

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

Question 1: Is the vision appropriate for guiding development and growth in West Northamptonshire up to 2050?

- 231 respondents said 'Yes'
- 578 respondents said 'No'
- 644 respondents provided specific comments

Those who supported the vision made the following key points:

- Support for the inclusion of climate change resilience.
- Support the recognition of the West Northamptonshire's leading role in the Arc and the strategic importance of its location and transport connections. Support recognition of the investment and growth opportunities presented by the Arc. The vision must align with the Arc Environmental Principles.
- Support for plan period to 2050.
- Support for hierarchy which recognises Northampton as the principal urban area.
- Specific acknowledgement of the role of the logistics industry to the local economy should be included.
- The vision reflects the existing spatial strategy which has served the area well.
- Support the identification of Daventry as a sub-regional centre
- The vision is consistent with the NPPF and will promote sustainable growth to meet the needs of the area, align growth and infrastructure and improve the environment and mitigate climate change. It provides a positive framework aligned with the three overarching sustainability objectives of the NPPF.
- Priority needs to be given to health.
- Must include reference to the sustainable use of natural resources
- Daventry should be clearly identified as a key location for housing and economic growth (rather than it being implicit). In addition, the Rural Service Centres should be identified as suitable for limited/non-strategic growth only.
- More detail on infrastructure provision and timing required.
- The vision for Brackley is appropriate.
- More sustainable energy supplies should be included.
- A positive and flexible approach will be required to ensure that the plan has the ability to be responsive and ambitious across the plan period.
- Would like to see more about improving Northampton as the County Town
- Should include reference to working with key partners such as health and the police.
- Some scepticism that the vision can be achieved.
- Support the pursuit of a thriving economy and an emphasis on innovation and high value sectors that provide jobs for residents. This approach encourages people to seek to live in vibrant and sustainable communities with access to services and facilities. It recognises the need to provide a network of vibrant and well-connected villages with a wider choice of homes and employment opportunities.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- Reconciling net gain in biodiversity and retaining an accessible green network with substantial house building and enhancing employment opportunities will be a challenge.
- Police and fire services are essential for our communities and developer contributions will be sought to secure the additional services that are required.

Those who objected to the vision made the following key points:

- More emphasis required on protecting beautiful landscape and countryside. All landscapes should be preserved and improved, not just ‘valued’ landscapes. Greater protection required for countryside and the setting of villages.
- There seems to be a focus on building thousands of homes which will have no links to the areas they are planned for. More emphasis on brownfield land and improving services and infrastructure. Focus of the vision is on providing more houses rather than on what residents want.
- Greater emphasis on promoting employment growth
- Concern that the specific development options are not compatible with the statements set out in the vision. Specific examples include Options to the north of Northampton (Boughton and Moulton), Brackley, Towcester, Old Stratford/Deanshanger, east of Northampton (Ecton), Daventry, Junction 18 options near Crick and east of the M1, to the south of Market Harborough (East Farndon), and Long Buckby.
- A visionary transport strategy is required to support the rest of the vision such as quality of life and health outcomes. This should include a viable and effective public transport network. Public transport links from Daventry, Brackley and Towcester are particularly poor. Better road links required to link development to trunk roads. Disused railway lines and stations should be reopened, alongside the better use of existing lines, enhancing sustainable travel and economic and social opportunities.
- Part 2 Plan for Daventry and the neighbourhood plans for Brixworth and Moulton should be incorporated without change.
- Could be a ‘Vision for Any Place’ and lacks distinctiveness. Could’ve been ‘cut and pasted’ from any political document. Does not give a clear vision of the outcomes for the new council area.
- The dependency on the Oxford-Cambridge Arc should be reduced and should not result in our area taking a disproportionate amount of growth. The Arc appears to have been dropped by Government and should not be supported by WNC. Arc related growth will have adverse impacts on landscape, green infrastructure, biodiversity, and heritage. There is no justification for seeking to focus one-third of the new homes needed in the Arc which is only one twentieth of the country’s area. It is questioned whether the Arc is either needed or wanted.
- New Towns are a better option than making established communities bigger.
- The vision should be flexible and respond to changes. Should be reviewed every five years.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- Will have a hugely detrimental impact on rural communities, the countryside, and rural landscapes. A fundamental rethink is needed.
- Rural areas paragraph is too woolly and should be rewritten. More information required on how rural areas will be protected.
- Should explain how the different elements of the vision integrate without conflict. For example, how economic growth and provision of jobs relates to the environment, rural areas, and villages.
- The vision lacks detail on how additional infrastructure and services will be provided to support the increase in growth, and how environmental and historic assets will be protected.
- Our vision should be to protect the environment and improve the quality of West Northamptonshire as a place to live and work. Insufficient attention is given to environmental issues including improved public transport.
- The impact of the Covid 19 pandemic, for example on working practices, has not been reflected in the plan.
- Greater emphasis required on place making e.g., ensuring new housing is designed with adequate green space and parkland. Need to raise the quality of design. Good design should reflect the best qualities of local distinctiveness.
- Insufficient focus on regeneration of brownfield land and ageing housing stock. Empty office and retail space could be utilised for housing. Greater focus needed on concentrated development in urban areas.
- Consider expanding Northampton to make it a substantial regional city. Spatial options do not support the vision of Northampton as a city and thriving hub for West Northamptonshire. Large developments on the periphery of the council area will not support the regeneration of Northampton. The neglect of the town centre should be addressed first before further greenfield land is lost. The document does not recognise the Council's ambition for Northampton to be a city.
- Consultation should be delayed because several factors are unknown e.g., the Arc Spatial Framework, the outcome of the Council's new settlements study, and the consideration of strategic warehousing needs. The process needs to be paused to enable a complete rethink.
- A range of different growth options should be presented together with an assessment of the impact of each option.
- A change of strategy is required to allow more growth in rural areas to support sustainability, local economy, and housing affordability. Growth in service villages should be part of a balanced housing strategy. The vision should be amended to ensure a positive, proportionate, and sustainable approach to growth in rural areas. Further housing growth of an appropriate scale to the villages should be supported.
- Housing should be spread more widely in locations where it will benefit Northamptonshire rather than adjoining areas such as Milton Keynes. Smaller developments in every village.
- Should revisit the rushed and poorly put together South Northamptonshire Part2 Local Plan

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- Reduction in housing proposed at Brackley, Towcester and Old Stratford.
- The plan fails to balance housing need with our climate emergency. A new outlook is required. There is no indication of how carbon neutrality will be achieved by 2030. The spatial options will not support the delivery of a low carbon West Northants.
- The timescale is too long and embeds a vision for growth that may be inaccurate. The time frame should be shortened. Not convinced that the data used to underpin the plan is valid given the impact of Brexit and Covid 19. Likely to need fewer houses than current estimates. A reassessment of the actual situation should be made.
- The document fails to provide any vision for the new authority. For example, how will it grow the local economy, what is the population target, how will the 'leading role in the success of the Arc' be measured, and what high value sectors are the council seeking to attract? A refresh is required.
- There is no mention of how residents will be involved in shaping their communities. There is no reference to democracy and how decisions will be made. A series of citizen assemblies should be held across the area to consider issues and develop ideas.
- Daventry's role as a sub-regional centre is questionable. The housing market is not strong enough and the previous Joint Core Strategy failed. The town lacks the necessary road and rail infrastructure. Major improvements to the amenities offered in Daventry are required to support the planned growth.
- Look at other options to expanding Northampton and other urban areas including free-standing new settlements such as Mawsley.
- More focus is needed on health and wellbeing including social care, CAMs, mental health, and expansion of hospitals.
- Infrastructure improvements are needed before further growth such as roads, healthcare, schools, and improved broadband connectivity.
- Scale of housing and employment development is disproportionate to the projected population growth and cannot be sustained by the existing infrastructure. Scale of growth should be reduced.
- The adequacy of the consultation arrangements is questioned. Plans should be built up from our local communities. Greater consultation and active engagement are required.
- Should include place-based visions for the new settlements at Old Stratford/NW Milton Keynes and Long Buckby.
- More consideration of flood risk is needed.
- Growth should be directed to the south-west of Northampton where infrastructure has already been provided i.e., the A45 Daventry Development Link (Flore-Weedon bypass).
- Overuse of the word 'sustainable'
- Should be focussing on housing that is affordable and economically achievable to address the affordability crisis and homelessness.
- A change of approach is required moving away from the developments of the last 25 years to support a low carbon economy. Society needs to adapt to lower levels of consumption and transportation.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- Specific mention of agriculture is required e.g., to provide local food for local people
- Fails to conserve our finest attributes and has no pride in our built and rural heritage. Will lead to the ruination of our countryside and heritage.
- More explicit recognition should be given of the strong functional links to Milton Keynes in the vision.
- The strategy does nothing to support a wider regional growth strategy and a more positive strategy which contributes to the Arc's objectives should be considered.
- The vision should be about providing homes and jobs for local people and to support services for existing residents.
- The vision is not ambitious for our area and does not equip us to meet the challenges of the next 30 years. By 2050 the UK is committed to be carbon neutral, and the consequences of the current pandemic are likely to be far reaching for lifestyles.
- There should be much greater focus on provision of residential and employment opportunities in much closer proximity, avoiding long journeys, minimising fuel consumption per capita and encouraging healthy exercise. There are no employment proposals associated with housing Towcester and Brackley and no housing proposals associated with employment at DIRFT.
- The West Northamptonshire Labour Group has the vision for West Northamptonshire as an integrated thriving green city region with a fully engaged population, excited by its future. It will have an increasingly skilled workforce living in good quality and improving housing. Young people will be at the centre with good schools and leisure facilities and a vibrant cultural life.

Other comments made by respondents who did not specify 'yes' or 'no':

- Promoting and unlocking the potential of the canal network would aid the achievement of many aspects of the vision. Any allocations should fully consider the impact on the canal network.
- The magnitude of the Northampton Gateway Strategic Rail Freight Interchange should be considered and reflected in a new settlement hierarchy.
- Consider a new rail station between Northampton and Wolverton
- Guidance provided by the Forestry Commission on assessing impacts on ancient woodland and the role of trees in supporting wider planning objectives.
- Should outline the opportunity provided by new settlements and strategic scale extensions to tackle issues such as health and wellbeing, climate change and modal shift through comprehensively planned large scale development.
- Should support redevelopment of brownfield sites in rural areas such as Hulcote
- A defined plan is required to support the delivery of local services otherwise development will continue to put strain on existing infrastructure.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- The plan's vision should set out the environmental ambition for the plan area with a strategic approach to the protection and enhancement of the natural environment. This should include opportunities for nature recovery. There should be links to relevant plans and strategies such as the Upper Nene Valley Gravel Pits SPA SPD and Mitigation Strategy. The Plan should encourage multiple benefits from the use of land in urban and rural areas, recognising that land can deliver a wide range of ecosystem services required for sustainable development including climate change mitigation, flood management, improved water resources and water quality, biodiversity net gain, accessible high quality green infrastructure and associated health and wellbeing benefits, enhanced landscapes, and soil resources.
- The WNSP needs to take a more positive approach to employment land, particularly sites that are capable of accommodating logistics development.

Parish/Town Council responses:

The following Parish/Town Councils supported the vision:

- **Blisworth Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Boddington Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Brackley Town Council** (no comments)
- **Braunston Parish Council** - Support underlying principles. Overall vision should recognise that growth at regional and sub regional centres could undermine the rural area vision. Some concern regarding the SLAA conclusions and consistency with the SA. Further consultation required on all the spatial options.
- **Brixworth Parish Council** – Should incorporate the Daventry Part 2 Local Plan and made Neighbourhood Plans without change. Must include references to new Local Centres and emphasise connectivity is not just roads, it must build in requirements for cycling, walking and buses where possible. Further technical assessment needed of all site options.
- **Bugbrooke Parish Council** - Have concerns about securing infrastructure investment e.g., secondary schools
- **Culworth Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Cogenhoe and Whiston Parish Council** - Green spaces should be accessible and protected.
- **Cold Higham Parish Council** - The key challenge is how to achieve the vision
- **Evenley Parish Council** - Add references to high quality design, historic built environment, and connectivity between villages.
- **Flore Parish Council** – The vision has fine aspirations but is under threat from the continued expansion and use of the M1 corridor for warehousing. The danger is that the area will be the poor relation in the Arc providing the less desirable services rather than supporting high skilled jobs.
- **Holcot Parish Council** – Less focus on Northampton, more on the remainder of the area.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- **Kingsthorpe Parish Council** - Providing more commuter choice in West Northants to connect urban centres, e.g., MK/Wellingborough. Investment in shuttle buses, coach station, trains.
- **Kislingbury Parish Council** – No specific comments on the vision
- **Nether Heyford Parish Council** -The progress of the Arc is just an assumption and subject to challenge. The goals need to be developed into SMART objectives.
- **Old Parish Council** - Doesn't mention prioritising the use of brownfield sites for housing growth, and is slightly vague on detail, e.g.: clearly defining what growth looks like or how rural villages will actually be connected.
- **Tiffield Parish Council** – The vision is appropriate but needs to take account of rapidly changing times. More detail and supporting evidence required.
- **Welton Parish Council** - Yes, as a region and Daventry is accessible to motorways, railways and DIRFT. However, infrastructure to accommodate growth would need to be radically expanded.
- **Woodford-cum-Membris Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Wootton Parish Council** (no comments)

The following Parish and Town Councils objected to the vision:

- **A5 Alliance of Parish Councils** - The document lacks vision and ambition and is driven by housing and employment targets. The vision needs a new approach to be resident focused, exciting and defines the role of West Northamptonshire locally, regionally, nationally, and internationally. The vision lacks detail on how improved services will be secured and provided. Clear measures of success and targets are required.
- **Cosgrove Parish Council**: The document lacks vision and ambition and is driven by housing and employment targets. The vision needs a new approach to be resident focused, exciting and defines the role of West Northamptonshire locally, regionally, nationally, and internationally. The vision lacks detail on how improved services will be secured and provided. Clear measures of success and targets are required.
- **Crick Parish Council** – There should be greater consideration for a low carbon economy adapted to climate change. Greater emphasis on a balanced economy. Greater emphasis on 'green and clean' to preserve greenfield sites, trees and rural settings, landscape and heritage, improved biodiversity, improved lifestyles and health and wellbeing. There should be a more innovative vision focussing on sustainable urban regeneration close to the labour market.
- **Daventry Town Council** - The towns selected for growth are not currently 'well-connected'. Transit hubs need to be created to reduce the reliance on car-based commuting.
- **Easton Neston Parish Meeting** - Does not reflect the changing times we live in such as climate change and the pandemic.
- **Ecton Parish Council** – Welcomes the vision but objects to the inclusion of Northampton East within the consultation document.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- **Hinton-in-the-Hedges Parish Meeting** - The need for housing and employment growth is questioned along with the concept of applying the Oxford/Cambridge Arc to WNC. No detail is given as to the provision of infrastructure such as doctors, schools, and utilities. The nature and character of rural settlements should be protected and respected.
- **Kilsby Parish Council** - Object to the employment land allocations until a separate study into Logistics has been concluded.
- **Little Houghton Parish Council** - The nature and character of rural settlements should be protected and respected. The way of life that rural areas provide should be particularly valued.
- **Long Buckby Parish Council** - Further evidence required to substantiate proposals.
- **Moulton Parish Council** - There is no sustainability or environmental context. More detailed background relating to what development activity has taken place in recent years is needed.
- **Old Stratford Parish Council** - The document lacks vision and ambition and is driven by housing and employment targets. The vision needs a new approach to be resident focused, exciting and defines the role of West Northamptonshire locally, regionally, nationally, and internationally. The vision lacks detail on how improved services will be secured and provided. Clear measures of success and targets are required.
- **Overstone Parish Council** - A comprehensive, transparent highways vision, strategic plan and needs assessment are required. Large scale development should be infrastructure led, particularly highways infrastructure. Development should be focussed where good highways infrastructure exists e.g., the A45 Daventry Development Link.
- **Potterspury Parish Council** - The document lacks vision and ambition and is driven by housing and employment targets. The vision needs a new approach to be resident focused, exciting and defines the role of West Northamptonshire locally, regionally, nationally, and internationally. The vision lacks detail on how improved services will be secured and provided. Clear measures of success and targets are required.
- **Stony Stratford Town Council** – Comments provided relate to Spatial Option 5b (Question 28)
- **Syresham Parish Council** – The vision is good but the plans for development do not support it.
- **Walgrave Parish Council** – The vision for the rural areas is vague. Priority needs to be given to highways infrastructure to reduce the impact of traffic in rural areas.
- **Weedon Parish Council** - West Northants is the poor relation in the Arc with a low wage economy and poorly performing centres in Northampton and Daventry.
- **Whittlebury Parish Council** - The document lacks vision and ambition and is driven by housing and employment targets. The vision needs a new approach to be resident focused, exciting and defines the role of West

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

Northamptonshire locally, regionally, nationally, and internationally. The vision lacks detail on how improved services will be secured and provided. Clear measures of success and targets are required. There is a disconnect between the plan and the Councils priorities.

- **Wicken Parish Council** - The document does not cover all of the options that should be considered and lacks any true visionary element.
- **Yardley Gobion Parish Council** - The document lacks vision and ambition and is driven by housing and employment targets. The vision needs a new approach to be resident focused, exciting and defines the role of West Northamptonshire locally, regionally, nationally, and internationally. The vision lacks detail on how improved services will be secured and provided. Clear measures of success and targets are required.

The following Parish/Town Councils did not specify 'yes' or 'no':

- **Blakesley Parish Council** - The document lacks vision and ambition and is driven by housing and employment targets. The vision needs a new approach to be resident focused, exciting and defines the role of West Northamptonshire locally, regionally, nationally, and internationally. The vision lacks detail on how improved services will be secured and provided. Clear measures of success and targets are required. The bid for city status should be mentioned.
- **Greens Norton Parish Council** - The document lacks vision and ambition and is driven by housing and employment targets. The vision needs a new approach to be resident focused, exciting and defines the role of West Northamptonshire locally, regionally, nationally, and internationally. The vision lacks detail on how improved services will be secured and provided. Clear measures of success and targets are required. The bid for city status should be mentioned.
- **Rothersthorpe Parish Council** – The vision lacks detail on how additional or improved services will be provided to support growth. There should be a defined plan for the provision of local services.
- **Silverstone Parish Council** – The vision fails to recognise the significance of the area as home to many leading high performance engineering companies as well as the world leading motorsport venue at Silverstone. Brackley and Towcester should be considered as separate settlements rather than bundled together.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

Question 2: Are the ‘Green and Clean’ spatial objectives 1 to 4 appropriate for guiding development and growth in West Northamptonshire?

- 275 respondents said ‘Yes’
- 403 respondents said ‘No’
- 496 respondents provided specific comments

Those who supported the spatial objectives made the following key points:

- Park and ride, effective public transport, and other measures to reduce traffic and pollution
- Support sustainable growth that supports natural capital gain
- New developments should be carbon neutral from the outset with active travel networks and public transport (electric buses) built in from the start. Innovative green energy microgrid options for new estates.
- Strategic development allocations should be located where they can mitigate the effects of climate change, by limiting the need to travel and offering a choice of travel modes.
- Further definition required i.e., net zero or carbon neutral and by when?
- Increased employment through the establishment of green industries should be included on the objectives.
- Implementation is crucial
- A more ambitious target of carbon neutral by 2027
- 2030 is an unrealistic deadline. Will require significant investment, higher house prices and new technologies.
- Include specific objective of reducing carbon through more tree planting
- Solar energy should be on existing and new buildings rather than as solar farms on agricultural land.
- Should acknowledge the key role that the sustainable movement of freight will play in achieving climate change goals
- Further growth in rural areas could enhance their sustainability
- Support that climate change is identified as a key strategic issue and these objectives should be key in determining the choice of development locations.
- Some green areas are not being used to their full potential.
- Financial and technological considerations need to be taken into account to ensure the transition to net carbon zero is sustainable. Impacts on society and the economy will need to be considered if people can’t afford to access ‘clean’ travel.
- Objective 1 could be broadened to include climate change adaptation, mitigation and resilience, sustainable design and construction, climate change impacts such as future flood risk, and retro fitting of existing development.
- An additional objective on natural resources cover water, minerals and waste could be added.
- Objective 2 should include a commitment to 20% net gain, address fragmentation of habitats and adopt a natural capital approach.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- There is a risk of development impacting upon the Nene Valley SPA and mitigation will be required.
- Objective 4 is welcomed, in particular the reference to ‘heritage assets and their settings’
- A number of respondents support the objectives and then seek to demonstrate that particular sites or spatial options that they are promoting are consistent with the objectives.

Those who objected to the spatial objectives made the following key points:

- A number of respondents consider that the spatial options are not consistent with the ‘Green and Clean’ spatial objectives. The specific options mentioned are land south of Market Harborough (East Farndon), North-west of Milton Keynes/Old Stratford, Long Buckby, Towcester, east of DIRFT, east of Northampton (Ecton), north and west of Daventry (Braunston), all of the employment options adjoining M1 junctions, options to the north of Northampton.
- Most of the options are greenfield which should be used for agriculture. Little consideration has been given to the use of brownfield sites. Each of the spatial options should be assessed against the objectives.
- Additional actions are required to achieve carbon neutral targets such as an integrated, sustainable, and inclusive transport strategy linking housing to employment and services, the establishment of green buffer zones around existing and new housing, a network of green corridors, and solar and wind generation which follows and community energy model.
- Ensure housing is located in areas of job growth to reduce commuting.
- The spatial objectives lack anything new and are ‘business as usual’. They smack of box ticking and green washing. They fail to provide any indication of the magnitude of ambition or any quantifiable target.
- Objective 1 should be more ambitious and positive.
- Measures to reduce travel are essential, such as improved public transport, and the provision of live/work units. Traffic congestion has a major impact on air pollution. The aim for every transport development or initiative should be to reduce emissions, infrastructure supporting the charging of electric vehicles of all descriptions, electric replacing diesel buses for example.
- More detailed, specific, and unambiguous objectives are required. Specific targets are needed. Stronger wording such as ‘insist’ rather than ‘encourage’. Aim for higher targets such as passive house level. Clear targets should be specified for the reduction in carbon levels and the scale of woodland/tree planting.
- The objectives do not go far enough, further detail required as to how the impacts of new development will be mitigated and the standards expected in terms of renewable energy, green space, electric charging, public transport, and active travel.
- Should create a woodland/forest area for carbon capture and create wild meadowland to support biodiversity.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- Spatial options do not indicate how green spaces would be provided within developments. Assurance is required that substantial areas of usable green space will be provided both for the existing villages and new developments. Protecting habitats, species and biodiversity should be integrated with all new development.
- All new housing should have air source heat pumps and car charging points.
- More thought required on the issue of lighting, including street lighting, and the impact this has on light pollution and energy use.
- Based on recent development and planning decisions a complete reappraisal is required on housing and the environment is required. Including the need for housing.
- West Northants should be self-sufficient in its waste management.
- Objective 3 should be about protecting landscapes which are valued by residents and users of the land.
- The carbon footprint of the spatial options should be set out.
- Concern that net gain in biodiversity cannot be achieved to the scale of development proposed.
- More can be done to design warehousing and housing developments so that they support wildlife
- Objective 4 – Heritage – the use of the words ‘where possible’ is too weak.
- There should be a clear strategy to limit the loss of greenfield sites and a target for the use of brownfield land.
- There should be specific recognition of the Northampton and Lamport Railway and other industrial heritage locations. Heritage locations should not be seen as negative constraints. For example, a heritage railway could be integrated into a larger rail-based operation.
- We need to support nature recovery and growth.
- There is no objective that refers to good design. Good design – building beautiful – including place making is at the heart of the NPPF and should be central to the Strategic Plan.
- Objective 3 – special landscape areas in Daventry’s area were previously removed – are these now to be reinstated? If not, Objective 3 is misleading. The LPA should be aware of the case law/ambiguities concerning what is now NPPF para 174 a) - as to which areas are to be regarded as valued landscapes, notwithstanding the lack of national or local designation. Landscape (and townscape) character is important throughout West Northants.
- Landscape policies should be working towards statutory designations such as an AONB.
- Tackling the climate emergency should be the starting point for every initiative. Developments should be carbon neutral or carbon negative. In new housing development, community energy models should be developed and housing future proofed.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- The green environment should be the starting point with environmental focal points linked by green corridors brought into our towns, settlements protected by green belt, zones for tree planting identified, and green space protected.
- History and heritage should be celebrated.
- Our streets and public spaces need to be safe

Other comments made by respondents who did not specify ‘yes’ or ‘no’:

- WNC should be the first council to make all new houses zero carbon
- The objectives are silent on other environmental sustainability targets such as biodiversity, protecting wildlife and habitats. The need for substantial areas of woodland needs to be considered.
- Land of high landscape sensitivity adjoining settlements should be protected
- Preservation of heritage assets should include a list of culturally sensitive sites.
- Some of the statements would benefit from strengthening e.g., ‘low carbon energy’ should be replaced by ‘zero carbon energy’.
- A flexible approach to biodiversity net gain is required to enable multiple options for securing off site compensatory measures.
- (Hardingstone Parish Council) concern how the climate change objective will be achieved without stronger mandates from central government on issues such as solar panels, and grey water recycling.
- Climate change should be a separate objective.
- Delivering development at net zero carbon through building fabric remains exceptionally challenging and costly. Carbon off-setting through the potential allocation of significant areas of open land for tree planting, would provide the opportunity to assist this objective in a way that could also enhance biodiversity.
- Objective 1 could explicitly recognise resilience to extreme heat, cold, air pollution and risk of flooding, especially for our most vulnerable residents. Should also include ‘active’ as well as ‘sustainable’ travel
- An additional objective relating to ‘carbon capture’ could be included.
- The Council should commission and publish a survey of all land in the District that could be used for Biodiversity offsetting purposes as this would create a register of sites and landowner that developers could use if their sites are unable to achieve a 10% biodiversity uplift on site.
- No clear objective to address car dependence and secure modal shift. The plan must secure a pattern and form of development that maximises sustainable travel modes over car use.
- More work is needed to identify how communities can grow whilst preserving heritage, landscape, green infrastructure, and the environment. There should be a greater focus on protecting green space and countryside.
- More emphasis is needed on localising service provision to reduce car travel.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

Parish/Town Council responses:

The following Parish/Town Councils supported the spatial objectives:

- **Blisworth Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Brackley Town Council** (no comments)
- **Braunston Parish Council** - Net gain in biodiversity should be secured within the WNC area and as locally as possible.
- **Cogenhoe and Whiston Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Cold Higham Parish Council** - How the objectives will be achieved and measured is key.
- **Culworth Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Ecton Parish Council** – the ‘Green and Clean’ objectives are welcome, and the recognition of landscape and heritage is good to see.
- **Evenley Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Flore Parish Council** – The objectives are fundamentally important and should have the highest priority. Objective 3 is undermined by the spatial option suggesting further logistics expansion at junction 16.
- **Hinton-in-the Hedges Parish Meeting** – The objectives are laudable, but the scale of growth is at odds with them. Renewable and low carbon energy should be encouraged everywhere.
- **Holcot Parish Council** – These objectives should overarch the other objectives.
- **Kilsby Parish Council** - Whilst the spatial objectives are supported the actual development options are detrimental to these
- **Kingsthorpe Parish Council** - New development to provide public transport contributions, more walking and cycling facilities, connectivity with existing centres. Newbuilds to avoid fossil fuel connections. Improve air quality across the County.
- **Little Houghton Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Old Parish Council** – Greater focus should be given on protecting more of the area’s green spaces.
- **Syresham Parish Council** – appropriate objectives but they have not been incorporated into the plans.
- **Tiffield Parish Council** – No indication of how carbon neutrality can be achieved.
- **Wappenham Parish Council** – Objectives 1-4 are key, but the spatial options contradict these objectives.
- **Woodford-cum-Membris Parish Council** (no comments)

The following Parish and Town Councils objected to the spatial objectives:

- **A5 Alliance of Parish Councils** – The objectives lack anything new and are all current well-established objectives. The proposals contradict the objectives especially Option 5b. A clear road map to achieving net zero is needed – ‘promoting’ and ‘encouraging’ are not enough. Each of the options should be

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

assessed against the climate change objectives. The strategy should seek to work with local councils to develop community plans.

- **Boddington Parish Council** - Climate change should be a major factor and include improvements to existing infrastructure and housing to reduce their carbon footprint. Mitigation schemes for HS2 and other large scale construction projects should be included.
- **Bugbrooke Parish Council** - The objectives don't go far enough in promoting sustainable design and construction. Promoting practical travel options should be a priority.
- **Cosgrove Parish Council** – Many of the objectives are legal requirements and there is not detail on how they will be achieved. They are too vague and need to be strengthened to achieve climate change objectives. The development proposals, particularly the proposals at Old Stratford, breach the objectives.
- **Crick Parish Council** – The objectives are not guiding development. Options 3a and 3b breach objectives on climate change and green infrastructure and natural capital.
- **Deanshanger Parish Council** – Many of the options ignore these laudable objectives. Option 5b will increase car use and will not support the climate change objectives.
- **Easton Neston Parish Meeting** – No detail of how climate change and wellbeing objectives will be achieved. Objective 3 should include 'making efficient use of land, along with the prudent use of natural resources and minimising waste and pollution.
- **Greens Norton Parish Council** - Many of the objectives are legal requirements and there is not detail on how they will be achieved. Many of the spatial options breach the objectives.
- **Long Buckby Parish Council** - Inclusion of provision for green energy generation projects.
- **Moulton Parish Council** - These objectives are superficial and lack any substance or useful information. This would seem to be a classic case of "greenwashing" with many fine words. There has been no mention of the impact on public transport nor what might be done to provide it
- **Nether Heyford Parish Council** - Waste management has been forgotten. Improved management of public spaces, particularly highway verges, is needed to attract visitors
- **Old Stratford Parish Council** - Many of the objectives are legal requirements and there is not detail on how they will be achieved. They are too vague and need to be strengthened to achieve climate change objectives. The development proposals, particularly the proposals at Old Stratford, breach the objectives.
- **Overstone Parish Council** - Building homes to the north of Northampton whilst promoting new employment areas to the south is not 'green and clean'. Stringent policies are required to protect villages from the impacts of growth such as traffic congestion.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- **Potterspury Parish Council** - The objectives lack anything new and are all current well-established objectives. The proposals contradict the objectives especially Option 5b.
- **Walgrave Parish Council** - A key emphasis should be to ensure our villages retain their heritage, green landscapes and natural green habitats and environments, and have a controlled traffic throughput.
- **Weedon Parish Council** - Question whether the objectives are realistic. Rather than encouraging large logistics developments the plan should be incentivising local farmers and suppliers.
- **Welton Parish Council** - 2030 carbon neutral timeline will adversely hit Daventry's economy.
- **Whittlebury Parish Council** - Many of the objectives are legal requirements and there is not detail on how they will be achieved. They are too vague. The development proposals contradict the objectives.
- **Wicken Parish Council** – The wording of the objectives, particularly Objective 1, is weak and ineffectual.
- **Wootton Parish Council** – Concerns about climate change and biodiversity.
- **Yardley Gobion Parish Council** - Many of the objectives are legal requirements and there is not detail on how they will be achieved. The development proposals contradict the objectives.

The following Parish/Town Councils did not specify 'yes' or 'no':

- **Blakesley Parish Council** - Many are legal requirements. No detail is provided as to how they will be achieved. The spatial options breach the objectives
- **Brixworth Parish Council** - clarification of terminology required between carbon neutral and net zero. Net zero by 2030 should be the target
- **Hardingstone Parish Council** - concern how the climate change objective will be achieved without stronger mandates from central government on issues such as solar panels, and grey water recycling.
- **Kislingbury Parish Council** - Green and open areas are irreplaceable resources for health and wellbeing they need to be preserved and made accessible. It would be a real achievement if West Northants became a 'golden triangle' for those who live here rather than for logistics, warehouses, and unaffordable homes.
- **Ravensthorpe Parish Council** - It is hard to see how the development proposals are compatible with the transition to net zero carbon.
- **Rothersthorpe Parish Council** - the 'green and clean' objectives do not go far enough. The plan should adopt a gold standard to ensure that West Northants is a national leader in 'green and clean' initiatives.
- **Silverstone Parish Council** - there is not enough about environmental initiatives such as fitting solar panels on commercial developments, increased home insulation and car charging points.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- **Towcester Town Council** - New housing must be heated by non-fossil fuel. New housing should be provided where the demand is driven by employment growth.
- **Yardley Gobion Parish Council** - Concern that the proposals breach the objective

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

Question 3: Are the spatial objectives 5-7 – Improved Life Chances – appropriate for guiding development and growth in West Northamptonshire?

- 280 respondents said 'Yes'
- 331 respondents said 'No'
- 366 respondents provided specific comments

Those who supported the spatial objectives made the following key points:

- WNC desperately needs enhanced children's special education needs provision.
- Recognition of the lack of equality in life chances and the objective of achieving equality should be included.
- Objective 5 – skills enhancement should be linked to economic objectives
- Objective 7 – should be more specific with regard to infrastructure objectives
- Good quality, accessible and affordable housing are important in achieving improved life chances.
- Clear plans for investment and infrastructure are required to support the objectives.
- There should be an emphasis on providing appropriate housing and facilities to support people throughout their life on a local level.
- For larger developments all the community infrastructure should be provided before 50% of the housing is built. Financial penalties should apply if this is not achieved.
- Objective 6 does not mention the hospitals that need to be further developed/redeveloped. Greater use of Daventry hospital.
- Education, health and wellbeing and infrastructure are vital for improved communities. Improvements in career guidance. More intention of providing local schools.
- Use of alternative healthcare services could be included.
- Concern that developers will not comply with the objectives.
- Lack of opportunities for young people mean they have to move away.
- Picking the correct locations for new schools is key.
- Further detail required on how they will be implemented.
- Objective 6 should be in front of Objective 5.
- Lack confidence that WNC can deliver the objectives
- Provide public housing for the elderly and those who need care.
- Development in sustainable rural settlements would provide investment to retain and enhance public transport connections to larger urban areas.
- Objective 6 - We would encourage this objective to consider existing inequalities that could be addressed through well planned infrastructure and growth. This could include the consideration of unequal distribution of green space and the correlations between air quality and areas of deprivation.
- Should focus on skills and education in the construction sector to address skills shortage.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- Would like to see specific mention of Daventry College and its development.
- Northampton needs a second or larger hospital.
- Could have a specific section on improving social mobility for our children and develop our higher education offer in areas such as engineering, bioscience, and IT.
- Support more housing in town centres and a vibrant social economy.
- Greater investment required in social, childcare, and the provision of greener more 'care economy' jobs is required. Too much focus on logistics and low paid/low skill jobs.
- Employment opportunities are relevant to improved life chances and there should be more emphasis on local employment.
- Infrastructure should be more than adequate and exceed current requirements.
- Objective 5 should recognise the importance of The Hub at DIRFT.
- Objective 7 should include specific reference to the logistics sector.
- Objective 6 – Sport England Active Design Principles should be embedded in policy to implement this objective.
- Greater youth facilities within Brackley. Retention of service such a Brackley Library.
- Deliver affordable homes which will enhance and maintain the rural area.
- Deliver sustainable tourism

Those who objected to the spatial objectives made the following key points:

- Objectives sound good but there is no detail on how they will be achieved. Objectives 7 and 8 are too vague. Specific requirements are needed to deliver improvements in a timely and sustainable manner. A clear understanding of how green infrastructure can be created and managed – for example a Parks Trust as in Milton Keynes. More information needed on how education and health services will be provided.
- Concern that further growth will exacerbate existing problems
- There should be greater emphasis on job creation
- A number of respondents consider that the spatial options are not consistent with the spatial objectives. The spatial options mentioned include Towcester, Long Buckby, north-west of Milton Keynes/Old Stratford, east of Northampton (Ecton), north of Northampton (Boughton/Moulton), south of M1 junction 15a.
- Life chances in rural areas are limited by accessibility to the private car. A strategic public transport policy is required to address this inequality.
- Need a comprehensive plan for post 16 education including a workable public transport system that young people can access for education and training.
- Loss of agricultural land means that tenant farmers are struggling to sustain workable sized farms.
- Affordable housing could be provided on brownfield sites and disused buildings.
- Significant investment is required to raise educational standards and the funding is not available.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- Objectives 5-7 should be implemented now before any of the development takes place. Further development without services such as education, health, and welfare will overburden existing services and increase congestion and the need to travel. Existing services such as health and education cannot cope with the existing population.
- Building more houses will not achieve the objectives. Pollution from the development proposals will adversely affect life chances.
- Reinstate former Councils to ensure closer connection with local communities.
- Detailed comments provided on the improvements required to the social care and education systems in West Northants.
- The objectives must aim to tackle inequalities and prioritise action to address poverty and suffering.
- Overemphasis on town/city life. Support is needed for young people in rural areas such as provision of local (small-scale) employment opportunities.
- Concern that the objectives are not deliverable.
- Concern that consultation has not been adequate.
- Objectives are unaffordable and will not be delivered.
- Improvement in education requires action at a national level.
- There are major problems in education and social care due to underfunding which will be exacerbated by further development. Building more houses will not address the cycle of poverty.
- Objective 6 should also look to enhance existing places.
- The wellbeing and life chances of exiting residents should be assessed as part of development proposals.
- Villages should retain their separate identities with clear before zones enhanced with tree planting
- New warehousing should be focused close to the motorway and served by rail to reduce climate impact.
- Investment needed in new schools and improved facilities at Brackley.
- Encourage links to the Open University and Open College provision.
- A clear schedule of infrastructure needs should be published.
- There is nothing about connectivity and e-learning or remote training. The importance of remote connections and support for remote health and education services needs to be included in this. There is little about protecting inner urban green areas. There is no reference to safeguarding the vulnerable within the society nor of the response to the increase in needs for an older population.
- Footpaths linking local villages should be reinstated and provided to enable exercise and access to existing facilities.
- Objectives 5, 6 and 7 do not fully correspond with the vision. Notably, reference to provision of and access to housing for all needs is missing and should be included.
- How could objectives 5 and 6 be applied to the consideration of planning applications?

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- The plan should consider a broader range of sites in and around the towns (the most sustainable locations) to ensure a supply of smaller sites as well as strategic ones.
- The proposed secondary school next to the Icon Centre in Daventry should be relocated to where the new housing is proposed.
- Loss of countryside will not improve life chances. People need access to nature to support their wellbeing.
- Primary service villages need to be able to grow in order to support infrastructure provision
- Objective 6 should facilitate active lifestyles
- Comments regarding the lack for services and facilities in Towcester to support the growth that is required.

