



## **WEST HADDON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**

### **Summary of responses received at Regulation 16 stage (submission)**

*Regulation 4(3)(b)(iii) of the Neighbourhood Planning (Referendum) Regulations 2012 (as amended)*

The following table comprises a summary of the responses received to the submission consultation of the West Haddon Neighbourhood Plan.

All of the responses summarised below were considered by the examiner when preparing his assessment of, and recommendations towards, the West Haddon Neighbourhood Plan. Where significant representations were received the summary and conclusions provided by the respondent have been used to populate the tables below. The summary of comments reflects the views put forward by the consultee and are abridged as faithfully as possible to ensure that the purpose of the original representation is maintained. The responses can be reviewed in full on the DDC website at: <https://www.daventrydc.gov.uk/westhaddonplan/>

Responses received to the submission consultation that were submitted to the Independent Examiner.

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Support/Object/Comment</b>	<b>Summary of response</b>
Bidwells on behalf of Davidsons Developments Limited	Object & Comment	<p>Following the approval of the residential development for up to 100 residential properties on land east of West Haddon, we consider that the development should be included within the development boundary and explicitly listed within policy WH10. This site, along with other consented sites, should be identified on the Proposals Plan so it is clear where development is consented and where such further development is anticipated to be delivered in West Haddon.</p> <p>The need to protect key features of West Haddon, such as the Open Space, footpaths, character and appearance of the village, needs to be balanced against the objectives to improve existing infrastructure such as the health facilities, bus services and a need to provide a range of house types and tenures.</p>
The Coal Authority	Comment	No specific comments to make on the plan.
West Haddon All Saints' Church Parochial Church	Support	West Haddon All Saints' Church Parochial Church Council supports the inclusion of the Church Glebe Field as a local green space.

Council		
Landmark Planning on behalf of	Object	<p>Objected to the plan for the following reasons;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There has been little or no discussion with landowners, including the owner of land off Guilsborough Road, where a development of up to 80 dwellings is proposed.</li> <li>• The aims to retain open spaces and views of open countryside in the future do not reflect the need to encourage sustainable development or the 'planning balance' between promoting housing and the economy and protecting the environment as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. It also does not recognise the need in the West Northants Joint Core Strategy for the rural area to accommodate a proportion of the overall necessary growth in the District in settlements such as West Haddon.</li> <li>• The Plan ignores the granting of outline planning permission for up to 100 dwellings on land opposite our client's site on Guilsborough Road. This will fundamentally alter the form and character of the village and sets a precedent for the development of the land to the north west of Guilsborough Road.</li> <li>• The opportunity to provide a new primary school, as part of the development of our client's land, should be properly considered in the Plan.</li> <li>• The housing needs of the village can only be satisfactorily addressed by the provision of new affordable housing within market-led schemes.</li> <li>• Criteria a) and b) of Policy WH1 and text relating to the Special Landscape</li> </ul>

		<p>Area (SLA) are overly restrictive and out dated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A policy approach that allows ‘small-scale only’ development would not reflect the need to encourage sustainable development.</li> </ul>
Mono Consultants Ltd on behalf of the Mobile Operations Association	Support	Support for the inclusion of Policy WH8.
Mr & Mrs Shakespeare	Comment	Requested an extension to the village confines boundary to take in their entire rear garden, rather than cut through a considerable amount of it.
Mr Weininger	Object	<p>The Plan does not sufficiently address the need for some residents to ‘downsize’ and remain in the village. The settlement boundary also cuts through some private gardens with no knowledge, consent or consultation with the individual landowner.</p> <p>The village confines/settlement boundary discriminates against both the aged and the disabled.</p>
Miss L Mather, County Archaeological Advisor, Northamptonshire County Council	Support & Comment	<p>Policy WH1 and WH2 will help maintain the historic landscape surrounding the village. Policy WH13 will ensure that the historic character of the designated and undesignated buildings is maintained.</p> <p>It is suggested that the Jurassic Way route could be promoted more within the village and along the Right of Way.</p>

<p>Ms H Webb, Principal Project Officer, Northamptonshire County Council</p>	<p>Support, Comment &amp; Object</p>	<p>Support for the inclusion of a policy on landscaping with some wording changes.</p> <p>Market Field (site G2) may constitute Accessible Natural Greenspace which would add weight to the argument for its protection under policy WH2.</p> <p>It is recommended that the cricket field and playing fields be removed from WH2 and protected under WH5 only.</p>
<p>Pegasus Group</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>There is no justification for the inclusion of the Special Landscape Area on the Proposals Map. It should therefore be deleted.</p> <p><b>Policy WH1</b> Criteria a) &amp; b) are overly restrictive. Criterion c) should be more clearly defined to relate to publicly accessible views.</p> <p>There is conflict with <b>Policy WH2: Protection of Local Green Spaces</b> and paragraphs 78 and 87-99 of the NPPF. Policy WH2 identifies land off Victoria Close as a proposed Local Green Space. The Examiner for the Plan needs to be certain that the justification for the designation of G1 is robust, and is not being proposed simply to prevent the site from being developed.</p> <p>It is considered that the site does not meet the requirements of the ‘demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance’ test as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site’s location in a Special Landscape Area (SLA) does not make it demonstrably special because the SLA covers such a wide area. There is no further appraisals that single out Site G1 as being demonstrably special;</li> <li>• The long distance and local footpaths within the site will be retained as part</li> </ul>

