEQUATE PARKING SPACE FOR VEHICLES CLEAR OF THE PUBLIC HIGHWAY IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE STANDARDS SET OUT IN APPENDIX 1.

- - - 0 - - -

**POLICY CM4**

**PLANNING PERMISSION WILL NORMALLY BE GRANTED FOR CAR PARKING AS PART OF DEVELOPMENT/REDEVELOPMENT OF:**

[A. - C.] as listed.

[Proposed Changes : See Core Document No.12]

7.43 **OBJECTION by :**

2309 DoE

**SUMMARY OF OBJECTION**

7.44 The policy lacks clarity. Car parking provision should only relate to the needs of the development and the provision of general car parking should not be a requirement; the policy should be deleted.

**THE ISSUE**

1. Whether the policy has any relevance at this point in the Plan period ?

**ASSESSMENT**

7.45 I agree with the Council and the DoE that it has little relevance and should be deleted.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

7.46 That the Local Plan be modified by the deletion of Policy CM4.

- - - 0

**POLICY CM5**

PLANNING PERMISSION WILL NORMALLY BE GRANTED FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF LAND TO THE REAR OF ABBEY STREET, ST. JOHNS SQUARE AND GOLDING CLOSE IDENTIFIED AS SITE 14 ON THE PROPOSALS MAP (DAVENTRY INSET) PROVIDED THAT CAR PARKING FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE TOWN CENTRE AS A WHOLE IS PROVIDED ADDITIONAL TO THAT FOR THE DEVELOPMENT ITSELF.

7.47      OBJECTION by :

2310      DoE

**SUMMARY OF OBJECTION**

7.48      The policy goes beyond the test of reasonableness in Circular 16/91.

**THE ISSUE**

1.          Whether the policy breaches the tests contained in Circular 16/91 ?

**ASSESSMENT**

7.49      The policy would seem to prejudge the outcome of any planning application insofar as planning obligations might arise from the development of Site 14. In that respect the policy goes beyond the test of reasonableness. The obvious riposte to the Council's defence of Policy CM5 is to question whether development should be permitted if it were to deny the present users of Site 14 of a much valued facility. I am unsure of the progress being made towards the development of Site 14 but I doubt that Policy CM5 is helpful and may be regarded as obstructive. I am of the view that it should be deleted.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

7.50      That the Local Plan be modified by the deletion of Policy CM5.

- - - 0 - - -

**POLICY CM6**

**PLANNING PERMISSION WILL NOT NORMALLY BE GRANTED FOR DEVELOPMENT IN THE VICINITY OF THE A14 WITH THE EXCEPTION OF ONE SERVICE AREA AT THE JUNCTION OF THE LINK ROAD WITH THE A50 NORTHAMPTON TO LEICESTER ROAD TO SERVE THE NEEDS OF THE USERS OF THE A14**

**7.51 OBJECTIONS by :**

572 Mr and Mrs Miles (573) (574) 2107 CPRE  
(575) (2375)

**SUMMARY OF OBJECTIONS**

7.52 The omission from the policy of a further exception to allow the development of a distribution centre, service area and truck stop on adjacent land. The need for B8 distribution centres and site for such purposes are an integral part of the national economy and has been recognised by Government by specific reference and in various policy documents; Policy EMP 4 was introduced into the Structure Plan as a result.

7.53 The Local Plan establishes policy until 2006; this is a substantial period of time in which different needs and opportunities will arise; Government policy emphasises the need for choice in employment related development. There is already pressure for a distribution centre along the A14 but suitable locations are limited; the objection land is suitable. The objection site is 'brown land' which relates well to the existing and committed commercial development within the landscape compartment.

7.54 The word, 'normally' should be deleted and the word, 'only' should be added to the last sentence of the policy to indicate that the proposed service area should not become the focus for general commercial activity.

**THE ISSUES**

1. Whether the Local Plan is deficient in not addressing the need for B8 distribution centres on the strategic routes in the District Council's administrative area ?
2. Whether there is a need for a distribution centre and, if so, whether the objection site meets the criteria of Policy EMP 4 or are there overriding reasons for not allocating the land for that purpose ?
3. Whether it would be reasonable to apply the restrictions required by the CPRE and whether they would be necessary for the reasons quoted ?