Other comments may by respondents who didn't specify 'yes' or 'no':

- Growth in rural areas could help to deliver these objectives. Without a meaningful level of growth these objectives will not be achieved.
- A number of respondents seek to demonstrate how the particular development proposals/ spatial options that they are promoting would help to deliver the objectives.
- Ensuring Northampton is a thriving county town is essential to achieve the objective. A range of transport improvement are recommended including a 360-ring road modelled on the A45, measures to improve traffic flows on the strategic access roads, and a network of park and ride/ rapid transport solutions.
- Initiatives to promote health and wellbeing are supported. These include, ensuring residential development follows Secured by Design principles, accessible employment opportunities are provided, and undertaking health impact assessments for major developments
- The strategy needs to respond to the demographic, technological and social trends likely to take place in the next thirty years, considering the geographical impact of the following changes:
 - Workplace organisation - greater automation of warehouses, self-driving lorries
 - A continuation of the trend towards working from home with implications for increasing minimum home sizes
 - The climate emergency – impact on housing and transport
 - The shift towards maintenance and durability, (of for example, white goods), and much more reuse and recycling.
 - Understanding better the relationship between housing need and affordability and the role of public and private sector housing in meeting this need.
 - An aging population
 - Health care and social care needs – implications of technology and developing models of care. Is the current acute hospital provision fit for purpose until 2050? Offering a range of provision for older people, including 'villages and stepped care.
 - Changes in leisure demands and its links with health. New school provision should be at the centre of our communities together with facilities for community learning. In supporting growth, the plan should aim to reduce inequalities and promote opportunities for all.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

Parish/Town Council responses:

The following Parish and Town Councils supported the spatial objectives:

- **Blisworth Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Brackley Town Council** (no comments)
- **Braunston Parish Council** – protection for vulnerable adults should be included.
- **Brixworth Parish Council** - The plan must include specific infrastructure objectives. Schools, primary care services must be provided online with building sustainable communities. Housing needs to be developed with more variety of choice to allow for the first-time buyer as well as homes aimed at older people.
- **Church with Chapel Brampton Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Cogenhoe and Whiston Parish Council** - Services need to be localised not just focussed on the urban developments
- **Cold Higham Parish Council** - Should the elderly have a mention, as the population is ageing?
- **Culworth Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Daventry Town Council** - Agree with wording but has to be further engagement with communities and schools to better identify location and investment to ensure positive outcomes.
- **Evenley Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Flore Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Holcot Parish Council** - The infrastructural needs should be prioritised - historic development has been development and growth in that 'infrastructure catches-up'. A single, joined-up plan is needed.
- **Kingsthorpe Parish Council** – Good aspirations.
- **Kislingbury Parish Council** - green and open areas are irreplaceable resources for health and wellbeing. They need to be preserved and maintained in the face of continued demands from developers. They also need to be made accessible through the provision of adequate bus, walking, and cycling routes as well as adequate health services.
- **Little Houghton Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Long Buckby Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Nether Heyford Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Old Parish Council** – access to green spaces should include good access to real countryside. Benefits to residents of integrated health and care packages and good public transport.
- **Syresham Parish Council** - Good objectives, but the size of the proposed developments will put enormous stress on local education and health services and infrastructure.
- **Tiffield Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Weedon Parish Council** – Cannot fault the objectives but are they over ambitious?

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- **Welton Parish Council** - Education in West Northamptonshire is recognised as under achieving and by working in conjunction with other life skill areas, horizons and prospects will be widened. Promoting health and well-being within schools will improve welfare in the home.
- **Woodford-cum-Membris Parish Council** (no comments)

The following Parish and Town Councils objected to the spatial objectives:

- **A5 Alliance of Parish Councils** - There needs to be a good and accessible education and training offer for young people in rural areas. This relies on effective public transport but there is no indication of how this will be provided. Developing links between business and schools also requires public transport. Schools should be within walking distance of new homes. Appropriate infrastructure such as education, health, community, roads, and services should be provided before expansion takes place.
- **Boddington Parish Council** – more emphasis needed on mobile phone coverage in rural areas.
- **Bugbrooke Parish Council** – Objective 5 should have a stronger focus on early years. Provision of community and village halls should be included.
- **Cosgrove Parish Council** - Schools should be within walking distance of new homes. Appropriate infrastructure such as education, health, community, roads, and services should be provided before expansion takes place.
- **Crick Parish Council** – The objectives are superb and appropriate, but they are not guiding development. Examples provided as to how Spatial Option 3a conflicts with the objectives.
- **Deanshanger Parish Council** - Schools should be within walking distance of new homes. Affordable transport should be provided for post 16 education and training. Appropriate infrastructure such as education, health, community, roads, and services should be provided before expansion takes place.
- **Easton Neston Parish Meeting** – Objective 6 – greater consideration needs to be given to the health and wellbeing of existing residents faced with large development proposals. Objective 7 – the infrastructure deficit needs to be addressed before further development.
- **Hinton-in-the-Hedges Parish Meeting** – Lifestyle is a bigger determinant of health and wellbeing than the quality of housing that is provided.
- **Moulton Parish Council** - Again, fine words rather than facts and no substance regarding how this might be achieved.
- **Old Stratford Parish Council** - All schools should be within walking distance of all new homes. All health facilities should be available from day one. Infrastructure and development need to state that this must be in place and enhanced prior to any expansion or new settlements being developed.
- **Overstone Parish Council** – Infrastructure should be prioritised. Poor road networks are detrimental to quality of life. The A45 Daventry Development Link Road provides the opportunity for development ahead of any other SUEs.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- **Potterspury Parish Council** - Education and training is crucial to our local economy. Much of secondary education in the rural areas, and post-16 provision in particular, relies on transport. Without a workable and a sustainable public transport system education in West Northants will not achieve its potential and underperform. Developing links between businesses and colleges and schools relies on accessible public transport. New developments must have schools and other infrastructure in place before homes are complete.
- **Towcester Town Council** – Objective 5 should specify that there are sufficient places available in local schools.
- **Walgrave Parish Council** - Whilst the objectives are positive and welcome, thorough consideration should be given to how these will be implemented within the rural areas, lack of public transport and social, facilities ensure that rural areas are disadvantaged compared to urban areas.
- **Whittlebury Parish Council** – Need strengthening to address climate change, schools within walking distance, include early years education. Infrastructure such as health facilities to be in place before expansion.
- **Wootton Parish Council** – Greater ambition needed to improve life chances. Infrastructure provision should be more than just ‘adequate’.
- **Yardley Gobion Parish Council** - Need strengthening to address climate change, schools within walking distance, include early years education. Infrastructure such as health facilities to be in place before expansion.

The following Parish/Town Councils did not specify ‘yes’ or ‘no’:

- **Blakesley Parish Council** - Schools should be within walking distance of new homes. Appropriate infrastructure such as education, health, community, roads, and services should be provided before expansion takes place.
- **Greens Norton Parish Council** - These need to be strengthened to support climate change and carbon neutral ambitions. All schools, sports facilities should be within walking distance of all new homes. All health facilities should be available from day one and not years after the developments are started. The infrastructure and development need to state that this must be in place and enhanced prior to any expansion.
- **Silverstone Parish Council** - Existing schools also need investment. The line ‘joined up and local services with health’ makes no sense. In Objective 5 the National College of Motorsport at Silverstone is not included. There is no reference to Leisure Centres including the excellent council-owned ones at Towcester and Brackley. Nothing about investment in health.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

Question 4: Are the spatial objectives 8 and 9 – Connected Communities – appropriate for guiding development and growth in West Northamptonshire?

- 256 respondents said 'Yes'
- 367 respondents said 'No'
- 422 respondents provided specific comments

Those who supported the spatial objectives made the following key points:

- Addressing social exclusion and areas of deprivation, achieving social cohesion, and maintaining residential amenity are all aims to be supported, as is the improvement of strategic public transport connections across the area.
- Smaller employment centres connected by active travel routes to existing villages and large employment areas focussed on the towns.
- Improved connectivity must also have the aim of achieving improvements in equality of opportunity and social mobility.
- There is a massive opportunity to increase cycling through the provision of an integrated network of cycle paths.
- Objective 8 should recognise the key role that the sustainable movement of freight can play in achieving climate change goals.
- A number of respondents seek to demonstrate that particular development proposals / spatial options would help to deliver the objectives.
- Rather than one or two major development locations, it is important to explore how a range of other smaller sites around the edge of Northampton can support better public transport connectivity
- The plan should not be over prescriptive in terms of measures such as EV charging which are being introduced through the Building Regulations.
- Specific targets for EV charging should be produced.
- An affordable public transport network is needed.
- A range of measures are suggested: car free town centres, low emission neighbourhoods, more investment in train/tram routes and better/subsidised bus routes to major employment areas.
- Greater integration of housing and employment required to reduce the need to travel.
- Traffic surveys should be undertaken to provide an overall assessment of the impact on communities.
- The plan should support sustainable growth in rural areas in order to safeguard services such as public transport.
- Should reference the need to integrate new infrastructure provision with wider natural capital benefits.
- Should consider transport issues across the Arc and not just within West Northants.
- It is easier to enhance transport links from the edges of towns into the centres of towns than try to build large communities in isolated places.
- Would prefer to see investment in rail infrastructure and accessibility ahead of more roads. Greater rail connectivity is required. Opportunities for reopening routes and light rail should be explored.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- Improved maintenance of roads and lighting required.
- Objective 8 should be strengthened to support development in accessible locations that maximise and makes efficient use of existing transport infrastructure and public transport connections. It should also have regard to the National Decarbonisation Plan for Transport.
- There should be a better framework for identifying community infrastructure requirements.
- The plan needs to embrace the use of heritage technology integrated with new/emerging technology e.g., very light rail and heritage railways.
- Accessibility for fire and rescue services needs to be considered.
- Improving social cohesion is beneficial in reducing antisocial behaviour. Incorporating secured by design principles reduces opportunity for crime.
- More charging points for Brackley and carbon neutral passenger services.

Those who objected to the spatial objectives made the following key points:

- The spatial options will not help to deliver these objectives. Specific examples include: North-west of Milton Keynes/Old Stratford, south of Towcester, Long Buckby, east of Northampton (Ecton), north and west of Daventry, north of Northampton (Boughton and Moulton), east of DIRFT, south of M1 junction 15a,
- Public transport not adequately addressed. A strategic public transport policy is needed especially for rural areas to secure regular public transport for all villages.
- Particular problems for younger people needing to access education and training are highlighted.
- An integrated, sustainable, and inclusive transport strategy is required, with visionary plans for public transport, an integrated network of EV charging points and car hire hubs. Major improvements to existing housing stock to support EV charging.
- Infrastructure needs to be provided at an early stage.
- Lack of confidence that WNC can deliver these objectives.
- More provision required for cycling and walking.
- Consideration should be given to the changes in travel demand e.g., more home working.
- Objectives lack detail as to how they will be achieved. How will they be measured?
- Not clear how reducing the need to travel can be achieved.
- Combatting congestion should be a major issue.
- Major improvements required to road infrastructure before development. Examples include Towcester bypass, dualling of the A5.
- Concern that major road improvements will either not be delivered or not delivered to an appropriate standard due to the reliance on developer contributions.
- Objective 9 should apply everywhere, not just to urban areas.
- Private car travel needs to be driven down in order to reduce pollution.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- Should include mobile and broadband connectivity.
- Unclear what is meant by maximising and promoting the use of alternative travel modes.
- The railway station at Long Buckby does not provide facilities for disabled access.
- Parking restrictions in Brackley are damaging local business and the environment.
- The objectives appear unrealistic given the poor state of our existing infrastructure such as roads. Will create dormitory towns increasing traffic and pollution.
- How will rail networks be improved? Suggested improvements include a Daventry Parkway station and new links for Brackley and Towcester.
- Introduce community car loan schemes.
- Northampton should consider park and ride locations.
- Too much emphasis on roads. Active and sustainable travel needs to be at the forefront of this objective. Objectives will lead to more congestion, pollution, and transport inequality.
- Focus new warehousing development in locations close to motorway junctions.
- Congestion can only be addressed by the construction of an orbital route around Northampton and the development of brownfield sites first.
- Urban communities are bad for people's health and wellbeing. WNC should not be protecting or building them.
- Disagree with the objective of linking 'new and existing communities. Communities need to be able to access green space on their doorstep.
- Spend limited funds on low emission buses, building cycle ways and improving footpaths.
- Not possible to prioritise sustainable travel in rural areas. Cars are essential.
- Stronger commitment needed to achieve modal shift through a range of measures such as rapid transit systems, new railways, bus services and lanes
- Good connections with North Northants are important and should be coordinated.
- More focus needed on delivery. There is little about the impact of through traffic on the area.
- The objective need to be applied to the spatial options.
- Deprivation will not be addressed by building more unaffordable homes.
- Patterns of development and urban design should make sustainable modes including public transport the natural first choice.
- Objective 8: Amend wording as described below to improve clarity and ambition: 'prioritise sustainable travel as an attractive and practical option across West Northamptonshire by maximising and promoting the use of alternative travel modes to reduce reliance on the private car'.

Other comments made by respondents who did not specify 'yes' or 'no':

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- The objective falls short of guaranteeing multi-modal infrastructure development. Integrated cycling and walking infrastructure should be a key part of the objectives.
- Major improvements to road infrastructure are required.
- Transport network needs to be planned as an integral part of new development.
- Electric charging for EV is not inclusive and should not be called out as a priority over improving and developing infrastructure that grows “Multi Modal” options.
- Objective 8 is meaningless unless there is an actual strategy to get people to change from driving to walking and cycling.
- Objective 8 – include active as well as sustainable travel. Objective 9 – could include health inequalities alongside deprivation.
- Current transport arrangements are piecemeal. There must be an integrated and sustainable transport strategy linking home, work, and leisure. Measures could include tram linking Northampton railway station to the University, Brackmills, Wootton, Grange Park and Northampton Gateway. Park and Ride and inner ring bus service. Better links to the Eastern District. Support community transport initiatives reduce air pollution and promote alternatives to vehicular transport. No further road building until a sustainable transport strategy is in place.

Parish/Town Council responses:

The following Parish and Town Councils supported the spatial objectives:

- **Blisworth Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Brackley Town Council** – Action needed to install more EV charging points. Commitment to more carbon neutral / electric passenger transport.
- **Braunston Parish Council**
- **Brixworth Parish Council** – Connectivity should include cycling and walking. Provision of charging points in new development and for public use.
- **Cogenhoe and Whiston Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Cold Higham Parish Council** - Should objective 9 also apply to rural areas?
- **Culworth Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Daventry Town Council** - If growth is to be based on logistics, then the development of employment areas must have good links to the development of residential areas for those employees via energy efficient transportation.
- **Evenley Parish Council** – Add reference to improving cycling in all areas.
- **Flore Parish Council** – To reduce travel distances there should be a drive to increase densities in urban areas. Sprawl and congestion in our urban centres mean people travel to centres further away.
- **Holcot Parish Council** – Build roads before the traffic arrives. Build in consultation with local communities.
- **Kingsthorpe Parish Council** – Investment in sustainable transport is essential.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- **Kislingbury Parish Council** – Green spaces need to be made accessible by bus, walking, and cycling routes.
- **Little Houghton Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Long Buckby Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Old Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Silverstone Parish Council** – reference to cycle ways, footpaths and active travel routes should be included.
- **Syresham Parish Council** – Proposals show no connections between rural settlements, market towns and Northampton. More emphasis needed on sustainable rural transport including bus services and safe active travel.
- **Tiffield Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Woodford-cum-Membris** (no comments)
- **Wootton Parish Council** (no comments)

The following Parish Councils objected to the spatial objectives:

- **A5 Alliance of Town and Parish Councils** - Objectives need to be strengthened. Connecting communities is crucial but the objectives lack vision. Rural transport needs to be prioritised and is currently poor in south Northants. Spatial options such as north-west Milton Keynes do not support the objectives. Objective 9 should also apply to rural areas.
- **Boddington Parish Council** – More emphasis on improving the quality of existing roads and more extensive bus services for rural areas.
- **Braunston Parish Council** – Should include ‘rural public transport’. Support for high-speed internet access in rural areas should be included.
- **Bugbrooke Parish Council** – More detailed measurable objectives are needed.
- **Cosgrove Parish Council** – Objective 9 should apply to rural areas.
- **Crick Parish Council** – Objectives are not driving the development options such as 3a and 3b. To achieve objective 8 employment should be within existing urban areas and not adjoining the M1. Objective 9 would be supported by urban regeneration, but this is absent from the plan.
- **Deanshanger Parish Council** - Rural transport needs to be prioritised and is currently poor in south Northants. Spatial options such as north-west Milton Keynes do not support the objectives. Objective 9 should also apply to rural areas.
- **Easton Neston Parish Meeting** – There is an infrastructure deficit and planning proposals are increasing road traffic massively.
- **Hinton-in-the-Hedges Parish Meeting** – This section is about urban communities. How are rural communities being covered?
- **Moulton Parish Council** - When was the business case for building and/or altering the roads serving this area? The bus network has diminished in recent years damaging the opportunities for improving connectivity. In order to accommodate the inevitable increase in car usage, Northampton needs to consider Park & Ride locations.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- **Nether Heyford Parish Council** – There needs to be an objective around increasing the use of public transport.
- **Old Stratford Parish Council** – Objective 9 must apply everywhere and not just in urban areas.
- **Overstone Parish Council** – Infrastructure before development. Strategic plans needed for Roads, Green Spaces, Health, and the impact of the pandemic.
- **Potterspury Parish Council** – Objectives are modest and lack vision. Objective 9 should apply everywhere.
- **Walgrave Parish Council** – rural areas are currently suffering from poor roads, congestion, traffic safety issues and poor public transport. Better roads and public transport are needed before any new development.
- **Weedon Parish Council** – Weedon is thriving due to its connectivity but our ‘sub regional centre’, Daventry is a mess. Improved public transport connections are suggested.
- **Welton Parish Council** – Until public transport is readily accessible this objective will not be achieved.
- **Whittlebury Parish Council** – Objective 9 should apply anywhere, not just urban areas. The proposal needs clarity and focus on sustainable transport.
- **Yardley Gobion Parish Council** – Objective 9 should apply to anywhere. Objectives not reflected in option 5b. There is no integrated public transport plan just more cars.

The following Parish and Town Councils did not specify ‘yes’ or ‘no’:

- **Blakesley Parish Council** – Objective 9 should apply everywhere, not just in urban areas.
- **Greens Norton Parish Council** – Objective 9 should apply anywhere, not just to urban areas.
- **Ravensthorpe Parish Council** – Plans for separating future employment and housing development will make the aim of reducing the need to travel difficult to achieve.
- **Rothersthorpe Parish Council** – The vision is fair in principle but falls short of guaranteeing the delivery of ‘multi-modal’ infrastructure.
- **Towcester Town Council** – Objective 9 should apply to all development, not just urban.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

Question 5: Are the spatial objectives 10 to 12 – Thriving Villages and Towns – appropriate for guiding development and growth in West Northamptonshire?

- 239 respondents said 'Yes'
- 365 respondents said 'No'
- 450 respondents provided specific comments

Those who supported the spatial objectives made the following key points:

- Designing out crime cuts down and permeability and can promote increased car use.
- Affordable housing is rarely of high-quality design.
- Objective 10 should say how the regeneration of town centres will be supported and consider new approaches to development within town centres such as the development of new urban living opportunities.
- Objective 11 should include adaptable housing so residents can stay in their homes when circumstances change e.g., reduced mobility.
- Objective 12 lacks detail and should be a priority objective given the rural nature of much of WNC.
- Careful management is needed of the space surrounding villages to maintain their identity.
- The strategy of relying on a small number of large sites has failed to deliver sufficient housing, especially affordable housing.
- Spread rural housing and the benefits of development across the area rather than large developments in urban areas. There should be an allowance for limited housing growth in villages which is consistent with their character. Limited growth will enable rural amenities to survive.
- Development should be focussed in areas with good infrastructure.
- Greater emphasis required on the regeneration of Northampton and brownfield sites.
- Northampton town centre is very poor for the size of the town. Northampton needs an imaginative vision for 2050 to provide a positive hub for retail, community, relaxation, and entertainment. No mention of Northampton's bid for city status.
- Affordable housing is critical for young people.
- The importance of bungalows should be highlighted in objective 11.
- Supporting the regeneration of town centres is a good objective but the lack of public transport and parking in Brackley works against this.
- A number of respondents seek to demonstrate that particular development options would support the objectives.
- Retro fitting of existing developments should be included to make them sustainable.
- The plan needs to guide development that will best support the regeneration of town centres.
- Development should be in keeping with landscape character including use of local materials.
- Objective 11 should specifically refer to meeting housing need.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- Further public engagement required to complete the vision for Daventry town centre.
- Greater engagement required with rural communities.
- The role of arts and culture in supporting town centres should be recognised.

Those who objected to the spatial objectives made the following key points:

- Insufficient detail provided on how rural areas will be supported and thrive. What do thriving and remaining vital look like? Such communities need a wider range of housing and population growth to support services.
- A number of respondents consider that the spatial options do not support the objectives. Specific examples include south of Towcester, Long Buckby, north of Northampton (Boughton and Moulton), east of Northampton (Ecton), south of M1 junction 15a, north-west Milton Keynes / Old Stratford, south of Market Harborough (East Farndon), north and west of Daventry, the expansion of DIRFT,
- Objective 11 should include an assessment of the adequacy of existing housing.
- There should be a wide choice of housing for sale and rent including housing for older people, and affordable housing.
- Some housing growth should be supported within the 'envelope' of rural communities, but this should be proportionate.
- The objectives are generic and could apply to any area.
- Measurable targets are required.
- Affordable housing needs to be genuinely affordable.
- A meaningful proportion of affordable housing (50%) should be secured.
- Objectives are weak and should link to the green vision and objectives.
- Not all town centres need regeneration.
- Specific measures should be put in place to maintain the character of rural communities including the design of new development.
- The traditional view of town centres is dead. There is a clear need to radically rethink the role of our town centres with opportunities for significant mixed-use development.
- Housing need estimates are too low with insufficient affordable housing.
- Communal energy sources and leading examples of refuse sorting should be considered for developments.
- More is needed to address rural poverty with better public transport and access to health and wellbeing services. Free transport needed for young people to enable them to access education, health, and leisure services.
- WNC is towing the government line and not meeting the needs of local people.
- Objective 12 is shamefully undeveloped.
- Objective 10 – democratic structures are required to ensure that residents and the users of town centres play a leading role in their development.
- Scepticism that the objectives will be achieved.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- Housing estates of the future should have parcel/delivery hubs as essential infrastructure.
- Rural communities should be protected rather than being surrounded by housing and warehouses. Existing green space and wildlife ecosystems should be preserved to protect the character and setting of villages, particularly those that are near Northampton. There should be specific protection from coalescence. Clear boundaries should be set for the expansion of towns.
- Focus on the regeneration of brownfield sites, particularly in Northampton.
- Objective 11 should set the scene for and drive housing growth policies.
- Objective 12 should support sustainable growth in rural areas through Neighbourhood Plans and a Site Allocations Plan.
- Objective 11 should recognise the importance of delivering an appropriate range of family sized housing.
- The planning process in WNC does not currently support the delivery of housing to meet the needs of all sections of society.
- Concern that large housing estates can attract crime and anti-social behaviour.
- A specific policy on design should be included setting out criteria against which planning applications would be considered. This could include design quality tools such as building for a healthy life (BHL) which has been adopted by Homes England.
- Priority should be given to creating local employment opportunities close to homes rather than out of town industrial parks which generate the need to travel.
- Should recognise the opportunity provided by the Oxford-Cambridge Arc to deliver transformational growth.
- It would be good to see some proposals for protection of heritage spaces for tourism in villages as well as bigger urban areas
- More emphasis needed on social cohesion and the social structure that is planned for new communities.
- Proposals are not consistent with the levelling up agenda.
- Objective 10 fails to recognise the impact of Class E in the Use Classes Order.
- Objective 11 should refer to local distinctiveness.
- Objective 12 should include 'accessible by public transport'.

Other comments made by respondents who did not specify 'yes' or 'no':

- Small scale developments of retirement homes would enable older residents to live within their existing communities.
- Robust sustainability goals are needed for domestic and commercial property to meet carbon neutral targets
- Brownfield sites should be prioritised.
- Objectives 10-12 are not fit for purpose and fall into the 'sustainability trap' referenced in the Taylor Review 2008. Some rural settlements would benefit

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

from meaningful housing growth to support affordable housing and investment in social capital.

- Changing in working practices post Covid may result in the need for services and facilities to be provided more locally outside of town centres.
- Objective 12 does not reflect the significance of rural areas and should be expanded to reference their social, economic, and environmental roles.
- Reference to heritage in objective 10 is welcomed.
- Concern regarding the impact of housing in multiple occupation (HiMOs) in Northampton. Concerns include the loss of family housing, the size and quality of the units created and the adverse impact on the conservation area and historic buildings.
- Objective 11 should refer to the role that larger villages can play in accommodating sustainable growth.
- Developer led model over the last 20 years has failed to deliver the right number and mix of housing, especially affordable housing. The balance between public and private sector needs to be reset, with WNC taking a lead role in development and planning.

Parish/Town Council responses:

The following Parish and Town Councils supported the spatial objectives:

- **Blisworth Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Brackley Town Council** (no comments)
- **Braunston Parish Council** – no changes proposed.
- **Brixworth Parish Council** – Town centres should be more ‘mixed use’. Developments should offer a wide range of dwellings from first time buyers through to housing for older people and to meet special needs. Rural areas need protection, but some proportionate growth is required.
- **Bugbrooke Parish Council** – The objectives feel aspirational and have not been delivered in the past. The villages around Northampton need to be kept rural and protected from expanding development such as Panattoni Park.
- **Cogenhoe and Whiston Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Cold Higham Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Culworth Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Daventry Town Council** – investment has to be made in the village/town to invite and welcome residents to support their local economy.
- **Evenley Parish Council** – Objective 11, add reference to high quality build standards. Objective 12 is very weak. Add references to the distinctive character of villages – social, economic and built environment.
- **Flore Parish Council** – Objective 12 should support Neighbourhood Plans.
- **Hinton-in-the-Hedges Parish Meeting** – more explanation of ‘how to protect rural communities’ is required.
- **Holcot Parish Council** – Affordable housing is critical for young people.
- **Kingsthorpe Parish Council** – Strategy to encourage people to come into town. Discourage gambling licences.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- **Kislingbury Parish Council** - Housing 'wants' rather than housing 'needs' are being met. Meeting housing need means that West Northants residents would live in homes that they can afford, are warm and dry, green and fuel efficient, and enable children and families to flourish. To enable real housing need to be met, there should be construction of homes available on a variety of tenures including shared ownership. The use of Community Led and not-for-profit housing initiatives needs to be prioritised to address the needs of residents whose housing needs will never be met in a market-led context.
- **Old Parish Council** – Should reference climate change resilience. Housing should not swamp the countryside and existing communities. Consider initiatives such as the National Forest as part of regeneration strategy.
- **Overstone Parish Council** – Housing design to reflect the character of local areas. Rural area objective is too vague. More affordable housing needed along with clear plans for sustainable villages.
- **Silverstone Parish Council** - Yes and no. Supporting town centres is ok but what about keeping alive and reviving village centres in larger villages? Increased affordable housing and council homes – but what about other social housing providers?
- **Tiffield Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Walgrave Parish Council** – Housing plans to reflect the character of local areas. Affordable housing is key to inclusive communities. Good transport needed from rural areas to support town centres.
- **Welton Parish Council** – town centres need improved access and parking.
- **Woodford-cum-Membris Parish Council** (no comments)

The following Parish and Town Councils objected to the spatial objectives:

- **A5 Alliance of Parish Councils** – The objectives should set targets against which performance can be measured. Objective 10 – the aims are modest and delivery is questionable as there are no plans to regenerate brownfield sites. Objective 11 is at odds with the spatial options which are all on greenfield land. Objective 12 provides no detail on the strategy for bringing jobs and infrastructure to rural areas.
- **Cosgrove Parish Council** – The objectives state the obvious and should have targets against which success or failure can be judged.
- **Crick Parish Council** – The spatial options do not support the objectives. For example, options 3a and 3b will destroy the rural communities of Crick, Lilbourne and Yelvertoft.
- **Easton Neston Parish Meeting** – Objectives 10 and 12 are appropriate. Objective 11 should include reference to infrastructure being in place.
- **Hinton-in-the-Hedges Parish Meeting** – more explanation of 'how to protect rural communities is required.
- **Little Houghton Parish Council** - Objective 12– what exactly does 'thrive and remain vital' mean? Spatial Option 6 – Rural Areas contains the words 'the level of growth needs to recognise the need to protect and enhance the special environmental and social characteristics of the rural area'. This

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

captures the sentiment in a more meaningful way and Objective 12 should be amended accordingly.

- **Long Buckby Parish Council** - A thriving community should not be allowed to grow beyond the local economy's ability to support otherwise they simply become dormitories. This size limit should be incorporated in the plan.
- **Moulton Parish Council** - Villages and towns thrive as individual communities with their own pride and identity. Development of infill land as this proposes damages rather than reinforces that sense of community. There is a clear conflict of objectives.
- **Nether Heyford Parish Council** - Insufficient aspiration around rural villages. They need protecting from excess development and being subsumed into larger conurbations. WNC should provide more significant support for the development of Neighbourhood Plans. More funding required for rural areas to support assets such as street-lighting.
- **Old Stratford Parish Council** – The objectives state the obvious and should have measurable targets.
- **Potterspury Parish Council** – Objective 10 is welcome but aims are modest. Delivery is doubtful with no plans to regenerate brownfield land. Many of the potential development sites conflict with objective 11.
- **Wappenham Parish Council** - This is written to give 'excuses' to developments or large or inappropriate size in small towns or villages. To thrive a village does not necessarily have to grow and in fact growth can actually harm.
- **Whittlebury Parish Council** – Most of the objectives are laudable, but there is a lack of clarity. The objectives should set targets against which policy can be judged.
- **Weedon Parish Council** – Growth is threatening villages such as Harpole and Kislingbury. Traffic congestion is a disincentive for travel to Northampton. Daventry is not a thriving town or town centre. Poor development on the edge of towns has not helped. Villages like Weedon need more affordable housing.
- **Wootton Parish Council** – Objective 12 lacks detail and ambition. Limited development in villages has led to a loss of services and facilities. A regenerated town centre will need easy access and parking at reasonable rates. The environment needs to enhance the heritage and cultural assets together with other town centre uses.

The following Parish and Town Councils did not specify 'yes' or 'no':

- **Blakesley Parish Council** - should set targets against which success can be measured e.g., housing density and the provision of green space.
- **Deanshanger Parish Council** - Objective 12 provides no detail of how rural communities will be supported and protected. There is no strategy for bringing jobs and infrastructure to rural areas.
- **Ecton Parish Council** – WNC is expected to protect precious villages such as Ecton.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- **Greens Norton Parish Council** – Should set targets against which success can be measured.
- **Rothersthorpe Parish Council** - Objective 12 gives no indication of the how the vision will be achieved. Spatial Option 1g south of M1 junction 15a is contrary to objective 12
- **Syresham Parish Council** - Key market towns need investment for regeneration, so residents of those towns and surrounding rural settlements are able to shop locally rather than travelling further to large shopping centres.
- **Silverstone Parish Council** - Yes and No. Supporting town centres is ok but what about keeping alive and reviving village centres in larger villages? Increased affordable housing and council homes – but what about other social housing providers?
- **Yardley Gobion Parish Council** - The objectives should set targets and give residents success and failure measures by which any good policy can be judged objectively.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

Question 6: Are the spatial objectives 13 to 16 – Economic Development – appropriate for guiding development and growth in West Northamptonshire?

- 225 respondents said 'Yes'
- 337 respondents said 'No'
- 351 respondents provided specific comments

Those who supported the spatial objectives made the following key points:

- Increased forestry could offset carbon emissions.
- Additional blue and green infrastructure and an improved rights of way network would have benefits for local residents and attract visitors.
- The approach to the Arc in Objective 13 is not consistent with the vision.
- Objectives should refer to the existing world class engineering, technology, and manufacturing industries.
- Should be clearer on the benefits offered by the Arc in terms of high-tech business and high paid jobs.
- Support further research on the supply and demand for logistics on a sub-regional scale.
- Objective 16 could reference existing initiatives to support tourism such as 'Hidden Northamptonshire'. Would like to see more in the vision about tourism. The objective understates the importance of tourism.
- Employment areas should be near housing with facilities and infrastructure planned from the start.
- Northants struggles to attract visitors in comparison to surrounding areas such as the Cotswolds / Warwick and Stratford.
- Leaving the EU has created problems for specialist food producers.
- A number of respondents support the objectives and seek to demonstrate that a particular development proposal would help to achieve the objectives.
- Focus on high tech, low footprint economy not warehousing and distribution. Emphasise localism and local entrepreneurship and encourage alternative business models such as cooperatives and social enterprise. Encourage financial investment and support in newer green, ethical and cooperative start-ups. Be a living wage accredited working environment.
- Concern about the impact of the logistics industry in the area such as the loss of landscape and habitat, the carbon impact, and environmental impacts such as flooding.
- More detail required.
- Objective 13 – the claim that we are internationally well-placed is disputed
- Rather than low wage logistics, push for companies who deliver better employment contracts and higher wages.
- Northampton needs to be connected to mainline high speed rail services.
- Support the recognition of the economic advantage the area has and the benefits of the Arc. The plan should seek to maximise these opportunities.
- Support the recognition of clusters of specialised industries. Silverstone Business Park and Technology University are particular examples.
- Rural diversification should come first.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- There are economic opportunities associated with the River Nene that could contribute towards West Northants. A waterspace study similar to those undertaken for Bedford and Peterborough could help stimulate the regeneration of the river corridor.
- Northampton and Daventry have the greatest employment need.
- A better integrated transport system is needed to support these objectives. Where is the rail connection to Oxford or Cambridge?
- Sufficient homes also need to be built to realise the economic benefits of the Arc.
- To support economic development further investment will be required in community policing and emergency response.
- WNC should recognise the significant role that the logistics sector plays in support the UK's economy. The importance of the sector will increase on the short to medium term. Objective 13 should mention DIRFT, the M1 junctions and the opportunities for growth.
- Much more could be done to attract tourism to Northampton given the town's history and wealth of monuments.
- Greater focus on development in the south of the area to support the Arc.

Those who objected to the spatial objectives made the following key points:

- A number of respondents argue that the spatial options do not support the objectives. Specific examples include south of Towcester, land south of M1 junction 15a, north-west Milton Keynes / Old Stratford, north and west of Daventry, north of Northampton (Boughton / Moulton), east of DIRFT, east of Northampton (Ecton), south of Long Buckby.
- Too much emphasis on logistics development which will bring heavy traffic for little employment gain. Question the need for further logistics development in the area.
- Greater emphasis needed on high quality jobs in green industries and the digital economy. The potential for a more decentralised economy should also be considered. Development of small businesses and craft skills hubs has been missed.
- Remove reference to the Ox-Cam Arc which has a very uncertain future. Too much emphasis given to the Arc. Northampton is unlikely to play a key role in the Arc given the lack of connectivity to Oxford or Cambridge.
- Not detail on how employment will be attracted. How will a diverse range of jobs be delivered?
- Objectives 14 and 15 should include rural areas.
- Focus on maintaining and building on existing strengths rather than seeking to diversify.
- Greater focus on brownfield sites rather than greenfield development. Greater emphasis on regeneration of existing urban areas. Should maximise the use of existing employment sites. Small and medium scale employment uses should be supported.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- Objectives 15 and 16 could have adverse impacts on agriculture and disrupt natural areas. Farming is undervalued in Northants. Further support is needed for farming communities.
- WNC should preserve assets such as ancient monuments and conservation areas which help to attract visitors.
- Objectives do not recognise the impact of Covid 19 and the change in working practice. For example, Objective 15 does not reference the positive impact that home working can have on the economy in rural areas. Will office space be required?
- Objective 16 – the large-scale development proposals will not support tourism.
- Creating a high-quality environment is essential to take advantage of our position in the Ox-Cam Arc.
- Timing of the consultation in advance of any plan for the Arc is questioned.
- Scepticism that the objectives can be achieved.
- Current road networks around Daventry do not support further development.
- Objectives 13 to 16 do not promote the flexibility necessary for businesses to respond to rapidly changing market circumstances.
- An additional objective is required which supports the conditions in which business can invest, expand, and adapt in changing circumstances.
- A specific objective should be included to make provision for storage and distribution uses at a variety of scales. The 20ha threshold is not supported or justified.
- Employment opportunities should be closely related to housing. The proposals for Northampton do not achieve this.
- More emphasis on infrastructure improvement needed.
- Opportunities for economic growth should not be maximised to the detriment of the countryside.
- There is nothing in the proposals that drives the economic growth of Northampton. The town should leverage its shoe, footwear, and leather heritage to become a major centre of that nature and a catalyst for wider regeneration.
- Economic growth needs to be caveated to ensure it is in line with net zero targets.
- Objectives unlikely to be achieved in the Daventry area. The amount of money required to support transport links and infrastructure is unlikely to be realised.
- Objectives 13 and 16 are mutually exclusive in that ugly economic development will reduce tourism.
- Stronger protection required for the landscape and assets such as the canal network.
- Objectives are vague and lack firm commitments.
- Our pretty villages between Daventry, Brackley and Towcester provide an alternative “Cotswolds” and could provide much tourist income, our canal

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

network should be celebrated, and our extensive heritage and history made accessible.

- Scepticism that WNC can deliver the objectives.
- Why are employment sites identified in South Northamptonshire when the HENA suggests there is a surplus?
- There needs to be recognition of the relationship between Northampton and economic development in the corridor of Wellingborough, Kettering, and Corby.
- Language is too passive. There should be a focus on making existing businesses such as high-performance engineering and logistics greener.
- A rail link from Northampton to Bedford would provide better links to the Ox-Cam Arc.
- A proper orbital route is required to the north and west of Northampton.
- Options should take best advantage of the strategic transport network, particularly rail. Daventry is not an appropriate location in this respect.
- Focus on the M1 is misplaced. This is an air-polluting, carbon, lorry, and car generating visual and aural eye/ear sore. Emphasis should be on sustainable growth.
- Opportunities to make better use of existing railways and to reopen former routes and stations would be transformational. A new rail and bus strategy should be a key priority.
- Growth driven by WNC's location on the strategic road network needs to be carefully controlled. Sites such as DIRFT and the M1 corridor should be considered to be at capacity.

Other comments made by respondents who did not specify 'yes' or 'no':

- Both logistics and high-tech development should be encouraged. Logistics should be focussed on rail connections and key motorway junctions
- Employment sites should be close to population centres and encourage active travel.
- Out of town shopping centres should not be approved.
- Objectives 13, 14 and 16 should reference Silverstone Park and the wider technology cluster and its importance for economic development, specialist business and the visitor economy. A positive policy framework is required to support continued growth.
- It is not explained how the Oxford Cambridge ARC can benefit West Northants which will only be on the periphery of it. It will lead to greater housing requirements but not necessarily employment or improvement to the local economy as residents could just be commuting to MK etc.
- Reference to heritage within Objective 16 is welcomed. However, it would be helpful to include reference throughout.
- It is unclear whether the impacts of Covid 19 and the likely reduction in the need for office space has been considered.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- Support objective 13 but strongly object to the findings of the Housing and Economic Needs Assessment which would fail to deliver the aspirations for economic growth.
- Sustainable housing growth is required to support economic development in rural areas.
- Effective rural broadband is essential.

Parish/Town Council responses:

The following Parish and Town Councils supported the spatial objectives:

- **Blisworth Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Brackley Town Council** (no comments)
- **Braunston Parish Council** – Objective 15 should seek to minimise the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land by maximising the use of brownfield sites and lower grade land.
- **Brixworth Parish Council** - Employment areas are needed. Concern that the options identified are road based. Clusters encouraging artisans and smaller businesses should be catered for, especially in rural settings
- **Bugbrooke Parish Council** – Support the objectives but these don't reflect the plans for large warehousing sites.
- **Cogenhoe and Whiston Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Cold Higham Parish Council** – wording of objective 15 is vague and open to interpretation.
- **Culworth Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Daventry Town Council** - Road network, investment in new technologies is key to growth. Rural diversification objectives will contradict economic development objectives they need to be considered separately to ensure the aims are focussed and work in tandem with the other to ensure one objective doesn't take precedence over the other. Visitor economy although feeding into the economic development within West Northamptonshire, should also be a separate objective.
- **Evenley Parish Council** – Add reference to high-speed internet provision to support homeworking.
- **Flore Parish Council** – Diversifying our economy is difficult in the face the increasing concentration of logistics in the area. Extensive warehousing development does little to support the visitor economy.
- **Holcot Parish Council** – Agree with the exception of 'internationally well-placed location'. Joined up plans need to be developed.
- **Kingsthorpe Parish Council** – Objectives 14-16 more critical.
- **Kislingbury Parish Council** - The logistics-led development that has occurred along the M1 corridor, despite local opposition has, presumably, made large profits for the businesses involved but it has created employment that is unskilled, insecure (zero contracts and agency work) and low paid. This makes it harder for people to afford houses locally. The residual requirements for economic (employment) need should be carefully focused and aligned with

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

the developing West Northants Anti-Poverty Strategy to develop to the greatest extent possible, well paid, permanent, and satisfying work.