		<p>of the development proposals; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identifying a site as demonstrably special for its use as a recreation area where there is no access beyond the public right of way is flawed.</li> </ul> <p>It is also considered that there is no evidence in the Consultation Statement that any of the consultation events generated any reported comment about Local Green Space designations.</p> <p>The Plan maintains that G1 is demonstrably special because it provides “extensive views to the north over the SLA”. We do not agree with this conclusion. The Chapel-en-le-Frith Examiner clearly states that “it is not the purpose of the Local Green Space designations to include countryside land that provides wider views of the countryside”.</p> <p>The Seddlescombe Examiner’s report concludes that “the threat of development” was not sufficient to make the site demonstrably special. Even though not all land to the west is proposed as a Local Green Space (LGS), the areas of land that have been selected effectively place a barrier on development from the existing built up area towards the bypass.</p> <p>Approximately 5 hectares to the west of G1 and the north of G2 is also likely to be prevented from being developed as a result of the proposed LGS designation, which together total around 11.5ha. The extensive nature of these designations cannot be described as being local in character and should be removed from the plan.</p> <p>The Chapel-en-le-Frith Examiner also recommended that a number of LGS designations were discounted because they were sites on the edge of the existing built up area which amounted to countryside and were not local in character.</p> <p>For the reasons described above, it is considered that the proposed Local Green</p>
--	--	--

	Support	<p>Space designations G1 and G2 should be duly deleted from the plan.</p> <p><b>Policy WH10</b> states that the proposed allocated housing sites “have been assessed using the Daventry District Council toolkit”. The evidence of this assessment has not been produced for public review. Without the publication of the site assessment results, we cannot be confident that the Plan is contributing to the achievement of sustainable development.</p> <p>Because the Plan allocates sites, it remains our contention that SEA should be carried out.</p> <p>We welcome the rewording of <b>Policy WH11</b> to allow housing outside the settlement boundary where it is provided for in Policy R1 of the Joint Core Strategy.</p>
Mr A Stephens	Support	<p>I think the Plan has been well thought through and provides a sensible managed approach to the future development of the village.</p>
Dr B Hemmings	Support	<p>The steering group have been extremely communicative throughout the process of constructing the plan, providing various forums for the population to their views. I also wholly endorse the section on future housing and development in section 4.5. Anything which exceeds this will affect the ‘community feel’ of the village.</p>
Mr T James, Senior Policy Officer, Daventry District Council	Object & Comment	<p>Evidence should be provided to demonstrate why the allocated sites have been chosen as allocations and provide evidence of their deliverability.</p> <p>The Plan lists policy HS21 but as this is a detailed policy specific for West Haddon it should be set out in more detail as has been done with policy HS11.</p>

Mr P Litchfield	Object & Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We would support low level industrial and commercial development to generate local employment.</li> <li>• The most vocal people objecting to the future development and retention of “open spaces” are the most recent additions to the village. The landscape and visual impact is a material consideration in planning and there is no personal right to a private view. Landscape views from the ‘Old Rec’ will still be available from the public footpath if Miller Homes plans are accepted. The footpaths will still be retained as part of the development.</li> <li>• The designation of my privately owned farmland as Proposed Protected Local Green Space is totally unacceptable to me as a farmer. The Parish Council’s application to have the ‘Rec’ designated as a village Green was unsuccessful. The field was and still is used for agricultural purposes. It is disingenuous for the village to now seek to use it for this use even when a playing field is available elsewhere in the village and anyone currently using the ‘Old Rec’ field as a playing field/recreation area is trespassing on private land.</li> <li>• Objections are raised to objectives a), g), h) &amp; i) of the plan (as set out in para.4.15).</li> <li>• Businesses have not been consulted as to whether they would be able to cope with an increase in population or not. A greater population has the potential to sustain and enhance local employment &amp; services and would increase the vitality of the village.</li> <li>• Faster broadband should make West Haddon a more desirable village to run a small business from.</li> <li>• Low cost starter homes and homes for elderly/disabled are mentioned. How</li> </ul>
-----------------	------------------	---



		<p>can these be available if no one wants housing development in the village? The Plan is proposed until 2029 and during that period the village will need many more houses than the small scale developments which are being proposed. The proposed development on the 'Old Rec' includes the provision for low cost housing and housing for the elderly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• An increase in traffic as a result of additional development off Victoria Close is not viewed by the Highways Authority as a constraint to development.</li><li>• Any percentage statistics are a percentage of the 76% returned questionnaires, not the 100% population.</li><li>• We and other landowners in the Parish were not directly consulted about the plan at any stage, particularly the Steering Group's proposals to designate my land as a Local Green Space.</li></ul>
--	--	--