

## **Part 2 Local Plan Workshops – 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> February 2016**

District Councillors and Parish Councillors were invited to attend workshops to explore issues that were included in the Part 2 Local Plan Issues and Options documents. Two workshops were held to ensure coverage across the District:

The first workshop was held on 2<sup>nd</sup> February at Daventry Working Men's Club and was attended by representatives from 18 Parish Councils and 6 District Councillors

The second workshop was held on 3<sup>rd</sup> February at Naseby Village Hall and was attended by representatives from 9 Parish Councils and 6 District Councillors. This workshop was also attended by Braybrooke Parish which adjoins the District and is part of Kettering Borough.

The workshops covered the following topics:

### **Settlements and Countryside Local Plan – Issues and Options**

- 1) Daventry Town Housing – Exploring options to deliver at least 511 dwellings
- 2) Vibrant Rural Communities – Services and Facilities: Should anything else be included?
- 3) Vibrant Rural Communities – Village confines: Which should be defined?
- 4) Protecting and Enhancing the Environment: Fringe of Daventry District, in particular Northampton and Daventry fringe

### **Gypsies, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Local Plan – Issues and Options**

- A) Site size – Gypsy and Traveller: What site sizes should be considered for this provision?
- B) Should the 18 residential pitches and the 2 Showpeople plots be provided on an extension of existing sites or new sites
- C) What tenure should be considered on the sites?
- D) Should all sites be allocated within the Part 2b Local Plan or should some provision be allowed to come through the normal development management process?
- E) Other issues raised relating to Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Local Plan

## Settlements and Countryside Local Plan – Issues and Options

### Workshop 1

#### Daventry Town Housing – Exploring Options to deliver at least 511 dwellings

Where should the remaining requirement of at least 511 dwellings go at Daventry and why should it go there?

Participants were given a map of Daventry Town with the three proposed options and asked to discuss each option

| Issues         | Comments   |
|----------------|--|
| Option A       | Option A is beyond the Marches area and not connected.   |
|                | Roads are a natural boundary to housing South of the town centre (Option A and C)  |
|                | The topography here is limiting to the amount of land available for housing.   |
|                | The development would be detached from the town and would not be large enough to provide appropriate services and facilities on its own.   |
| Option B       | The North and North West of the town have already had a lot of development   |
|                | Employment opportunities are not in the town centre, there are far more at DIRFT. Location of workplaces should be taken into consideration when planning for new housing, therefore the Northern area should be favoured. |
|                | Residents of Middlemore feel isolated from the rest of the town and the road is not safe for children walking to school. Further development in this area would help make it more sustainable and inclusive to the town.   |
| Option C       | Roads are a natural boundary to housing South of the town centre (Option A and C)  |
| Other comments | Daventry has a compact feel as a market town which is a positive feature and good for young families and the elderly. This should be retained.   |
|                | People don't use the town centre to its full potential partly due to the fact there are few offices located there. Therefore the town centre should be a focus for residential.  |
|                | Housing West of industrial estates would not be well connected and is not supported  |
|                | The housing should all be located together rather than split across multiple small sites to ensure the appropriate services and facilities are provided  |
|                | Need to consider transport links, recent development, one large site one possibly more viable  |
|                | Could the extra dwellings be added to sites already in place?  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | Can underused industrial sites be developed for housing?   |
|  | As rural housing figures have been met – concerns that no more affordable homes will be built in villages. |
|  | Concerns that more housing will lead to loss of separation from Daventry to Villages                       |
|  | Can we define meaning of Hamlet and parish annex system?   |

**Workshop 2**  
**Vibrant Rural Communities**  
**Services and Facilities**  
**Do you agree with the Most Important, Important and Other Services and Facilities?**  
**What should be changed and why?**  
**What else should be included and why?**

|                | Issues                  | Comments  |
|----------------|-------------------------|---|
| Most Important | Public House/Restaurant | 4 groups agreed most important, 1 group felt should be classified as important, 1 group felt should be other  |
|                | General Food Store      | All agreed should be Most Important   |
|                | Primary schools         | 5 groups felt that Primary school should remain as most important, with 1 group considering it belonged in the other category.<br><br>1 group discussed that the existence of a school isn't always the most important thing. It is what the school also offers. Pre school and after school clubs are important to sustaining a school as it supports working parents. The quality of the school is also important. Access to quality schools with wrap around care is very important. |
|                | Secondary schools       | 1 group agreed it should remain as Most Important, 2 groups felt it should be classified as Important, 2 groups felt it should be measured as accessibility to secondary school instead therefore it might not have to be in the village- Serves a wider catchment than the village in which it is located... 1 group felt it should be classified as other.  |
|                | Post Offices            | Post offices have very different opening hours therefore it is difficult to classify them all together.   |