- **Little Houghton Parish Council** (no comments).
- **Long Buckby Parish Council** (no comments).
- **Nether Heyford Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Old Parish Council** – strengthening the local economy should not mean building lots of warehousing that stands empty for years.
- **Tiffield Parish Council** – the plan should show how WNC will support farming.
- **Welton Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Woodford-cum-Membris Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Wootton Parish Council** (no comments)

The following Parish Councils objected to the spatial objectives:

- **A5 Alliance of Parish Councils** - Should be more explicit in naming the target industries. The strategy should aim to provide high quality green jobs and jobs in the digital economy. Diversity in our economy is welcome, but there is a lack of direction in these objectives. Reliance on the Oxford-Cambridge Arc could be misplaced.
- **Cosgrove Parish Council** - The Plan could be more explicit in naming some of the target industries. It is clear that Logistics and High-Performance Engineering, (which centres on Motor Sport) are some of the key industries to retain and attract but this needs to be made MUCH clearer.
- **Crick Parish Council** – the objectives are not driving the development options. The options for the expansion of DIRFT will not diversify the economy (Objective 13) will decimate local agriculture (Objective 15) and will not support the visitor economy (Objective 16).
- **Easton Neston Parish Meeting** – Objectives 13,14 and 16 are appropriate. Objective 15 should show how WNC will support farming.
- **Greens Norton Parish Council** - The Plan could be more explicit in naming some of the target industries. It is clear that Logistics and High-Performance Engineering, (which centres on Motor Sport) are some of the key industries to retain and attract but this needs to be made clearer.
- **Hinton-in-the-Hedges Parish Meeting** – Should explain why economic growth is needed. Should seek to limit the impact of the Arc on rural WNC. Objective 14 should specify that ‘clusters’ should be ‘in sustainable areas’
- **Moulton Parish Council** – The former Daventry District appears to be taking the brunt of development which will add to the residential burden but do nothing to assist economic development.
- **Old Stratford Parish Council** – The Plan could be more explicit in naming some of the target industries. It is clear that Logistics and High-Performance Engineering, (which centres on Motor Sport) are some of the key industries to retain and attract but this needs to be made clearer.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- **Overstone Parish Council** – Northampton is on the edge of the Arc and in no better location than other towns and cities. Vastly improved infrastructure is required.
- **Potterspury Parish Council** - A diversity of our economy would be welcome. Unfortunately there is no detail or an indication which direction this will take. Some indication as to how the town centres will be regenerated would be welcome. Presuming initiatives will emerge post-Covid, what will be their focus? There is a clear lack of direction in these objectives and the reliance on the Oxford Cambridge Arc could be misplaced.
- **Walgrave Parish Council** - What are the plans to ensure that our villages retain economic advantage and business development? To enable the rural and visitor visions to be achieved we need vastly improved infrastructure.
- **Weedon Parish Council** – refer to objections to the HENA set out in question 7.
- **Whittlebury Parish Council** - The Plan could be more explicit in naming some of the target industries. It is clear that Logistics and High-Performance Engineering, (which centres on Motor Sport) are some of the key industries to retain and attract but this needs to be made clearer.
- **Yardley Gobion Parish Council** - The Plan could be more explicit in naming some of the target industries. It is clear that Logistics and High-Performance Engineering, (which centres on Motor Sport) are some of the key industries to retain and attract but this needs to be made clearer.

The following Parish and Town Councils did not specify ‘yes’ or ‘no’:

- **Blakesley Parish Council** - Should be a little more explicit in naming some of the target industries. Logistics and high-performance engineering (centre around motorsport) are some of the key things to retain and attract. Promote Northampton Waterside Enterprise Zone home to high performance tech and automotive e.g., Cosworth and MAHLE Powertrain.
- **Greens Norton Parish Council** - The Plan could be more explicit in naming some of the target industries. It is clear that Logistics and High-Performance Engineering, (which centres on Motor Sport) are some of the key industries to retain and attract but this needs to be made clearer.
- **Rothersthorpe Parish Council** - concern that objective 15 could have negative impacts on local farmers and tenant farmers. Objective 16 – Land south of junction 15a would disrupt assets which attract visitors such as the Grand Union Canal conservation area.
- **Silverstone Parish Council** - Yes and no. What about building on our existing expertise such as in high performance engineering/motorsport. There is reference to supporting and developing opportunities for specialist employment clusters (this exists at Silverstone) but not all focused on a low carbon economy. We must not forget traditional ways completely. Sports should be included here with not only Silverstone but rugby, cricket, and football amongst others. There is no mention anywhere about the canals.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

Question 7: Do you agree that the findings of the HENA reflect the housing and/or economic needs of the area?

- 132 respondents said 'Yes'
- 437 respondents said 'No'
- 440 respondents provided specific comments

Those who supported the findings of the HENA made the following key points:

- We note that the proposed strategy is to meet the housing need as calculated using the standard method and also to allocate employment land to meet the calculated unmet need. We support this approach and have no further comments to make at this stage.
- HENA rightly identifies that warehousing is likely to attract in commuting from other areas.
- Agree that the HENA identifies the minimum needs but an uplift needs to be considered in response to the Arc.
- Co-location of housing and employment to reduce the need to travel.
- Northampton is the area of greatest need and should be the focus for new housing. This would be consistent with the city status bid.
- In considering employment needs WNC should consider the opportunities that arise from existing employment sites such as Silverstone.
- The HENA will need to be updated in the light of the Arc Spatial Framework and up to date economic forecasts.

Those who objected to the findings of the HENA made the following key points:

- The HENA does not adequately reflect the aspirations of the emerging Oxford-Cambridge Arc Spatial Framework. The employment land figure does not address the need for transformational growth in the Arc.
- A number of respondents question whether the HENA justifies the specific spatial options which have been identified and are concerned about the impacts of the development required to meet the levels of need identified. These include south of Towcester, North-west Milton Keynes / Old Stratford, M1 junction 18 / DIRFT expansion, north and west of Daventry, north of Northampton (Boughton and Moulton), south of M1 junction 15a, east of Northampton (Ecton).
- Concern that the location of the spatial options does not relate to the local needs for housing and employment.
- The spatial options, especially in South Northants would result in a massive oversupply of land against the needs identified in the HENA.
- The housing need should reflect the shortfall in provision at Northampton, leading to a reduction in the planned growth in the former Daventry and South Northamptonshire areas.
- Unclear how the housing and economic development needs will be met.
- A number of respondents dispute the validity of the standard method for calculating housing need. The population projections are 2014 based may be

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

inaccurate given the impacts of Brexit and Covid. The formula continues the disproportionate growth that has occurred over the past 20-30 years. Housing need is overstated when compared to ONS figures showing declining fertility rates and reduced numbers of overseas workers. Need to factor in increased homeworking and the impacts of climate change. The findings are speculative. The adjustment for affordable housing results in a projection of need which is larger than required. The calculation is based on achieving the government's target for 300,000 homes per annum which is unsubstantiated. Requiring more houses to be built does not improve affordability and suppress prices.

- Concern that too many large 4-5 bed homes are built in the Daventry area.
- Allocation of office space in Northampton is very low considering bid for city status
- It is unclear how the identified housing numbers link to rates of population growth across WN and through to the spatial options – how much housing is needed by area linked to expected population growth and do the spatial options reflect this?
- The relationship between housing and warehousing may be inaccurate. Job numbers are likely to fall, and rates of pay are low meaning affordable housing is needed.
- The work to identify the strategic need for warehousing needs to be completed. There is substantial evidence of a shortfall in supply and significant demand which is not being met.
- A number of respondents are seeking increases in the housing need figures. The reasons for this include; application of a 5% buffer to increase choice, to support the aspirations of the Ox-Cam Arc, to address the worsening affordability ratios, to meet and support the baseline economic growth forecasts, to meet jobs growth associated with developments such as Northampton Gateway, to take account of existing growth rates in the Joint Core Strategy, the Arc related option included in the Issues consultation, should use 2021 figures which have increased affordability ratios, past under delivery highlights the need for contingency and flexibility, to meet the government's objective to significantly boost the supply of housing. The HENA would perpetuate declining affordability and increase net commuting. The basis for the windfall allowance is questioned. Various figures are suggested as follows: 2,389 dwellings per annum, 47,303 dwellings (as opposed to the 30,000 currently proposed), a 20-25% uplift as proposed by the Aylesbury Vale Inspector, a 20% flexibility allowance as recommended by the Local Plans Expert Group (2016), between 37,816 and 44,332 dwellings (depending on the extent of the contingency buffer), a minimum 10% uplift.
- A number of detailed technical comments are raised in respect of the HENA and the Housing Background Paper these include the need for greater clarity on what constitutes existing supply, dispute the windfall allowance, further evidence needed to justify assumptions regarding the reemployment of those who lost jobs during the pandemic, contingency figures should apply to the total housing requirement.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- The need for employment land should be considered on a plan wide basis rather than as the sum of the three former council areas.
- Decisions should be made by people affected by developments.
- There should be no reliance on the Oxford-Cambridge Arc for housing needs. Northampton is unlikely to benefit from the Arc and the justification for growth associated with it is disputed.
- Simply increasing the number of houses to be provided is unlikely to improve affordability. Genuinely affordable housing is required rather than more 'market led' 4-5 bed detached houses. Smaller houses and apartments are needed.
- There is too much uncertainty in these figures, and they reflect more accurately MK's needs than the broader area of West Northants.
- The HENA does not adequately consider the impacts of the pandemic and Brexit.
- An update of the HENA is needed to support the draft plan to reflect the latest growth forecasts and jobs figures.
- The employment need identified in the HENA is not sufficiently ambitious and does not reflect the government's aspirations for the Arc. A figure of 48ha will severely constrain growth within this strategically important location.
- HENA may need to accommodate overspill from neighbouring councils.
- A number of respondents raise detailed technical comments regarding the employment aspects of the HENA. These include failure to consult stakeholders, failure to understand wider needs and the area's role in the 'Golden Triangle', failure to consider structural changes post pandemic and Brexit, reliance on out of date and pessimistic forecasts, inconsistencies and errors in calculations, failure to acknowledge losses of employment land, fails to assess the sub-regional need for strategic warehousing. The Experian forecasts do not factor in strategic logistics. If the actual level of demand over the past 13 years is projected forward to 2050 the need would be 875ha. The use of inconsistent data sources, timeframes and methodologies, flawed assessment of housing needs not aligned with employment need, and inadequate commercial market assessment. The industrial needs are stated as being 203.4ha for 2020-50 and reducing this to achieve the balance of 47.62ha, by simply deducting the perceived supply of industrial land, is overly simplistic
- Little or no account of an ageing population and their needs. If older people were encouraged to downsize the number of new homes could be reduced by 75%
- The data is confusing and not properly explained.
- The surplus of industrial land in South Northants should be taken into account in the consideration of warehousing.
- The basis of the HENA is fundamentally flawed and should be challenged. The HENA does not consider alternative scenarios or variation in outcome.
- The housing need figures are too high, especially for South Northants. They represent an unsustainable growth in population and migration.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- Some concern that a separate office component has not been identified for the former Daventry area.
- Northampton has grown rapidly and is now at capacity in terms of services and transport infrastructure.
- There should also be consideration of environmental sustainability, economic and social infrastructure. Not just housing numbers.
- Priority should be given to the use of brownfield land to meet the housing and employment needs which have been identified.
- The need for offices and warehousing is too high having regard to the impact of Covid and the existing supply of warehousing across the area. Growth and location of warehousing is a major concern. Demographic change means that less employment land is required. The proposals in the plan will drive inward labour migration.
- Housing should be built to the highest 'green' standards and supported by social facilities.
- Consultation is premature in the absence of work to assess requirements for strategic logistics and the potential for new settlements. It may also be prudent to wait for the results of the 2021 census.
- Demand for housing associated with DIRFT is being met by large development in Rugby Borough. This should be considered.
- The picture used to support this section is a very poor example of a new housing estate.
- The plan making process should include a locally based assessment of housing need to which communities can easily engage with and which will consider the issue of capacity.
- Trying to predict housing needs up to 2050 is unreasonable. A shorter time period should be considered.
- Given that the unmet need for employment land is 48ha, it is not clear why so many potential employment sites have been identified. This could lead a significant oversupply.
- To reduce reliance on large strategic sites, the plan should allocate smaller sites in the towns to maintain a five-year land supply and protect the rural areas.
- The lack of need for intermediate affordable housing products identified in the HENA does not reflect demand reported by registered providers. Intermediate products boost choice and can help viability to support the delivery of affordable rented housing.

Other comments made by respondents who did not specify 'yes' or 'no':

- As the housing need element is prescribed by a national formula in the NPPF it is difficult to suggest an alternative. Concern that the formula produces a disproportionate number of dwellings which are likely to be above the locally derived need for West Northamptonshire.
- It is a matter of concern that the standard method prescribed by national policy, the HENA, does not take account of the local environmental capacity.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- Concern that the housing needs estimates are too low.
- The use of figures for the former Council areas in the HENA causes confusion.
- A strategic plan for 35 years should start with serious consideration, drawn from across industry and commerce, as to what is needed to encourage new jobs to be created in a way which meets the need to reduce transportation and consumption.
- The plan does not currently address the requirements of particular business sectors or clusters, such as the high performance and technology sector. A positive policy framework is required to support sites such as Silverstone.
- The HENA demonstrates the acute shortfall in affordable housing especially in the rural areas of South Northants.
- There is minimal discussion about the duty to cooperate and potential requirements to meet unmet need from neighbouring councils.
- Any policies relating to accessible and wheelchair user dwellings need to be applied flexibly.

Parish/Town Council responses:

The following Parish and Town Councils supported the findings of the HENA:

- **Blisworth Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Culworth Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Kislingbury Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Long Buckby Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Nether Heyford Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Silverstone Parish Council** – Yes, but question whether new thinking is required now there is one council. Further information required regarding existing commitments and action to reduce the time taken to commence and complete permitted developments. The type of housing provided will influence the number of residents they will house.
- **Woodford-cum-Membris Parish Council** (no comments)

The following Parish Councils objected to the findings of the HENA:

- **A5 Alliance of Parish Councils** - Unfortunate that economic needs are still assessed across the former Council areas. Information on the plans for identifying warehousing need and how these will be accommodated is required. The population data is confusing and difficult to compare. The statistics on affordable housing are not clear and open to interpretation. The plan does not provide a target population for 2050. Question whether the housing numbers required have been calculated correctly.
- **Brackley Town Council** - Projections of growth should be supplemented with targets or descriptions of suitable population levels.
- **Braunston Parish Council** - would welcome more explanation of the basis of modelling and how employment and housing needs have been coordinated to reduce travel and thus carbon footprint.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- **Cosgrove Parish Council** - This vision does not set out what the target population West Northamptonshire wishes to see by 2050. Without this we are asked to trust the Council that it has calculated the nationally required housing numbers in the correct way. As there is now one Council and given that Joint Core Strategy has been in existence for a number of years it is somewhat disappointing that there is NO common standard method across the whole area.
- **Daventry Town Council** – the type and supply of housing needs to reflect needs to reflect the employment demographic. Can existing or future warehousing be adapted to accommodate changing demands such as a reduced reliance on goods manufactured overseas?
- **Easton Neston Parish Meeting** - the findings of HENA do not reflect the housing and economic needs of the area. There are fundamental errors which make the conclusions incorrect.
- **Flore Parish Council** – More effort is needed to attract employment in high quality offices and manufacturing rather than relying on warehousing. Growing need for housing for older people, built to lifetime homes standard.
- **Hinton-in-the-Hedges Parish Meeting** – No evidence of unmet need. Dispute the need for warehousing. Does natural growth support the numbers proposed or are we encouraging people to move to the area?
- **Holcot Parish Council** – The HENA should be redone to take account of the other spatial objectives, the rise of home working, and the impacts of climate change.
- **Kingsthorpe Parish Council** - Prefer more affordable housing rather than build to rent by private landlords.
- **Little Houghton Parish Council** – More work needs to be undertaken to justify the need for 30,000 additional homes.
- **Milton Malsor Parish Council** – The predictions that underpin the standard method have been shown to be inaccurate. The growth projections for 2016 and 2018 are much lower than the 2014 based projections. Impacts of Covid and Brexit mean that population growth will be lower. Seeking to plan over a 30-year period is likely to result in miscalculation and potential over development.
- **Moulton Parish Council** - This shows a simple arithmetic progression and appears to propose straight line increased development for the next thirty years. This is a simplistic assumption based on no published evidence and is unreasonable and unobtainable.
- **Old Parish Council** – Both figures seem excessive and will lead to a loss of land to development. Concern that the area is seen as an easy target for London overspill, and that development is not related to the needs of the local population.
- **Old Stratford Parish Council** - This vision does not set out what the target population West Northamptonshire wishes to see by 2050. Without this we are asked to trust the Council that it has calculated the nationally required housing numbers in the correct way. As there is now one Council and given that Joint Core Strategy has been in existence for a number of years it is

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

somewhat disappointing that there is NO common standard method across the whole area.

- **Overstone Parish Council** - Does the analysis take account of the large volume of vacant offices, shops, and warehouses in Northamptonshire.
- **Tiffield Parish Council** – The HENA does not reflect the housing and economic needs of the area. Future population growth is overestimated. The use of 2014 projections is incorrect. The calculation for affordable housing assumes it is provided in addition to mainstream housing which is incorrect. Population growth is in the over 60s which means future employment sites will experience a shortage in labour supply. The plan creates employment opportunities at the expense of established businesses and does not reflect the impact of Brexit on labour supply.
- **Walgrave Parish Council** – There is scope for review in the light of changes to the way we work and use our home environments over the last 18 months.
- **Weedon Parish Council** – More quality housing needed in Daventry town and small quality developments in villages. Better jobs for highly qualified workers would boost the economy and reduce out commuting. Concern about the impact that government’s planning reforms may have and the opportunities for local people to comment on future changes.
- **Whittlebury Parish Council** - This vision does not set out what the target population West Northamptonshire wishes to see by 2050. Without this we are asked to trust the Council that it has calculated the nationally required housing numbers in the correct way. As there is now one Council and given that Joint Core Strategy has been in existence for a number of years it is somewhat disappointing that there is not a common standard method across the whole area. Office requirements are calculated differently for Daventry making comparison difficult.
- **Wootton Parish Council** – We need more information to be able to comment.
- **Yardley Gobion Parish Council** - The vision does not set out what the target population West Northants wishes to see by 2050. Now that there is one council and given that West Northants Joint Core Strategy has been in existence for many years, it is disappointing that there is not a common standard method across the whole area. The office requirements are calculated differently in Daventry area making comparison difficult.

The following Parish and Town Councils did not specify ‘yes or ‘no’:

- **Blakesley Parish Council** - The vision does not set out what the target population West Northants wishes to see by 2050/ Without that we are asked to trust the council and GL Hearn that it has calculated the nationally required housing numbers in the right way.
- **Brixworth Parish Council** - Is the Council satisfied that the evaluation process is transparent and objective?
- **Bugbrooke Parish Council** - Other than the HENA data Bugbrooke Parish Council do not have any other evidence. However, it does show that South Northants has a surplus of Industrial buildings, and the council would like that

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

considered when looking at warehousing that impacts the parish of Bugbrooke.

- **Cogenhoe and Whiston Parish Council** – development needs to respect village confines. Bungalows and affordable housing are needed.
- **Cold Higham Parish Council** – not qualified to answer.
- The stated shortfall in employment land is too low and the intention to undertake a study to establish the wider sub-regional needs for logistics is supported.
- **Evenley Parish Council** – do not have the expertise to comment.
- Potential changes to the standard method as outlined in the 2020 Planning White Paper may need to be considered.
- **Hackleton Parish Council** - How up to date is the assessment? Does it factor in the pandemic and Brexit? Will it be updated annually? Current allocated sites have progressed more slowly than anticipated which may indicate lower need than originally thought.
- **Potterspury Parish Council** – The lack of data available to the consultees makes it difficult to comment. Use of former council areas makes the figures confusing and difficult to compare. The statistics on affordable housing are not clear and are open to interpretation. Concern that developers could take advantage of this to reduce the level of affordable housing they provide.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

Question 8: Do you agree that there is potential for directing further development at Northampton, as the principal urban area, as of part the spatial strategy for West Northamptonshire?

- 412 respondents said 'Yes'.
- 202 respondents said 'No'.
- 458 respondents provided specific comments

Those who supported the potential for directing further development at Northampton raised the following key points: (These are grouped under headings for ease of reference)

Spatial ambitions & structure:

- Plan should be seeking city status for Northampton and additional planned growth at Northampton will support this achievement.
- Development should build more towards Daventry; you can't just keep lumping everything into Northampton Town area. Support the identification of Daventry as a sub-regional centre.
- A continuation of previous growth strategies whereby the majority of development is concentrated on the main settlements and development elsewhere is significantly constrained should not be taken forward in this plan. This long-standing approach has resulted in severe pressure on infrastructure in these areas which has not been enhanced to a level to support the increased population.
- The housing allocations surrounding Northampton make a vital contribution to providing the much-needed homes for the town's growing population and as a Principal Urban area for Northamptonshire.
- Option needs promote sustainable growth to meet the needs of the area, align growth and infrastructure and improve the environment and mitigate climate change.
- Several factors make an extension to Northampton viable. Rail, road links already established as is the public transport system. Brownfield sites and existing empty properties. Better job opportunities.
- Northampton represents in excess of 50% of the county's population, demand from growth must surely be better sited in and around that area to grow the town into a city rather than depleting the beautiful surrounding countryside. Northampton should be the main focus of development, as that is where it would be less encroaching on green space, wildlife, the environment, and the character of existing settlements and its surroundings.
- Whilst villages should be vibrant and well connected the plan should avoid extending urban areas in a way which may seriously impact upon or absorb local villages.
- Northampton already has 55% of the population of West Northamptonshire and has the best transport links to the rest of the country. It also would support the town desire to become a city, by accepting additional population growth to 300,000 people.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- Development here would be a good option with existing public transport, rail and road links, brownfield sites and empty town centre properties. This is where majority of WN population is (56%) and most of the jobs and where the majority of housing development should be.
- With a vision of Northampton being designated a city, it is unclear what radical changes will be made to enhance, improve, and put it on the map.
- The rural areas around Old Stratford have abandoned Northampton in favour of MK Housing and employment areas should be more equally distributed throughout Northampton [not all the house building to the north and all the industry is to the south].
- Supporting the M1 corridor as the most appropriate location to focus meeting employment needs.
- Development here would be a good option with existing public transport, rail and road links, brownfield sites and empty town centre properties. This is where majority of WN population is (56%) and most of the jobs and where the majority of housing development should be.
- New low-rise developments in the TC: Given the road and rail connections in Northampton, there is a strong case for providing low-rise developments there, rather than expanding even further into the surrounding countryside. Not everyone wants a house with a garden or to be reliant on a car.
- Enough land available on its outskirts that is not too close to villages.
- Northampton should be the focus of all major development. This will ensure people and jobs reduce journeys on the already congested road network.
- There is plenty of warehousing already in this area and there are newly built sites at J16 which further away and much less impacting on residential areas.
- There is no analysis of Northampton's current or potential capacity, and this should be a key element of this plan.
- To meet development needs, opportunities to reuse suitable previously developed land and vacant and under-used buildings within the existing urban area of Northampton should be prioritised.
- Brownfield sites should be considered as a priority- in order to achieve this Council should providing planning incentives to developers.
- There are insufficient sites identified to allow a meaningful choice between the various options. In effect, all will need to come into play providing Hobson's Choice for residents – particularly if our suspicion that the actual housing need exceeds that identified.
- It is important that growth at Northampton and any proposed major urban extensions are deliverable in a realistic timeframe. During the recent Daventry Part II Local Plan Examination, housing under delivery at the NRDA was discussed but due to the two-part nature of the development plan, it could not be addressed through this non-strategic part of the plan. This was a simple failure of the two-part plan process which was unable to react in a timely manner.
- A single development plan document would greatly help the authority to identify a balanced range of site sizes within the plan area. It is noted that if all the proposed Spatial Options 1a-d were included in the emerging plan, this would potentially deliver 11,100 dwellings which may or may not be enough to proportionally address the housing need requirement.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- Northampton is already the principal urban area, but its boundaries seem to be spreading.
- the Council will need to carefully consider the scale of housing development it directs to Northampton given the level of existing commitments.
- It is already a core economic centre for the area, so development would be building on that fact. But in addition, modern development would have the added benefit of bringing some older, less economically relevant areas up to the modern day, making it a more economically competitive town in the UK.
- In addition to development directed to the urban edge of Northampton, growth should be complimented by the appropriate apportionment of housing growth targets to all settlements across the hierarchy to ensure that complimentary growth is achieved alongside the strategic approach which has historically been taken.
- This spatial option should not be relied upon due to the previous under-supply of housing.
- We say that this Strategic Plan should not direct growth to Northampton whilst proposing growth at Long Buckby and Old Stratford, while there is no housing growth at all directed to Roade. [Chartwell Industries Ltd. land at Roade].
- If you develop westwards, you will be able to meet many of your strategic plan objectives.
- You need accurate information before you can put forward any plan.
- Why not have some communities that are separated from the town say a couple of miles of clear space away from the current boundaries.
- Any development should be concentrated on Northampton as it is the employment centre for West Northants.
- Many residents of Tiffield, Towcester, use Northampton Town Centre as an employment, shopping, and cultural centre.
- Developers for northern areas in Northampton [Option 1a, 1b & 1c] promote and confirm that development parcels can be developed separately or in cooperation with other land promoters and housebuilders.
- The Council needs to carefully consider the scale of development it proposes within and around Northampton, to make sure that development proposals are achievable within expected time frames
- More appropriate to expand Northampton, as it is already an urban area, than Potterspury being subsumed into MK.
- Agree that the preferred Spatial Strategy for West Northamptonshire is likely to comprise of a combination of the Council's potential Spatial Options because of disadvantages associated with pursuing any one potential Spatial Option in isolation. The preferred Spatial Strategy should ensure the availability of a sufficient supply of deliverable and developable land to deliver the housing requirement.
- Large warehousing should be next to motorways and not impact local communities. SME sites need easy access.
- The scale of the proposals up to 2050 hard to justify for any community and its infrastructure.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- Northampton should see more development and regeneration to help it become the thriving principal town in Northamptonshire and the outer villages should be preserved in their current state.

Town Centre regeneration:

- Northampton needs new life breathed into it, particularly in the town centre and the focus should be on developing the town, not the villages around it.
- To those living in South Northamptonshire, the most prosperous part of WNC, Northampton has become a very unattractive place to go, so the local wealth is being directed towards Milton Keynes. WNC need to recognise this.
- Northampton is looking pretty dilapidated and with previous works down by the council around the future of town centres, it feels like a significant opportunity.
- I would also recommend a good look at investing in dedicated office spaces in the town centre [as commuting might be an option]; Milton Keynes has more suitable office space at the moment [Alex Fenwick].
- Town centre and transport needs investment - people voting with their feet and shop anywhere but Northampton.
- Focus on regeneration of run-down areas.
- Northampton is no longer an attractive town to visit, so many shops closed too many betting shops. Drink & drug problems; feel safe and safety an issue in the town centre.
- Relying solely on a call for sites is not going to meet the urgent need for regeneration.
- Northampton is seeking City status and yet there is little in the plan to reflect that vision and little reference to regeneration of the town centre
- There are many disused buildings in Northampton which could be regenerated as housing and would really improve the town rather than taking the easy option of destroying Northamptonshire countryside.
- Pleased to see the proposal for redundant retail premises in the town centre being turned into residential. Care needs to be taken in town development to prevent it being hollowed out. There is nothing to go for except perhaps the theatre occasionally or hospital if needed.
- Northampton develops into a doughnut - a town with no centre but an ever-expanding outer ring
- There is economical scope in re-generating existing brownfield sites.
- More emphasis needs to be on the re-development of the Town Centre.
- There is a lot of brownfield and older industrial estates that could be re-vitalised and organised - a zonal approach to what goes where.
- More emphasis needs to be on the re-development of the Town Centre.
- There is a lot of brownfield and older industrial estates that could be re-vitalised and organised - a zonal approach to what goes where.
- Brackmills is orderly with good access and well supplied with bus routes and cycle lane.
- Make the town centre car free.
- The town centre of Northampton is not attractive or vibrant. Increased accommodation houses/flats in the centre should improve that.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- Abington Street is sorely in need of improvement. Why not encourage independent shops and market traders by offering initial low rents.
- Options to opportunities for urban regeneration, multi-use, reuse and repurposing of brownfield sites missing.
- Northampton could really benefit from a whole renewal and regeneration programme. It's a super town, but just needs to be carefully and sympathetically developed in order to return it to what was one a glorious place to live, work and play.
- Northampton town centre could be the jewel in our crown. Its historic centre, it's interesting heritage and its central position in the country could make it a go-to destination. Too many unattractive out of town retail parks draw essential shoppers away from the town which has become unsafe, unattractive, and unpleasant to visit.
- Completion of existing committed projects and regeneration of under/dis-used buildings and premises should be the focus first. We would want to see the historic Northampton 'Alive' projects completed first.

Infrastructure:

- The North West Relief road would need to be provided for PRIOR to any expansion and not as a way of offsetting the issues.
- Option 1 [Development in Northampton] is welcomed, as Northampton has a railway station and hospital and more infrastructure than Deanshanger.
- Active travel corridors would be needed to feed into the town centre.
- With public transport links and a population used to urban as opposed to rural areas, development in this area makes sense.
- There is little or no information concerning infrastructure provision around proposed new development areas. It does seem sensible to concentrate development around Northampton although the potential for development around the western boundary of Northampton is constrained by the boundary with North Northamptonshire, therefore narrowing choices
- Developments should not be driven by the need to fund improved connectivity per se (e.g., financing the North Orbital Road) but should be justified in the overall planning context (which ultimately may lead to the provision of improved connectivity but without connectivity being the initiating and driving force).
- The infrastructure is already there to cope with new developments.
- By 2030 there is a real possibility that the current car ownership model will have changed dramatically and simply building more roads is probably not the answer.
- Better public transport links are needed to connect villages to the town. Northampton is the county town but there is no bus / insufficient bus service to get to it.
- Clearly information needed on infrastructure within and around proposed new development areas: Need to ensure adequate recreation and green spaces area are included with cycle and walking pathways. Local amenity areas need to be included.
- The needs of those growing communities for schools, medical facilities, leisure, and childcare must be taken into consideration during the growth phase, not as a reluctant afterthought when the money has run out.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- Other Issues:
- There is no mention of support with housing for the homeless in Northampton or of the need for increased social housing.
- Clearly information needed on infrastructure within and around proposed new development areas: Need to ensure adequate recreation and green spaces area are included with cycle and walking pathways. Local amenity areas need to be included.
- Better development, yes. Development in current style - heavy, housing lacking ambition, no.
- With a net zero agenda, the council must also be transparent about the carbon cost of both infrastructure and developments. It must also future proof plans.
- Northampton needs massive investment to grow as a centre.
- Not enough information on Sustainable public transport, especially post-covid and post climate crisis.
- Don't build around Obelisk Rise and Boughton. The area cannot sustain more development.
- Affordable housing provision is required, to help tackle the issue of the affordability crisis.
- Create green routes around and through the town.
- There may be insufficient permitted capacity at Water Recycling Centres to accommodate additional foul flows. The relevant water company will therefore need to make permit or infrastructure alterations to accommodate additional flows via their sewerage infrastructure and water recycling centres. Without this there may be concerns regarding increased risk of flooding, pollution of the water.
- Any new developments will need to follow the Water Framework Directive (WFD) requirements to demonstrate no deterioration of river quality and aim to achieve Good WFD status.
- The cumulative impact of directing further development to Northampton on the integrity of the Upper Nene Valley Gravel Pits Special Protection Area will need to be carefully considered and demonstrated through a Habitat Regulations Assessment.
- Housing delivery is optimised where a wide mix of sites is provided, therefore strategic sites should be complimented by smaller non-strategic sites.
- The widest possible range of sites by both size and market location are required so that small, medium, and large housebuilding companies have access to suitable land to offer the widest possible range of products. A diversified portfolio of housing sites offers the widest possible range of products to households to access different types of dwellings to meet their housing needs. (HBF)
- Should developing existing parts of Northampton without encroaching on green space (e.g., old Bus Station area plan). Co-locating employment and housing in urban centres.
- Development in Northampton to ensure WNC's commitment to net zero can be achieved.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- The new rail freight terminals M1 South (Collingtree/Milton) and DIRFT would serve as better locations as there is already prime space for industry available. It is not fully utilised, so the felling of ancient trees and destruction of farmland and wildlife is pointless in this case in the Daventry Braunston area.
- Development in Northampton to ensure WNC's commitment to net zero can be achieved.
- Large housing developments in Northampton and lower cost of housing compared to the rural villages lend itself to a greater labour pool locally.
- Town housing should be kept in towns and not extended out into the open countryside, in particular enveloping surrounding settlements.
- The Government wants from Northampton to support the Oxford-Cambridge Arc - can the town/county ask the Government for levelling up funds to support the transformation that is needed.
- The new rail freight terminals M1 South (Collingtree/Milton) and DIRFT would serve as better locations as there is already prime space for industry available. It is not fully utilised, so the felling of ancient trees and destruction of farmland and wildlife is pointless in this case in the Daventry Braunston area.
- Development in Northampton to ensure WNC's commitment to net zero can be achieved.
- Large housing developments in Northampton and lower cost of housing compared to the rural villages lend itself to a greater labour pool locally.
- Town housing should be kept in towns and not extended out into the open countryside, in particular enveloping surrounding settlements.
- There's no need for further development, how many are second homes to people living in London. Local people, families, singles can't afford the cheapest of houses.
- The longer-term growth of Northampton was considered during the preparation of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS).

Those who objected to the potential for directing further development at Northampton raised the following key points:

Infrastructure & Transport:

- No development- not until the infrastructure is improved. Hospital needs to be moved and a new state of the art one built. Road infrastructure is inadequate.
- All recent connectivity has been through road building. There has been no improvement to rail connections via the Northampton loop.
- Infrastructure first, then a gradual and sensible development, which needs to be much more joined-up.
- The hospital site is not fit for purpose despite recent works to support further population in this area.

Spatial Focus:

- No, we don't agree at all, as Northampton has already seen massive waves of new developments and there is to the best of our knowledge no indication at all that this would have been a particularly successful strategy.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- The increasing traffic volumes constitute a huge problem (one of many) and we refer back to our previous comments that there needs to be infrastructure first, then development.
- Too much development in Northampton already!
- Building lots of new houses on the periphery of Northampton town will mean more traffic, facilities are out of town and not in the town centre. Carving up good agricultural land where people walk and exercise and spoiling beautiful old villages.
- Adding piece meal to Northampton is not good future planning.
- What about building a New Town? A new village/parish such as Mawsley for 10,000 in a well-located area. One that has a better infrastructure than the ones at Overstone.
- Any more expansion and we will literally be gridlocked
- Northampton suffers from all of the well-documented disadvantages that urban areas create, crime, pollution etc. It should be de-urbanised and large parts demolished and returned to nature.
- Although Northampton needs to attract new hi-tech employers to replace declining industries this does not necessarily mean that the boundaries of Northampton and its surround villages need to be enlarged taking over green spaces as your plan suggests.

Town Centre regeneration:

- Develop existing empty buildings before building on Greenfield, especially in Northampton.
- Need to be positive and proactive about regenerating areas in the existing town and converting existing buildings to housing. With innovative ideas this could create a vibrant community in the town - which is currently a very depressing place.

Parish/Town Council responses:

The following Parish and Town Councils supported the potential for directing further development at Northampton:

- **A5 Alliance of Parish Councils** - Development in Northampton would be a good option with existing public transport, rail and road links, brownfield sites and empty town centre properties. This is where the majority of WN population is (56%) and most of the jobs, and where the majority of housing development should be. There is a need for an Urban Capacity Study specifically for the Northampton & Northampton-related Development Area, and more new development should be placed here in ratio with existing population, rather than in any other area in WNC. Town centre living has been promoted and the A5 Alliance would welcome a vibrant centre to Northampton that would reinforce its stated aim to become a city. This strategic plan fails to provide the vision required for Northampton as it lacks a coherent sustainable public transport objective for Northampton. Question why the development

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

site around the Brackmills area was identified in the SHLAA (Site 36) but has been dropped and is not an option for consideration in this consultation. The draft Plan seems to be for new expansive residential areas that are developer-led through the SLAA and not for a town centre regeneration plan or a plan that examines the sustainability of existing centres. The spatial options do not appear to offer what the town centre of Northampton requires.

- **Blisworth Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Brixworth Parish Council** - More information needed on infrastructure within and around proposed new development areas. Need to ensure adequate recreation and green spaces area are included with cycle and walking pathways. Local amenity areas need to be included. Town centre developments could include retail and leisure outlets on ground level, with dwellings above. The marketplace is very important part of Northampton heritage, but is currently ill-used. Look to find imaginative ways to encourage visitors/tourism.
- **Bugbrooke Parish Council** - it is essential that Northampton is developed as a principal urban area. This vision is starting to be reflected with the University and waterside developments. However, the potential of Northampton town centre is not being met. There needs to be integration of Northampton town centre into West Northants and make sure all the surrounding villages have access to the town with bus services. Northampton town centre needs to move away from being a separate entity and unify the whole of West Northants.
- **Cogenhoe and Whiston Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Cosgrove Parish Council** - there are no planning objectives to support the City Bid of Northampton.
- **Culworth Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Daventry Town Council** (no comments)
- **Deanshanger Parish Council** - repeat the comments from The A5 Alliance of Parish Councils (see above).
- **Ecton Parish Council** - object to the identification of Northampton East as a proposed site as it is outside WNC and would be against the recently adopted Ecton Neighbourhood Plan. Disappointed that the other options that WNC are investigating are pretty much all on green field sites. We recognise that windfall sites have been mentioned however we would expect much more regeneration and more ambitions planning in brownfield and town centre sites. Town centre sites clearly are not as profitable as urban sprawl for the developer but would help to regenerate a tired town centre that is struggling to keep any retailers.
- **Evenley Parish Council** - Increase focus of plan on maximising reuse of previously developed and vacant land within existing urban area – this should precede growth on greenfield sites. Focus on high quality design and build to ensure sustainability and longevity of all new developments.
- **Flore Parish Council** - The roads between their location and the town already heavily congested; the major beneficiaries will be workers commuting in from the smaller urban areas within and outside the county, who will have a much easier journey, and the logistics companies who will often be

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

headquartered elsewhere and have very little or no commitment to the town. The tendency may then well be to gradually bring the town outwards, thereby compromising the identity of villages, eliminating large areas of productive agricultural land (likely to become in more demand as climate change puts pressure on production elsewhere), and negatively affecting attractive landscapes which provide important relief to urban dwellers. This is particularly true in the case of the proposal at Junction 16 where the proposal would encroach on a special landscape area.

