

## **FLORE 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 Flore Neighbourhood Plan.

All of the responses summarised below were considered by the examiner when preparing his assessment of, and recommendations towards, the Flore 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/living/planning-policy/neighbourhood-planning/flore/>

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>
Marrons Planning on behalf of Barwood Homes	Comment	Whilst it is accepted that the Flore Neighbourhood Plan seeks to reflect the Spatial Strategy adopted by the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy, it is considered that in order to avoid Policy F2 of the Neighbourhood Plan becoming out-of-date should a 5 year housing land supply shortfall emerge, the Neighbourhood Plan should plan proactively and consider a potential reserve site (i.e. Land to the East of Brington Road, Flore).
Pegasus Group on behalf of the landowners Mr and Mrs Kemble, Mr Freeman and Mrs Buswell	Object	<p>Policy F2 – It is considered that the policy represents an overly restrictive approach to future development in the settlement over the plan period to 2029 which does not properly consider the opportunity for further sustainable development to the north of the settlement. This restrictive approach is not considered to be appropriate having regard to national policy or in conformity with strategic policies in the development plan.</p> <p>Proposals Map – The Village Development Area should be amended to include recently consented residential schemes to the north of the village. It would also be useful if the Proposals Map was also extended to show the route of the link road and its effect on all land to the north of the settlement.</p> <p>Paragraphs 2.10-2.14 – We consider that the Neighbourhood Plan as currently</p>

		<p>framed is not in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Core Strategy as it unnecessarily seeks to restrict development in what is a sustainable settlement, capable of accommodating some further limited growth.</p> <p>Policy F1.2 – This policy is not supported as it is not adequately justified and does not contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. Map 2 and the Proposals Map do not show the route of the now approved Daventry Development Link Road. It is not clear therefore that the Neighbourhood Plan has appropriately considered the implications of the route of the Link Road for land to the north of the settlement, taking account of recently approved residential developments.</p> <p>Paragraphs 4.1.2 and 4.1.3 – The sustainability credentials of the settlement have been acknowledged by Daventry District Council in recent decisions to approve new residential development proposals to the north of the settlement. As part of these submissions we have identified the scope for some further growth on land between Brockhall Road and Brington Road that enjoys similar sustainability credentials.</p> <p>Paragraphs 4.2.10 to 4.2.25 – The section makes no reference to the Daventry Development Link Road, its impacts on the area and the implications and opportunities for development on land to the north of the settlement.</p> <p>Policy F7 and Map 3 – The proposed further development to the east of Brockhall Road would not impact on identified protected views. For the nearest view, View 1, the site sits behind the already consented development off Brockhall Road so would not affect this view. This further demonstrates that there is scope to provide for some additional development north of the village without any unacceptable impacts.</p> <p>Objectives 1 and 2 – These objectives in relation to housing provision in the village are supported. We have set out above our objections to the plan in relation to the need to make further allocation for residential development on land to the north of</p>
--	--	--

		the village.
Howkins & Harrison on behalf of Mr Green	Support & Object	<p>Policy F1 – The priority given to making the best use of previously developed land in sustainable locations and the Village Development Area defined in Map 2 are supported. Criterion 5 should be amended to exclude protection of local facilities that are no longer viable or sustainable.</p> <p>Policy F2 – Criterion 1 should be amended/expanded to give recognition to circumstance where local facilities are no longer viable.</p> <p>Policy F10 – The inclusion of the petrol filling station/garage in the list of facilities which proposed Policy F10 seeks to protect is objected to. Moreover, it should not be a requirement, in the case of the petrol filling station/garage site, that a minimum of 12 months should pass before it can be demonstrated that there is no demand for the facility.</p> <p>The inclusion of the petrol filling station/garage in the list of local facilities to be retained in the village amounts to a lost opportunity for the re-development of the site to make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area, and the amenity of the village.</p>
Andy Clarke on behalf of Mr Thomas	Object	<p>Proposals Map - There is no evidence in the reports that the public consultation process led on the conclusion that 1 High Street should be excluded from the Village Development Area (VDA). There is no evidence that there has been a reasoned justification, in planning terms, for excluding 1 High Street and its near neighbours.</p> <p>The VDA is not defined in the glossary. The absence of clear planning definition for and justification for including or excluding property in the VDA makes this proposal</p>

		<p>unsound.</p> <p>The Daventry Development Link is not shown on the Proposals Map. The absence of the new road from the map tends to suggest that the implications of the development of Flore have not been properly evaluated.</p>
Anglian Water Services Ltd	Support	Policy F8 – Anglian Water is supportive of the policy.
Daventry Council District	Comment	<p>Policy F1 – The latter sections of criteria 1, 7 and criterion 9 are considered to be overly prescriptive.</p> <p>Policy F5 – Criterion 2 is considered unnecessary and the latter half of criterion 4 overly prescriptive.</p> <p>Policy F6 – Criteria 3 and 6 are considered to be overly prescriptive.</p>
Mr R Dinsdale	Object	Policy F7.4 – Trees should be kept away from boundaries and boundaries should be limited to hedging of a reasonable height, native or otherwise.
Weedon Bec Parish Council	Support	Weedon Bec Parish Council is happy with the proposed Neighbourhood Plan.