|           |                                       |   |
|-----------|---------------------------------------|---|
|           |                                       | 1 Group discussed that post offices may not exist by 2029 so maybe shouldn't be included in this list at all. Rather they should be part of a definition of shop. However could be classified as other  |
|           |                                       | 5 groups felt should be classified as Most Important.   |
|           | Public Transport (Quality of service) | All agreed most important however noted that it should be reliable  |
|           | GP Surgery                            | All agreed should remain Most Important   |
|           | Village Hall Community Centre         | All agreed should remain most important   |
| Important | Local employment provision            | 5 groups felt it should remain as important, 1 group felt should be classed as 'most important' or employment provision well linked to public transport should be classed as 'most important'   |
|           |                                       | Local employment provision should be differentiated to some extent. DIRFT attracts commuters; it is not just employment for Crick.  |
|           | Other Shops/Takeaways                 | 4 groups agreed important but 2 Groups felt Should be classified as other   |
|           | Libraries / outreach centres          | 5 agreed should remain as important, 1 group felt Should be classified as other   |
|           | Pre-school provision                  | 5 agreed should be important and 1 group felt should be most important  |
| Other     | Allotments                            | All agreed should remain as other.  |
|           | Sports ground                         | 2 groups felt should be most important ( 1 group felt important when sports club active), 1 felt important and 3 thought should remain as other. However should differentiate between a club style set up and a sports pitch used for recreation. |
|           | Play areas                            | 3 groups felt should be classified as Most Important, 2 groups felt important and 1 as other.<br>Some discussion about Need to differentiate between younger and older children. Play areas for younger children should be classed as 'important' |
|           | Church/Chapel                         | 1 group felt should be classified as Important  |
|           | Parks and Special open space          | 1 group felt should be classified as Important  |
|           | Broadband                             | 4 should be classified as Very important as school children require it and increasingly people are working from home.   |
|           | Connectivity between villages         | Currently this is unsafe for children.  |
|           |                                       | Need to understand which villages are served by primary service villages and determine how they can be safely connected by cycle, walking or bus.   |
|           | Older Persons Facilities              | 1 group felt Should be a classified as Most Important   |
|           | Public Footpaths/Rights of way        | 1 group felt Should be classified as other  |

|  |                             |  |
|--|-----------------------------|--|
|  | Tourism/Special Features    | 1 group felt Should be classified as other   |
|  | Graveyards                  | 1 group felt Should be classified as Important   |
|  | Recycling Centre            | 1 group felt Should be classified as Other   |
|  | Road/Service Infrastructure | 1 group felt should be most important  |
|  |                             | School and work days are more flexible. Services need to respond to this and also be more flexible. The post office may be the only contact some people have – could this be incorporated into other facilities. |
|  |                             | Guilsborough school has very poor transport and is not ideal for extra-curricular activities. Guilsborough could potentially have further development but would require significant transport improvements.      |

### Workshop 3

#### Vibrant Rural Communities

**What are the benefits and dis-benefits of mapping confines?**

**Which categories of villages should have confines mapped?**

| Comments  |
|---|
| There is no benefit to drawing a confine. An application has recently been refused just outside the confine when the community thought it was acceptable.     |
| Defining a confine is restrictive because villages have to grow.  |
| Confines are worth defining. A description becomes complicated and can be unpicked.   |
| A suggestion was made to have an indicative line rather than a confine  |
| Defining a confine is positive and the community understand this idea.  |
| Primary service village need to be more flexible to be sustainable. Small villages may be better defined in order to stay small. Sustainability is important. |
| Why map confines if no development pressure   |
| Confines drawn around edge of properties gardens to prevent development   |
| Is confine – building line, settlement line or character line   |
| Would infill policy still apply?  |

**Workshop 4**  
**Protecting and Enhancing the Environment**  
**Fringe of Daventry District, in particular Northampton and Daventry fringe**  
**What do we want to try and achieve out of a policy?**

**Comments**

Support for a strong policy that offers some sort of green wedge protection. This will support maintaining the rural character of villages.

A designation some way between a Special Landscape Area and a Green Space could be used to define important undeveloped areas.

A5 between Daventry and Rugby is a significant barrier and should not be breached by Rugby's growth

A corridor or buffer may be better as it is more permeable

Co-operation between counties is important.

As town expands can cause pressure on villages and infrastructure – need to protect countryside

Are we liaising with neighbouring authorities to stop development encroaching into our district?

Need to leave green corridors to enable walking from village and not using transport.

Urban crime needs to be taken into consideration

Infrastructure – some people want town facilities on their doorstep

Footpaths to connect settlements

## Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Local Plan

### Workshop A

#### Site size – Gypsy and Traveller

What site sizes should be considered for this provision?

#### Comments/questions raised

Agreement that smaller pitches are easier to manage. Families prefer sites of 4 to 5 pitches for members of their own family. The impact on the settled community is less, impact on local schools is better and provides for better integration-example of Braybrooke school provided.

Do traveller sites get preference for planning over normal housing development?

Family relations can cause issues if site becomes too large – disagreement with communities within the site therefore more smaller sites may be more preferable

Are managed sites an option?

What is a sensible mix – 2 pitch site may be preferred locally but larger sites may be easier to manage

Need to consider schools and doctors surgeries – are they able to accommodate more people?

### Workshop B

Should the 18 residential pitches and the 2 Showpeople plots be provided on

- a. An extension of existing sites or
- b. New sites

#### Comments/questions raised

Agreement that it is better to have more locations rather than concentrating the population at fewer large sites.

If school near site is full would this stop an extension to an existing development

How long do we have to provide these sites?

**Workshop C**

**What tenure should be considered on the sites?**

Comments/questions raised

Could sites be included in Affordable Housing requirement?

Is it better for them to be privately owned, managed by Travellers, managed by separate management company or local authority?

Council controls would be preferable

If sites were purchased out right does this give them more rights as land owners and building on site?

Housing association management would be beneficial

**Workshop D**

**Should all need be allocated within the Local Plan Part 2b or should some provision be allowed to come through the normal development management process?**

Comments/questions raised

Agreement that the whole requirement should be allocated as this provides certainty

Strong agreement that the emergency stopping place should be allocated.

Allocate some of need and allow others to come forward

Allocate all of need to keep control



**Workshop E****Other issues raised relating to Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Local Plan**

| Issues   | Comment   |
|----------|---|
| Issue 10 | There was a concern that by allowing rural exception sites for Gypsy, Traveller or Travelling Showpeople pitches that this could effectively allow for pitches anywhere |
| Issue 15 | The phrase 'light touch' SEA is considered to be too vague  |
|          | Locating the sites on urban fringes may have a lower impact   |