- **Greens Norton Parish Council** - There is a need for an Urban Capacity Study specifically for the Northampton & Northampton-related Development Area, and more new development should be placed here in ratio with existing population, rather than in any other area in WNC. This strategic plan fails to provide the vision required for Northampton as it lacks a coherent sustainable public transport objective for Northampton. This strategy has very little development in the former NBC area and it is inadequate. If we desire Northampton to be a city, it needs to act, look, and feel like one. This plan does not help with this. The opportunity to tie these plans into one coherent vision backed with an action plan has been missed.
- **Harrington Parish Council** - The existing infrastructure and town centre could be improved, provided that any development was fully integrated with the town and not built as a separate, self-contained entity. The design and layout of the houses is also crucial to the question of whether or not the development is suitable.
- **Kislingbury Parish Council** – refers to comments submitted in response to questions 1 and 2.
- **Little Houghton Parish Council** - The potential for using brown-fill sites and under used town centre buildings for both housing and employment should be urgently assessed, together with an exploration of the identified constraints. Sites already identified within the JCS should be progressed before further land is allocated for development.
- **Long Buckby Parish Council** - Keeping economic activity & the associated workforce close together promotes both the business development & green objectives of the plan.
- **Moulton Parish Council** – Assuming this refers to the boundaries of the former borough. Plan needs to reflect government policy and prioritise brownfield development before considering greenfield.
- **Old Parish Council** - Seems logical that the focus of growth is on Northampton, with a view to improving retail and leisure options within the city, which have fallen behind other neighbouring cities.
- **Old Stratford Parish Council** - Brownfield sites should be explored first and foremost for development to avoid using sites on open countryside. Using greenfield sites without the proper infrastructure and planning does not make sense. Highways have got to provide roads to take these people east and west.
- **Potterspury Parish Council** - The urban centre of Northampton needs regeneration, and this would benefit the whole of West Northants. We note that town centre living is being promoted and we would welcome a vibrant

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

centre to Northampton that would reinforce its stated aim to become a city. We are concerned that the plans under consideration are for new expansive residential areas that are developer led through the SLAA and not for a town centre regeneration plan or a plan that examines the sustainability of existing centres. The spatial options do not appear to offer what the town centre of Northampton requires to make it a regional centre. This strategic plan crucially fails to provide the vision required for Northampton which is seeking city status. As an example of its inadequacy, there is the lack of a coherent sustainable public transport objective for Northampton. Without a sustainable transport system, the long-term growth of Northampton is at risk.

- **Silverstone Parish Council** - Town housing should be kept in towns and not extended out into the open countryside, in particular enveloping surrounding settlements.
- **Tiffield Parish Council** – Focus on greenfield sites misses the opportunity to support the town centre in accordance with objective 10.
- **Wappenham Parish Council** - Northampton is more sustainable with 56% of WNC population. Support the City Status bid. Needs to look and feel like a city. Increase the density and build up not out. Better road and rail connections. Better public transport needed to support more growth in Northampton.
- **Weedon Parish Council** - It is necessary if Northampton is not to become a completely failed town, but it should be better and higher quality development to raise the economic base. There is no reassurance that the current expansion of Northampton is of any benefit to surrounding communities, for example it has resulted in traffic chaos for peripheral villages and slower journeys for commuters and shoppers. The DDL has done much to improve access from our village to places where there are better opportunities and shops than Northampton. From the Weedon point of view, developments on the edge of Northampton are a disincentive to visit the town as the roads into Northampton have become more congested. Sixfields has become a 'no go' area, because of traffic and parking chaos which will inhibit the growth of better retail. People from the villages take their money elsewhere.
- **Whittlebury Parish Council** - Northampton needs to have a proper urban capacity study to ascertain what its capacity is or could be with new infrastructure. The existing West Northants Joint Core Strategy had 66% of the proposed development in the Northampton area, reflecting the population balance. This strategy has very little in the former NBC area and it is inadequate. We desire Northampton to be a city, it needs to act, look, and feel like one. This plan does nothing in that regard. The opportunity to use the plan to help with the regeneration of the town centre and direct, or redirect, growth and change the nature of areas within the plan is sadly lacking.
- In order or meet some of the objectives of sustainable transport, easy access to services and access to public transport, there will need to be a significant increase in these services in Northampton. This plan does not address this issue at all.
- **Wicken Parish Council** - Northampton already has 55% of the population in West Northamptonshire and holds the best transport connections in the

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

county. The town's desire to become a city would be enhanced by accepting additional population growth to bring it nearer to 300,000

- **Yardley Gobion Parish Council** - Northampton needs to have a proper urban capacity study to ascertain what its capacity is or could be with new infrastructure.
- The existing West Northants Joint Core Strategy had 66% of the proposed development in the Northampton area, reflecting the population balance. This strategy has very little in the former NBC area and it is inadequate.
- We desire Northampton to be a city, it needs to act, look, and feel like one. This plan does nothing in that regard.
- The opportunity to use the plan to help with the regeneration of the town centre and direct, or redirect, growth and change the nature of areas within the plan is sadly lacking.
- Development here would be a good option with existing public transport, rail and road links, brownfield sites and empty town centre properties. This is where the majority of WN population is (56%) and most of the jobs, and therefore where the majority of housing development should be.

The following Parish and Town Councils objected to the potential for directing further development at Northampton:

- **Church with Chapel Brampton Parish Council** - objects to Option 1 and emphasises the need to improve road infrastructure.
- **Holcot Parish Council** - If there are brownfield sites that avoid using sites in open countryside, then this would make sense. But using greenfield sites aligned to Northampton, with no apparent plans to change transport, employment, social and other aspects, make no sense.
- **Kingsthorpe Parish Council** - Only if investments in appropriate infrastructure are made. Routes into Northampton are already congested, and the town is already over developed.
- **Overstone Parish Council** - Brownfield sites should be explored first and foremost for development to avoid using sites on open countryside. Using greenfield sites without the proper infrastructure and planning does not make sense. Highways have got to provide roads to take these people east and west.
- **Walgrave Parish Council** - Careful consideration should be given to the use of any greenfield sites with the full options of using brownfields sites taken first. What plans are being placed to improve Northampton to ensure that it is a principle urban area that would support a growing community?

The following Parish and Town Councils did not specify 'yes' or 'no':

- **Crick Parish Council** - Northampton is the place that gives you most opportunity to deliver your objectives, but the options that you have identified are missing employment and housing in urban centres.
- **Blakesley Parish Council** - Northampton needs to have a proper urban capacity study. The opportunity to use the plan to help with the regeneration

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

of the town centre and direct, or redirect, growth and change the nature of areas within the plan is again sadly lacking. The opportunity to tie these plans into one coherent vision backed with an action plan has been missed.

- **Braunston Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Easton Neston Parish Meeting** (no comments)
- **Hackleton Parish Council** - support the development of Northampton as a sustainable centre for the County. The Strategic Plan must support the regeneration of the Town Centre and ensure that development brings prosperity to the County, not more dormitory estates which feed to Milton Keynes and London. All development must be underpinned by sustainable growth, sufficient quality infrastructure and improved life experiences for all residents.
- **Hinton-in-the-Hedges Parish Meeting** - Difficult to answer as Northampton Town has already burst its current town boundaries and is already eating into rural areas. The poor villages surrounding Northampton are going to be subsumed into being a suburb of Northampton. If someone thinks this is a valid idea, then by all means put everything into Northampton and leave the rest of the countryside alone.
- **Moulton Parish Council** - Assuming this option refers to the boundaries of the former Borough of Northampton, this document needs to reflect the change of government thinking that “brownfield” development is more sustainable and should always be considered a development priority before any consideration of “greenfield” development.
- **Milton Malsor Parish Council** - Existing JCS and Part 2 Plan has kept development within the confines of the M1. As there are now several proposals involving land to the west of the motorway, this elicits concern that Milton Malsor and adjacent villages will be absorbed into Northampton. Northampton needs to increase its housing supply not the neighbouring areas of South Northamptonshire. The proximity of Milton Malsor and neighbouring villages to Northampton raises the prospect of overspill development impinging on these areas due to potential difficulties in fulfilling Northampton’s requirement. With regard to the specific areas proposed for possible development, areas allocated under Part 2 of the Local Plan include four housing areas immediately adjacent to the M1 motorway. For reasons of air and noise pollution, these must be amongst the least suitable locations available.
- **Pitsford Parish Council** - Northampton has grown significantly over the last 20 years to a population of 225,000. By 2050 this and existing plans propose that Northampton expands by almost 40,000 more dwellings. We do not believe that the town has the capacity or infrastructure to support such expansion and that development should be based in areas with the ability to develop such facilities. We agree that Growth round Northampton is constrained by the limited capacity of existing highway networks and the need to protect the landscape fringe and character of adjoining villages. We object to development that impacts on these constraints.
- **Nether Heyford Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Welton Parish Council** (no comments)

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

Question 9: Do you agree that spatial option 1a – Northampton North – North of Buckton Fields - has the potential to deliver residential and or local employment development?

- 216 respondents said 'Yes'.
- 202 respondents said 'No'.
- 298 provided specific comments.

Those who supported the spatial option 1a – Northampton North – North of Buckton Fields, raised the following key points:

- The North West Relief road would need to be provided for PRIOR to any expansion and not as a way of offsetting the issues.
- Active travel corridors would be needed to feed into the town centre.
- a school would need to be provided to reduce the existing stresses on local primary/secondary schools.
- Green spaces at Buckton Fields have recently been given up to a large number of houses.
- Further lead to further traffic congestion and danger, noise, and pollution.
- The area to the north of Buckton Fields might be suitable for a much smaller amount of development, accessed from the Brampton Lane.
- Important that the Plan recognises the importance of the Brampton Valley, within which the development will be located.
- Existing new development in this area is already compromising the road network. The North Relief Road is not yet defined, approved, or funded (except with possible additional debt taken on by WNC).
- Major road building schemes clearly have a carbon impact, and it would be helpful for the plan to clarify whether an alternative spatial strategy may avoid or reduce the need for such a scheme?
- Consider where people of that area going to work.
- Electric / light trains would be the way forward [along A508?]
- This development suggests building on an area which is currently a quarry and the piece that is not a quarry is a historic park.
- Buckton Fields is still under construction and when completed there will be over a thousand houses, the development has already had a massive impact on the traffic.
- As long as the flood plain is not built on.
- Local employment seems unlikely.
- This site would help to meet Northampton's housing need and Northampton is the most sustainable location in West Northamptonshire.

Those who objected to spatial option 1a – Northampton North – North of Buckton Fields, raised the following key points:

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- This part of Northamptonshire is included in Natural England's National Character Area 95 (NCA 95): the Northamptonshire Uplands, an area characterised by gently rolling hills, important river valleys, 'small, nucleated villages' and 'wide long-distance views'.
- There would be a significant impact upon Boughton Registered park and garden and its buildings, together with the Scheduled monument of Boughton Bowl Barrow and there is the high potential for other archaeological assets.
- There is also the potential for impact upon Chapel Brampton Conservation Area and potentially Church Brampton. There are views across both conservation areas and park and garden. As such, this site should be discounted at this stage as it most likely to be found unsound by HE.
- The roads serving the area will simply become totally unusable. Until the infrastructure is in place you should not even be considering this as an option.
- Local development will contribute further to congestion of already congested A508.
- Additional congestion at junctions will cause further 'rat-running' in neighbouring villages.
- The local children walking every day to school will experience more pollution, noise, and danger.
- The land to the north is partially a quarry and would need to be filled to accommodate development. There is a significant change of levels from the Boughton Road down into the quarry site. Therefore, the deliverability and potentially the viability of the quantum of development is questionable.
- There has been no cycling infrastructure built in the town recently.
- Bus services will need great improvement.
- If you had a plan to open the Brampton valley way as a bus lane, or light railway then could work.
- Wonder how potential bus routes would run without causing even more traffic problems.
- The proposed site is not suitable for development to the degree included at this time.
- Moore woods sits to the west of the proposed site and remains as a valuable educational asset to Moulton college as well as the local community. The woods and the agricultural land to its east and north east suffers seasonally with water saturation, the whole of the area to the West saw some serious flooding earlier this year.
- Site being considered only if investments in appropriate infrastructure are made.
- The plan will completely change the fabric of the village - it will no longer feel like a village, but more like an extension of Northampton.
- Proposals would have a significant impact on police and fire operations from Mereway and Moulton fire stations and Campbell Square, Wootton Hall, and Weston Favell police stations.
- No more new housing on farmland.
- Areas have multiple landowners, difficult to develop comprehensively.
- The proposal lies immediately west of the nationally significant Boughton Hall Park (Registered Grade II), on the other side of the A508.
- Chapel Brampton is a Conservation Area, and it should not lose its individuality.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- We shouldn't be expanding the suburbs of Northampton when we could be building higher density within the existing envelope of the town.
- Careful consideration should be given to the development on greenfield sites and the build-up of residential infrastructure.
- The number of new dwellings required being estimated seems rather out of context when one considers net migration figures and the 34,000 dwellings already allocated in Northamptonshire.
- Why, given the amount of brownfield space within the obvious catchment area of the town centre of Northampton, is there a need to extend the already newly densely populated area of the Buckton Fields site.
- Traffic through the areas of Boughton, Chapel and Church Brampton and especially Kingsthorpe has grown to an unsustainable level over the last few years, and it is realistically very unlikely there will be anything done to alleviate this going forward
- Chapel Brampton is a Conservation Area and shouldn't lose its individuality. These are premium villages within the County and add to the County's desirable status as a place to live – the town centre offers nothing to attract new residents. We need to keep what we have remaining i.e., green fields and some premium areas!
- If we want all new development being sustainable. They must be sited in areas with good strong EXISTING transport links, not on the fringes of villages where new homes would necessitate the owners having at least one if not two cars to get about their daily business.
- The current draft plan should be withdrawn and instead you need to look at redeveloping areas close to the town centre with its existing transport links. No major retailers are ever going to consider the sites left behind by the demise of BHS, M&S and Debenhams.
- Provide some good affordable housing on these sites before we start carving up even more of The Rose of The Shires"!
- Buckton Fields has seen an incredibly large increase in traffic, that likely has been added to by the many new local housing estates, what adds to noise, pollution and road safety worries and considerations, especially for children.
- Concern about the heritage and integrity of the historically important villages of Chapel and Church Brampton being lost as local development will swamp and join the villages to Northampton. The villages will completely lose their character,

Other comments made by those who did not specify 'yes' or 'no':

- Employment? Depends on scale and nature of employment. If it generates high quality jobs that support quality homes and minimal commuting that could work. But all 3 elements need to be delivered as one.
- If more houses are needed, it is better to develop the area close to the M1 where there will be more possibilities of employment.
- Connection of Option 1a site with Northampton and Lamport Railway?
- Option 1a/b/c to 1d when put together form an arc around the whole of the top side of Northampton and should be considered as such. As individually they

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

may look like they are acceptable together they have a much more fundamental effect on the whole town.

- Existing new development in this area is already compromising the road network. The North Relief Road is not yet defined, approved, or funded (except with possible additional debt taken on by WNC).
- Kingsthorpe has significant traffic issues that will be worsened by this development and the A508 is barely adequate for current needs. Phase one of this development had been earmarked to provide a park and ride facility on site, which has now been taken to build more housing capacity. The council is about to invest heavily in a new multistorey at the station whereas an efficient bus service between a decent park and ride and the railway station may well have been far more cost effective and environmentally effective
- Enhance cycle parking at the rail station should also be considered (c.f. the Netherlands) as NCN6 links this site with the rail station.

Parish/Town Council responses:

The following Parish and Town Councils supported spatial option 1a:

- **Blakesley Parish Council** - Yes it has potential. The North West Relief road would need to be provided for PRIOR to any expansion and not as a way of offsetting the issues.
- **Blisworth Parish Council** - no comments.
- **Brixworth Parish Council** - This site mentions local employment development - the only mixed-use site. What is envisaged here? The northern relief road is not defined/approved which hampers decisions on scale of site. The A508 will be compromised, what plans for upgrade if any? Need local centres.
- **Cogenhoe and Whiston Parish Council** - All development must have the infrastructure in place first.
- **Culworth Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Greens Norton Parish Council** - Option has potential. The North West Relief road would need to be provided for PRIOR to any expansion and not as a way of offsetting the issues.
- **Long Buckby Parish Council** – refers to previous comments
- **Woodford-Cum-Membris Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Weedon Parish Council** - Option has potential. The North West Relief road would need to be provided for PRIOR to any expansion and not as a way of offsetting the issues.
- **Yardley Gobion Parish Council** (no comments)

The following Parish and Town Councils objected to spatial option 1a:

- **Boughton Parish Council** - Many of the 237 sites identified are unlikely to have the same historical significance as Boughton: It is mentioned in the

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

Domesday Book in 1086. The village is rich in archaeological remains, including Saxon and Roman sites. From 1351 to 1916, Boughton Fair was reputed to be the biggest in the country. The ruined church of St John the Baptist saw a significant investment of £200,000 by Heritage England in 2018/19 as it continues to be a local point of interest. Medium to high landscape sensitivity: This could result in delay and increased costs to both the planning and construction phases. Focus should be on sites that are less problematic, as there are numerous examples of developers reducing affordable homes or delaying the building of infrastructure because the site has simply become too costly for them. Whilst the consultation refers to protection of some green space, an increase of 1,500 dwellings to the village does not maintain its historical integrity and important landscape. Development at land on site 1a has significant traffic implications on all the surrounding area, including Boughton. If options 1a/b are progressed, then Boughton will provide over 11% of the total options for West Northamptonshire, which is grossly unfair to a historic village which has had typically a population of under 1,000 residents (not dwellings). A New Town option should be considered. This would release development pressure from the neighbouring villages. Alternative locations are suggested near the A45 link road and to the north of WNC near M1 J18.

- **Church and Chapel Brampton Parish Council** - The Parish Council do not believe that Northampton has the capacity or infrastructure to support an expansion by almost 40,000 more dwellings, and that development should be based in areas with the ability to develop such facilities. We agree that Growth round Northampton is constrained by the limited capacity of existing highway networks and the need to protect the landscape fringe and character of adjoining villages. The next stage draft WNSP must include strategic priorities that protects the important rural areas to the north of Northampton, specifically Church and Chapel Brampton. We object to development that impacts on these constraints, specifically:
We object to the possible urban extension 'North of Buckton Fields' that identifies an area able to deliver 2,000 dwellings. The recently completed Buckton Fields development has already had a significant impact on traffic movement in the area particularly on the A508 and A5199 resulting in the Bramptons becoming a rat run, and serious delays through Kingsthorpe not only at peak times but throughout the day. We are aware that this area is a valued haven for wildlife, flora, and fauna. The quarry area has been replanted with trees and set aside grassland is a huge benefit for the environment and the people living in the vicinity of these grasslands.
- **Great Oxendon Parish Council** – Object on the grounds of the impact this would have on the busy A508 which would increase the traffic problems already experienced in the village.
- **Maidwell with Draughton Parish Council** - None of these proposed residential options are acceptable, employment options strategically placed on the current road network might be more acceptable.
- **Nether Heyford Parish Council** – Refer to comments regarding subsuming distinct villages into urban conurbations. In addition, any proposed development in these areas would have to include significant infrastructure investment in roads, schools etc.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- **Overstone Parish Council** - None of these proposed residential options are acceptable. These proposed houses are to be built in areas with poor infrastructure, the worst of which is the inadequate road network. Alternative locations are suggested in Lilbourne, Yelvertoft and Flore Parishes which have better infrastructure and space to accommodate growth. With less highways infrastructure to pay for, money from these projects could be used to pay for an enhanced road network before more homes are built in other areas of West Northants.

The following Parish and Town Councils did not specify ‘yes’ or ‘no’:

- **Braunston Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Daventry Town Council** (no comments)
- **Easton Neston Parish Meeting** (no comments)
- **Harrington Parish Council** - there is potential for building on 1a/1b, but the numbers are too high, the density too ambitious. Building with employment opportunities on Option 1A would be welcome. Whilst there is a proposal for a new ring road that would not necessarily alleviate the significant delays into and out of North Northampton on the A508. Both sites would contribute to congestion on what is already a very busy road.
- **Hinton-in-the-Hedges Parish Meeting** -The fairness of further development on the local population is questionable.
- **Welton Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Whittlebury Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Wootton Parish Council** (no comments)

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

Question 10: Do you agree that spatial option 1b – Northampton North – East of Boughton - has the potential to deliver residential development?

- 204 respondents said 'Yes'.
- 221 respondents said 'No'.
- 259 respondents provided specific comments.

Those who supported the spatial option 1b – Northampton North – East of Boughton raised the following key points:

- The North West Relief road would need to be provided for PRIOR to any expansion and not as a way of offsetting the issues.
- Proximity to the industrial site [Moulton Park] is a strength.
- Preferred to infill development.
- Option 1b, is a logical extension to the outward expansion of Northampton.
- Any use of flood plains needs very careful consideration.
- Road congestion could also be a big issue and needs to be addressed.
- Developing the area should bring social, environmental, and economic benefits associated with the proposal.

Those who objected to spatial option 1b – Northampton North – East of Boughton raised the following key points:

- There is a likely objection in principle by Historic England. There is likely to be significant impact upon Boughton Hall Registered Park and Garden and Conservation Area. Old St John's church is a scheduled monument on the HAR register; Historic England grant aided vegetation clearance and repairs.
- This allocation would potentially result in the merging of the historic villages of Chapel Brampton, Boughton, and Pitsford. There is also the high potential for other archaeological assets. With this proposal the character and setting of the village of Boughton would be destroyed as a separate identity.
- Scale of development in North Northampton as proposed is excessive.
- The land east of Boughton should be considered as two potential strategic sites, north and south of Moulton Lane.
- This is an area of importance for wildlife, fauna, and recreational use by residents. Development would infringe residents' opportunities to access green space.
- New houses require new services and new facilities.
- The existing services (schools, doctors, dentists etc) and infrastructure (roads, technology etc) are already overstretched.
- Development will cause a lot of further congestion by opening on to Holly Lodge Drive. This is extremely congested during rush hour and there will be potential for accidents. There are children crossing Holly Lodge Rise to 2 schools
- Options for development partially dispersed to other settlements should be explored.
- Redevelop the town centre instead.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

Parish/Town Council responses:

The following Parish Councils supported spatial option 1b:

- **Blakesley Parish Council** - Yes – it has potential. The North West Relief road would need to be provided for PRIOR to any expansion and not as a way of offsetting the issues.
- **Blisworth Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Brixworth Parish Council** -The northern relief road is not defined/approved which hampers decisions on scale of site. The A508 will be compromised, what plans for upgrade if any? Need local centres.
- **Cogenhoe and Whiston Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Greens Norton Parish Council** – Yes it has potential. The North West Relief road would need to be provided for PRIOR to any expansion and not as a way of offsetting the issues.
- **Long Buckby Parish Council** – refers to previous comments
- **Woodford cum Membris Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Yardley Gobion Parish Council** - Yes it has potential. Access issues will need to be solved PRIOR to any expansion. These must be done initially and not piecemeal with developer contributions.

The following Parish and Town Councils object to spatial option 1b:

- **Boughton Parish Council** - If options 1a/b are progressed, then Boughton will provide over 11% of the total options for West Northamptonshire, which is grossly unfair to a historic village which has had typically a population of under 1,000 residents (not dwellings). Land south of Moulton Lane is proposed to be accessed via Holly Lodge Drive. Whilst the extent of the development represents a further unplanned expansion to the parish, the Council notes the proposed drawing submitted by the developer does maintain a green wedge. Land north of Moulton Lane is entirely unsuitable for housing and should be kept free from development. Land south of Moulton Lane would lead to significant, currently unplanned, expansion of the village but clearly has less impact so long as the green wedge is maintained. Focus should be on sites that are less problematic, as there are numerous examples of developers reducing affordable homes or delaying the building of infrastructure because the site has simply become too costly for them. This development risks coalescence between the rural and urban areas. The plan should protect the important rural areas to the north of Northampton.
- **Church with Chapel Brampton Parish Council:** The proposed 1,500 dwellings East of Boughton would also result in similar traffic issues and object to this development area. Regarding the impact on the character and setting of the village of Chapel Brampton, and to a lesser extend Church Brampton, a further 2000 dwellings North of Buckton Fields will inevitably have a significant impact until highway improvements are completed. The village character and setting will change as the urban extension will bring Northampton even closer resulting in the loss of the village individuality. This development risks coalescence between the rural and urban areas. This is

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

especially important as much of Chapel Brampton is a designated Conservation Area which provides protection for the setting and character not just the buildings. The tranquil nature of the area is threatened. The plan must be amended to prevent any further development until the Northern Orbital Road is completed. In addition, access to the M1 via Sandy Lane must be improved. All policy must specifically state that any urban extensions must be contained well within the line of the road. The impact of the road on adjacent villages particularly Chapel Brampton must be carefully considered at the design stage to mitigate the impact of even more noise and pollution.

- **Holcot Parish Council** - Greenfield location, no firm plans for infrastructural development aligned to its impact on existing communities.
- **Kingsthorpe Parish Council** - Only if investments in appropriate infrastructure are made. Routes into Northampton are already congested, and the town is already over-developed.
- **Nether Heyford Parish Council** - New developments subsuming distinct villages into urban conurbations. Any proposed development in these areas would have to include significant infrastructure investment in roads, schools etc.
- **Old Parish Council** - Weaknesses outweigh strengths, especially access issues and habitat loss, with relatively low additional housing capacity.
- **Overstone Parish Council** - The current roads are inadequate for the news builds already planned and existing residents. Lack of highways infrastructure and no funding to build the required infrastructure. Housing needs to be built where highways are already in place, towards the M1, A5, A45 and A14. This will provide funding for infrastructure to the North east of West Northants. This will also give Highways time to provide an adequate route east toward Wellingborough. Currently there is no obvious provision for this, and this must be a priority. The same applies for the West of West Northants and M1. Planners need to take a holistic approach which must include existing and planned residents when looking at development in any area.
- **Walgrave Parish Council** - Housing needs should be considered where highways are already in place, potentially towards the M1, A5, A45 and A14. Planners need to take a holistic approach which must include existing and planned residents when looking at development in any area.
- **Weedon Parish Council** - Concerns as expressed at Q8 and Q9 apply here

The following Parish and Town Councils did not specify 'yes' or 'no':

- **Braunston Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Easton Neston Parish Meeting:** (no comments)
- **Hinton-in-the-Hedges Parish Meeting** - The fairness of further development on the local population is questionable.
- **Welton Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Whittlebury Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Wootton Parish Council** (no comments)

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

Question 11: Do you agree that spatial option 1c – Northampton North – West of Moulton - has the potential to deliver residential development.

- 211 respondents said 'Yes'.
- 209 respondents said 'No'.
- 258 respondents provided specific comments.

Those who supported the spatial option 1c – Northampton North – West of Moulton raised the following key points:

- The North West Relief road would need to be provided for PRIOR to any expansion and not as a way of offsetting the issues.
- Sufficient appropriate infrastructure needs to be provided first.
- Proximity to the industrial site [Moulton Park] is a strength.
- Employment should be created nearby.
- In conclusion, the site at Holly Lodge reference ID 29 and as part of Spatial Option 1c is available, achievable, and deliverable.
- Any use of flood plains needs very careful consideration.
- The development of an additional sustainable urban extension west of Moulton would have the potential to deliver further residential and employment development.
- More clarification is needed in regard to the delivery of part of North Northampton Orbital Road.
- Opportunity to link to existing town infrastructure.
- Make sure that the right type of housing is built, as required by young community.

Those who objected to spatial option 1c – Northampton North – West of Moulton made the following key points:

- There is the potential for impact upon Old St John's Church (scheduled monument built on the site of an earlier Saxon church) as above and the Grade I church of St Peter and St Paul at Moulton and Moulton Conservation Area.
- This area is poorly served by Highways. The NNOR or an improved version should be built prior to any development. The A43 after Overstone Green is in North Northants so West Northants has no control over its improvement, which also needs addressing prior to any further development in this area.
- This area experiences frequent flooding because of the new houses built.
- Too over-developed and roads not good enough.
- The area is already hugely congested. 40 mins to drive to a 3-mile trip to town as it stands at peak times.
- There is no argument for improving the climate and protecting the environment by building on existing green field sites and agricultural fields.
- Northampton is already too big. New development should go westwards if you are to meet many of your strategic plan objectives.
- Any further development that joins Moulton to Northampton contravenes the objectives of the approved Neighbourhood Plan. Moulton/Overstone have already been joined and engulfed by the SUE.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- There are known education and health service capacity restraints. The existing services (schools, Drs, Dentists etc) and infrastructure (roads, technology etc) are already in a poor state and without significant investment will mean this area is not fit for further development.
- Moulton could lose its 'village' character.
- The local schools are already oversubscribed. There are no schools or community facilities for this type of expansion across the top of the town.
- All northern extensions pose a threat to existing communities, Kingsthorpe, Boughton and Moulton. Moulton is very close to having its distinctiveness obliterated. Overstone is having its distinctiveness removed.
- The plan identifies the green wedge being protected but this does not protect the north and north west edge of the village from physical and visual separation.
- Rat-running at minor local roads.
- Bus and active travel should be prioritised.
- We shouldn't be expanding the suburbs of Northampton when we could be building higher density within the existing envelope of the town.
- Loss of too much open countryside.
- The development of housing on the farmland west of Moulton is neither necessary nor desirable.
- Moulton has experienced a substantial amount of development. This has had a huge impact on the character of the Village of Moulton, which if further development happened it would reflect a huge urban sprawl as opposed to a village.
- Boughton Park is associated with Northamptonshire's largest collection of eighteenth-century follies and other structures and two listed buildings (Holly Lodge and The Spectacle) and is adjacent to the scheduled remains of another (ruins of Church of St John the Baptist).

Parish/Town Council responses:

The following Parish and Town Councils supported spatial option 1c:

- **Blisworth Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Brixworth Parish Council** - The northern relief road is not defined/approved which hampers decisions on scale of site. The A508 will be compromised, what plans for upgrade if any? Need local centres.
- **Cogenhoe and Whiston Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Culworth Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Greens Norton Parish Council** - Yes it has potential. The issues raised in the consultation about the effects on the village of Moulton need careful consideration
- **Long Buckby Parish Council** - same comments as under Q8-Q10.
- **Nether Heyford Parish Council:** (no comments)
- **Woodford-Cum-Membris Parish Council** (no comments)

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- **Yardley Gobion Parish Council** - Yes it has potential. The issues raised in the consultation about the effects on the village of Moulton need careful consideration.

The following Parish and Town Councils objected to spatial option 1c:

- **Holcot Parish Council** - Greenfield location, no firm plans for infrastructural development aligned to its impact on existing communities.
- **Kingsthorpe Parish Council** - Only if investments in appropriate infrastructure are made. Routes into Northampton are already congested, and the town is already over developed.
- **Old Parish Council** - same comments as before. Weaknesses outweigh strengths, especially access issues and habitat loss.
- **Overstone Parish Council** - This area is poorly served by Highways. The NNOR or an improved version should be built prior to any development. The A43 after Overstone Green is in North Northampton so West Northants has no control over its improvement, which also needs addressing prior to any further development in this area. A Bypass for Holcot, Overstone and Sywell to take increased traffic from the A43 going east towards Wellingborough is a must as Holcot Lane, Billing Lane and Sywell Road are not built to contend with this traffic.
- **Walgrave Parish Council** - Careful consideration should be given to the build-up of residential infrastructure without due consideration to the impact of village environments and heritage constraints. A Bypass for Holcot, Overstone and Sywell to take increased traffic from the A43 going east towards Wellingborough is a must as Holcot Lane, Billing Lane and Sywell Rd., and local village roads are not built to take this traffic.
- **Weedon Parish Council** - See previous two answers. The Orbital Road on which much of these proposals depend on, feels more like an orbital nightmare due to the impact it is having on surrounding village communities and the rural setting.

The following Parish and Town Councils did not specify 'yes' or 'no':

- **Blakesley Parish Council** -Yes - it has potential. The issues raised in the consultation about the effects on the village of Moulton need careful consideration.
- **Braunston Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Hinton-in-the-Hedges Parish Meeting** - The fairness of further development on the local population is questionable.
- **Kislingbury Parish Council** - as in Q9 and Q10.
- **Moulton Parish Council** - The question should be 'does such development deliver benefit and enhance the local community?' to which the reply is absolutely not.
- **Welton Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Whittlebury Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Wootton Parish Council:** (no comments)

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

Question 12: Do you agree that spatial option 1d – Northampton North – North of Moulton - has the potential to deliver residential development?

- 211 respondents said 'Yes'.
- 207 respondents said 'No'.
- 251 respondents provided specific comments

Those who supported the spatial option 1d – Northampton North – North of Moulton raised the following key points:

- The North West Relief road would need to be provided for PRIOR to any expansion and not as a way of offsetting the issues.
- Proximity to the industrial site [Moulton Park] is a strength.
- This area could support c 2500 dwellings with additional employment provided nearby could create a sustainable community especially with its closeness to Northampton.
- Not ideal but preferable to option 1c as less impact on village and adjacent to other recent developments east of the A43.
- A43 needs duelling through to Kettering though - if not, then this option (or any other) isn't viable.
- Climate emergency needs to be addressed.
- The sites should get aligned with a clean and green vision of planning and for alternative transport to the private car.
- Such a scheme would be supported as it would also have the additional benefit of providing further services, facilities, and employment opportunities for the existing and future residents of existing settlements such as Moulton and Boughton.
- This side of Moulton has the road improvement already in place to support a large development.
- Broadly agree with development around the outskirts of Northampton subject to the rural and heritage constraints outlined in the plan. However, scale is too big.
- Option will support the delivery of the Northern Orbital.
- The site is exceptionally hard to integrate into the public transport system.
- The site is also reliant on the delivery, in whole, of the Northern Orbital Road, and with it, a very large quantum of associate development. This raises concerns about both appropriateness, and also deliverability.
- The A43 which has recently been upgraded to a dual carriageway, this severs this site from the North of Northampton SUE to the east. This makes integration of the site with the committed SUE far from straightforward. While in broad land use terms it looks as if it acts as some kind of consolidation of what is already an exceptionally lobate form of development, we consider this hypothesised advantage is greatly over-played.
- The development is west of the A43 cannot obviously take advantage of any bus service serving land to the east unless it would come forward as an extension of some kind of local service serving the SUE. While technically possible, the routing of such a service would take it through the SUE and then in all probability Moulton Village, which would make the relevance and attractiveness of the

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

service extremely limited. When set against the immediate availability of the A43 at the site entrance which then feeds into the wider primary and national road network, it is hard to see why any resident would use the bus if they had a car available for use.

- Should the site accommodate 1600 dwellings – which may be optimistic – it could operate as a functional neighbourhood with basic local services. However, it is relatively remote from employment within walking and cycling distance. Round Spinney is the nearest and the form of this development “turns its back” to the north so great efforts and care will be needed to address this issue.
- This site would help to meet housing need in West Northamptonshire however residents of Moulton should be able to access the affordable housing as well as Northampton residents despite this being an NRDA site.
- This site should be used by specialist builders, which consider affordability and specialist needs of young families.
- Boughton is a heritage location.
- More needs to be done to support the existing housing before any new housing is built.

Those who supported the spatial option 1d – Northampton North – North of Moulton raised the following key points:

- Connection to employment opportunities on old established industrial estates is questionable.
- The proposed scale of development would be over-development.
- Leave as green space.
- Flood risk.
- Keep village Identity.
- Moulton is already over-developed.
- Additional housing would bring increased traffic and safety issues to the Grove and to the village centre.
- Moulton village is designated as a conservation area and the site of Hog Hole spinney sited off ‘The Grove’, is an area for wildlife habitat and of historic significance having been mentioned in the Domesday Book.
- Northampton North has high pressure gas pipelines.
- Impacts from new houses: traffic, noise and air pollution, sewerage needs to be dealt with and also more water usage.
- Will cause coalescence between Moulton and Overstone Leys.
- This land is agricultural. It would link Boughton and Moulton village to Northampton.
- the increase in traffic in an already congested Kingsthorpe would be great especially given that the routes to employment to the east and south have to run through pinch points in the town or country lane, which leads to 'rat runs'.
- Moulton has already been expanded beyond all recognition and should not be further expanded.
- Too far from Cambridge and Oxford and no roads or trains to take residents to either place.
- More development would destroy walking routes, green spaces, and fields.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- There are not enough infrastructure/services in Boughton to support further housing.
- This is a bold intrusion into open countryside.
- Development would not be sustainable in that it is too far from Northampton town centre but is not large enough (1,600 dwellings) to support a local infrastructure (shops, medical centre etc).
- There is already ample over development in the Overstone Leys area. Developing this area between Holcot and Moulton would result in appalling loss of habitat and green space.

Parish/Town Council responses:

The following Parish Councils supported spatial option 1d:

- **Blisworth Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Brixworth Parish Council** - The northern relief road is not defined/approved which hampers decisions on scale of site. The A508 will be compromised, what plans for upgrade if any? Need local centres.
- **Cogenhoe and Whiston Parish** - (no comments)
- **Culworth Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Greens Norton Parish Council** - Yes it has potential. The issues raised in the consultation about the effects on the village of Moulton need careful consideration.
- **Long Buckby Parish Council** - same comments as under Q8-Q11.
- **Nether Heyford Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Old Parish Council** - Not ideal, but of the North of Northampton options, this has the best access and is adjacent to current house building (giving better value for improved infrastructure).
- **Woodford-Cum-Membris Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Yardley Gobion Parish Council** - Yes it has potential. The issues raised in the consultation about the effects on the village of Moulton need careful consideration along with access issues.

The following Parish and Town Councils objected to spatial option 1d:

- **Holcot Parish Council** - Greenfield location, no firm plans for infrastructural development aligned to its impact on existing communities.
- **Kingsthorpe Parish Council** - Only if investments in appropriate infrastructure are made. Routes into Northampton are already congested, and the town is already over developed.
- **Overstone Parish Council** - The A43 Moulton Bypass does not solve issues for existing residents. Planners need to consider how these developments will affect/already affecting existing residents. NCC Highways need to tackle the traffic going from the A43 through to Wellingborough's industrial parks to enable the urbanisation of the North East of West Northants along the border between North Northamptonshire and West Northamptonshire. Current

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

developments, also in Wellingborough force both, industrial traffic along Holcot Lane through Sywell, together with motorists through both Overstone and Sywell. A bypass for Overstone and Sywell similar to the A45 link road would be fantastic. Green field sites have already been built on in North East, West Northants. Other sites throughout West Northants should be looked at to save some of the green areas in eastern West Northants.

- **Walgrave Parish Council** - Careful consideration should be given to the build-up of residential infrastructure without due consideration to the impact of village environments and heritage constraints. A Bypass for Holcot, Overstone and Sywell to take increased traffic from the A43 going east towards Wellingborough is a must as Holcot Lane, Billing Lane and Sywell Rd., and local village roads are not built to take this traffic.
- **Weedon Parish Council** - Moulton has already had substantial development. It has important conservation areas; very great care is needed to produce a sympathetic solution. The Orbital road connection to A43 and to Moulton Park needs to be very carefully handled as there is great danger of rat runs through narrow and twisting village streets.

The following Parish and Town Councils did not specify ‘yes’ or ‘no’:

- **Blakesley Parish Council** - Yes it has potential. The issues raised in the consultation about the effects on the village of Moulton need careful consideration along with access issues.
- **Braunston Parish Council** - (no comments)
- **Hinton-in-the-Hedges Parish Meeting** - The fairness of further development on the local population is questionable.
- **Kislingbury Parish Council** - as in Q9 and Q10.
- **Moulton Parish Council** – The question should be ‘does development deliver benefit and enhance the local community to which the reply is absolutely not.
- **Welton Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Whittlebury Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Wootton Parish Council** (no comments)

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

Question 13: Do you agree that spatial option 1e – Northampton South-East - has the potential to deliver residential development?

- 206 respondents said 'Yes'.
- 221 respondents said 'No'.
- 264 respondents provided specific answers, however 10 of those said that they had no specific comments.