**ASSESSMENT****First Issue : A Deficiency in the Local Plan ?**

7.55 There is no lack of guidance and advice about distribution development in what might be regarded as the hierarchy of policies supporting the Local Plan nor is there any doubt about the changing trend to distribution parks which offer economies of scale to consumers and businesses alike. Both the Council and the objector deploy arguments which are based on their interpretation of that guidance and advice and I consider first, Structure Plan Policy EMP 4.

7.56 The wording of all but one of the policies under the Head of 'Industrial and Commercial Development' in the Structure Plan has a consistency which leaves little room for doubt or misinterpretation; policies are either expressed positively with qualifying criteria or negatively with exceptional circumstances admitted. Policy EMP 4, however, seems to depart from these formats in being expressed negatively but listing criteria which would not be amiss if the policy had been expressed otherwise. The objector takes the view that it is a policy to which the Council should 'respond', [by way of identifying sites and making provision for storage or distribution development], whereas the former regard it as a policy to have reference to only when 'exceptional' proposals have to be considered.

7.57 Both parties cannot be right but both have a case. The Secretary of State's decision letter of 27 January 1992 is clear in the intention that Policy EMP 4 was not to be regarded as an enabling policy, (paragraph 6.12), but rather a policy dealing with exceptional cases. As a consequence of that conclusion he added Criterion H that required that proposals should be in the Local Plan. But that act and that criterion do seem to beg the question, whence the **exceptional** cases ?, if permission for development were to depend on a site's inclusion in the Local Plan, (paragraph 6.12).

7.58 I therefore find the Structure Plan and Policy EMP 4 somewhat confusing but Regional Planning Guidance, (RPG8), is a document which post dates the Structure Plan Alteration No.1 and is clear. Paragraph 7.11 contains the following; 'New developments should however be identified through the development plan process rather than on an ad hoc basis. Local authorities should therefore consider whether there is likely to be a need for further (distribution) sites within their areas of jurisdiction and plan accordingly.' The Council clearly has a duty to have considered the requirement for distribution centres in conjunction with other authorities.

7.59 Of course, Policy EM20, represents a substantial proposal which includes a reference to Class B8 Uses at Criterion D but it is in the context of other acceptable uses to that of the Daventry International Rail Freight Terminal. It does not read as being the result of the considered study that RPG8 advocates. The Local Plan should, therefore, indicate what provision for Class B8 distribution centres, if any, is deemed necessary in the administrative area and indicate the level of consultation that has taken place in reaching that conclusion. I do not think the Council can rest its case on a rather brief reference to distribution centres in Policy EM20.

**Second Issue : Need**

7.60 Clearly the Council takes the view that the unspecified provisions of Policy EM20 would meet any demand. It rejects the suggestion that more may be needed in the District or that the objection site would be a suitable site for development. The Council puts great store on the contents of RPG8 and it sees as crucial to its arguments paragraphs Nos. 4.7, 5.30 and 7.11 which deal with various locational considerations ranging from the obvious, [sites should be located where they would cause least nuisance to urban residents, (paragraph 4.7)], to the particular in naming Kettering and Corby as able to accommodate development pressures.

7.61 The evidence of take-up rates of available buildings does indicate a steady pressure for development in this strategically important area of which B8 Uses are undoubtedly a growing element. But the amount of land available within the 15 mile radius of the objection site would be theoretically sufficient for another 81 years, although I hasten to add that I do not put too much faith in projections of that sort which ignore quality and locational factors. Nevertheless, there would seem to be no lack of alternatives to the objection site which is sited in open countryside and on agricultural land of good quality, contrary to the provisions of Structure Plan Policy EMP 4.

7.62 There is nothing, therefore, in the objector's case which convinces me that the objection site should be allocated in this Local Plan. The only conclusion I can draw is that it has been for the purposes of meeting this objection that the Council has given consideration to the provision of distribution centres but it has compiled sufficient evidence to convince me of its case. My recommendation is therefore limited to making good the deficiency in the Local Plan regarding the outcome of these considerations; it follows that I make no recommendations for modification of the Local Plan in respect of objections Nos. 573, 574 and 575; I have previously considered objections to Policy EN1, [objection No.2375], and come to the conclusion that that policy should be deleted from the Local Plan.

