

#17

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 2 (Web Link)
Started: Tuesday, October 02, 2018 7:40:42 PM
Last Modified: Tuesday, October 02, 2018 8:49:04 PM
Time Spent: 01:08:22
IP Address: 90.210.176.68

Page 2: Part A

Q1 Personal Details*

Title	Cllr
First Name	Mark
Last Name	Wesley

Q2 Personal Details Continued

Postcode
Email (If provided we will always contact you this way)

Q3 Agents Details (If Applicable) **Respondent skipped this question**

Q4 Agents Details Continued **Respondent skipped this question**

Page 3: Part B

Q5 To which part of the Local Plan does this representation relate? Please state paragraph Number/ Policy Number/ Policies Maps

Site HO1 I broadly accept the plan is sound apart from the conclusion that site HO1 is selected as development site

Q6 Do you consider the Local Plan is:(Please tick in the box below as appropriate and then provide details in the space below)

(3) Sound? **No**

Q7 (1) Please give details of why you consider the Local Plan is not legally compliant, be as precise as possible. **Respondent skipped this question**

Q8 (2) Please give details of why you consider the Local Plan does not comply with the duty to co-operate, be as precise as possible. **Respondent skipped this question**

Q9 (3) Please give details of why you consider the Local Plan is not sound, referring to the tests of soundness as appropriate, be as precise as possible.

The basis of the plan is the development of the WNJCS. Policies S1 and S3 set the scale of housing distribution and D1 details development in Daventry Town Centre. The JCS came into being in 2014 but much of the framework data and vision pre dates its inception going back as far back to 2002.

Huge changes have ensued. The economic crash, shopping habits, work patterns, house prices, incomes, household structure. The JCS has not kept up and developments are lagging behind in Town Centre Development Infrastructure. The centre has not seen a new transport system, waterspace, or full retail provision.

Housebuild has lagged behind with infill sites, redevelopments and HMO's making up for lack of progress on the SUE which has been downgraded in number of houses it can deliver

The part 2 plan recognises the issue then seeks to continue with the existing policy, this works to a degree but not in full. Obviously the town centre part has just not happened but there appears to be progress though site 1 the Waterspace and Transport are nowhere near reality in their planned form.

The plan details new developments around the natural edge of the town along with infills. This does not yield enough houses to meet the land supply requirements. The solution is to locate a site that was rejected from the JCS planning process. It then gets rejected by the evaluation process but re instated as the least worst option. The site selection document details the many issues as to why HO1 is not a valid site.

There are sustainability issues with HO1 - The development is clearly cut off from the town of Daventry by the A45. This road supports local employment activity and will require unhelpful restrictions to activate the development. This applies to the A361 as well. I question the employment/housing link. Daventry is a low cost housing market compared to South Northants, Milton Keynes, Banbury, Leamington Spa, Warwick and alike. It is inevitable high quality housing will be taken up by families who's economic activity lies to the South and West where incomes outstrip those in the local economy.

The Town Centre does not supply the development to meet the population growth, there are serious pressures on health resource. The remote community will need links building into the town which in itself lacks usable cycle paths (shared space, painted broken lines, unsuitable surface and subservient to motor vehicles.

I see no work on viability of the site in terms of the infrastructure provision required, road, cycle, water, leisure school and health. Particularly if these are to be provided up front or close to upfront of the development.

The plan as far as the site HO1 is concerned for the above reasons and also for the failure to look at the obvious option and alternative of re visiting the JCS S1 and S3 distribution of housing to make up the shortfall of around 500 dwellings in the district as a whole.

Q10 Please set out what modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the matter you have identified at part 4(1) or 4(3) above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this modification will make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

site selection

We reject HO1 as being unsuitable, unsustainable and not viable.

Q11 If your representation is seeking a modification, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination? (please tick as appropriate) **No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination**

Q12 If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary.

Respondent skipped this question

Q13 Do you wish to be notified of further progress of the Local Plan

Yes