Those who supported the spatial option 1e – Northampton South-East raise the following key points:

- Develop at brown field sites first.
- Good transport links and the space to be able to build new areas without the concern of further traffic problems or overcrowding.
- Could work and support circa 4500 dwellings. Nearby employment area of Grange Park would create a sustainable community with appropriate infrastructure and amenities provided by developer contributions.
- Support only partially, the land above Wootton Road. The road links below Wootton Rd (M1 side) would be pressurised by a large-scale development.
- The sites should get aligned with a clean and green vision of planning and for alternative transport to the private car.
- Very near a lot of existing employment.
- Development of the area would provide opportunity to provide a landscape corridor connecting landscape assets. These landscape corridors provide conduits for local wildlife and safe and attractive routes for pedestrians and cyclists. Significant additional tree planting can be incorporated throughout the site which will also contribute towards biodiversity enhancement.
- The area provides easy links to the motorway and dual carriageways allowing residents to travel into Northampton and to surrounding towns.
- Current data suggests that while there is Dry Water Flow (DWF) capacity at the works to accommodate the flows for some of these options, the capacity is limited, and the works may not have the DWF capacity to accept flows from all of these sites.
- This site would help to meet Northampton's housing need and Northampton is the most sustainable location in West Northamptonshire.
- This site has the potential to add to the pressure on the M1 J15 and the A508 as many of the residents may work in Milton Keynes. That will then impact on the A508 / A5 Roundabout at Old Stratford / Deanshanger which is now at capacity.
- This area is within flood zones 2 and 3 and therefore would require careful management. Subject to a carefully designed interface with the open countryside these areas may be acceptable.
- A larger block of land within this broad option north of Quinton Road and east of the Caroline Chisholm campus would be potentially well located with regard to providing further provision for education.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- The capacity of the site might be significantly larger than that site that formed part of the application but looks most unlikely to be of a size (perhaps 1500-1600 dwellings) that would justify an entirely new bus route.
- We support the allocation of Spatial Option of 1e but feel that the plan has failed to consider the potential of this site, with a wider allocation providing an improved infrastructure to Northampton instead of pepper potting of development.
- Should options 1e and 1f go ahead, Quinton, Preston Deanery and Courteenhall would no longer be villages
- The villages already suffer from huge amounts of traffic and transport infrastructure has not been identified to cope with increased traffic volumes on existing roads which can barely cope now. Public transport is insufficient.

Those who objected to spatial option 1e – Northampton South-East raised the following key points:

- Weakness outweighs strengths, lack of transport infrastructure in that part of the town area already - A45 is a traffic jam most mornings and evenings.
- Washbrook Lane will not take the amount of increased traffic. It doesn't now with all the lorries coming out of the compound onto the lane.
- Insufficient road network east of Northampton.
- Objections to a scheme to develop 900 homes on three fields on the edge of Quinton.
- The proposed scale of development would be over-development.
- Concern from additional traffic coming up from warehousing going up at J15.
- Concerns over flood risk, and that new development would impact on run off and flood defence options.
- Existing impacts from Amazon warehouse parking and loading docks.
- People living in the proposed new estates, especially the elderly, will have difficulty in accessing shops and medical facilities in Grange Park and Wootton.
- Green Space framework in this area will be impacted on. Impact on the environment needs to be addressed.
- People who work in the existing warehouses and those who will work in the new rail freight interchange do not and probably cannot afford, to live in Grange Park.
- Local surrounding residents should have a say (vote) on this matter.
- This area is essential to flood run off and urban development is likely to be impacted by this and impact flood relief in this area.
- While these sites have more room for expansion and better infrastructure, the development will still impact detrimentally on the rest of the town and county.
- Development of it would lead to the quadrupling of traffic on the narrow B and C roads north and south through Quinton village.
- The area comprises mainly land where existing old woodland exists which supports diverse wildlife.
- The area serves communities in proximity of Quinton and exposed to noise pollution from the M1. The Foxfields area of Grange Park is a valued community asset. The remaining land falls mainly within a flood zone and acts as a flood plain for the area. Any reduction to the natural flood plain serving Wootton Brook

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

could have serious implications on the frequency of serious food events to historic rural communities such as Preston Deanery.

- Negative impacts of development would include: the tiny Wootton Brook would bear the brunt of excess run-off water from 2000 homes built above it, which a 'soakaway' could not possibly mitigate, and the accompanying pressure on the sewerage system in this area.
- Public transport would have to double or triple to support such an increase in population, merely aggravating the traffic congestion on local roads, destroying perfectly serviceable green fields, and obliterating the 'healthy gap' between Grange Park and Quinton.
- No more housing in hope the infrastructure will keep taking it. The St Georges Fields development, and Landimore Park development, has shown that Newport Pagnell Road is at capacity.
- Impact on country park.
- Part of the planned area includes fields close to Quinton and south of Grange Park that were rejected back in 2020.
- Land East of Grange Park and South of Quinton, South of Quinton Road, land East of Grange Park has already been promoted and failed at appeal. This is because it relates poorly to the existing urban form and fabric including sustainable transport infrastructure and services. The existing established woodland blocks reinforce its visual and physical isolation.

Parish/Town Council responses:

The following Parish and Town Councils supported spatial option 1e:

- **Blisworth Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Brixworth Parish Council** - Becoming a crowded area near Grange Park. Potential access not yet clear. Flood risk mitigation should not simply move the risk elsewhere.
- **Cogenhoe and Whiston Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Culworth Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Long Buckby Parish Council** See previous responses i.e., same comments as under Q8-Q12.
- **Nether Heyford Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Old Parish Council** - Has some issues, as other sites do, but has the advantage of bigger capacity and fewer weaknesses.
- **Woodford-Cum-Membris Parish Council** (no comments)

The following Parish and Town Councils object to spatial option 1e:

- **A5 Alliance of Parish Councils** - As an area adjacent to existing large residential developments that currently feed into the A45, this proposed development will create congestion that will extend into Northampton and Milton Keynes. It will add to the already congested A508 that is used by

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

commuters going to and from Northampton and Milton Keynes. Additional traffic will place extra burden on the village of Grafton Regis where many historic buildings are affected negatively by the road vibrations. This route that will become even more busy when the Northampton Gateway is fully functioning.

- **Grange Park Parish Council** - Option 1e and also 1f should not be considered for development, but in case they are please consider: The planning inspectorate has already dismissed an application to build 330 houses on this land for serious and substantial planning reasons. The restructure of junction 15 is nearing completion. The new design is supposed to meet a 30% increase in demand on the junction brought about by rail central. We doubt that the extra traffic from the proposed three thousand new dwellings were factored into the capacity calculations. There is a considerable flood risk to mitigate in part of the proposed area. With climate change rightly on everyone's agenda at present it will be unwise to plan over a flood plain particularly around Caroline Chisholm School and down towards to junction of Wooldale and Quinton Roads. The country lanes around Wootton, Quinton and Grange Park will have to be torn up and rebuilt. Primary school, Secondary school and health care infrastructure in the area have already reached their capacity with no proposed infrastructure extension planned. Making the most of previously developed land is a government priority and it will help protect our cherished countryside and green spaces.
- **Greens Norton Parish Council** -The SHLAA has other more comprehensive ideas especially for 15,000 dwellings that are dismissed as undevelopable. These would interact with that scheme and should be given consideration at this point. The Northampton centric, ideas where the developments are pushed out to the former SNC and DDC areas are very evident with these proposals. Some of these sites were lost at appeal; they are close to areas where flooding has occurred in the recent past. Any development would need to ensure that flooding was not exacerbated. These sites would not link easily with the existing settlements at Grange Park and will have issues with access.
- **Hardingstone Parish Council** - Newport Pagnell Rd. Is a minor B Road not designed for large volumes of traffic and is already at full capacity at peak times now, even before those developments are complete. There is no way the road could be modified to mitigate this. Many of the proposed properties in this suggested area would need to use this road to get to the major road network. 3000 further houses would bring about a state of complete gridlock. Each house is likely to have at least two cars bringing a potential 6000 cars. The other two roads-Wootton and Quinton- are equally unsuited to traffic generated by an extra 3000 houses, as are the Queen Eleanor roundabout and the A45. The Joint Core Strategy noted that the A45 Wootton Junction can't take any more. This again is before the 1800 houses are built of already approved development. Access to M1 J15 is likely to be hampered by traffic gridlock from housing and industrial development and the Northampton Gateway, including fleets of HGVs. Will consultations take place with the police and emergency services, education authorities, and GP surgeries to find out if they could provide services and facilities? Northampton General Hospital has been at full capacity, frequently at crisis point, even before the pandemic. A vast influx of new residents without enlarged facilities is a recipe for disaster.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- **Kingsthorpe Parish Council** - Only if investments in appropriate infrastructure are made. Routes into Northampton are already congested, and the town is already over developed.
- **Potterspury Parish Council** - As an area adjacent to existing large residential developments that currently feeds into the A45, this proposed development will create congestion that will extend into Northampton and Milton Keynes. It will add to the already congested A508 that is used by commuters going to and from Northampton and Milton Keynes. This route that will become even more busy when the Northampton Gateway is fully functioning.
- **Wootton Parish Council** - Wootton Parish is hemmed in not only by both Grange Park and the Hardingstone expansion, but also by the A45 to the north and the M1 to the west. This contributes to considerable congestion and pollution, which will only be made much worse by the opening in 2023 of the Gateway Freight Terminal at J15. This development, a Nationally Important Infrastructure Project and therefore outside of local or regional planning control, will deliver up to 14,000 HGV movements per day. The result of residential development here would be to completely encircle the Parish, reduce or eliminate a hugely important green buffer of diverse rural wildlife and landscape, and present the Parish with overwhelming traffic congestion and pollution for the future. We fail to see how this development would present 'opportunities to deliver net biodiversity gain and through an appropriate landscape framework present a more sensitive edge to the countryside in this part of Northampton.' This development would deplete the natural environment. Wootton Parish' immediate area is seeing so much development that we are collapsing under the vehicle congestion, air and noise pollution and development. It makes no sense at all to build in flood zones. We are already experiencing flooding issues which extend from J15a, through the proposed development area and up to Horton. Additional construction will lead to additional run off and increased flooding.
- **Yardley Gobion Parish Council:** -The SHLAA has other more comprehensive ideas especially for 15,000 dwellings that are dismissed as undevelopable. These would interact with that scheme and should be given consideration at this point. The Northampton centric, ideas where the developments are pushed out to the former SNC and DDC areas are very evident with these proposals. Some of these sites were lost at appeal; they are close to areas where flooding has occurred in the recent past. Any development would need to ensure that flooding was not exacerbated. These sites would not link easily with the existing settlements at Grange Park and will have issues with access. This site has the potential to add to the pressure on the M1 J15 and the A508 as many of the residents may work in Milton Keynes. That will then impact on the A508 / A5 Roundabout at Old Stratford / Deanshanger which is now at capacity. Additional traffic will place extra burden on the village of Grafton Regis where many historic buildings are affected negatively by the road vibrations.

The following Parish and Town Councils did not specify 'yes' or 'no':

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- **Blakesley Parish Council** - The SHLAA has other more comprehensive ideas especially for 15,000 dwellings that are dismissed as undevelopable. These would interact with that scheme and should be given consideration at this point. The Northampton centric, ideas where the developments are pushed out to the former SNC and DDC areas are very evident with these proposals. Some of these sites were lost at appeal; they are close to areas where flooding has occurred in the recent past. Any development would need to ensure that flooding was not exacerbated. These sites would not link easily with the existing settlements at Grange Park and will have issues with access.
- **Braunston Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Hackleton Parish Council** - We do not understand how this option would “present opportunities to deliver net biodiversity gain or present a more sensitive edge to the countryside”. The area is predominantly agricultural land with hedges which provide wildlife habitats and wildlife corridors. Some of the agricultural land in question is even planted with wild bird seed mix where previous flooding incidents have occurred. We refer you to the Hackleton Neighbourhood Plan Appendix Map 8 which shows the sub-regional wildlife corridors which interconnect two SSSI’s/SSI’s as well as the Upper Nene Valley Special Protection Area. The Wooldale Road and B526 are bottlenecks and the A45 queues badly. The slip road from the A45 to Wootton notoriously queues back onto the A45 at peak times which is hugely dangerous. We also understand that it breaches air quality guidelines. Flooding from the Wootton Brook is also a big concern with the culvert under the A45 not fit for purpose. We refer you to the Hackleton Neighbourhood Plan Appendix Map 7 which shows the current flood risk which extends from junction 15a all of the way through the proposed development area to Horton. A new Emergency Planning Team has been set up by West Northants Council to look at improving community and property resilience to flooding in the Wootton Brook catchment.
- **Hinton-in-the-Hedges Parish Meeting** - The fairness of further development on the local population is questionable.
- **Kislingbury Parish Council** – refer to responses submitted to Q1 and 2.
- **Little Houghton Parish Council** - LHPC has insufficient local knowledge to comment specifically on identified sites. LHPC finds it difficult to agree with further expansion of the towns into rural areas without understanding the impact on heritage assets, conservation areas and existing infrastructure - in particular the highways network. Building on the flood plain MUST be avoided. The potential for using brown-fill sites and under-used town centre buildings for both housing and employment should be urgently assessed, together with identified constraints. Sites already identified within the JCS should be progressed before further land is allocated for development.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- **Overstone Parish Council** - Possibly. This area is not as well served with transport links as the A45 Link road area or Lilbourn and Yelvertoft. The area is near to Northampton Town and therefore facilities and decent transport links are more readily available.
- **Quinton Parish Council** – Question how this can be an appropriate option in the light of the Manor Oak application which was dismissed by a planning inspector in 2020. We are equally concerned that it proposes to join the Manor Oak Homes plan with one put forward in 2017 by Barratt Homes for 1200 homes wrapped around Caroline Chisholm School - a plan which was shelved by SNC. The number of vehicles on site 1e would double, or even treble, the traffic on the narrow B and C roads north and south through Quinton village. This increase in traffic would put huge strain on the very narrow, windy, and badly kept road from Quinton to the A508 (Wash brook Lane), which was declared by the Planning Inspector not to be 'of the standard suitable to serve the level of development proposed'. Caroline Chisholm School is already oversubscribed, as are nearby primary schools, so 1,500 or more children on site 1e would have to be driven to schools elsewhere, or to newly built schools, thus creating yet more traffic on our roads, as well as more risk for children walking to and from existing local schools. Considerable financial investment in new GP surgeries would be required, because the local GP surgeries do not have space for another 5,000 people from 1e. The tiny Wootton Brook would bear the brunt of excess run-off water from 2,000 homes built above it, which a 'soakaway' could not possibly mitigate. The sewerage system in this area could not accommodate this increase in population. Considerable financial investment in public transport would be required, but that would merely aggravate the local traffic congestion. Destroying perfectly serviceable green fields and obliterating the 'healthy gap' between Grange Park and Quinton would hardly 'present a more sensitive edge to the countryside in this part of Northampton' (Plan p.16). The proposal has been put forward not as the result of a serious consideration of whether this development is actually needed, or is in the right place, or is sustainable in the long run, but because the land is available. Spatial Option 1e threatens the very existence of Quinton as a rural community and is in no way suitable for inclusion in WNC's Strategic Plan.
- **Walgrave Parish Council** – Possibly. The area is near to Northampton town and therefore facilities and transport links are more readily available.
- **Weedon Parish Council** - We can see some sense in these proposals because of connectivity, existing and proposed, to the M1 corridor provided but provided there is sufficient protection given to assets like Courtnall estate. Also, that traffic is directed so that rat runs into local communities are prevented when new development is planned and not after it is experienced to be a problem.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

Question 14: Do you agree that spatial option 1f - South of M1 Junction 15 - has the potential to deliver employment development?

- 256 respondents said “yes”
- 185 respondents said “no”
- 291 respondents provided specific comments

Those who supported spatial option 1f – South of M1 Junction 15 raised the following key points:

- The option would provide a sensible extension that utilises existing connecting infrastructure effectively.
- The location of spatial option 1f is located close to the existing road network, especially the M1.
- The location of spatial option 1f has good logistic connections as well as good routes into Northampton
- Development of good quality employment opportunities next to the M1 has some merit as the location next to the motorway would not suit housing.
- Considering neighbouring development, this proposal is acceptable.
- Provision of employment sites would provide the people of Northampton with jobs.
- It is understood that employment use is already on part of this site and it would be sensible and practical to continue to develop what is brownfield land.
- One respondent considered that this location would be ideal for enhancing Northampton’s existing reputation as a prime logistics centre, with a view to supporting sustainable logistics via a new rail freight interchange. However, there must be adequate landscaping and flood alleviation provisions.
- In principle support development at this location but would like to see further details on the land take and type of employment.
- There is lots of potential for businesses in this area as it is a central location within the country.
- No objection to strategic employment growth strategy of allocating sustainable sites on the edge of settlements. However, consideration of the wider Oxford to Cambridge Arc is needed and the context within it, and with neighbouring authorities.
- Whilst strategic employment sites are needed, a greater acknowledgement of the contribution that smaller employment sites make to the economy is needed.
- Issues such as any impact on Courtnall could be overcome through the use of tree screening and bunding.
- The site could be used for some B Class employment which compliments the strategic rail freight interchange, but any proposals would need to be engineered to align with HGV procedures for Northampton Gateway to ensure HGV traffic cannot travel south on the A508.
- The infrastructure changes have already started in this location.
- Other development (employment and residential) is located nearby which is a benefit.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- The land here has the potential to deliver employment opportunities but also important to allow new commercial developments in rural areas.
- Support development here on the proviso it does not cause further congestion at the Old Stratford roundabout.
- If the development is implemented, then public transport would need to be improved to avoid single car trips.
- If an employment allocation is made at this site then there will need to be improvements to infrastructure, especially transport infrastructure.

Those who objected to spatial option 1f – South of M1 Junction 15 raised the following key points:

- Further development here would increase air pollution and decrease quality of life for existing and new residents. If seeking to minimise carbon, then developing open fields should be the last resort. An increase in air pollution would also conflict with the Green and Clean objective.
- Developing this site would remove green areas and farmland which is currently preventing coalescence with the village of Courteenhall.
- Development here would have an adverse impact on the landscape and character of the area.
- Whilst part of the site is currently being used it should be seen as greenfield land and not brownfield.
- Brownfield land should be developed before greenfield.
- Developing this site would remove amenity from residents who use the fields for walking / leisure.
- Respondents raised the issue that more jobs will be automated in the future and will employ less people, especially in the logistics and warehousing sectors.
- The jobs that are provided in warehousing / logistics would be low skilled and would be at odds with trying to raise attainment and improve life chances of the residents of West Northamptonshire.
- One of the most raised issues was around traffic and congestion. Respondents noted that surrounding roads are already at capacity (especially the A508 and the M1 junction) and that development here would increase traffic as employees would rely on the use of a car to commute.
- Along with increasing poor air quality, it was considered that the amenity of residents will be further decreased through noise pollution.
- It was noted that there was an oversupply over industrial employment in the area with the employees expected to have to travel from Northampton to get to work.
- Concern was raised over potential development on a flood plain and that any mitigation on the site should not increase risk elsewhere. However, it is noted that the Environment Agency state that 'There are ordinary watercourses located on the site which have not been modelled, however this should not prevent the site from being developed'.
- Concerns on the impact of potential development on the heritage of Courteenhall (Grade II* and Registered Park and Garden) and the character of Courteenhall village.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- A new, self-contained village or town with residential and employment development would be a better option.
- Employment should be in larger settlements such as in Northampton which could be regenerated for such purposes.
- Development here would impact on biodiversity.
- The proposals would have a significant impact on police and fire operations from Mereway and Moulton fire stations and Campbell Square, Wootton Hall, and Weston Favell police stations. Information is currently being sought on the capacity within these facilities.

Parish / Town Council responses:

The following Parish / Town Councils supported spatial option 1f:

- **A5 Alliance of Parish Councils** (no comment)
- **Blakesley Parish Council** – area is in effect brownfield and is pragmatic to allocate this land and allow some B Class Use.
- **Blisworth Parish Council** (no comment)
- **Brixworth Parish Council** – flood risk should not be moved elsewhere and note that the junction to and from the M1 is crowded.
- **Cogenhoe and Whiston Parish Council** (no comment)
- **Cosgrove Parish Council** – in effect it is brownfield land with good transport links
- **Culworth Parish Council** (no comment)
- **Greens Norton Parish Council** – in effect brownfield land so pragmatic to allocate this.
- **Kingsthorpe Parish Council** – has good routes into Northampton
- **Long Buckby** (no comment)
- **Nether Heyford Parish Council** (no comment)
- **Old Parish Council** – meets most requirements and not too many weaknesses
- **Old Stratford Parish Council** – In effect brownfield land with good transport links
- **Silverstone Parish Council** – if distribution developments are necessary then it is important that they adjoin the motorway junctions. However, access must be limited to A508 and A5.
- **Whittlebury Parish Council** – The area is in effect brownfield land and it is therefore pragmatic to allocate it. HGVs should not be able to travel south on the A508
- **Wootton Parish Council** – in principle agree but would need to see details of the proposed units to be built.
- **Yardley Gobion Parish Council** - The area is in effect brownfield land and it is therefore pragmatic to allocate it. HGVs should not be able to travel south on the A508.

The following Parish / Town Councils objected to spatial option 1f:

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- **Easton Neston Parish Meeting** – the strategy lays out an oversupply of industrial land and the road network is at capacity.
- **Grange Park Parish Council** – Raise concerns about the capacity of junction 15 of the M1 and of other infrastructure such as schools and health care. Concern also on the flood risk of bringing the site forward.
- **Hackleton Parish Council** – Development along the M1 is predominantly warehousing which brings low skilled and paid jobs. Should be looking to attract high skill jobs to the area. If continuing with warehousing, then low-cost housing will be a priority.
- **Hardingstone Parish Council** – The junction is already busy with queues at peak time.
- **Little Houghton Parish Council** – finds it difficult to agree with further expansion of towns into rural areas without understanding the impact on heritage assets, conservation areas and existing infrastructure, in particular the highways network.
- **Overstone Parish Council** – the area is not as well served with transport links as the A45 link road area of Lilbourn and Yelvertoft. However, it is near to Northampton where facilities and decent transport links are more readily available.
- **Tiffield Parish Council** – The strategy lays out an oversupply of employment land. Development at J15 would compromise the ability of the road network to accommodate the increase in traffic movements.
- **Walgrave Parish Council** – full consideration should be given to heritage

Moulton Parish Council – did not specify ‘yes’ or ‘no’ but noted that the map showed no residential development within reach of the employment areas.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

Question 15: Do you agree that spatial option 1g - South M1 Junction 15a - has the potential to deliver employment development?

- 224 respondents said “yes”
- 215 respondents said “no”
- 271 respondents provided specific comments

Those who supported spatial option 1g – South M1 Junction 15a raised the following key points:

- The site is accessible: it is right next to the M1 and A43 (and onto the M40)
- The site is also well connected in terms of the rail terminals, and north/south and east/west motorway and trunk routes.
- If development does go ahead in this location, a green wedge should be implemented between the new development and existing villages.
- Views of the landscape should be protected if development happens here.
- Infrastructure is already developed in this area and should be utilised.
- In some cases where respondents were supportive of this proposed allocation, they also stated that infrastructure would need to be improved. This was especially in the case of transport infrastructure: improvement to junctions and increasing capacity of M1.
- This proposed allocation would benefit from proximity to the existing Swan Valley employment area.
- Housing development nearby make this site ideal for employment.
- Some residential provision should also be made for those working in this proposed employment area
- The amenity of nearby residents should be protected if this site is developed
- If developed, the Grand Union Canal should not be disturbed or ruined
- The Grand Union Canal would run through the site. It is a designated conservation area with Grade II Listed locks and, as such, a detailed heritage assessment would be required.
- There is an opportunity to establish a sustainable approach to employment that looks at the wider area of West Northamptonshire.
- Consideration should also be given to neighbouring authorities and the wider Oxford to Cambridge Arc.
- Large employment development is supported but there needs to be a greater acknowledgement of the contribution that which is made to the economy from smaller employment sites.
- Development here would help Northampton’s ambition to become a city.
- Any sites coming forward here should be assessed in accordance with land contamination.
- If developed, appropriate design and landscaping should take place to maintain villages
- The proposals would have a significant impact on police and fire operations from Mereway and Moulton fire stations and Campbell Square, Wootton Hall, and Weston Favell police stations. Information is currently being sought on the capacity of these facilities.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- Concern over commuting to work – consideration needed of how this would be mitigated – i.e., not increase motor journeys and increase public transport
- Development supported – the site could supply 200,000sq.m of employment floorspace; approx. 2,500 – 3,000 jobs
- The proposals have the potential to improve cycle / walkways

Those who objected to spatial option 1g – South M1 Junction 15a raised the following key points:

- The proposed site is too big
- Employment development should be kept to the north of Junction 15A of the M1.
- The site would impact on adjoining villages in terms of the quality of life of the residents
- Towcester should not be extended further
- If developed, this proposal would join up Northampton and Towcester
- M1 traffic is at a standstill during the rush hour and development here would further exacerbate that problem.
- Many respondents commented that providing employment here would significantly increase traffic on the road network overall due to over reliance on the car for commuting and from HGV movements.
- Concerns on the heritage of nearby villages including conservation areas (Rothersthorpe and Milton Malsor).
- Concerns over the impact of proposed development on the Grand Union Canal (and its heritage)
- Development of this site would cause light pollution
- Development of this site would cause noise pollution
- Development of this site would cause air pollution
- Part of the site is within a flood plain area and development could cause flooding
- The Grand Union Canal is a wetland area that regularly gets water-logged.
- Concerns that development of this site would worsen flooding nearby
- Development of such a big employment site would swallow up existing businesses.
- The development would have negative impacts on tourism and visitors would not want to come to the area.
- Development would cause the loss of public rights of way
- Any development here would impact the rural character of the area and nearby villages would lose their identities.
- Concerns over the impact of the proposed allocation on Rothersthorpe' s heritage (above and archaeological, below ground heritage).
- Development of this site would mean that the green buffer between Northampton and surrounding villages would be reduced.
- Development of proposed employment allocation and loss of open fields / countryside
- Development would result in the loss of important habitats and be detrimental to biodiversity.
- There is an over dependence on logistics employment

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- There is too much development in this area
- There is an over-supply of industrial land
- Warehousing is expected to become automated and would not bring the expected jobs
- The site is remote from residential development and would promote commuting.
- Warehousing provides low skilled and low paid jobs only; and mainly male-dominated
- If concentrating on low skilled and low paid jobs, will need low-cost housing as a priority
- Development here would involve the loss of arable land
- Junction 15A of the M1 would need to be altered and improved, which might mean the service stations would need to be moved, rendering the site unviable.
- Any development on this site should be proportionate to the village of Rothersthorpe – potentially the site could be used for housing or a retail village hub.
- Warehouses that have just been constructed have not been let yet therefore building more might not be necessary
- Development of brownfield land should be a priority
- Concern about where the employees going to come from
- Concern about coalescence with nearby villages
- This land should be designated as Green Belt
- Concern for the mental health of villagers who chose to live surrounded by greenspace
- Concerns raised over whether the site can be effectively served by public transport and on the transport modelling behind the plan.

Parish / Town Council responses:

The following Parish / Town Councils supported spatial option 1f:

- **Blisworth Parish Council** (No comment)
- **Brixworth Parish Council** – Support the proposed allocation but ask whether it could be scaled back so as to not impact on the conservation areas of Rothersthorpe and Milton Malsor.
- **Daventry Town Council** – The site's proximity to a major road network suggests the area has potential to be an asset, as long as the design blends in with the nearby conservation area.
- **Kingsthorpe Parish Council** (No comment)
- **Long Buckby Parish Council** (No comment)
- **Nether Heyford Parish Council** (No comment)
- **Woodford-cum-Membris Parish Council** (No comment)

The following Parish / Town Councils objected to spatial option 1f:

- **Blakesley Parish Council** – To develop this site, there would need to be significant improvements to junction 15A of the M1. This might require the

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

relocation of the service stations which would make the site commercially unviable.

- **Bugbrooke Parish Council** – Considers the area to already be very industrial looking
- **Culworth Parish Council** (No comment)
- **Easton Neston Parish Meeting** – The strategy lays out an oversupply of industrial land. The road network is at capacity and would not be able to accommodate the additional traffic. The development will subsume the village of Milton Malsor.
- **Flore Parish Council** – ‘Big sheds’ would have a detrimental impact on Rothersthorpe village and the canal.
- **Greens Norton Parish Council** – To develop this site, there would need to be significant improvements to junction 15A of the M1. This might require the relocation of the service stations which would make the site commercially unviable.
- **Moulton Parish Council** – The map shows no residential within reach of the employment areas.
- **Old Parish Council** – Concerns over heritage and flooding
- **Silverstone Parish Council** – The site borders too closely to Rothersthorpe and Milton Malsor. Being on the A43 would place an even greater strain on it.
- **Syresham Parish Council** – large warehousing will have a detrimental impact on the local environment and landscape. The A43, M1, B4525 and A422 will be further impacted by HGV traffic.
- **Tiffield Parish Council** – The strategy lays out an oversupply of employment land. Development at J15A would swamp Milton Malsor and compromise the ability of the road network to accommodate the increase in traffic movements.
- **Weedon Parish Council** – Development here would impact the village, its heritage assets, and the canal corridor.
- **Whittlebury Parish Council** – To develop this site, there would need to be significant improvements to junction 15A of the M1. This might require the relocation of the service stations which would make the site commercially unviable.
- **Yardley Gobion Parish Council** – To develop this site, there would need to be significant improvements to junction 15A of the M1. This might require the relocation of the service stations which would make the site commercially unviable.

The following Parish and Town Councils did not specify ‘yes’ or ‘no’:

- **Braunston Parish Council** (No comment)
- **Hackleton Parish Council** – Current development along the M1 is warehousing which brings low skilled and low paid jobs. We should be looking to attract high skilled jobs to the area. If warehousing developments are continued, then low-cost housing is a priority. To grow and regenerate Northampton, vacant and underused buildings should be developed for business using high quality urban design. Development of brownfield sites should be a priority.
- **Hinton in the Hedges Parish Meeting** – Everything has ‘potential’ but has concerns as to whether council taxpayers want it.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- **Kislingbury Parish Council** – The response declines to vote for particular options.
- **Little Houghton Parish Council** – Finds it difficult to agree with further expansion of towns into rural areas without understanding the impact on heritage assets, conservation areas and existing infrastructure, in particular the highways network.
- **Milton Malsor Parish Council** – Concerns over possible access from Towcester Road, the site consuming large amounts of agricultural land and impinging on the rural setting and approaches of Milton Malsor.
- **Rothersthorpe Parish Council** – The council provided a comprehensive response which raised the following issues:
 - Loss of productive arable land
 - Undermining of local tenant farm businesses and employment
 - Negative landscape impact
 - Loss of open field wildlife habitats and ecology impacts [impact on biodiversity]
 - Negative impacts to ancient Osier Reed Beds located on the eastern fringe of the proposed site
 - Negative impact on the Grand Union Canal Conservation Area (Buffer)
 - Negative impact on local tourist businesses and employment
 - Noise pollution associated to a 24-7 operational supply chain / industrial development
 - Light pollution
 - Pollution (vehicles, building operations, waste, Carbon footprint of physical warehouse construction)
 - Cumulative impact that effects development within existing parish boundaries
 - Traffic impact on Highway's network, motorways, and local villages
 - Loss of existing public rights of way
 - Increased flooding risk onto North Street Rothersthorpe
 - Proximity to significant historical earthworks, land features and recorded sensitive archaeology assets
 - Impact to the rural character and history of the village
 - Loss of identity as the village is consumed into the town with no greenspace to preserve village boundaries
- **Wootton Parish Council** – Additional information required

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

Question 16: Do you agree that spatial option 1h – Land at M1 Junction 16 has the potential to deliver employment?

- 259 respondents said 'Yes'
- 152 respondents said 'No'
- 236 respondents provided specific comments

Those who supported that spatial option 1h – Land at M1 Junction 16 raised the following key points:

- Easy transport links – proximity to M1
- There are no options that have zero detrimental effect. This site has the potential for both residential and employment options. Nearly all of the other proposed residential options will overburden already stretched resources and this site has the option to create a new hub with potential for further development. The site offers the best option for both employment and residential development because:
 1. It has the least detrimental effect on existing rural communities
 2. Access would need minimal new provision
 3. It has close proximity to employment opportunities minimising travel requirements for residents
 4. It has potential for future expansion
- Local houses should be considered to create sustainable communities
- If the area was reduced in size and followed closely the M1 corridor, as well as not intruding too far off the A4500 the impact would be reduced
- Good area as compliments existing developments on A45 around M1 J 16.
- Better to locate industry here as there are better transport links to the north/south and to the east and west via the A45/A43 Further away from residential areas
- Infrastructure is already developed in these areas.
- Better to locate industry here as there are better transport links to the north/south and to the east and west via the A45/A43 Further away from residential areas
- Most favourable of the three motorway areas highlighted due to less flooding impact.
- It will support workers in that area and so benefit that local economy directly.
- Significant access to major roads and infrastructure to support
- Warehouse expansion in this area continues to establish the important role that Northampton will fulfil in this area and the growing importance of Northamptonshire itself.
- A sensible extension that utilises existing connective infrastructure effectively.
- Prefer to see a new hospital built there. Is that land not subject to a planning request for a solar farm?
- Future development must have access to electric railways.
- This option is shown on the flood map as within flood zone 1. There are ordinary watercourses located on the site which have not been modelled, however this should not prevent the site from being developed. The site options 1a – 1h are all adjacent to the Great Billing Water Recycling Centre catchment which we assume would treat the foul flows they would generate.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

Current data suggests that while there is Dry Water Flow (DWF) capacity at the works to accommodate the flows from some of these options, the capacity is limited, and the works may not have the DWF capacity to accept flows from all of these sites.

- For business and for housing as well, more or less the size of Towcester.
- This would be a preferred option - as this would not have a negative impact on the environment or residential potentials.
- Loads of potential for businesses in this area, central to country, seems like a reasonable proposition and would encourage more employment opportunities
- At a reduced scale possibly. The infrastructure and industry look to be in place already to some degree, access to M1 a positive. If the underlying need for housing in Northants is to service areas outside of the county this option would rate highly due to the location and M1 access. Seemingly minimal impact to North and East. Public rights of way can be diverted or the development sympathetic to their position. Flooding needs to be addressed as a priority climate change tells us this will only get worse.
- Despite effect on some local landscape, warehousing should always be delivered adjacent to motorways.
- J16 has great potential for further commercial and residential development and help towards building the target housing required by the government. Also, to offer great opportunities for the village of Harpole and possibly bring the needed affordable housing of its residents' children without losing its character. J16 also has great commute opportunities for both London or Birmingham and is the perfect location for development.
- These proposals would have a significant impact on police and fire operations from Mereway and Moulton fire stations and Campbell Square, Wootton Hall, and Weston Favell police stations. Information is currently being sought on the capacity within these facilities.
- All this employment development centres around transport & logistics and increasing traffic on the M1 and surrounding roads. This is not only male-dominated/low skill/low paid employment, but at odds with the Green & Clean objective. How does adding thousands more lorries to our roads and building these massive warehouses on greenfield sites align with this objective? Northamptonshire is not the country's warehouse.
- The centralised logistics/'deliver one item at a time' model is absolutely at odds with the need to develop a more sustainable, more green economy and alternatives to this must be explored first.
- If WNC genuinely have Climate Change as Objective 1, they need to reassess their dated economic growth plans and develop new job opportunities in town centres.
- We consider that this location takes good advantage of direct public transport links that are amenable to effective further improvement. We broadly support identification of this location for employment. It relates directly to the existing strategic bus corridor between Northampton and Daventry, and as a result both benefits from the service and credibly supports measures that would tend to strengthen. A bus only link between the western end of the site and the accommodation bridge over the M1 at Upper Heyford could greatly assist bus penetration and service delivery not only at shift change times, but also throughout the day. A bus spine through the site parallel to and north of the

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

M1 would maintain the maximum flexibility for parcelling up the land in response to market/occupier requirements, and we urge the promoter and the Council to look at this very carefully.

- The site promoters have provided a detailed response in support of the potential spatial options. This argues that the merits of the site need to be considered in the current planning context which is different from that considered by the Joint Core Strategy Inspector who rejected this site. The changed circumstances include up to date national policy which identifies the logistics sector as being crucial and having specific locational requirements, the prevailing economic circumstances which identify substantial demand for logistics sites, and an up-to-date consideration for the Special Landscape Area which need not prejudice consideration of further employment allocations at J16.
- Support as long as there are employees in the local area to fill the vacancies.

Those respondents who objected to spatial option 1h – Land at M1 Junction 16 raised the following key points:

- There is potential, but not wholly appropriate across the whole site, due to the impact on nearby Harpole. A more linear development along the northern side of the M1 would be preferable, with suitable screening options hiding the development from Harpole and provide a suitable corridor for any diverted public rights of way to run through - including surfaced active travel routes.
- Landowner unwilling for this land to be developed and the land will not be made available for development.
- Over dependence on logistics. Warehousing is and will become almost entirely automated meaning large areas developed with few employees required. Environmental considerations would imply a development of a low-rise buildings for manufacturing purposes would be more suitable.
- This is all just going to make the traffic and environment unsustainable.
- Protect our countryside. Use what exists first
- WNC's Planning Inspector who said that this option is within a special landscape area as identified in the South Northamptonshire Local Plan (Part 2) and employment development, which would inevitably involve large buildings and would have a significantly detrimental impact on the local landscape north of the A4500.
- It will deliver employment but is too rural. Increased environmental impact due to transport to site.
- The disadvantages far outweigh the advantages
- Although you claim to want businesses based on low carbon and new technologies, you are basically providing locations for development sites for distribution and fulfilment centres. All of the M1 sites are very good for the logistics industry and keep vehicle movements out of Northampton. All good, but this is an industry with enormous potential for automation and this will happen as access to cheap labour continues to dry up. Where are the sites local to where people live?
- Traffic increase. Too far from town. We must use brown field sites first.
- Warehouse development in this area has already ruined the Nene Valley landscape.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- The WNSP recognises the following weakness of the site. Given that employment development in this broad location has already been assessed as harmful in a local plan examination context, and that reasonable alternatives for the proposed development exist elsewhere, it would be inappropriate to consider Spatial Option 1h for development potential. There are also reasonably available sites appropriate for employment development in areas with potentially less landscape and overall sustainability harm, that being at land north of Bedford Road, Northampton.
- Recent developments such as Panattoni Park have had a detrimental impact on the landscape character of this area. It does not need more.
- Developer-driven development has no place in strategic planning. Where is the genuine and publicly supported evidence of need?
- There would not be any material benefit to the local area from further development. The appearance of the existing development and the additional heavy goods traffic it generates have already had a very detrimental effect. The area is already very industrial looking. The existing development has already had a detrimental impact on the local landscape, noise levels and wildlife. The existing development should be screened by trees to reduce the impact on surrounding once rural villages that are losing the rural views to industrial units.
- No because of its proximity to the village of Harpole. However, the land surrounding Harpole could be considered for smaller scale residential development, building on the special characters identified there.
- Focus should be on regenerating existing built-up areas, not building on 'green space' in the interest of profits for developers. Building on such areas will affect biodiversity, pollution, traffic, and existing infrastructure.
- The spatial options 1f, 1g & 1h presents a very significant change to the precise nature of our quiet, rural village and surrounding area. It will damage wildlife habitats and eco systems, it will present increased incidence of flooding, will have a negative visual impact on our village, is over-bearing in its nature and creates an imposing and out of character impact on our existing conservation area.
- The main attraction of the area is attributed to warehouse and distribution due to proximity to the M1 and London main rail line. Modern day warehouse modal hubs are and will be more automated than ever before - employment opportunity will be very low due to automation.
- The option has no rail connections.
- Junction is already at capacity.
- Almost daily incidents with this stretch of the M1 means that the M1 would not be able to cope with the increased amount of cars and traffic from residents in this area. Increased traffic, air, noise pollution and decreased quality of life.
- CPRE would be opposed to the development of this land which is designated as a special landscape area as identified in the South Northamptonshire Local Plan and was upheld by the Inspector who examined the plan. Development in this area would also have a detrimental impact on the setting of Harpole as a rural community and also upon the conservation area.
- It is in the Nene Drinking Water Protected Area.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

Other comments made by respondents who did not specify ‘yes’ or ‘no’:

- M1 is already at a standstill during rush hours - why add more burden?
- Is there sufficient public transport to that area?
- There is no point having COP 26 etc if all the planning ignores the impact of all this development in rural areas – the carbon footprint in the immediate area must be immense and the solar and wind farm will do little to alleviate this problem.
- This option is very remote from residential areas so would promote a very significant increase in commuting. It is not well served by walking, cycling or public transport alternatives to commuting. Area within a Special Landscape Area! Thus, opposite to stated policy in Objective 3: To protect and enhance West Northamptonshire’s distinctive landscape character especially those valued landscapes which have been designated as special landscape areas.
- You need accurate information before you can put forward any plan.
- M1 safety issues due to smart motorways.
- Given the structural changes which have occurred there is now an opportunity to establish a truly sustainable approach which considers the plan area as a whole rather than the former sum of its parts (Northampton, Daventry, and South Northamptonshire). To this end, it is considered that greater consideration should be afforded to neighbouring authority areas, which will influence the spatial pattern of economic development. For example, the needs arising from the Arc in the south and high levels of growth in the north, for example Rugby Borough.
- There also needs to be a greater acknowledgment of the contribution which is made to the economy from smaller employment sites.
- The authorities Conservation and Archaeological advisors should be consulted. There is archaeological potential at the site. There is evidence of ridge and furrow. Further assessment will be required, with specific reference to impacts upon the Grade II* church at Harpole.
- Building more warehouses is not necessarily delivering employment development.
- The focus of this development seems to be within the logistics area. Another group of warehouses would provide employment, but it is not highly skilled not does it provide much in the way of career development for local people. In what way will the council promote and encourage businesses requiring highly skilled workers into the area? How will the effects of a commute to work be mitigated in terms of traffic congestion and pollution?