**Third Issue : Restrictions**

7.63 The CPRE would restrict the use proposed service area to 'users of the A14', on the basis that this would ensure no future development on the site. The restriction would most probably apply in practice but would be unenforceable and I see no merit in the suggested change either in its restrictions or intentions.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

7.64 That the Local Plan be modified by the inclusion in Chapter 5, (see also objections to Policies EM19 and EM20), of an explanation of the consideration given to the provision of distribution centres in the administrative area of the District Council. This explanation to include details of the consultations carried out with other authorities.



POLICY CM7

PLANNING PERMISSION WILL NORMALLY BE GRANTED FOR A SERVICE AREA AT THE A14/A5 JUNCTION PROVIDED THAT:

[A. - F.] as listed.

[Proposed Changes : See Core Document No.12]

7.65 OBJECTION by :

2108 CPRE

SUMMARY OF OBJECTION

7.66 Criteria B, C and D should be changed, viz :

- B. It has a high standard of design using traditional materials.
- C. Buildings are no more than single storey in height with pitched roofs.
- D. Storage areas are to be either internal to the buildings or if external, screened from general view.

THE ISSUE

1. Whether the suggested criteria would be too onerous and unreasonably prescriptive ?

ASSESSMENT

7.67 I am with the Council in taking the view that the suggested criterion B would be unreasonable and too onerous and that there would be no visual advantage in restricting the height of buildings to single storey. To do so would result in a greater area of land being developed and there being less scope for imaginative design. The Council's suggested changes which incorporate 'D' above and modify the criterion designed to lessen the visual impact of the parking areas seem to offer a better guarantee of an acceptable development. I am content to recommend their adoption.

RECOMMENDATIONS

7.68 That Policy CM7 be modified by the substitution of the following Criteria for D and E, viz :

- D. STORAGE AREAS TO BE EITHER INTERNAL TO THE BUILDINGS OR IF EXTERNAL, SCREENED FROM GENERAL VIEW.
- E. THE IMPACT OF PARKING AREAS IS TO BE MINIMISED BY SUBSTANTIAL PERIMETER AND INTERNAL PLANTING.

- - - 0 - - -

**POLICY CM9**

**THE OPPORTUNITY TO ASSIST THE PROVISION OF PUBLIC TRANSPORT WILL BE A CONSIDERATION IN GRANTING PLANNING PERMISSION FOR NEW DEVELOPMENT.**

[Proposed Changes : See Core Document No.12]

7.69 **OBJECTION** by :

2324 DoE

**SUMMARY OF OBJECTION**

7.70 The policy refers to an administrative action rather than a proposal or policy for control; it should be reduced to the supporting text.

**THE ISSUE**

1. Whether the draft policy and the suggested change warrant 'policy status' ?

**ASSESSMENT**

7.71 The Council's suggested change would go some way to meeting the DoE's objection but it repeats a format of which I have been previously critical, [see Policy CM3]. The implication is misleading and should be corrected; I suggest an alternative wording.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

7.72 That Policy CM9 be modified, viz :

**THE GRANTING OF PLANNING PERMISSION FOR DEVELOPMENT WILL BE DEPENDENT ON PROVISION BEING MADE FOR PUBLIC TRANSPORT, WHERE APPROPRIATE.**

- - - 0 - - -

POLICY CM10

PLANNING PERMISSION WILL NORMALLY BE GRANTED FOR LARGE SCALE DEVELOPMENTS PROVIDED THAT SAFE AND CONVENIENT CYCLIST AND PEDESTRIAN ROUTES HAVING REGARD TO EXISTING AND PLANNED FOOTPATHS AND CYCLE TRACKS IN THE AREA ARE PROVIDED.

7.73 OBJECTIONS by :

539 Mr RA Pinckheard 155 Preston Capes Parish Council (156)

SUMMARY OF OBJECTIONS

7.74 The existing footpath/cycleway system should be shown on the Proposals Map. The existing system is poorly signed, designed and maintained and reflects the manner in which the car has been allowed to dominate cyclists and pedestrians in Daventry. There would appear to be no link between cycling and tourism; opportunities exist for the use of disused railway tracks as cycle routes.

THE ISSUES

1. Whether the showing of the existing footpath/cycleway system would be an appropriate addition to the Proposals Map ?
2. Whether an opportunity has been missed in the promotion of tourism as a result ?

ASSESSMENT

7.75 I agree with the Council that the Proposals Map is the vehicle to illustrate the areas of the application of policy and the location of proposals, it is not intended to be a definitive record of the state of development in the District. The level of detail it can contain is limited. It is not, therefore, an appropriate document to illustrate the footpaths and cycleways of the area.