Parish / Town Council Responses

The following Parish and Town Councils supported spatial option 1h:

- **Blisworth PC** (no comments)
- **Cogenhoe and Whiston PC** – (no comments)
- **Culworth PC** – No comment provided
- **Daventry Town Council** - Unable to give a knowledge-based answer to this question or argue the rationale. However, the strengths outweigh the weaknesses and road infrastructure can be easily adapted to accommodate increased traffic flows. Considered planning (in relation to heritage and

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

landscape) and choice of industry would need to be undertaken to mitigate the detrimental impact on the landscape.

- **Greens Norton PC** - Yes -It has potential, but this site was specifically removed by the inspector at the last South Northants Local Plan Part 2 - what has changed to include it now?
- **Kingsthorpe PC** - Proximity to motorway and land for warehousing.
- **Long Buckby PC** - LBK evidence of some serious investigation of the proposed sites. Not just a few bald facts available from the internet. A thriving community should not be allowed to grow beyond the local economy's ability to support otherwise they simply become dormitories. This size limit should be incorporated in the plan. Keeping economic activity & the associated workforce close together promotes both the business development & green objectives of the plan. Assuming the Daventry NE residential development takes place
- **Overstone PC** – (no comments)
- **Woodford Cum Membris PC** – (no comments)

The following Parish and Town Councils objected to spatial option 1h:

- **Flore PC**- We re-iterate here the point made in response to Q2 above. The proposal to use this site is specifically NOT 'logical'. It intrudes substantially into, and is entirely detrimental to, a special landscape area whilst this Strategy's Objective 3 Landscape is "To protect and enhance... especially those valued landscapes which have been designated as special landscape areas". Glassthorpe Hill Is that an important landmark in West Northamptonshire and should be respected as such. Many formally attractive areas of landscape on the route out of Northampton have already been lost to westward development. It is important that this area is protected. In addition, Panettoni Park is already adding to the congestion on the A4500 into Northampton and is likely to benefit workers from outside the county as much as those from the town, while its incongruously white elevations already have a jarring detrimental impact on views from the western south. In order to retain the identity of Harpole and Kislingbury it is also important that a green swathes of open landscape is maintained which will also make the approach into Northampton much more attractive and appropriate to a town hoping to make itself more attractive to visitors and potential investors.
- **Harpole PC** - Harpole Parish council understands that the owner of much of this site wishes to retain the land for agricultural purposes and has no wish to accommodate further logistics development. The Parish Council objects to the proposed location for the following reasons:
 - The option is within a special landscape area identified in the South Northamptonshire Local Plan. The location of the site would result in large unsightly warehousing that would not be compatible with the special landscape character. The site is located in the Nene Valley and as such is visible from the surrounding hills and any development would have a significantly detrimental impact on the landscape setting.
 - This detrimental impact should be assessed against the generation of employment opportunities for the local economy. However, there would only be a small number of low paid warehouse and distribution jobs generated locally. The Oxford Cambridge Arc, which Northamptonshire is supposedly part of, is promoting highly skilled

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- employment opportunities. These should be the priority for employment opportunities across Northamptonshire.
- The visual impact and loss of vegetation and trees associated with the existing Panattoni Park demonstrates the inappropriate nature of this development and the impact that it has had on the landscape setting. The detrimental impact on the Special Landscape area should not be further compounded.
 - Concerned about the increase in large polluting vehicles through the parish. The community regularly use Weedon Road to access Upton Country Park, Kislingbury and Northampton, some by sustainable modes of transport such as walking or cycling. Many residents within the parish also live next to the busy Weedon Road and Sandy Lane. The development will inevitably increase the number of large HGVs through the parish. These vehicles are dangerous and increase air pollution.
 - The allocation offers few if any benefits to the parish. An alternative allocation to the south of the M1 at could provide direct access to Junction 16 for the existing Flour Mill, would remove a significant proportion of HGVs from village roads in three village Parishes and place the allocation further away from the special landscape area.
 - Despite further planned housing employee access to the proposed employment site is poor as it is relatively isolated from any potential workforce and access via sustainable means of travel is weak. As a result, most people will drive, as is currently the case with Panattoni Park. On that basis the site allocation should be considered unsustainable.
 - It is recognised that there is increased demand for large B8 distribution warehousing around Northamptonshire and the site is located within the so called 'Golden Triangle' considered the centre of UK logistics. If WNC was minded to continue with this allocation the following issues should be considered in terms of the policy supporting the allocation.
 - Landscape Setting
 - Environmental Impact
 - Building Design
 - Access
 - HGV Parking.
 - Restricted Village Access
 - Noise
- **Nether Heyford PC** - Land north of the A4500 to the east of J16 and west of Sandy Lane, inclusive of the settlement of Harpole, should be retained as a green buffer zone to the overall growth of Northampton eastwards. This is the lower southern part of an escarpment which is an important rural asset. Employment development should continue to be focused on land to the south of the A4500 and east of the M1, excepting the flood zone and protected areas of the River Nene.
 - **Old PC** - Weaknesses outweigh strengths.
 - **Whittlebury PC** - It has potential, but this site was specifically removed by the inspector at the last South Northants Local Plan Part 2 – what has changed to include it now?

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

The following Parish and Town Councils did not specify ‘yes’ or ‘no’:

- **Blakesley PC** – It has potential, but the site was removed by the Part 2 Local Plan Inspector. What has changed?
- **Brixworth PC and Strategic Planning Working Group** - Area within a Special Landscape Area! Thus, opposite to stated policy in Objective 3: To protect and enhance West Northamptonshire’s distinctive landscape character especially those valued landscapes which have been designated as special landscape areas.
- **Hackleton PC** - Spatial Options 1f, 1g & 1h Current development along the M1 corridor, the particular example being at M1 junction 15 is for predominantly warehousing. This brings with it low skilled, low paid jobs. This is not the development Northamptonshire should be concentrating on, we should be looking to attract high skilled jobs to the area. If we do continue with the warehousing developments, then low-cost housing will be a top priority. This will be out of step with what the developers want to provide. In order to regenerate and grow Northampton vacant and underused buildings should be developed for business using high quality urban design and business support schemes. Brown field sites should also be a priority so to prevent ongoing urban decay.
- **Hinton-in-the-Hedges PM** - Everything has a ‘potential’ – the question is whether it is morally right to do it – do the council taxpayers already there want it?
- **Kislingbury PC** - In relation to housing needs, it seems that housing ‘wants’ rather than housing ‘needs’ are being met. Meeting housing need means that West Northants residents would live in homes that they can afford, are warm and dry, green and fuel efficient, and enable children and families to flourish. To enable real housing need to be met, there should be construction of homes available on a variety of tenures including shared ownership. The use of the term ‘affordable’ on the Strategic Plan should be monitored and readers should be made aware that this really means prevailing market value. The use of Community Led and not-for-profit housing initiatives needs to be prioritised to address the needs of West Northants residents whose housing needs will never be met in a market-led context.
- **Little Houghton PC** - LHPC has insufficient local knowledge to comment specifically on identified sites. LHPC finds it difficult to agree with further expansion of the towns into rural areas without understanding the impact on heritage assets, conservation areas and existing infrastructure - in particular the highways network. Building on the flood plain MUST be avoided. The potential for using brown-fill sites and under used town centre buildings for both housing and employment should be urgently assessed, together with an exploration of the identified constraints. Sites already identified within the JCS should be progressed before further land is allocated for development.
- **Weedon PC** - This would be a most unfortunate ‘logical extension’ of the existing Panattoni employment area as it would mean that open countryside, which provides a green wedge between Northampton and villages such as Harpole and Kislingbury, would be breached leading to a spread of housing estates and the joining of such villages to the sprawl of Northampton town. In addition, despite improvements, the Weedon Road is becoming increasingly

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

busy with gridlock at roundabouts at the Sainsbury's/Marks & Spencer area of Sixfields since the bus lane hours have been extended. This and the chaotic parking at Sixfields are a very big deterrent to shopping. It is often easier now to get to Towcester, Rugby or even Milton Keynes where there is more, and better parking coupled with more varied and accessible retail options.

- **Wootton PC** - Additional information required.
- **Yardley Gobion PC** - It has potential, but this site was specifically removed by the inspector at the last South Northants Local Plan Part 2.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

Question 17: Do you agree that there is potential for directing further development at Daventry, as a sub-regional centre, as part of the spatial strategy for West Northamptonshire?

- 278 respondents said 'Yes'
- 166 respondents said 'No'
- 257 respondents provided specific comments

Those respondents who supported the potential for directing further development at Daventry, raised the following key points:

- Daventry is a sustainable location with a suitable number of facilities and services capable of supporting growth. However, this spatial option should not be relied upon due to the previous undersupply of housing and lack of evidence to justify further growth.
- Daventry as a whole is able to be made bigger without as much damage to local villages. There is a lot less risk of villages being merged into the town centre like Boughton, Moulton and Overstone blending into Northampton.
- Any new developments will need to provide there is investment new schools and allow existing schools to be upgraded to meet modern standards.
- Could work if employment and housing were developed together to create a sustainable community.
- Development should be in conjunction with residents
- Area around Churchill Rd and London Rd has scope for industrial development
- Requires investment in transport infrastructure and needs comprehensive access and infrastructure improvements
- Only develop moderately, preserve outlying villages heritage, independence, and visual appeal
- Daventry was built as a new town and the whole area is ripe for expansion and development in conjunction with what has already been built there.
- Good road network and potential for distribution hub
- Infrastructure already in place to cope with new developments
- Better to locate industry on the West of Daventry where there is already large industrial areas and the road width and capacity to handle the traffic, ensure doesn't impact A5
- Care needs to be taken in the development of Daventry as existing development has moved away from the town centre in pretty much one direction, creating an off-centre town. The housing developments are largely a community of commuters.
- There has been little development of employment opportunities locally for some years following initial development of Daventry
- Strategy included within the Settlements and Countryside Local Plan
- Strong economic centre which could be effectively developed as the secondary hub. Good road networks and links to other areas.
- Daventry appears to have the capacity for further development and appears more aligned with achieving the clean and green credentials of the plans' proposed vision. However, their viable delivery at this location needs to be proven.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- Reliance on a single site to deliver such a significant proportion of Daventry's housing supply is a concern but providing that it can be demonstrated to meet the test of being deliverable, then other sites in other nearby locations and settlements could underpin housing/ affordable housing delivery to assist in smoothing out any potential delays.
- To ensure housing delivery risk a range of sites and sizes should be allocated.
- There is a need for secondary schooling and social housing
- Daventry and its surrounding areas have developed a real strategic advantage within the UK for the industries it supports, taking advantage of its geographical location.
- Further development should be directed towards Daventry as it is a sub-regional centre and should be a key component part of the strategy up to 2050.
- Daventry has the infrastructure (including railway station), facilities and roads to successfully enlarge.
- Other towns within Northamptonshire should carry some of housing burden however there is a risk to Daventry being ruined
- Daventry and South Northants tried to put all their development at the fringes of the old Borough, next to Northampton. Time for Daventry to have its share of development!
- Link development to existing towns including Daventry.
- Clear advantages to Daventry, if it is decided that growth is required but not assumed it is a necessity.
- Daventry big enough to support mix of commercial and residential expansion without losing its identity
- Potential to become a large town independent from Northampton and Milton Keynes
- With adequate infrastructure in place. In particular: There may be insufficient permitted capacity at Water Recycling Centres to accommodate additional foul flows. The Water Companies will need to consider future growth giving regard to the capacity in the sewerage network, to allow them to make medium and long-term infrastructure plans, where necessary. Any new developments will need to follow the Water Framework Directive (WFD). Water cycle studies may be required/refreshed. Without this there may be concerns regarding increased risk of flooding; pollution of the water environment; surface or groundwater infiltration.
- Further detail required on impact on social infrastructure (doctors, school, police, fire, hospitals)
- Long Buckby could be a good location for further development. Provided there was suitable infrastructure including safe foot and cycle access from Long Buckby station to Daventry town centre, affordable housing and traffic improvements, education contributions.
- Must consider impact on surrounding countryside and villages as well as social infrastructure such as doctors and schools
- Whilst there is a base for police and fire and rescue services in Daventry, there is still a concern about the ability to attend incidents in a timely manner and within published timescales, without adequate infrastructure to serve the

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

developments. These proposals would have a significant impact on police and fire operations from Daventry fire and Police station.

- Essential if West Northants is to build its own identity. Otherwise, services and amenities will continue to focus elsewhere, not necessarily benefiting Northamptonshire.

Those respondents who objected to the potential for directing further development at Daventry, raised the following key points:

- Daventry Town Centre is far too small for the amount of housing it has now without adding more.
- Parking in Daventry is difficult now without adding more people with the proposed extra housing and factories.
- There has already been far too much unattractive housing development here.
- Environmental impact on the beautiful countryside between Daventry and Braunston, including impact on The Jurassic Way, Kentle Woods and landscape from Braunston and Flecknoe will be completely overshadowed.
- Impact on the A45 (level of traffic and safety concerns)
- Coalescence between Daventry and surrounding villages Norton, Welton and Braunston, making Braunston in particular a suburb of Daventry (5 respondents)
- Northampton would be a better option
- How do you intend to see Daventry grow as a town /city? how does this fit into the overall thinking about Daventry, its regeneration and the future overall 'shape' of the town, community, and associated facilities
- Daventry has many residents that out commute for work on the road network that is heavily congested. This will increase pollution, which will cause harm to the residents and environment.
- The town currently does not have the essential services needed for the current number of residents
- There is no option around Daventry where housing can be built and should be removed.
- Develop the urban areas of Daventry, concentrating on the brownfield/ urban areas.
- Impact on traffic and environment will make it unsustainable (x2)
- Local residents should have a say (vote) on the matter
- Why create two regional centres? Concentrate on Northampton rather than allowing Daventry to sprawl into the conservation areas
- While there may be opportunities for further development at Daventry, existing allocations for residential development mean that the town is already on course for a very large increase in its population. The questions should be (1) whether Daventry can cope with an increase on this scale, and (2) whether it should be asked to do so.
- Existing expansion plans were made before the District Council had seriously considered the implications of the threat of climate change and the land allocations of the existing Joint Core Strategy should therefore be reviewed.
- Daventry is 'characterised by a well-defined network of green infrastructure'. One of the defining characteristics of the town, is an extensive green area, bordered by trees, yet one of DDC's last acts was to offer this area for the

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

building of a school, Given the need to develop green areas to absorb emissions and to improve the environment for health reasons (including mental health), the decision to build on this site appears to be totally at odds with WNC's commitments on climate change and with the objectives of the new Strategic Plan.

- Concentrate employment on existing industrial estates
- Daventry has already had too much development
- Travel links are poor relying on Long Buckby Railway station
- Negative impacts on environment and climate change
- Any developments would be better realised in the environs of Northampton or to the South East of Daventry with access link or near M1 junction proximal to Flore.
- This option increase traffic congestion, more pollution and damage to the local environment as people travel to this area to work and loss of green spaces.
- No rail station for high-capacity sustainable transport development. Local roads going north to the M1, and the A45 towards Coventry, already carry substantial traffic including many large HGVs. Daventry still retains some of its previous market town character. It is contradictory to propose Daventry as a sub-regional centre and target it for economic expansion; this will destroy its remaining market town characteristics.

Comments made by respondents who did not specify 'yes' or 'no'

- Any further growth of Daventry needs to have comprehensive access and infrastructure improvements to support it
- Industry and further residential development appropriate
- Important to recognise that Daventry and Northampton Borough previously allocated land within their Part 2 Local Plans, whilst South Northamptonshire District made no housing allocations in their Part 2 Local plan.
- Rural housing requirements for Daventry have been met based on analysis of future trends
- Maybe some limited capacity. Daventry needs to be a more balanced community with less emphasis on warehousing employment, and better public transport connectivity before accepting significant amounts of new development.

Parish and Town Councils Responses

The following Parish and Town Councils supported the potential for directing further development at Daventry:

- **Braunston PC** - Daventry should supply its share of land for residential and employment development, where a need is identified in the West HENA, the current consultation does not present options. Land parcels to the south west of Daventry should also have been included as options, allowing consultees a choice of sites for further housing development or the option of proposing a combination of parts of more than one site. An additional map should be provided in future documents showing all the spatial options (residential and employment) around Daventry on a single map, to assist consultees in understanding the overall context. Clearer statements should be included on how the site selection/assessment criteria in the SLAA, and SA have been

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

applied specifically to the sites around Daventry. Both land to the north and west of Daventry (sites 16, 18 and 19) included in Spatial Options 2a and 2b and rejected sites east and south east of Daventry (sites 15 and 17) are subject to numerous environmental and landscape constraints and it is not clear why viable residential sites could not have been identified to the south east, with boundaries drawn to take account of key constraints (such as the presence of scheduled monuments). This would have given consultees real choices of options for meeting the residential development need.

- **Brixworth PC** and **Brixworth Strategic Planning Working Group** - This strategy is included within the Settlements and Countryside Local Plan
- **Cogenhoe and Whiston PC** (no comments)
- **Greens Norton PC** - Any further growth of Daventry needs to have comprehensive access and infrastructure improvements to support it
- **Kingsthorpe PC** - Spreads development around the area, encourages more diverse businesses.
- **Long Buckby PC** – yes, assuming the Daventry NE residential development takes place.
- **Nether Heyford PC** (no comments)
- **Old PC** - Summary identifies possible options for further development, if on a limited scale.
- **Overstone PC** - Facilities and infrastructure are already established. The population of Daventry is approx. 26,000 the predicted population of Overstone Parish is 12,000 plus. Daventry is far better served than Overstone and therefore will easily be able to accommodate a further 5-6000 homes.
- **Walgrave PC** - Facilities and infrastructure are already established, it would appear that there is further opportunity to develop the area further.
- **Welton PC** - Of course there is potential for further development but only with topographic consideration.
- **Woodford-cum-Membris PC** (no comments)

The following Parish and Town Councils objected to the potential for directing further development at Daventry:

- **Culworth PC** (no comments)
- **Daventry Town Council** - Daventry is currently not well-connected. There is no easy access to the rail network, bus routes are limited and infrequent. The road network, especially the key 'A' roads are narrow and not suitable for heavy goods vehicles. Existing commercial areas are already beginning to envelope the Town's residential areas, resulting in increased air pollution. Daventry has to be considered as an area that needs to look at air quality and make this a key factor in any decision making that relates to increasing large commercial areas. The Town needs to look at economic growth from a technology and office provision perspective, and subsequent residential development for employees working in that work environment.
- **Flore PC** - Any further development would have to include an enormous amount of input to improve the quality and ambience of the town and its offer to visitors, residence, shoppers, tourist, and leisure seekers.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- **Moulton PC** - Much more residential development not accompanied by economic opportunity.
- **Weedon PC** - Not until some consideration is given to making any new development of a better quality than in the past. It does not operate as a sub-regional centre as residents of surrounding villages look to pleasanter locations further away e.g., Towcester even for the weekly shop. We do not feel proud to identify Daventry as our local centre.

The following Parish and Town Councils did not specify ‘yes’ or ‘no’:

- **Blakesley PC** - Any further growth of Daventry needs to have comprehensive access and infrastructure improvements to support it.
- **Easton Neston PM** – Unable to comment
- **Hinton-in-the-hedges PC** - Everything has a ‘potential’ – the question is whether it is morally right to do it – do the council taxpayers already there want it?
- **Kislingbury PC** – decline to vote for particular options
- **Little Houghton PC** - finds it difficult to agree with further expansion of the towns into rural areas without understanding the impact on heritage assets, conservation areas and existing infrastructure - in particular the highways network. Building on the flood plain **MUST** be avoided. Sites already identified within the JCS should be progressed before further land is allocated for development.
- **Wootton PC** – Additional information required
- **Yardley Gobion PC** - Any further growth of Daventry needs to have comprehensive access and infrastructure improvements to support it.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

Question 18: Do you agree that spatial option 2a – North of Daventry – has the potential to deliver residential development?

- 237 respondents said 'Yes'
- 209 respondents said 'No'
- 251 respondents provided specific comments

Those who supported spatial option 2a, north of Daventry raised the following key points:

- With the appropriate services this could create c2000 houses and with developer contributions provide infrastructure and local services for existing and new residents
- It will require infrastructure to support it
- Agree provided top right corner field bordering the A361 and Welton Road is removed as it will encroach too far into open countryside
- Infrastructure is already there to cope with new developments
- It would need to be close enough so that new people could access the town centre facilities.
- The connectivity to Daventry and existing cycle and walking routes would be good, however the size of development will start to encroach on other neighbouring villages.
- Daventry could become a larger town, independent from Milton Keynes and Northampton.
- Provided this is done in a sensitive way and a sustainable timeframe.
- Connects well with existing and planned development
- Investment in key routes to the town centre are a priority and community facilities to prevent these residential areas becoming isolated and dormitory.
- Development must be of a design that blends in with and complements the surrounding landscape and canal heritage.
- It has potential but further demonstration of how and with what impact on surrounding area needs to be undertaken prior to any decision.
- Using the canal as a cycle route or walkway would enhance its focus, as it has done in many other areas.
- Needs to have links with the railway
- This option is shown on the flood map as within flood zone 1. There are ordinary watercourses located on the site which have not been modelled, however this should not prevent the site from being developed. This option is adjacent to the Whilton Water Recycling Centre sewerage catchment which we assume would take the foul flows from this developments. The data available suggests that there is Dry Weather Flow (DWF) capacity at the works to accommodate the foul flows from this development.
- This would build on development at Micklewell Park
- Limited scope to consolidate development west of the A361 and North of Middlemore exists, subject to effective integration with the existing built form
- A361 is the main public transport corridor between Daventry and Rugby. It also directly serves DIRFT, with journeys timed to ensure shift changes are

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

covered. As such it is an area that in part could take advantage of reasonable public transport options, and help support further improvements

- The pedestrian integration of this option with Middlemore will also be crucial and could help areas more distant from the A361 benefit from existing bus services, as well as other facilities in reasonably close proximity. The potential to provide good pedestrian and cycling links to major employment to the south west is another substantial advantage. It is also one of the very potential areas of extension that avoid significant landscape and topography constraints around the town.

Those respondents who objected to spatial option 2a, north of Daventry raised the following key points:

- Area can't support development here.
- Extend the existing allocated site to the existing strategic commitment to the east of the A361 instead
- Explore new potential for development on the southern entry to Daventry District Council
- Not suitable due to the topography of land.
- Development here means any housing will severely impact the views and landscape from Braunston
- Coalescence between Braunston and Daventry together which should not be allowed to happen - there should be a visual separation between settlements.
- Traffic impact on Braunston would become much busier with traffic as this would be the cut through for all wishing to get to the A45 (as seen when A361 had a temporary closure).
- There is a wooded area Middlemore Gorse which should be kept as this is a home for wildlife and there is already enough deforestation in this world today.
- Negative impact on heritage to the canal conservation area and grade 2 listed tunnel
- A little extension here would be reasonable, but not nearly as much as proposed
- Proposed sites look very much like an almost random addition to the town – going beyond the current boundary and stretch towards Braunston.
- Alternative sites along the A45 would have seems more in keeping with maintaining the integrity of both Daventry town and the villages surround it.
- Already lots of new homes, not all of which have been filled
- Impact on and increase in traffic, including more HGV's, and safety concerns associated with that.
- Impact on junctions with A361
- Encroachment of Daventry onto Braunston and the negative impact it will have on the view looking back towards Daventry.
- Potential impact on the setting of All Saints Church in Braunston as well as t views from Braunston and also long-distance views to the west where Kentle Wood.
- Value of Kentle wood for landscape, biodiversity and well being
- Part of this area is identified as a green wedge in the Daventry Settlements and Countryside Local Plan, which requires proposals to maintain the physical and visual separation between settlements.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- The topography could have impact on format of buildings in this option which could further increase the landscape impact.
- A local wildlife site is situated to the south (not within site boundary) and the southern corner of the area forms part of the special landscape area.
- Impact on the Jurassic Way long distance footpath, its enjoyment would likely be affected by the development of this site.
- Local employment opportunities are largely on mature industrial estates which are becoming limited in number.
- This will create dormitory accommodation for commuters.
- Focus on large towns
- Excessive urban sprawl from Daventry, already too much creeping up the A361 and A45
- Option does not have the potential to deliver the housing required as a singular option.
- Option is disproportionate in its size
- Braunston will become a suburb to Daventry when it should remain a village
- Must use brownfield sites first
- Expansion of Daventry towards Weedon
- An area of land should be retained to ensure Braunston would never be connected to Daventry to form a suburb. Braunston is and should remain a village.
- Tourism in Braunston is high due to our scenic location and amenities. It will be impacted by development
- Expansion of Daventry should be towards Weedon, Staverton, Newnham or south east of Daventry.
- Daventry has already experienced a lot of development at Lang Farm, Monksmoor, Middlemore, now Micklewell Park.

Comments made by respondents who did not specify ‘yes’ or ‘no’:

- This site lies to the north of Drayton reservoir and straddles the line of the Braunston tunnel. The canal is designated as a conservation area, A detailed heritage assessment looking at both direct impacts and indirect impacts where there may be effects on the setting of listed buildings and the character and appearance of the conservation area would be required
- High-density development would be of concern as the tunnel and its setting are an important feature of Braunston creating a visual sense of arrival into the village. The zone of influence of the tunnel varies dependant on the depth of cover but generally we ask for no development within a stand-off distance equal to the depth to the invert of the tunnel on both sides of the tunnel line. Any construction access roads should cross the tunnel perpendicularly and avoid any former construction shafts which will need to be investigated.
- Natural drainage should not be significantly altered to ensure there are no additional inflows or shrinkage. Any proposals would therefore need to retain a buffer from the tunnel, taking account of the above and allowing for access to ensure the preservation of any below ground archaeology such as horse tracks etc that ran alongside the tunnel.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- The canal would provide linkages from the site to both and improvements to the towpath surface, width, and access points to support this additional use should be a requirement for any development of this site.
- Unclear why specific development types have been identified. Mixed use sites for example offer a more sustainable solution than independent employment and residential areas that require longer journeys to reach

Parish / Town Council Responses

The following Parish and Town Councils supported spatial option 2a:

- **Blisworth PC** (no comments)
- **Brixworth PC and Strategic Planning Working Group** - Strategy included within Settlements and Countryside Local Plan. Create a sympathetic feature of the canal area. Maintain the green wedge between Daventry and Braunston if possible.
- **Culworth PC** (no comments)
- **Daventry Town Council** - If further development is required within the parish of Daventry, this area does connect well with existing and planned development. Investment in key routes to the town centre are a priority and community facilities to prevent these residential areas becoming isolated and dormitory. Development must be of a design that blends in with and complements the surrounding landscape and canal heritage.
- **Long Buckby PC** - More evidence of some serious investigation of the proposed sites. Not just a few bald facts available from the internet. A thriving community should not be allowed to grow beyond the local economy's ability to support otherwise they simply become dormitories. This size limit should be incorporated in the plan. Keeping economic activity & the associated workforce close together promotes both the business development & green objectives of the plan. Assuming the Daventry NE residential development takes place
- **Overstone PC** - This 1200 is less than Daventry could take but would be good as part of the 5-6000 homes suggested.
- **Walgrave PC** - Facilities and infrastructure are already established, it would appear that there is further opportunity to develop the area further.

The following Parish and Town Councils objected to spatial option 2a:

- **Braunston PC** - Concern that the proposed spatial option would adversely affect the Grand Union/Oxford Canal Conservation Area as well as adversely affecting the setting of the listed tunnel portal and listed buildings in Braunston. It would also erode the gap between Braunston and Daventry, in contravention Local Plan and Neighbourhood plan .>We propose that Spatial Option area 2a should be replaced with a smaller site extending only as far north as a buffer zone established along the southern boundary of the Grand Union/Oxford Canal Conservation Area, with a second development area south east of Daventry, close to the A45 where there is more public transport, could be included in the proposals as land for residential development. Access to the northern part of the site as proposed in the consultation document would rely on the A361 for access. This road is already overloaded,

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

and the problem will be exacerbated when the Micklewell Park development is completed. And would cause unacceptable congestion affecting access to employment and services. The area proposed as lies within land mapped as having a high to moderate probability of falling into the category of best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land, so development would erode the local sustainable agriculture resource.

- **Courteenhall PC** - For the reasons of weakness identified in the consultation
- **Flore PC** (no comments)
- **Old PC** - Weaknesses outweigh strengths.
- **Weedon PC** - NO because of risk to heritage assets and historic landscape. The Parish Council is opposed to these options because of the adverse impact on the historic site of Braunston
- **Welton PC** - This potential area for development falls again within Welton Parish who have accommodated both Micklewell H03 and H02. This potential area contravenes Welton Neighbourhood Plan 2018-2029: Surrounding Landscape Character 4.27, Vision and Objectives 6.3, 6.5, 6.6 and is not supported within Daventry Urban Fringe 4.28, 4.29, 4.30, 4.32 and Key Views 4.33. More consideration is necessary in the area around H01.

The following Parish and Town Councils did not specify 'yes' or 'no':

- **Hinton-in-the-hedges PC** - Everything has a 'potential' – the question is whether it is morally right to do it – do the council taxpayers already there want it?
- **Kilsby PC** - Any expansion of Daventry to the North will increase traffic on the A361. This road splits Kilsby village and is already highly dangerous. It currently acts as a route for a higher-than-average number of HGVs.
- **Kislingbury PC** – Decline to vote for particular options.
- **Little Houghton PC** - LHPC has insufficient local knowledge to comment specifically on identified sites. LHPC finds it difficult to agree with further expansion of the towns into rural areas without understanding the impact on heritage assets, conservation areas and existing infrastructure - in particular the highways network. Building on the flood plain MUST be avoided. The potential for using brown-fill sites and under used town centre buildings for both housing and employment should be urgently assessed, together with an exploration of the identified constraints. Sites already identified within the JCS should be progressed before further land is allocated for development.
- **Whittlebury PC** - Don't know. Difficult to comment as no knowledge of these areas
- **Wootton PC** – Additional information required.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

Question 19: Do you agree that spatial option 2b – North and West of Daventry – has the potential to deliver employment development?

- 234 respondents said 'Yes'
- 205 respondents said 'No'
- 247 respondents provided specific comments

Those who supported option 2b – North and West of Daventry raised the following key points:

- Close to the M1 for transport
- Good transport links however if houses were added to nearby sites this would create sustainable communities.
- Provided it was limited so ensured that Jurassic Way was protected
- Growth west of Daventry
- Daventry and its surrounding areas have developed a real strategic advantage within the UK for the industries it supports, taking advantage of its geographical location. The County should look to continue to exploit this competitive advantage.
- Site promoter welcomes their land being included within the option and supports the promotion of the land for employment development. Land to the north and west of Daventry presents a logical extension to Daventry and the successful Royal Oak industrial Estate. If the option were to come forward for development, suitable mitigation could be secured as part of a future scheme to ensure appropriate measures are put in place to reduce any harm.
- This option is shown as within flood zone 1. There are ordinary watercourses located on the site which have not been modelled, however this should not prevent the site from being developed. This option is adjacent to the Whilton Water Recycling Centre sewerage catchment which we assume would take the foul flows from this developments. Different employment services can generate vary different volumes and qualities of effluent. There is some Dry Weather Flow capacity to accept flows from this site however some activities may cause it to be limited.
- It may be better to incorporate the housing proposed in Spatial Option 2a at this location, extending westwards, rather than risk coalescence between Daventry and Braunston. The development of housing close to employment areas should be made a priority.
- Modest extension to the existing industrial area
- Proposals will have a significant impact on police and fire service operations from Daventry.
- Landowner considers that land within spatial option 2b has the potential to deliver employment land to support the evidenced local need in Daventry. Prologis is seeking to promote the part of Spatial Option 2b which lies to the north of the A45 and would comprise an expansion to the existing and successful Prologis Apex Park Estate.
- The proposed expansion of Apex Park is a logical location for additional employment land in Daventry. The proposed area promoted by Prologis is appropriate in scale and character to the existing industrial park on the edge of the town. It is considered that the parcel of land would also facilitate a number of important social, physical, and environmental benefits.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- Christ Church supports the identification of its land interest within Spatial Option 2b and the potential for the site to deliver a sustainable form of employment development at Daventry. The existing infrastructure, coupled with the potential for enhancements to this through delivery of a sustainable urban extension, justify further consideration of this development option.
- Now is an opportunity to establish a truly sustainable approach which considers the plan area as a whole rather than the former sum of its parts (Northampton, Daventry, and South Northamptonshire). To this end, it is considered that greater consideration should be afforded to neighbouring authority areas, which will influence the spatial pattern of economic development, for e.g., the needs arising from the Arc in the south and those areas experiencing high levels of growth in the north, Rugby Borough

Those who objected to spatial option 2b – North and West of Daventry raised the following key points:

- Too close to green spaces, look at Brownfield sites such as the hotel/scrap yard south east of Daventry.
- It would impact on Braunston in terms of traffic (increase in volume and safety), light and noise pollution and visual impact on Braunston due to the topography
- Impact on the local landscape and long distant views would be completely ruined, currently Kentle Wood defines the western edge of Daventry and this is a strong landscape feature
- The Jurassic Way an 88-mile public right of way runs through the proposed site, the enjoyment of this would be ruined and impact negatively on local biodiversity.
- A visual separation should be maintained between Daventry and Braunston – proposed option builds too close to Braunston. Encroachment on the green wedge
- Use of greenfield land is inappropriate
- Proposed site on the west of the existing industrial area is reasonable, but not the relatively small extension to the northern industrial site as it already spoiling the visual appeal from Braunston to residents and visitors/tourists due to massive warehouses with no consideration to building natural looking barriers,
- Would cause coalescence between Daventry and Braunston and add to the cumulative impact of other developments
- Impact on the heritage areas of Braunston including the canal conservation area and the village's setting
- Negative impact on natural environment, landscape and biodiversity and agricultural land
- Not clear of how Daventry will grow as a town /city? And how this fits into the overall thinking about Daventry, its regeneration and the future overall 'shape' of the town, community, and associated facilities
- Negative cumulative impact of developments on views from Braunston, including night light pollution
- Growth at Northampton would be a far better option

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- Overdependence on logistics – warehousing will become automated and will require less employees. Consideration of low-rise buildings for manufacturing purposes more suitable.
- Excessive urban sprawl from Daventry creeping up the A361 and A45
- No reference to support infrastructure
- Developer driven development has no place in strategic planning
- Mixed use sites for development offer a more sustainable solution than independent employment and residential areas that require longer journeys to reach.
- The option is 90ha, the shortfall of employment land in HENA is 26.6 ha, which would result in an over provision of employment land.
- The topography would result in visually intrusive development impact on the surrounding countryside and villages.
- Better option is to plan for employment area to the north east of A45
- Not considered an appropriate direction for development. It represents urban sprawl and directs development away from existing and credibly achievable public transport provision - the existing employment areas on this side of the broadly do not own offer existing public transport services. It would not represent an easy location to provide relevant public transport choices to. In fact, the significant gradients are also likely to make walking and cycling routes rather less attractive too.

Comments made by respondents who did not specify ‘yes’ or ‘no’:

- Growth at Northampton, Daventry, Wellingborough, and Kettering
- Although set back from the canal the potential visual impacts to its current rural setting would need to be considered. The canal towpath is an important traffic free route for walking / cycling for both leisure and utility walkers and could provide a commuter route to neighbouring urban areas. The impacts of any increased use would need to be considered and as with Spatial option 2a improvements to the towpath surface, width, and access points to support this additional use should be a requirement for any development of this site.
- There is an opportunity to establish a truly sustainable approach which considers the plan area as a whole rather than the former sum of its parts (Northampton, Daventry, and South Northamptonshire). To this end, it is considered that greater consideration should be afforded to neighbouring authority areas, which will influence the spatial pattern of economic development e.g., the needs arising from the Arc and in Rugby Borough.
- This site would be a likely objection from Historic England. The proposal would impact on views of Braunston and the scheduled monument of Braunstonbury deserted medieval village (1017580), together with NN19829 - Earthworks of medieval/post-medieval ridge and furrow, part of the open field system of Braunston. Harm is also likely to be high to the scheduled monument at Flecknoe due to its Saxon origins and hilltop location with open landscape around forming an important part of the experience. Due to the topography and contours of the area, impact is likely to be high. If taken forward for further assessment, a better understanding of landscape in relation to the Scheduled Monuments would be required to understand impact on setting and whether harm can be managed.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- Lack of proximity to good road or rail lines – access and infrastructure improvements are required.
- Based predominantly on topography but also on the distance and physical separation of this land from the nearest residential properties at the town must be concluded that this land is entirely unsuitable for additional commercial development, particularly of the type proposed on our client's land.
- The entirety of the employment land lies within a current 'Green Wedge' The development of this part of the site would therefore be strongly at odds with the Council's concerns in respect of visual coalescence with Braunston village
- A further point is that the site is likely on the wrong side of Daventry if there is any intention for future employment land at the town to 'plug in' to the growth along the M1 corridor. Indeed, logistically the majority of commercial traffic will likely look to access the north south M1 corridor to the east presenting the south-eastern edge of the town fringing the A45 as the most logical location for further employment uses.
- Spatial Option 2b suffers from significant physical constraints that would severely restrict the areas of the site where development is appropriate, if not sterilise it entirely.

Parish and Town Council Responses

The following Parish and Town Councils supported spatial option 2b:

- **Blisworth PC** (no comments)
- **Brixworth PC and Strategic Planning Working** - Maintain the green wedge between Daventry and Braunston if possible.
- **Cogenhoe with Whiston PC** (no comments)
- **Greens Norton PC** - This site appears to be unsuitable for employment as it will be B8 distribution centres and not in any proximity to the road or rail networks. Access and infrastructure improvements are required to make this viable.
- **Long Buckby PC** - More evidence of some serious investigation of the proposed sites. Not just a few bald facts available from the internet. A thriving community should not be allowed to grow beyond the local economy's ability to support otherwise they simply become dormitories. This size limit should be incorporated in the plan. Keeping economic activity & the associated workforce close together promotes both the business development & green objectives of the plan. Assuming the Daventry NE residential development takes place
- **Overstone PC** - Daventry will need increased employment for the residents of the new SUEs
- **Welton PC** - Any industrial expansion will create employment. However, this is at the expense of the Green Wedge being infringed and its purpose to restrict the spread of built development beyond prescribed settlement boundaries and allocated sites jeopardised. Furthermore, the wildlife corridor from Swinnel and Middlemore Gorse to neighbouring parish of Welton will impact on the already affected area by development at Micklewell. WNC Tree Policy must be observed, and Light Pollution cannot be ignored. The topography of this development, increase of traffic on the A45 notorious for accidents, disregard of the Jurassic Way and historical Braunston Tunnel do not make this a suitable location.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- **Woodford-Cum-Membris Parish Council** (no comments)

The following Parish and Town Councils objected to spatial option 2b:

- **Braunston PC** - We have commented separately on three parts of the site as shown on map Daventry 2b map.jpg; as constraints on each of the areas are very different. Area A – delete this area (west of existing industrial estate and north of A45). As development here would increase the existing adverse visual impact of the industrial estate on the local landscape and views from Braunston, encroach on the green wedge and result in coalescence with Braunston in direct contravention of the Local Plan Part 2 and the made Braunston Neighbourhood Development Plan (Policy G). Area A is not required to fulfil the identified need for employment land, which could all be met within Area C. Area A should therefore be deleted. Area B– Delete the finger of land along A45, as it would represent ribbon development and it would also eliminate completely the gap between Braunston and Daventry causing direct coalescence with the Old Road/Hill Row area of Braunston, in contravention of the adopted Daventry Settlements and Countryside Local Plan (Policy ENV1) and the made Braunston Neighbourhood Development Plan (Policy G). Area B is not required to fulfil the identified need for employment land, which could all be met within Area C. Area B should therefore be deleted entirely from Spatial Option 2b. Area C - reduce the size to meet only the identified demand (the currently identified option 2b [A+B+C] provides 90 ha of capacity, while the need is only 26.62 ha according to the HENA). The resultant site should be a much smaller, roughly rectangular site north and east of the golf course and entirely south of the access road to Berryfields Farm and east of the Jurassic Way, not intruding into the special landscape area to the south west, with access only via Browns Road. Any extension of the site towards A425 should ensure existing community sports facilities and the green wedge between Daventry and Staverton are protected. A woodland screening buffer zone for the Jurassic Way long-distance footpath should be provided along the western boundary and there should be a requirement to retain and protect the existing Kentle Wood (managed by the Woodland Trust). Further comments Braunston PC has answered 'no' to this question because of the lack of demonstration of need for the area as it is presented (see below). With the option reduced to match the identified need, located within the southern part of Area C, our response would be 'yes', subject to the amendments and conditions proposed. The area shown in Spatial Option 2b is a gross overprovision (of 90 ha) set against the need identified in the HENA and shown in Table 1 on page 8 of the consultation document of 26.62 ha (which already includes a 23% margin for 'flexibility'). It appears that the boundary of the site has been drawn simply based on land availability with no appraisal of need or suitability or compliance with the adopted Daventry Settlements and Countryside Local Plan or Braunston Neighbourhood Plan. Area A, and to some extent Area B would be highly visible from Braunston and from Warwickshire as this land is on the watershed of England, exacerbating the already significant adverse impact of the existing Drayton Fields Industrial Estate on views from Braunston village and would affect the setting of many listed buildings in the village (not only All Saints Church, which is mentioned in the consultation document). Area A would also erode the green wedge defined in Daventry Settlements and

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

Countryside Local Plan (ENV3) and both Area A and Area B would be inconsistent with Policy ENV1(B)(iv) of this plan, which is to avoid physical and visual coalescence between settlements, and with the made Braunston Neighbourhood Development Plan Policy G, which specifically mentions preventing coalescence between Braunston and Daventry. The consultation document states as strengths that the site is adjacent to existing industrial estates and therefore can link to existing infrastructure which includes public transport. While the link to existing industrial estates applies to Area A and Area C, this is not the case for Area B. Note also that there is no public transport on most of the A45, so Area B and Area C have no public transport links. The document also mentions a cycle link to Daventry town centre (and in the short term also to Braunston) via the former railway line. Note that the link to Braunston is not currently in place and it is not proposed that it will use the former railway line.

- **Daventry Town Council** - The proposed extension of the existing industrial sites to the north and west of Daventry would challenge the Local Plan – Part 2, in relation to the green wedge area adjacent to land already identified (EC7) for development. The linear strip of woodland, known as Kentle Wood, would be consumed by the proposed commercial development, when this area should be identified as an area to expand the green infrastructure, planting more trees to encourage wildlife and help to address the issue of climate change. This proposed area also adjoins the Braunston Covert an identified local wildlife site, which currently sits in open countryside. The landscape in this area is an important visual asset traversed by the Jurassic way, an ancient ridgeway traversing Britain. It's a popular walk for ramblers, leaving from Charwelton to Braunston, a distance of approximately 9 miles (14.48 km). It is important to preserve the visual heritage of this area and protect the countryside from encroachment of any type of development.
- **Old PC** – Weaknesses outweigh strengths
- **Weedon PC** – Due to risk to heritage assets and historic landscape. The Parish Council is opposed to these options because of the adverse impact on the historic site of Braunston

The following Parish and Town Councils did not specify 'yes' or 'no':

- **Blakesley PC** - This site appears to be unsuitable for employment as it will be B8 distribution centres and not in any proximity to the road or rail networks. Access and infrastructure improvements are required to make this viable.
- **Hinton-in-the-Hedges PC** - Everything has a 'potential' – the question is whether it is morally right to do it – do the council taxpayers already there want it?
- **Little Houghton PC** - LHPC finds it difficult to agree with further expansion of the towns into rural areas without understanding the impact on heritage assets, conservation areas and existing infrastructure - in particular the highways network. Building on the flood plain MUST be avoided. The potential for using brown-fill sites and under used town centre buildings for both housing and employment should be urgently assessed, together with an exploration of the identified constraints. Sites already identified within the JCS should be progressed before further land is allocated for development.
- **Wootton PC** – Additional information required

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- **Yardley Gobion PC** - This site appears to be unsuitable for employment as it will be B8 distribution centres and not in any proximity to the road or rail networks. Access and infrastructure improvements are required to make this viable

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

Question 20: Do you agree that there is potential for directing further employment development at M1 Junction 18 as part of the spatial strategy for West Northamptonshire?

- 274 respondents said 'Yes'
- 161 respondents said 'No'
- 435 respondents provided specific comments

Those who supported the potential for further employment at M1 Junction 18 raised the following key points:

- Could create employment hot spot, with houses to southwest to create a local employment pool.
- Acceptable provided it considers neighbouring villages - with buffer zones that protect Kilsby, Crick and Yelvertoft.
- Provided that there is protection of wildlife areas, landscape, and natural environment
- There are tranches and pockets of land that appear to be suitable
- Warehousing and industrial development should be concentrated in the whole Dirft area and not spread across the rest of West Northamptonshire. Makes an ideal location with good rail links and access to M1.
- Good existing rail and road network and access (M1, M6, A14)
- Add to the enhancement of development of Northampton
- It clearly makes commercial sense to enhance the DIRFT complex. However, DIRFT is remote from major local population centres so generates commuter traffic. Surely there is an opportunity for a rail commuter service (perhaps limited to shift change times) from Northampton and Rugby to supplement the existing (limited) bus service and to ameliorate traffic growth.
- Also, essential that there is a link to access junction 19 of the M1 from and to the A14 south of the M1/M6/A14 interchange, otherwise "satnav" directs trucks through the villages to "cut the corner". This was major oversight and must be addressed if this area grows further.
- Best strategic option location as it is within the core of the "Golden Triangle" and benefits from the success of DIRFT. It has excellent rail connectivity to both the West Coast Mainline fast and slow lanes and remaining motorway capacity at J18 of the M1. It is also close to the A14 route to Felixstowe and has demonstrated strong market performance, with DIRFT3 continuing to attract large lettings and with space consistently being taken up at higher rates than elsewhere in the locality.
- Incorporate housing to the South and North East of it. The site for Employment could be reduced on the eastern edge to avoid having an adverse impact on the village of Lilbourne Meadows. Good natural screening should be part of the overall strategy throughout – also to increase carbon absorption, especially as large swathes of grassland are being commandeered.
- DIRFT is a successful logistics development providing significant employment. Given the continuing shift towards an online economy, it is essential that sufficient employment land is provided to continue the controlled

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

expansion of high-quality sustainable logistics parks. However, impact on surrounding villages must be minimised.

- Expand Daventry as a second hub
- Support to the text within the Section ‘Spatial Option 3’ of the Consultation Document that states ‘This location is strategically located at the heart of the road and rail network and is well placed in relation to the logistics “golden triangle”’.
- The effective expansion of DIRFT makes sense but the distance between the development and Yelvertoft must ensure no serious conflicts in terms of view, traffic, or other environmental issues. This is a much better alternative than developments at Junction 15 and 15A.

Those who objected to further employment at M1 Junction 18 raised the following key points:

- This area is already over-developed (DIRFT and Houlton), and this option would turn it into a vast industrial complex, swamping the villages of Yelvertoft, Lilbourne and Crick.
- Option 3a will not deliver employment as the labour market is already saturated with opportunities in this area and there is a wealth of evidence of current DIRFT businesses unable to fill vacancies and a consequential impact of the local skills shortage impacting key services such as refuse collection and grounds maintenance job roles in the local economy.
- The scale of this option is inappropriate.
- Will impact on biodiversity and
- Damage the rural setting and distinctive landscape to the north of Crick and the view of and from Crack's Hill.
- Endangering green and active modes of transport and preventing access to green landscapes and Public footpaths EM2, Public Bridleways EM13 and FP3
- Cumulative impact with Houlton SUE has eroded the greenspace between M1 and rugby. Land to east of M1 now acts as a green buffer between the new SUE and DIRFT and Crick and Yelvertoft.
- Greenfield development with an impact on the setting of the villages
- There is no business case for further development post Phase 3, HENA states there is uncertainty about strategic warehouse demand with a requirement for a separate study that needs to consider wider sub-regional issues.
- Lack of benefits to the local communities and environment which, with the vast costs of installing this facility, is a poor return on investment, it will create few jobs with no guarantee that these will employ local people.
- Existing negative impact of noise, air, and light pollution from DIRFT and other peripheral development on Crick.
- Impact on local roads from Junction 18 and A5 traffic
- The current DIRFT development already offers high levels of employment for the population from Northamptonshire, Warwickshire and Leicestershire with vacancies regularly advertised. Employment opportunities are also close by at industrial parks at Magna Park Lutterworth, Daventry and in Rugby.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- The cost of housing is high and affordable housing in the area is not available on the scale in line with jobs and salaries currently offered at DIRFT therefore people out of area commute to DIRFT increasing traffic congestion on the local roads.
- Impact (including litter) of overnight stays in lay-bys by lorries and on roadsides around the village where drivers do not have facilities to use.
- DIRFT has reached its maximum size, it won't be too long until crick is connected with Rugby,
- Over dependence on logistics - the nature of DIRFT does not maximise employee ratio to square footage and in the future more and more jobs will become automated especially distribution and warehousing.
- Should be promoting high tech high wage opportunities
- Rural areas and smaller towns should remain rural
- More thought should go into smaller scale light industrial units which provide more employment per square metre.
- Road and improved M1 before development
- DIRFT not operating to full capacity so unclear how this will be sustainable
- All proposals need better understanding of the impact of climate change
- This is an unacceptable extension of the DIRFT facility which will have a highly detrimental impact on the surrounding villages and the rural environment.
- Public transport connections are poor and a substantial proportion of the roles at DIRFT are done by persons who live some distance away and commute.
- This would make the village of Kilsby a southern extension of DIRFT. The area is on a ridge of higher ground which would make it visible from most of Kilsby. There would be very little employment of local people as the housing in the area is too expensive for low-skilled workers, most of whom would be transported in from nearby cities. The number of jobs which would be created is also questionable.
- Labour market is saturated with opportunities in this area – with demand outstripping supply and would require in commuting which is not a low carbon option and is incompatible with WN becoming a net zero carbon area.
- Before any further development is planned at Junction 18 of the M1, WNC needs to properly assess the impact of the existing development upon the village of Crick. What its predecessor has created is an unrestricted colossal fridge that operates 24/7 and 365 days of the year. No thought was given to this, i.e., that the warehouses are huge refrigeration units and that refrigerated lorries queue with their loud noise and fumes, especially in the early hours of the morning and late at night. The enormous concentration of bad neighbour uses in one location is always going to create a mammoth environmental health impact and no more should be planned until existing issues have been remedied. In addition, there are no affordable services for lorry and delivery drivers which means they cause congestion in the centre of the village whilst shopping at the co-op and constantly block access.
- Key impacts will be noise and light pollution and an adverse impact on air quality. The proposal will cause irreparable damage to the local environment and communities and take substantial areas out of agricultural use
- As with all development, particularly that located in open countryside there needs to be a conclusion to further expansion and as a whole CPRE

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

considers that with the DIRFT site the full potential of further large-scale development has now been reached. Further development will cause significant harm to the countryside

Comments made by respondents who did not specify ‘yes’ or ‘no’:

- These sites are some distance from the canal though visual impacts may need to be considered as part of an LVIA. In addition, consideration of potential impacts to the canal, its users and associated infrastructure from increased vehicular movements would also be a required.
- This is now an opportunity to establish a truly sustainable approach which considers the plan area as a whole rather than the former sum of its parts (Northampton, Daventry, and South Northamptonshire). To this end, it is considered that greater consideration should be afforded to neighbouring authority areas, which will influence the spatial pattern of economic development. For example, the needs arising from the Arc in the north and high levels of growth in the north, for example Rugby Borough.
- There has already been substantial development which is still ongoing. This will already have substantial but as yet unquantified impact on the locality, in particular Kilsby and Crick, and the impact on the highways (A5 and A428 and Junction 18) by substantial increased traffic from the already approved DIRFT extensions and the emerging new town of Houlton which will access onto the A5.
- This option is shown on the flood map as within flood zone 1. There are ordinary watercourses located on the site which have not been modelled, however this should not prevent the site from being developed.
- Expect that this scale of growth would have a significant impact on the operation of M1 J18. We note that option 3a would require a new bridge crossing over the M1 and Option 3b would be accessed via the A5 and A428.
- Employment sites such as this raise their own issues for the Police and Fire and Rescue Services. In terms of Policing, the existing site has provided funding for training and equipment for 3 PCSO's who serve the development. Additional resources will be required to service the proposed development in the future. We would ask that any policy relating to this site is subject to Secured by Design and other relevant crime prevention measures, to take antisocial behaviour and vehicle crime.
- In terms of the Fire and Rescue Service, if this development is to be predominantly “big sheds”. This causes issues in terms of appropriate vehicles to tackle warehouse fires. For this type of development, hydraulic platforms are required to give the necessary height and reach to tackle this type of fire. The Fire and Rescue Service will be seeking financial contributions to ensure that such equipment is available to serve this and other large scale relevant developments.
- This area will be very difficult to make readily serviceable by sustainable modes of all kinds owing to the severance presented by the M1, and its distance from the main bus corridor on the A428 through junction 18. Concerns that it will induce substantial amounts of traffic at peak/shift change times west of the M1 on the A428, seriously hindering the operation of existing and future anticipated bus services.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- Warwickshire County Council (WCC) is keen to ensure that the cumulative traffic impacts of Spatial Options 3a and 3b are appropriately assessed in terms of their likely impacts on routes and junctions in Rugby and surrounding area. Comprehensive list of capacity constrained routes includes M6 Junction 1; A5 /A426 Gibbet Hill; A426 Leicester Road corridor; A428 Crick Road/Hillmorton Road/Ashlawn Road corridor; A426/A428/B4642 Rugby Gyratory.
- The significant scale of Spatial Option 3a to the east of the M1 is likely to generate additional commuter and HGV trips on already congested routes and at capacity constrained junctions and may require further mitigation over and above scheme interventions which are already planned or committed.
- WCC would therefore seek an opportunity to work jointly with West Northamptonshire Council and National Highways at an appropriately early stage to agree modelling assumptions, methodologies and scope for a Strategic Transport Assessment of Spatial Options 3a and 3b on the routes referred to above to ensure potential cumulative traffic impacts associated with these spatial options are identified and appropriately mitigated where there are likely to be demonstrable impacts on capacity, road safety and/or air quality

Parish / Town Council Responses

The following Parish and Town Councils supported the potential:

- **Blakesley PC** - Yes, given the access to infrastructure, although public transport links need to in place
- **Blisworth PC** (no comments)
- **Brixworth PC and Strategic Planning Working Group** - Essential that there is a link to access junction 19 of the M1 from and to the A14 south of the M1/M6/A14 interchange, otherwise “satnav” directs trucks through the villages to “cut the corner”.
- **Cogenhoe and Whiston PC** (no comments)
- **Daventry Town Council** - Located to major road network, and rail link, good infrastructure already in place to cope with commercial traffic.
- **Greens Norton PC** - Yes, given the access to infrastructure, although public transport links need to in place.
- **Long Buckby PC** - More evidence of some serious investigation of the proposed sites. Not just a few bald facts available from the internet. A thriving community should not be allowed to grow beyond the local economy's ability to support otherwise they simply become dormitories. This size limit should be incorporated in the plan. Keeping economic activity & the associated workforce close together promotes both the business development & green objectives of the plan. Assuming the Daventry NE residential development takes place
- **Old PC** - Reasonable strengths to the proposal.
- **Overstone PC** - An employment area so near to strategic transport links, M1, M45, M6, A5 and the A14 is a great location. Coupled with homes built near the A14 and M1 would be ideal.
- **Walgrave PC** - Given the transport links, M1, M45, M6, A5 and the A14 is a great location, this would seem suitable.
- **Weedon PC** – No comments provided

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

The following Parish and Town Councils objected to the potential:

- **Crick PC** - The labour market is SATURATED with opportunities in this location. Demand is already massively outstripping Supply. There is a high % of vacancies. There are banners advertising jobs on every fence, signpost, and roundabout. Job Agencies are spamming social media groups based in Crick, Yelvertoft and Lilbourne but are unable to recruit sufficient staff to fill current vacancies. Recruitment standards are being lowered at warehouses in this area in order to try to find more staff. Councils and related support services cannot attract labour for key worker roles such as refuse collection as warehousing/driver rates are more competitive. DIRFT Labour is travelling long distances from outside West Northamptonshire (e.g., Birmingham, West Bromwich!) using non-green methods of transport. The road network is already dangerously congested with HGVs and cars, particularly when shifts changeover. There is noise pollution, light pollution, and litter everywhere. Further intensification of this model is NOT a sustainable, low-carbon option. It is NOT compatible with the transition of West Northamptonshire to a net zero carbon area. It does NOT support the objectives of health and wellbeing, supporting rural communities, thriving villages, rural diversification, landscape or heritage,
- **Kilsby PC** - This would not have the potential to deliver meaningful employment in West Northamptonshire, rather it is more likely to draw on labour from the Rugby area due to the proximity of the development to the boundary with Warwickshire.

The following Town and Parish Councils did not specify 'yes' or 'no':

- **Little Houghton PC** - LHPC has insufficient local knowledge to comment specifically on identified sites. LHPC finds it difficult to agree with further expansion of the towns into rural areas without understanding the impact on heritage assets, conservation areas and existing infrastructure - in particular the highways network. Building on the flood plain MUST be avoided. The potential for using brown-fill sites and under used town centre buildings for both housing and employment should be urgently assessed, together with an exploration of the identified constraints. Sites already identified within the JCS should be progressed before further land is allocated for development.
- **Kislingbury PC** – Decline to vote on particular options.
- **Wootton PC** – Additional information required

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

Question 21: Do you agree that spatial option 3a – Land to the East of DIRFT – has the potential to deliver employment development?

- 256 respondents said “yes”
- 388 respondents said “no”
- 480 respondents provided specific comments

Those who supported spatial option 3a - Land to the East of DIRFT raised the following key points:

- Best option, many advantages over the other options. DIRFT is a well-established logistical centre, provides significant employment, fits the needs, and has infrastructure that could take infill or be expanded.
- Essential that sufficient employment land is provided to allow controlled expansion of high-quality sustainable logistics parks. Minimise impact on villages.
- Great location for business, especially with the Warwickshire council proposal for a railway station near DIRFT.
- Excellent strategic location next to motorway, A5 and existing infrastructure will allow for road-based connectivity.
- Development likely to minimise transport issues on more rural surroundings.
- Area is already compromised by development. It would keep traffic congestion, noise, and pollution away from rural areas.
- Despite excellent location, cost of bridge over M1 will need serious consideration.
- The proximity to Rugby, including the Houlton SUE and Crick provide access to services and facilities.
- Would benefit from having a large pool of potential employees nearby.
- Consider where potential employees will come from. There is an opportunity for rail commuter facility to make it more sustainable.
- Good opportunity for employment growth in an area where there isn't much, very central due to motorway network.
- Concentrate warehousing and industry in the DIRFT area, it is ideally located for rail and motorway. Do not spread it around the rest of West Northamptonshire.
- Should be combined with a housing allocation to enable walking or cycling to employment to create a sustainable community and reduce carbon footprint.
- Need to incorporate sufficient driver facilities.
- Yes, but need to consider impacts on villages, in terms of view, traffic and other environmental considerations.
- In order for country to keep up with changing economy, developments like this are inevitable.
- Allocating land within options 3a and 3b will provide choice within the market, forge new connections and secure/strengthen supply chains by allocating additional land east and west of J18. This would not detract from DIRFT, it could enhance it, particularly where occupiers are attracted to the location because they are supplying at DIRFT based company.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

Those who objected to Land to the East of DIRFT raised the following key points: (These are grouped under headings for ease of reference)

Scale and type of proposed employment

- Option's strengths are weak, weaknesses are substantial, it would be contrary to many of WNC's priorities.
- Cannot see how this is sustainable as DIRFT is not operating at full capacity.
- No business case or need for more development. Development at Houlton and other warehousing is already happening. Should wait until additional study on strategic warehouse demand. It might not even meet all the warehousing needs.
- No guarantee that it will provide jobs for the local workforce. Salaries are not in line with local housing costs so it would not benefit the villages.
- Minimal public transport means that cars are already excessively used.
- Many workers at existing businesses are not local, commuting into the area to work and contributing to road traffic and congestion. This is not environmentally friendly.
- Development will not deliver employment, existing businesses are unable to fill vacancies at existing developments at DIRFT, Magna Park, Daventry, and Rugby.
- Unemployment is low in this area. If jobs are needed, they should be built near where people who want to live.
- Limited number of new high-quality jobs because it is logistics. Will not create meaningful employment opportunities. Need more diverse employment, including skilled manufacturing and high-end technology and sustainable and environmentally sound sectors.
- This part of Northants has taken a large proportion of the warehouses and industrial land over the last 5 years. Area of DIRFT 1-3 at J18 is already overdeveloped. This and Houlton SUE have eroded green space between M1 and Rugby. Land east of M1 acts as a buffer between the SUE/DIRFT and Crick and Yelvertoft. Further development would lead to coalescence with the solar and windfarm.
- Scale is totally inappropriate, it would have a devastating effect on Yelvertoft, Crick and Lilbourne, it would turn it into a vast industrial complex.
- Would result in warehouses all the way from Crick to Hinckley and beyond.
- Need to move away from outdated vision of building warehouses everywhere.
- Provide opportunities for local and agile companies rather than those with financial backing to acquire land.
- DIRFT 1 was well planned to create an acceptable environment. Subsequent phases are disappointing, land is neglected and the multi storey car park unattractive. DIRFT has not been planned well, it does not compare well with the Lutterworth Ullesthorpe development where buildings and roads are acceptable, and a new roundabout is in place.
- 3a far exceeds the HEDNA needs and would require a major new structure across the M1, which would be difficult and costly. It would not have its own rail connection, relying on DIRFT 3 terminal, putting occupiers further away from

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

terminal and increasing HGV movements. Risks coalescence with Yelvertoft and would displace the wind farm.

Impact on natural environment and villages

- Would lead to the permanent loss of unique Northamptonshire rural landscape, productive agricultural land, green buffer/Green Belt, green spaces that act as a carbon sink and wildlife habitats.
- Avoid sensitive areas, wildlife areas, important woods, and general landscape.
- Existing non-agricultural uses such as wind turbines, solar farm, trail bikes and gun club are all temporary uses which could be easily returned to agriculture.
- Visual impact, light, noise, and air pollution from existing operations (Rugby Radio site, DIRFT 1, 2, 3 and Crick) and the road network already affects Crick, Lilbourne, Kilsby and Yelvertoft. This would make it worse.
- Litter and lorry parking close to DIRFT/other warehousing is an existing concern.
- Offers no protection, there is nothing green and clean about this option, it will not help climate change. There needs to be substantial tree planting to screen villages.
- It would have a devastating effect on Yelvertoft, Lilbourne, Crick, West Haddon, and Clay Coton in terms of their rural setting, tranquillity, natural environment between villages, quality of life, living standards, property prices and sense of place as communities. Option would turn area into a vast industrial complex around Yelvertoft, Crick and Lilbourne.
- Not in line with Yelvertoft design plan. It would bring additional traffic to the village, be a road safety issue, and increase the likelihood of flooding. It would be right next to housing the edge of the village which already suffers from light, air, and noise pollution.
- Lilbourne is already impacted by rail freight, DIRFT, wind turbines, M1, Catthorpe interchange and housing development. Hedgerow on Lilbourne Meadows was destroyed in nesting season which made most of the reserve unusable. Visual impact of large warehouse is not mitigated by mounding and landscaping, trees will take years to grow. Feels like Lilbourne is neglected, it is no longer peaceful with a lot of noise and light pollution.
- Site straddles bridleway between Crick and Yelvertoft/Yelvertoft and Hillmorton and circular walks around Crick. These are already adversely affected by DIRFT 3 and will be worse with more development.
- Major warehousing would have a detrimental effect on Crick and Yelvertoft from an aesthetic and recreational perspective.
- Loss of distinctive landscape north of Crick, special landscape area, and views from Crack's Hill. Existing warehouses already block these views.
- Contrary to surveys for Crick neighbourhood plan which showed people valued access to the countryside and rural setting.
- Significant proportion of the area has a high change of surface water flooding. Development would increase flood risk to other areas of the catchment. Residents of Yelvertoft already suffer localised flooding even after the flood alleviation scheme.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- Site is within flood zone 1. Ordinary watercourses on site have not been modelled but should not prevent site from being developed.
- Negative effects of development would impact on residents' mental and physical health and wellbeing. Prospect of development is already causing worry.
- Likely to have a negative impact on tourism, including the canal network, walking, and cycling.
- General lack of awareness of climate change and carbon challenges. Need for greater sustainability and resilience in options.

Reduced allocation & alternatives

- Use previously developed land first.
- M1 should be the limit to development, do not develop east of the M1 or as far east as shown to reduce impact on Yelvertoft.
- Some scope but only from the M1 as far as the motocross track.
- There are other sites along the M1 and A5 that are nowhere near villages.
- Site clearly has potential to deliver employment development, however, should also allow new commercial developments in the rural parts of former DDC, particularly close to larger settlements with a good level of services and facilities and close links to the strategic transport network such as West Haddon.
- Already an employment area so generally suitable but perhaps on a smaller scale e.g., c. 50ha. However, attention must be given to the local villages who have already experienced increased traffic and noise as well as the construction of large wind turbines in what was once attractive countryside.
- Any consideration of this area should involve the three counties affected and proposals take full consideration of local communities.

Highways and transport

- It will be dangerous for green and active modes of transport (cyclists and walkers) and prevent access to green spaces and public footpaths and bridleways.
- Impact on Crick-Yelvertoft bridleway, both in terms of visual intrusion on enjoyment of this route and possible loss/disruption of the bridleway. Yelvertoft does not have a bus service, and this is the only route for some Yelvertoft residents to access services in Crick.
- HGVs already cause congestion, health, and road safety issues. Putting more diesel HGVs into a confined area will lead to more pollution.
- HGVs have already damaged local village roads.
- Current road infrastructure would not be able to cope. There will be a need for substantial new infrastructure for the influx of vehicles.
- Added pressure on the road network, particularly the A5.
- Yelvertoft, Crick and Lilbourne roads already suffer from high levels of traffic congestion. Roads are minor and not designed for heavy traffic, they will not cope with more traffic.
- Employment opportunities would not be available to local people due to lack of public transport from the villages and no suitable cycleways to the site.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- Poor bus routes and active travel connectivity although would be possible from Rugby and Houlton. These would have to be improved.
- Safe walking and cycling routes and other non-vehicle transport should be prioritised.

Heritage

- Potential to impact on conservation areas at Lilbourne, Yelvertoft and Crick and scheduled monuments at Lilbourne, plus nationally important ridge and furrow. If taken forward, detailed assessment would be required, particularly referencing the setting of surrounding assets at an early stage to inform allocation.
- Should be strict development boundaries to avoid negative impacts on heritage.
- Would destroy local heritage, archaeology, and culture.

Infrastructure

- Access by sustainable modes of transport would be difficult due to M1 and distance from main bus corridor. Provision of a bus access over the M1 from DIRFT 3 via a new bridge would be very costly but would address this issue.
- Would displace renewable energy projects including the recently installed windfarm and proposed solar farm, contrary to being green and clean.
- No mention of additional services and facilities needed.
- Would need to be accompanied by better truck driver facilities and stopping places as the laybys which are always full.
- Impact on police and fire services based in Daventry, information being sought on their capacity. Existing DIRFT development requires significant support for various types of incidents. Expansion would be expected to provide sponsorship of an additional PCSO and potentially specialist vehicles capable of accessing larger buildings. Adequate safe driver facilities would also be required.

Other

- Complaint about the consultation, timing so close to Christmas, lack of publicity and communication, there should have been a public meeting. Document does not show enough detail on boundaries, buildings, roads, number of employees etc. And is drafted in a way that is not aimed at the general public. Unable to make an informed response.
- Full and open consultation with residents required before any decisions are made on the Strategic Plan.
- A balanced strategy of spatial distribution is needed to ensure appropriate delivery.

Town and Parish Council Responses:

The following Town and Parish Councils supported spatial option 3a:

- **Blisworth Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Brixworth Parish Council** – Essential there is a link to access J19 of the M1 and to the A14.
- **Culworth Parish Council** (no comments)

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- **Daventry Town Council** - Located close to major road network and good rail links. Good infrastructure already in place to cope with commercial traffic.
- **Cogenhoe and Whiston Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Long Buckby** – refers to previous responses
- **Nether Heyford Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Syresham Parish Council** - Commend using railways for freight and it is sensible to keep warehousing close to DIRFT. However, there will be further HGV pressure on the M1 and A5. The scale of the proposed development would be unacceptable for the small rural settlements in the area.
- **Old Parish Council** - Reasonable strengths to the proposal.
- **Woodford-cum-Membris Parish Council** (no comments)

The following Town and Parish Councils objected to spatial option 3a:

- **Crick Parish Council** - Have provided a comprehensive response covering the following issues:
 - Breaching the demarcation provided by The M1.
 - Coalescence with the existing solar farm.
 - Loss of green space and rural character that is identified as important in the Neighbourhood Plan survey.
 - impact on the landscape should be considered but also the loss of valuable agricultural land along with the natural habitat for much wildlife.
 - Inadequate lorry parking at the existing DIRFT site.
 - Vehicles wishing to exit the motorway at J18 on the M1 already are frequently queuing on the carriageway at certain peak times of the day. Further intensification of traffic using this junction will only exacerbate the problem.
 - When there is an incident on the M1, the A5 becomes the diversionary route and consequently experiences significant congestion, which is a safety issue.
 - The proposal to build a bridge over the M1 will also have a further negative impact on the green spaces to the east of the motorway as this will be a driver to allow further industrialisation into the already depleted countryside surrounding these villages.
 - The impact of the significant growth in housing in this area has to be considered, both in terms of the construction traffic and the movements of the residents once the houses are occupied. There will be 6,200 at Houlton, 6,000 at Daventry and a potential 5,000 at Long Buckby. Safety concerns on the A5 are highlighted.
 - Pollution is a further major concern both in terms of air, light, and noise.
 - Crick already struggles to provide parking provision. It is a historic village with narrow roads and on street parking.
 - Even though DIRFT 3 has yet to be completed there is already a significant problem in filling the job vacancies. Banners are hung all around DIRFT advertising job vacancies and there is a plan currently being explored to bring workers in from as far away as Leicester to satisfy the demand.
 - The impact on the villages of Crick, Yelvertoft and Lilbourne will be catastrophic. Already the 200-acre solar farm has been granted approval and any further expansion to the east of the motorway will certainly be contrary to

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

the wishes of the villagers according to the evidence gained in the Crick Village Neighbourhood Development plan.

- **Lilbourne Parish Council** - Area is already over-developed and this option would turn it into a vast industrial complex, swamping Yelvertoft, Lilbourne and Crick. M1 is a well-defined boundary between large-scale development to the west and the agricultural landscape to the east. Development beyond this would be an unacceptable extension into the rural landscape, causing significant adverse landscape impact and unacceptable visual intrusion. It would cause an unacceptable detrimental impact on nearby villages. It would be right up to housing on the edge of Yelvertoft and have significant adverse effect on Lilbourne, Crick and Clay Coton. The villages are all already significantly affected by light and noise pollution from DIRFT and the employment areas at Crick where the noise of movement of lorries and other machinery continues 24/7. Site is low lying adjacent to the Clifton Brook but rises up significantly from there. This would lead to buildings climbing up the hillside and becoming an unacceptable feature on the skyline. Development could be partly set into the ground; however, the scale of the buildings and external service areas would lead to major earth shaping. Development contrary to Objective 1: Climate Change. Site is distant from a local labour supply. Would be a significant loss of productive agricultural land, contrary to national concerns about climate change, the need for the country to become more self-sufficient in food production and reduce food miles. Large part of the area is at high risk of surface water flooding. Climate Change brings more frequent extreme weather events; therefore, development cannot be sustainable and would increase flood risks in other parts of the Avon catchment. Part of site is occupied by relatively new wind turbines, which have many productive years remaining. This is contrary to policies and national needs for green energy. Area already suffers from air pollution from the M1, A14 and DIRFT. This would be significantly increased by this proposal particularly for villages downwind/receiving the prevailing wind like Yelvertoft. Development of DIRFT 3 extension has disrupted wildlife habitats. Full extent is unknown despite mitigation measures at Lilbourne Meadows. Option would affect the same species and includes an important nesting area for curlews. Site straddles the bridleway and footpath which links Yelvertoft to Crick, Yelvertoft to Hillmorton which are already adversely affected DIRFT 3 extension. This development would create an unpleasant experience with noise and traffic and would not be a safe place for horses and riders.
- **Yelvertoft Parish Council** – Climate change should be at the top of the agenda. Large scale nature of the proposal is out of character with the rural landscape and will result in loss of habitat, species and flora and fauna, and natural drainage. Extending beyond the current defined boundary would have an unacceptable impact on the landscape and villages including Yelvertoft. Loss of agricultural land will reduce food production. Development would displace wind turbines and reduce renewable energy. Contrary to the climate emergency and national sustainability objectives and policies. Significant proportion of the site is at a high risk of flooding. Further information on flood risk is needed. Bridleway is

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

missing from the plan. (There is an error in the SLAA assessment of site 139 which incorrectly refers to a bus service to Towcester)

The following Town and Parish Councils did not specify ‘yes’ or ‘no’:

- **Blakesley Parish Council** – not able to comment
- **Easton Neston Parish Meeting** – not able to comment
- **Hinton-in-the-Hedges Parish Meeting** - Everything has a ‘potential’ – the question is whether it is morally right to do it – do the council taxpayers already there want it?
- **Kilsby Parish Council** - This would not have the potential to deliver meaningful employment in West Northamptonshire, rather it is more likely to draw on labour from the Rugby area due to the proximity of the development to the boundary with Warwickshire.
- **Kislingbury Parish Council** – decline to vote for particular options.
- **Little Houghton Parish Council** – see response to Q8
- **Weedon Parish Council** – see response to Q20
- **Whittlebury Parish Council** – not able to comment
- **Wootton Parish Council** – additional information required

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

Question 22: Do you agree that spatial option 3b – land at M1 Junction 18 – has the potential to deliver employment development?

- 261 respondents said “yes”
- 231 respondents said “no”
- 287 respondents provided specific comments

Those who supported spatial option 3b - land at M1 Junction 18 raised the following key points:

- Already an employment hub and would be a sensible extension.
- Essential that sufficient employment land is provided to allow controlled expansion of high-quality sustainable logistics parks. Minimise impact on villages, especially Kilsby.
- It would benefit from having a large pool of potential employees nearby.
- Should be combined with a housing allocation to enable walking or cycling to employment to create a sustainable community and reduce carbon footprint.
- There is an opportunity for rail commuter facility to make it more sustainable.
- Better alternative to J15 and J15A options.
- Better than in villages and on green spaces but scale is mammoth.
- Need to consider impacts on villages.
- As long as the necessary infrastructure is provided.
- Size of development looks sustainable.
- Concentrate warehousing and industry in the DIRFT area, it is ideally located for rail and motorway. Do not spread it around the rest of West Northamptonshire.
- Excellent strategic location with access to major roads (A5, A14, M1, M6) and infrastructure to support it. Creative planning options can address identified weaknesses.
- Eco-park@DaventryInterchange parcel west of A5/bounded by railway lines is the best fit for employment growth. It offers three options for rail freight and has no environmental constraints. It is close to Kilsby but at a lower level and would be screened by topography and existing rail and roads. It is also next to land holding to the south where a country park is proposed and would achieve environmental performance, carbon reductions, promote healthy lifestyles and provide access to green space. It has advantages over the other 3b parcels in terms of scale and delivery and option 3a.
- Impact seems modest compared to recent industrial development.
- Certain parts would be possible, area east of M1 is already used as a depot, therefore partly industrialised.
- Should offer a diversity of employment.
- Public rights of way can be diverted or development sympathetic to their position.
- Full extent of potential site is not shown, site should be extended west of M1 to increase developable area. This site offers chance to provide choice and flexibility in the market, different to DIRFT, to allow B2/B8 operations to move into the area and make connections with DIRFT/supply company based at DIRFT. Extending site to include site east of the M1 will not detract from DIRFT and

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

needs support of the local plan. It would also provide green infrastructure and biodiversity net gain.

- Option does not identify entire land parcel west of J18. The site could be extended to increase developable area and provide green infrastructure and on-site biodiversity net gain. DIRFT is fulfilling its potential as a strategic rail freight terminal of regional/national importance and growth is seen as necessary in the plan period. Allocating land within options 3a and 3b will provide choice within the market, forge new connections and secure/strengthen supply chains by allocating additional land east and west of J18. This would cater for localised West Northants market to expand existing facilities or as a new investment. It would not detract from DIRFT, it could enhance it, particularly where occupiers are attracted to the location because they are supplying at DIRFT based company.

Those who objected to spatial option 3b - land at M1 Junction 18 raised the following key points: (These are grouped under headings for ease of reference)

Scale and type of proposed employment

- Development would not deliver spatial objectives.
- No business case or need for more development. Should wait until additional study on strategic warehouse demand.
- Smaller and more proportionate sites but DIRFT is not operating at capacity.
- Developer driven development, no evidence of genuine and publicly supported evidence of need.
- Development will not deliver employment, existing businesses are unable to fill vacancies at existing developments at DIRFT, Magna Park, Daventry, and Rugby.
- No guarantee that it will provide jobs for the local workforce. Many workers at existing businesses are not local, commuting into the area to work and contributing to road traffic.
- Limited number of high-quality new jobs because it is logistics.
- Unemployment is very low in this area.
- If jobs are needed, they should be built near where people who want to live.
- Salaries are not in line with local housing costs, it would not benefit the villages as people will commute in to work, adding to congestion and not environmentally friendly.
- Council is obsessed with building warehouses everywhere with no consideration of the visual impact. Unimaginative. Give more thought to alternatives, they are not environmentally friendly.
- Existing warehouses are vacant for long period and rail freight is not fully used.
- Scale is totally inappropriate, it would have a devastating effect on Yelvertoft, Lilbourne and Crick.