7.76 I am with the Council too in rejecting the idea that the Local Plan has a promotional role, especially where tourism is concerned. The link between that activity and cycling which the Parish Council discern is not obvious to me. However, the phraseology of the policy is again rather clumsy and misleading; I suggest an alternative wording.

RECOMMENDATIONS

7.77 That Policy CM10 be modified, viz :

THE GRANTING OF PLANNING PERMISSION FOR LARGE SCALE DEVELOPMENTS WILL BE DEPENDENT ON THE RETENTION AND PROVISION OF SAFE AND CONVENIENT CYCLIST AND PEDESTRIAN ROUTES IN THE AREA.

**POLICY CM13**

**THE DISTRICT COUNCIL WILL IMPLEMENT THE FOLLOWING ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT/TRAFFIC CALMING SCHEMES IN DAVENTRY, AS SHOWN ON THE PROPOSALS MAP, (DAVENTRY INSET AND DAVENTRY TOWN CENTRE INSET).**

7.78 **OBJECTION** by :

338 National Westminster Estate Management.

**SUMMARY OF OBJECTION**

7.79 Whereas there is no objection to pedestrian priority measures in principle, they must not be at the expense of maintaining proper and secure access to business premises.

**THE ISSUE**

1. Whether the Local Plan contains sufficient safeguards for the operators of vulnerable businesses in Daventry ?

**ASSESSMENT**

7.80 The Council is right to point out that the measures proposed are 'pedestrian priority' measures and do not amount to full pedestrianisation where access to business premises would be more restricted. Nevertheless, the objector has good reason to point out that no business should be forced to adopt lower standards of security as a result of these measures and it follows that they should have the support of the business community in that respect. The objection is not to policy, per se, my recommendation is therefore confined to an addition to paragraph 7.57 which is aimed at protecting business interests.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

7.81 That the Local Plan be modified by the addition of the following sentence to paragraph 7.57, viz :

**'That review will involve consultations with the business community and have particular regard to the questions of access and security of the premises which might be affected.'**

**POLICY CM14**

**PLANNING PERMISSION WILL NORMALLY BE GRANTED FOR DEVELOPMENT PROVIDED THAT ADEQUATE ACCESS IS MADE IN LAYOUTS FOR LESS ABLE AND ABLE BODIED PEOPLE ALIKE.**

[Proposed Changes : See Core Document No.12]

7.82 **OBJECTION** by :

2311 DoE

**SUMMARY OF OBJECTION**

7.83 The policy is unclear and imprecise; it should be deleted or reworded.

**THE ISSUE**

1. Whether the draft policy and the suggested change warrant 'policy status' ?

**ASSESSMENT**

7.84 I agree with the DoE that Policy CM14 does not warrant policy status. In its present wording it is misleading and does nothing more than introduce the Supplementary Planning Guidance on the subject of accessible environments. The subject is a worthy component of the Local Plan but it is one which could be adequately covered in the supporting text.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

7.85 That the Local Plan be modified by the deletion of Policy CM14.

- - - 0 - - -

**POLICY CM15**

PLANNING PERMISSION WILL NORMALLY BE GRANTED FOR BUILDINGS TO WHICH THE PUBLIC WILL HAVE ACCESS PROVIDED THAT THE DISTRICT COUNCIL IS SATISFIED THAT REGARD HAS BEEN PAID TO THE NEEDS OF DISABLED PEOPLE, PARTICULARLY IN RESPECT OF:

[A. - C.] as listed.

[Proposed Changes : See Core Document No.12]

7.86 OBJECTION by :

2312 DoE

**SUMMARY OF OBJECTION**

7.87 The policy lacks clarity.

**THE ISSUE**

1. Whether the Council's suggested change would more accurately reflect the aims and objectives of the Local Plan ?

**ASSESSMENT**

7.88 The Council's suggested change goes some way to clarifying the intent of the policy but it is still misleading in its implication, (see my comments on Policy CM3). I suggest a modified wording.

**RECOMMENDATIONS.**

7.89 That the Policy CM15 be modified, viz :

THE GRANTING OF PLANNING PERMISSION FOR BUILDINGS TO WHICH THE PUBLIC WILL HAVE ACCESS WILL BE SUBJECT TO THE NEEDS OF DISABLED PEOPLE IN RESPECT OF:

[A. - C.] as listed.

- - - 0 - - -