Impact on natural environment and villages

- Would lead to the permanent loss of unique Northamptonshire rural landscape, productive agricultural land, green buffer/Green Belt, green spaces that act as a carbon sink and wildlife habitats.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- Development of these sites will make remaining agricultural land prime for development.
- Existing non-agricultural uses such as wind turbines, solar farm, trail bikes and gun club are all temporary uses which could be easily returned to agriculture.
- Covering land in concrete and warehouses will further impact on the environment.
- Offers no protection, there is nothing green and clean about this option, it contradicts objectives 1 and 2. Will not help climate change or save the planet.
- It would have a devastating effect on Yelvertoft, Lilbourne, Crick, West Haddon, and Clay Coton in terms of their rural setting, tranquillity, natural environment between villages, quality of life and sense of place as communities. It would be right next to housing the edge of Yelvertoft.
- Option would turn area into a vast industrial complex around Yelvertoft, Crick and Lilbourne.
- Essential to maintain a buffer between industrial areas and the villages.
- Loss of important buffer area to maintain integrity of Kilsby village. Remove area next to Jubilee Wood from the proposal.
- Negative effects of development would impact on residents' mental and physical health and wellbeing. Prospect of development is already causing worry.
- Area is already over-developed around the motorway junctions, which presents a poor image at the entrance to West Northants.
- Visual impact, light and air pollution and constant noise from operations at existing development (Rugby Radio site, DIRFT 1, 2, 3 and Crick) already affects Crick, Lilbourne, Kilsby and Yelvertoft. This would make it worse.
- Litter and lorry parking close to DIRFT/other warehousing is an existing concern.
- This would be on land at a higher level than existing DIRFT buildings which would have a major adverse impact on visual aspect, character, and amenity of villages.
- Crick was always a great place to live due to countryside, wildlife and beautiful. It has changed over last 20 years because of DIRFT. Contrary to surveys for Crick neighbourhood plan.
- Proposed extension of Crick industrial estate will bring it closer to the village and destroy part of the green buffer between commercial area and historic parts of village. Would also adversely affect the allotments. It is already an unattractive entrance to the village, concerned that extension would be similar due to lack of management company.
- Landscape is under threat of flat blocky warehouses, particularly around the motorway junctions. Loss of distinctive landscape north of Crick, special landscape area, and views from Crack's Hill. Existing warehouses already block these views.
- Land next to J18 east of the M1 is elevated and would have a detrimental impact on historic setting of Crick and its heritage assets, of which St Margaret's Church is grade I listed. Land west of M1 and railway is a better location for this reason.
- DIRFT development has been constant. Assurances given to Kilsby residents that there would be no expansion south of freight line. This would bring

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

warehousing development south of the rail freight line closer to Kilsby and would impact on the historic tunnel, a designated heritage asset. It would be visible from Kilsby. Would also impact on the desirability of the village and house prices.

- Questions the SEA scoring matrix, cannot understand how site has good sustainability performance. Will have a severe negative impact on setting of Kilsby and its residents. Kilsby already faces disruption from light and noise pollution and congestion.
- Yelvertoft village offers a small village environment which many people have chosen because of country lanes, wildlife habitats, small school, positive mental health benefits, safe and healthy environment. Already suffer from M1, wind farms, motocross, solar farm and DIRFT. Way of life could be ruined by pollution from lorries and factories, unsafe roads.
- Significant proportion of the area has a high change of surface water flooding. Development would increase flood already suffer from localised flooding. Land acts as a flood storage in a high-risk flood area. Flood mitigation works would exacerbate problem.
- Two areas adjacent to J18 of the M1 are in flood zone 3, an assessment of the flood risk would be required. Clifton Brook runs through the site west of the M1 which may limit capacity. FRA would be required and if taken forward as an allocation, a level 2 SFRA would potentially be needed.
- General lack of awareness of climate change and carbon challenges. Need for greater sustainability and resilience in options.

Reduced allocation & alternatives

- Use previously developed land first.
- M1 and A5 are logical limits to development, do not develop east of the M1 or west/south of A5. Could support middle site between DIRFT and M1 because it keeps the area concentrated within the current site footprint. Land north of DIRFT has been generally supported by the village, limited impact on surrounding villages. Land on other side of A5 would be suitable for further development with potential for a woodland to separate it from Houlton.
- Not all 3 areas. Area near Kilsby would impact too much on the village and should be discounted, the other two areas would be more suitable and appear to have less impact on residential properties.
- 3 smaller sites are much more sustainable and appropriate for the rural setting of Crick and Kilsby and for the 2 eastern sites, are essentially infill.
- Could develop small areas east and west of M1 but not the larger area between the railway lines.
- Areas closest to J18 would be best. Not the area south of the railway/west of A5.
- Contain between the railway lines to protect villages.
- Do not support building towards Kilsby and beyond the Northampton loop railway line. Small site closest to Kilsby will not offer much benefit to the whole.
- Site south of Eldon Way should be added to candidate sites under option 3b.
- If the area next to the weighbridge was developed it would open up the area to the north.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- Should be looking at a wider geographical area to neighbouring council areas including the Arc and Rugby Borough.
- Should be greater acknowledgement of the contribution made by smaller employment sites.

Highways and transport

- Access by sustainable modes of transport would be difficult due to M1 and distance from main bus corridor. Provision of a bus access over the M1 from DIRFT 3 via a new bridge would be very costly but would address this issue.
- It will endanger green and active modes of transport (cyclists and walkers) and prevent access to green spaces and public footpaths and bridleways. Mitigation is required to ensure the public rights of way network is maintained.
- Suggestion for a commuter rail link between Rugby and Northampton at shift change times to supplement the existing limited bus service.
- HGVs already cause congestion, health, and road safety issues. Putting more diesel HGVs into a confined area will lead to more pollution. HGVs have already damaged local village roads.
- Unsure how transport infrastructure will cope with additional development.
- M1 is congested and blocked regularly.
- Added pressure on the road network, particularly the A5 and A361 from Kilsby to Daventry. Substantial new infrastructure will be needed for the influx of vehicles.
- Yelvertoft, Crick and Lilbourne roads already suffer from high levels of traffic congestion. Roads are minor and not designed for heavy traffic, they will not cope with more traffic. It is an area where major roads converge, which creates stress on the minor roads.

Heritage

- Impact on heritage. Part of site is adjacent to Watling Street Roman Road scheduled monument on which there would be a significant impact. High potential for roadside archaeological remains and further south. Impacts on grade II* listed buildings and structures at and outside Kilsby. If taken forward, further detailed assessment would be required including views from Barby motte castle.
- Land next to J18/east of M1/opposite Crick industrial estate is elevated. Potential to impact on historic setting of Crick and listed buildings.
- Land next to J18/east of M1/opposite Crick industrial estate is elevated. Potential to impact on historic setting of Crick and listed buildings.

Infrastructure

- Inadequate truck driver facilities lead to use of verges and laybys for overnight parking, causing significant litter issues and fouling.
- Impact on police and fire services based in Daventry, information being sought on their capacity. Existing DIRFT development requires significant support for various types of incidents. Expansion would be expected to provide sponsorship of an additional PCSO and potentially specialist vehicles capable of accessing larger buildings. Adequate safe driver facilities would also be required.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- Villages cannot cope with more people, doctors and schools are at maximum capacity.
- Would displace renewable energy projects including the recently installed windfarm and proposed solar farm, contrary to being green and clean.
- No mention of additional services and facilities needed.

Other

- Disappointed at lack of communication from WNC. There should have been a public meeting. Closing date and time were difficult to achieve and unhelpful.
- Maps and information are not sufficiently detailed to make an informed response.

Parish / Town Council Responses:

The following Parish and Town Councils supported spatial option 3b:

- **Blisworth Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Brixworth Parish Council** - Essential that there is a link to access junction 19 of M1 from and to the A14 south of M1/M6/A14 interchange, otherwise satnav directs trucks through villages.
- **Cogenhoe and Whiston Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Daventry Town Council** - Appears to be infilling existing employment development. Disagree that the labour market is close by. Current employment is mainly warehousing and demographic for this type of work is based in the larger towns (Coventry/Northampton)
- **Nether Heyford Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Overstone Parish Council** - Great location close to strategic links. Would be ideal if combined with housing close to A14/M1.
- **Long Buckby Parish Council** – refers to previous responses
- **Syresham Parish Council** - Commend use of railways for freight and it is sensible to keep warehousing close to DIRFT. However, there will be further HGV pressure on the M1 and A5 and the scale would be unacceptable for the small rural settlements in the area.
- **Walgrave Parish Council** - Given transport links it is a great location and suitable.
- **Woodford-cum-Membris Parish Council** (no comments)

The following Parish and Town Councils objected to spatial option 3b:

- **Crick Parish Council** - Option will not deliver more employment, labour market is already saturated with similar opportunities. Current DIRFT businesses are unable to fill vacancies. Consequential impact of local skills shortages is impact on key services like refuse collection and grounds maintenance jobs in the local economy. Location is wholly inappropriate. It will endanger life because it is on the floodplain. It will destroy biodiversity, decimate the rural setting and distinctive landscape north of Crick and views of and to Crack's Hill. It will affect health due to pollution, endanger green and active modes of transport by creating

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

congestion and RTAs at the M1/A5 interchange. It will prevent access to green landscapes and public footpaths. No enhancement, no protection, no diversification, and nothing green and clean. Thousands of residents will suffer badly.

- **Kilsby Parish Council** - Option is three separate options, each with merits and disadvantages. It is therefore difficult to provide a response that does justice to all three. Would not have the potential to deliver meaningful employment in West Northants, more likely to draw labour from Rugby due to proximity to Warwickshire boundary. Impact on Kilsby Conservation Area and certain listed buildings would be significant and beyond mitigation. Local highway infrastructure is already insufficient. Existing DIRFT expansion plans exceed capacity. Further expansion would add more traffic and make traffic through Kilsby intolerable. Noise, air, and light pollution would seriously impact Kilsby residents. Land is included in the Kilsby NDP as an important buffer between the village and DIRFT. Option would remove that buffer. Public right of way runs through the site. Detrimental impact on wildlife.
- **Old Parish Council** - Weaknesses outweigh strengths.

The following Parish and Town Councils did not specify ‘yes’ or ‘no’:

- **Blakesley Parish Council** – not able to comment.
- **Easton Neston Parish Meeting** – not able to comment.
- **Hinton-in-the-Hedges Parish Meeting** - Everything has potential, question is whether it is morally right to do it, do the council taxpayers already there want it?
- **Little Houghton Parish Council** - Insufficient local knowledge to comment on specific sites, however, it is difficult to agree to towns expanding into rural areas without understanding impact on heritage and infrastructure, particularly highways. Potential for using brownfield sites and underused town centre buildings should be addressed as well as the identified constraints. Progress existing JCS sites before allocating more land.
- **Kislingbury Parish Council** – declines to vote for particular options.
- **Weedon Parish Council** – see response to Q20
- **Whittlebury Parish Council** – not able to comment
- **Wootton Parish Council** – additional information required.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

Question 23: Do you agree that there is potential for directing further development at Brackley and Towcester, as rural service centres, as part of the spatial strategy for West Northamptonshire?

- 233 respondents said 'Yes'
- 253 respondents said 'No'
- 315 respondents provided specific comments

Those who supported the potential for directing further development at Brackley and Towcester, as rural service centres, raised the following key points: (These are grouped under headings for ease of reference)

General

- The principle is acceptable provided the history of the towns is preserved.
- A limited amount of residential development would be appropriate in both Brackley and Towcester, provided the growth is appropriate in scale and does not result in overdevelopment.
- Mixed employment and residential uses would create sustainable communities.
- Lovely market towns with good economies and facilities that could be developed in line with their current character.
- There is no evidence to suggest that Brackley or Towcester would be unable to accommodate some future growth in the next 30-year time period; however, there is equally no evidence to suggest that it could viably be delivered in the context of its strategic infrastructure needs.
- It would be leveraging already successful towns so that the benefit could be felt more readily and more significantly.
- Based on the desire to build commuting settlements for the Oxford - Cambridge Arc, then these towns work quite well. The problem is with the assumption the Arc will benefit Northamptonshire.
- Any proposals would need to be sustainable.
- It is essential that suitable levels of growth are directed towards Brackley and Towcester, to ensure these key settlements can continue to grow up to 2050. These settlements are the third and fourth most sustainable settlements in West Northamptonshire and it is essential that the growth to these settlements is not unnecessarily curtailed and can contribute towards meeting overarching strategic development needs. There remains significant outstanding housing and employment commitments from both the Core Strategy and South Northamptonshire Part 2 Local Plan. However, it must be remembered that these commitments will not continue to deliver to 2050, with both having a functional plan period up to 2029, some 21 years shorter than that now being proposed. As such it is entirely sensible and commensurate for additional allocations to be delivered, to cover the 2029-2050 period.
- The towns are well connected to urban centres of Banbury, Bicester, Oxford, and Milton Keynes and have great residential demand.
- Growth at the Market Towns of Brackley and Towcester is considered to be an appropriate spatial development strategy to help deliver the Spatial Vision.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- Growth in these towns would result in improved access to services for those living in the smaller surrounding villages, including Silverstone.
- Care and thought needs to be given to the fact that the town centres will be remote from the extensions and how links can be created to capitalise and leverage growth.
- Any growth would need to appreciate the needs of an ageing (and increasingly isolated) population.
- These proposals would have a significant impact on police and fire operations and would be served by Brackley and Towcester fire stations and Brackley and Campbell Square police stations. It should be noted that Towcester is served by a community policing team and a retained fire service only and any major incident would require attendance by the relevant service based in Northampton. Information is currently being sought on the capacity within these facilities, but it is expected that additional cover and investment will be required to meet the needs of these developments.
- There's a drugs problem in both towns that really needs to be dealt with, but I don't think this is the place to raise this.
- 'Rural Service Centres' is not defined in the Spatial Options Consultation.

Highway issues/capacity

- Growth should be accompanied by the necessary highway infrastructure, including sustainable transport options, which should be in place prior to development.
- Brackley is more suited to development than Towcester because of its road networks.
- Proper road links reduce pollution (Speed changes of vehicles is energy intensive).
- With the exception of the established Brackley to Banbury service 500 operated by Stagecoach West, neither town can support a strong commercial bus service at this time. The main link between Towcester and Northampton has in the past been weakly commercial on an hourly basis, but the links to Milton Keynes and between Brackley and Towcester to date have failed to establish sufficient patronage to be sustainable. In part this reflects service design that was driven mainly by the needs of pensioners, demand from which has been declining steadily even before the impact of COVID.
- Stagecoach continues to look seriously at a radical new service offer in the wider A43 corridor that would aim to provide relevant choices to much larger numbers of people in this geography who are making rather longer journeys than the previous and current services have ever provided an option for. Maintaining a strong eye on this major strategic opportunity should be a key concern of the plan, as it would be likely to create near-term scope to substantially decarbonise what is currently one of the most car-dependent and carbon intensive patterns of movement in England.

Infrastructure

- Any development needs to be accompanied by associated infrastructure such as doctors' surgeries, medical facilities, schools, community centres, sports

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

facilities etc This infrastructure would need to be carefully planned simultaneously rather than as an afterthought.

Towcester (Specific)

- It is noted that the proposed development location affects a Grade I listed building and Grade II* park and garden, both of which are significant and material, and the planning authority needs to be mindful of the high bar set by the NPPF where heritage assets of this magnitude are impacted by development and this needs to be properly considered in the context of both the NPPF (section 16) and the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
- If the town is to flourish, then parking and traffic flow have to be properly thought out.
- A good transport assessment would be required to ensure Towcester is not impacted negatively by traffic.
- There are significant benefits both locally to Towcester but also to West Northamptonshire as a whole to recognise, allocate and support strategic employment growth to the north / north west of Towcester, as a key facet of the emerging Plan's spatial strategy and wider regional aims being delivered through the Oxford Cambridge Arc.
- However, there is an urgent need to build the Towcester relief road as there is congestion in Towcester, particularly when vehicles are being diverted off the M1 along the A43.
- The potential for directing further development to Towcester as part of the spatial strategy may be constrained by highway capacity unless Milton Keynes North West (Site ID: 47 to the north of the A5) is allocated, as this development provides the ability to deliver Park and Ride/Mass Rapid Transit, and physical improvements to the A5/A508 junction to address the existing highway constraint.
- Towcester is a local market and rural trading centre that could do with some further development within the town to benefit it, but existing properties not open green spaces bordering the town should be used.
- Further growth at Towcester provides a logical extension that reinforces the current spatial strategy.
- The proposed growth area would deliver junction improvements at the A43/A413 to unlock transport capacity at the town, including at the new A43/southern link road junction, which would otherwise be at capacity when the committed development is completed.
- The ambition is to deliver a sequence of new '15-minute walkable neighbourhoods' with local services and a strong character and identity set within a high-quality green network to deliver a vibrant place to live, work and visit. The proposals are designed as a series of distinct 'villages' to enable the delivery of early phases ensuring that development in this location will make a positive contribution to the Council's housing needs in the short term, as well as the medium to long term.
- The proposals are of a scale to ensure that infrastructure is funded and delivered in tandem with the housing.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- The woodlands, copse, and vast majority of the hedgerows and trees on the site, as well as the watercourse and ditches, will be retained within the development, and can be connected by creating a network of green corridors along them.
- Effectively serving the currently proposed 3,000-unit Towcester Southern Extension with bus services has, to date, proven to be impossible, and it may not benefit from any credibly relevant bus service for a considerable time to come. This ought to be a significant concern to all stakeholders.
- It is hard to see how further development can be accommodated on the former Racecourse in a way that makes it possible to provide a relevant public transport choice.
- Towcester has experienced proportionate and appropriate growth over the past 20 years demonstrating that this market town is capable of supporting future growth within the South Northamptonshire area.

Brackley (Specific)

- Brackley has a satisfactory by-pass and is close to the M40.
- Brackley offers a sustainable location for increased housing growth.
- There are more suitable locations for allocation than the land to the North-West of Brackley identified under Spatial Option 4a.
- The areas in West Northamptonshire already suffering most from housing affordability are to the south and west around Brackley. That problem will therefore become worse and could potentially become a barrier to economic ambitions if not addressed through increased housing supply.
- There is a very strong likelihood that by 2027/2028 there will be no significant housing land available in Brackley to meet its future needs. Given the economic significance of Brackley and affordability issues in the area, no growth at Brackley cannot be an appropriate strategy for the Plan.
- The provision of enhanced sports facilities in Brackley is welcome and would allow WNC to capitalise on its property portfolio.
- Such growth can and should be brought forward in accordance with the successful urban design principle at Radstone Fields.
- Providing relevant bus service options to recent and more established suburban development at Brackley has proven to be quite challenging.

Those who objected to the potential for directing further development at Brackley and Towcester, as rural service centres, raised the following key points: (These are grouped under headings for ease of reference)

General

- South Northamptonshire Council previously placed over-reliance upon these settlements to deliver the required growth for the area without sufficient infrastructure investment / upgrade. These settlements are not therefore suitable for further significant growth.
- The remaining land on their boundaries is increasingly constrained and of higher environmental quality. Land release should therefore be considered in

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

other towns before these Brackley and Towcester to provide for a more evenly distributed growth strategy.

- South Northamptonshire has a high degree of out-commuting, identified in both the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (Part 1), para 5.59, and in the South Northamptonshire Local Plan (part 2), para 5.1.1, which also highlights the area's low job density. Building significant additional numbers of houses in dormitory towns will exacerbate this existing issue - As we look to create a more sustainable future, we must prioritise putting new housing close to where the jobs are, or are going to be created, so that sustainable travel to work is feasible.
- The strategy should not create dormitory (housing) communities for more distant employment opportunities that do not exist locally.
- The quality of life of current residents should be considered.
- The impact of development would not be capable of sufficient mitigation to outweigh the level of harm that would arise.
- Brackley and Towcester are not ideal development areas. Areas near the M1 should be considered before Brackley and Towcester.
- There are already huge housing estates in both towns which dominate the local rural communities and spoil the nature of rural life.
- More detailed and accurate information is required before you can put forward any plan.
- Neither Towcester nor Brackley are topographically suited to vast expansion.
- More thought needs to go into brownfield sites in Northampton and other town centres negating the need for the urban sprawl that the spatial strategy envisages.
- Brackley and Towcester are the nearest things Northamptonshire still has to attractive market towns. Please don't ruin them too.
- The proposed development is of disproportionate scale to the surrounding West Northamptonshire settlements.
- Existing developments need to be completed first with a subsequent period of stabilisation, before further growth is proposed, or they will become dysfunctional and incur disproportional social costs.
- The proposed development areas are too far from their respective town centres.
- Further development of these towns will not only destroy their characters but also the surrounding rural landscapes and wildlife.
- Any further development must show carbon neutrality by recycling existing assets.
- Developer-driven development has no place in strategic planning. Where is the genuine and publicly supported evidence of need?
- Towns have to grow and develop but in a sympathetic and sustainable manner.
- The proposals lack an understanding of what you are trying to achieve in each development. There is a danger that it is once again developer driven expansion of housing without a sense of what you want each town to be, how you will invest in the town centres and options to think creatively about building community in existing built areas and redevelopment.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- Brackley and Towcester must be considered separately.
- 'Rural Service Centres' is not defined in the Spatial Options Consultation.

Highway issues/capacity

- If growth were to go ahead without the correct highways infrastructure in place the roads will be constantly grid locked – road infrastructure must be in place, prior to any construction.
- The roundabout at Old Stratford is already congested at peak times, and often at non-peak times.
- The road congestion and environmental impact of queuing cars is unacceptable already.
- Without an integrated public transport system that links these towns with the major larger towns such as Northampton, Daventry, Milton Keynes, Banbury and Bicester and their local villages, further growth will just exacerbate reliance on private cars.
- As public transport is pretty much non-existent in the area, any future developments will put even more strain on the overloaded local road system.
- Traffic issues are compounded by the lack of a North bound exit and Southbound entry to the A43 at Shacks Barn.

Infrastructure

- The scale of the proposed development here would be a disaster without infrastructure planning. Any residential development needs to be accompanied by associated infrastructure such as doctors' surgeries, medical facilities, police, fire services, schools, community centres, sports facilities etc
- These towns are already over developed for the infrastructure that supports them.
- Broadband infrastructure must be addressed before any more development is allowed.

Towcester (Specific)

- Towcester should not be further extended to become 3 times bigger than its original size – the approved extension already doubles its size. Now you are planning to add more. Towcester has had enough construction and can take no more without severely damaging the look and feel of a rural town.
- You are making Towcester a polluted large town/small city and destroying the wildlife.
- Traffic through Towcester is a significant issue and will only get worse with further houses being added.
- Towcester is in effect a dormitory town for Milton Keynes and traffic is already a significant problem. It has a poor location and is badly served for access from the south as well as being distant from both the M1 and M40.
- The so-called relief road is already not going to be fit for purpose as it is simply an access road and further development to the southwest of it will no doubt require another road.
- The proposed area is within the Yardley Whittlewood Ridge.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- The building of houses so close to the Grade II area to the south of the racecourse appears to be on or close to the flood plan of the Tove. Properties and farms to the south will be flooded again.
- This is totally at odds with the green aims set out by WNC.
- The road infrastructure system around Towcester is already under extreme pressure and further housing or industrial development will only exacerbate matters.
- Towcester is a local historic market town and rural trading centre. There's potential for further development within the town envelope but not to the detriment of the green spaces bordering the town. Any development should therefore demonstrate carbon neutrality by making use of brown field sites.
- If the racecourse is developed it needs to be for something other than housing to continue to provide the town with a unique identity.
- Towcester has already increased in size without having a proper bypass delivered as they originally promised. The locals have been fobbed off with promises that never materialise, and someone is making a lot on backhanders on these projects that the locals do not want.
- The full implications of the ongoing development at Towcester South (SUE) and the ability (or otherwise) of the town and its associated physical and social infrastructure to satisfactorily absorb such a massive increase in the size of the town, remains unclear given that the SUE is still in the early stages of implementation and will take several years to be completed. It would be both premature and wrong to consider allowing any further significant growth on greenfield land on the edge of the town during the proposed plan period.
- It needs to be recognised that not all towns have the potential for significant ongoing expansion, and that some reach a point where they become incapable of accommodating anything other than limited incremental growth. Towcester falls into this category by reason of its geography, historical development pattern, landscape setting, the level and accessibility of necessary supporting infrastructure as well as sustainability reasons.
- I am truly horrified at the level of development you are proposing to our unique and beautiful town and surrounding villages. I appreciate growth needs to happen, but your plan (combined with other plans recently submitted e.g., HUGE DHL warehouse, emergency services hub and new retail park) all start to turn Towcester into a completely different place to live. It will then start to attract different demographics and lifestyles - heartbroken.
- There is further potential development for Towcester, but that this must be within the existing town and not be to the detriment of the green spaces around the edge of the town.
- It is essential that the Towcester Relief Road is not only completed quickly but that a weight limit is imposed on the A5 through Towcester to exclude HGVs from the town.
- The police station isn't utilised fully - rehouse the police and court and redeploy that building to save using up more green space.

Brackley (Specific)

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- Brackley does not have the services and infrastructure to support the extensive development that is proposed for the north-west side of the town.
- Halse Road is narrow and already used by a large number of vehicles to access Halse, Humphries Drive and Poppyfields estate. Furthermore, the single path is dangerous for pedestrians as they barely have room to walk safely whilst large vehicles are passing close by.
- Brackley has two natural road barriers, the A43 and the A422 to Farthinghoe. Developing land in fields on the other side of these natural barriers will bring into question vehicle access, road congestion/accidents and the impact on the environment. There will be an adverse effect on public safety with pedestrians trying to cross busy roads. To reduce the risks, significant speed restrictions would be required on the main roads with the addition of other traffic calming measures. Perhaps weight restrictions on the A43 to keep large lorries away from the area.

Comments made by respondents who did not specify 'yes' or 'no':

- Market towns need to be supported with sympathetic local centres. It is recognised that both towns have already absorbed as much housing as the current infrastructure can bear, so any plan must address not just mitigation for the increase in population but also provide an advantage to the existing community.
- We should create opportunities for our smaller rural centres to grow within reason and providing vibrant hubs that reduce the need to travel; however, if this option is to be considered then we need to develop a strategic plan that considers local transport, mixed housing, and environmental protection for green spaces.
- With the right developments and improvements to infrastructure, prior to commencement, there could be the potential to expand both towns.
- 'Rural Service Centres' is not defined in the Spatial Options Consultation.
- Towcester has a high degree of out-commuting which also highlights the area's low job density. Building a significant number of additional houses in or close to Towcester will only exacerbate this issue. As we look to create a more sustainable future, we will need to prioritise planning for houses closer to where jobs are, and thus reduce commuting. Despite the move to homeworking since the pandemic, commuting continues to create congestion, pollution, and delays on local roads, including the A43 and A5.
- Towcester has accommodated quite a considerable amount of growth through the Core Strategy to date. The allocation of smaller sites in the area are more likely to be supported.
- Towcester is an historic market town that requires sensitive treatment. Uniquely it contains the Easton Neston estate, Grade I and II listed buildings and historic parkland which should not be engulfed by further housing and commercial development. There is potential for tourism, but this should be provided for by further green spaces for recreational use, including substantially more tree planting. Trees have been cut down in the town to make way for newbuild. This is wrong.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- The plans for further development are utterly daunting for local residents who witness the daily impact of more housing with little supporting infrastructure put in place or properly thought out beforehand.
- Brackley's close links with Buckingham and Bicester need to be recognised in this strategy.
- Oxfordshire County Council note that this is still an early stage of plan preparation and as such the options are presented in the paper as potential spatial options, and not a preferred spatial strategy. Oxfordshire and West Northamptonshire's shared boundary means there is a key interrelationship between Brackley, Banbury, Bicester and onto Oxford. As such we are particularly interested in Spatial Option 4 – Growth at the Market Towns of Brackley and Towcester.

Parish / Town Council Responses

The following Parish and Town Councils supported the potential for directing further development at Brackley and Towcester:

- **A5 Alliance of Parish Councils** - Developing both market towns as rural service centres is a laudable objective. Both have seen significant growth in population in recent years but at their core the services offered are limited and reducing. Increasing the residential capacity around the towns (urban fringe) will not necessarily improve the viability of the centre without clear planning vision. Further improvements in their infrastructure and sustainable transport are required if they are not to become dormitory settlements without a core. The lack of detail and vision is worrying because the potential developments listed (particularly Option 4b) do not appear to offer any of the required benefits and would appear to make traffic congestion worse.
- **Blakesley Parish Council** - With the right improvements to the infrastructure there is potential to further expand Towcester and Brackley. What needs to be learned from the existing experiences is that the roads need to be built before any new housing and therefore not allow a significant development to add pressure for years before.
- **Blisworth Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Brackley Town Council** - Comments provided from Brackley Town Council refer to Brackley only - the Council is not commenting on the suitability of the proposals for Towcester. Although we agree that the options are most suitable in terms of the local area and geography, we would like to reiterate our objection to the further growth of Brackley at this time due to risk of the town being overwhelmed given the recent and already approved/planned rapid growth. Request that a scaled-back 15-year strategic plan is provided instead of a 30-year plan so that development over the medium term can be evaluated.
- **Brixworth Parish Council (inc. Brixworth Strategic Planning Working Group)** - Market towns need to be supported with sympathetic local centres. It is recognised that both towns have already absorbed as much housing as the current infrastructure can bear, so any technical plan must address not just

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

mitigation for the increase in population but also provide advantages to the existing community.

- **Bugbrooke Parish Council** - Towcester has the potential to be a thriving small town in South Northants with great independent shops. The weakness is transport links, including no bus service from surrounding villages such as Bugbrooke.
- **Cogenhoe and Whiston Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Cosgrove Parish Council** - Lessons must be learnt from existing experiences - roads need to be built before any new housing is developed.
- **Culworth Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Evenley Parish Council** - The Plan flags the need for further work on constraints and infrastructure requirements. We would add the need for long-term work on community development and integrating existing communities in both towns with communities in new areas of housing.
- **Greens Norton Parish Council** - With the right improvements to the infrastructure there is potential to further expand Towcester and Brackley. What needs to be learned from the existing experiences is that the roads need to be built before any new housing and not allow a significant development to add pressure for years before.
- **Kingsthorpe Parish Council** - These are desirable areas, but insufficient knowledge to comment further.
- **Long Buckby Parish Council** - Supports the proposal, which increases the size of an already substantial conurbation with established facilities and takes advantage of excellent communications.
- **Syresham Parish Council** - While there is potential for further development, growth must be restricted to protect surrounding valued agricultural land and the character of the market towns.
- **Nether Heyford Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Old Parish Council** - Growth currently ongoing anyway.
- **Old Stratford Parish Council** - Whatever improvements are required to facilitate such developments, lessons must be learnt from existing experiences - do not allow significant housing to be developed before road infrastructure.
- **Potterspury Parish Council** - Developing both market towns (Brackley and Towcester) as rural service centres is a laudable objective. Both have seen significant growth in recent years, but at their core the services offered are limited and reducing. Increasing the residential capacity around the towns' urban fringe will not necessarily improve the viabilities of the centres without a clear planning vision - Further improvements in infrastructure and sustainable transport are required if they are not to become dormitory settlements without a core. The lack of detail and vision is worrying because the potential developments listed (particularly Option 4b) do not appear to offer any of the required benefits and would appear to make traffic congestion worse.
- **Wappenham Parish Council** - Limited development in this area could be appropriate as they have both already seen huge increases in housing

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

recently. Need improved road access – The A43 and A5 and needs careful consideration before further expansion.

- **Weedon Parish Council** - Yes, if done sensitively as the current new development around Towcester seems to have been. There have been welcome improvements to the town centre, including parking, making it a pleasant place to visit (in stark contrast to Daventry).
- **Whittlebury Parish Council** - Yes - there is potential for some further expansion, but this would require appropriate investment in the transport infrastructure. Around Towcester the major local roads including the A5 and A43 are already inadequate with severe congestion at peak times. The half-built Towcester Relief Road is poorly designed, and we are facing an increase in traffic with the in-progress Towcester South SUE and proposals for multiple warehouse developments in the area. Public transport has been cut back in recent years, resulting in more reliance on individual car journeys.
- **Woodford-cum-Membris Parish Council** (no comments)

The following Parish and Town Councils objected to the potential for directing further development at Brackley and Towcester:

- **Daventry Town Council** - Towcester and Brackley are not well-connected to major road or rail networks. Although the road networks to the major roads is good, this is not discouraging traffic movements and reductions in carbon emissions.
- **Easton Neston Parish Meeting** - Towcester is a local market town and rural trading centre. There could be further development within the town envelope but not to the detriment of the green spaces bordering the town. These were identified in 2011 Towcester Masterplan and again in 2020 Local Plan. They need to be preserved and possibly enhanced. Any development should demonstrate carbon neutrality by making use of brownfield sites. We cannot comment on Brackley.
- **Hinton-in-the Hedges Parish Meeting** - Both towns have already exceeded their sustainability levels and there are more dwellings than their infrastructures can deal with. There is not a thought in the current proposals about green issues – not a single solar panel or electric charging point as a requirement of build. Totally overwhelmed existing medical, school and parking facilities. Whilst this section seems sympathetic to these issues, it doesn't seem to stop a suggestion that a further 3,000 houses could be built in Brackley.
- **Silverstone Parish Council** - Brackley and Towcester must be treated separately. Both are in the process of large-scale expansion with a total of about 4,400 homes under construction. There must be sufficient time for these developments and their residents to become integrated into the communities. The relationship with employment is an essential factor in deciding house numbers and the current focus on warehousing in the Towcester area means lower employment than for other types of employment development. An essential prerequisite is that the Towcester Relief Road is

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

not only completed quickly but that a weight limit is imposed on the A5 through Towcester to exclude HGVs from the town.

- **Tiffield Parish Council** – Agree that there is potential, but this must be within the town and not on green spaces. Further development should recycle existing assets.
- **Wicken Parish Council** - WNC should not be creating dormitory communities for more distant employment locations because local ones do not exist.

The following Parish and Town Councils did not specify ‘yes’ or ‘no’

- **Cold Higham Parish Council** - Cannot answer definitively either way, but Towcester is already a nightmare for traffic at times, and something would need to be done to alleviate this in advance of any further development.
- **Deanshanger Parish Council** - With the right infrastructure there is the potential to further expand Brackley and Towcester. Roads and other infrastructure need to be in place before development.
- **Kislingbury Parish Council** - Declines to 'vote' for particular options.
- **Little Houghton Parish Council** - LHPC finds it difficult to agree with further expansion of the towns into rural areas without understanding the impact on heritage assets, conservation areas and existing infrastructure - in particular the highways network. Building on the flood plain **MUST** be avoided. The potential for using brownfield sites and underused town centre buildings for both housing and employment should be urgently assessed, together with an exploration of the identified constraints. Sites already identified within the JCS should be progressed before further land is allocated for development.
- **Wootton Parish Council** - Additional information required.
- **Yardley Gobion Parish Council** - With the right improvements to the infrastructure there is potential to further expand Towcester and Brackley; however, the roads need to be built before any new housing.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

Question 24: Do you agree that spatial option 4a – Brackley North West Expansion – has the potential to deliver residential development?

- 210 respondents said 'Yes'
- 186 respondents said 'No'
- 212 respondents provided specific comments

Those respondents who supported spatial option 4a - Brackley North West Expansion raised the following key points:

- Brackley is located on the A43 with good links to the M40, Banbury, Oxford, and Northampton.
- Infrastructure is already in place to support development.
- Based on the desire to build commuting settlements for the Oxford - Cambridge Arc, then development at Brackley works quite well. My problem is with the assumption the Arc will benefit Northamptonshire.
- Several respondents considered that the option has potential for development, but the option would be overdevelopment and it would cause local services to struggle.
- At a reduced scale possibly. The impact of such a development proportionally to Brackley might be too much unless scaled down.
- Several respondents identified a need for employment development, local jobs, and infrastructure to support housing growth.
- Several respondents considered that the option could deliver growth but only if appropriate highway and other infrastructure is in place before development.
- Brackley has absorbed already as much housing as the current infrastructure can bear, so any technical plan must address not just mitigation for the increase in population but also provide an advantage to the existing community.
- Social family houses 3 and 4 bed are required.
- It would be leveraging an already successful town so that the benefit could be felt more readily and more significantly.
- It only serves to emphasise the inappropriateness of proposals for Spatial Option 5a.
- It is obvious that wherever there is development there will need to be educational, health, road and infrastructure developments and it seems odd to offer these here as weaknesses, as is remoteness from the centre. Daventry is a Town and therefore has a high % of the population and therefore should have development in proportion to that.
- Yes, but the SHLAA had other sites being promoted. A proper set of links to this to existing communities would be required. Such a level of development could bring the sports village, but there would be a need to ensure that there is a ring road round the town.
- Future development must be close to railways.
- The town requires improved infrastructure to accommodate growth such as a local bus service, perhaps ring and ride service to give residents at the far edges of development the opportunity not to drive their cars. More houses mean more people means more crime - Brackley needs a police Station.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- Long-term investment in community development, plus a clear statement that Brackley would be bounded by A43 and A422, and that these would not be crossed by development in future, in order to contain the spread of the town.
- As long as any proposed development is sympathetic to the town and not just another site of soulless boxes that developers seem to favour these days.
- This may be small scale village expansion as required. I am unsure of any larger scale development potential. I would think that the transport links would also preclude this.
- Radstone Fields was originally built as a result of a large brownfield becoming available. To extend this would be a natural progression and serves to 'wrap around' the town of Brackley. Transport links would already be in existence and so again there is the opportunity here to use green strategies to avoid excess car use.
- The area continuing to the proposed HS2 could be developed, but Brackley has already increased tenfold in last ten years and is there enough infrastructure / schools etc. to cope.
- These proposals would have a significant impact on police and fire operations and would be served by Brackley and Towcester fire stations and Brackley and Campbell Square police stations. It is expected that additional cover and investment will be required to meet the needs of these developments.
- Developing existing urban and town areas, with their existing infrastructure, seems to be most compatible with the objectives, as it minimises carbon impact and retains the overall character of the region (as opposed to new sites and village expansion)
- Any of the developments consulted on need to be able to demonstrate what benefits will accrue to the area in terms of S106 and CIL and it needs to be ensured that they are taking the development specifically benefits and any monies received are not used elsewhere in the area.
- Providing the development incorporates employment opportunities and is either self-sufficient or services at Brackley are expanded to accommodate a substantial increase in demand. It would be essential for a Brackley northern by-pass/link road to be in place before this development took place. Another situation where planning of roads and transportation links should be integral alongside residential and employment developments.
- Look at the re-use of existing unused buildings rather than build on new areas. Brownfield developments must be prioritised over green field developments. Expansion of existing areas, utilising existing infrastructure should be the primary consideration. Additional schools, doctors, leisure facilities etc. are required before further expansion.
- This site is on the wrong side of Brackley with regard to employment sites which are mainly at Silverstone and further north on the A43. The site is also divorced from the town by the A422.
- Natural in fill and will provide better road network for the whole town.
- Similar to Daventry, a good location to create a secondary centre in the south.
- Brackley needs increased infrastructure to be able to take this development. The town has suffered recent under investment in Police, Ambulance, and fire services, doctors' surgeries, Dental, school and nursery places. Roads will

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

need considerable improvement and Brackley is not ready for further Building on the scale of the Radstone Field estate build until these important changes are made. The importance of keeping Brackley's Rural Market Town identity must not be lost it must be safeguarded for the future and urban sprawl must be stopped.

- This area is predominately Flood Zone 1 with Ordinary watercourses that drain the land towards the Great Ouse. The development of this area should be achievable in a sequential and safe manner, so not to place buildings in areas of flood risk and not increase flood risk elsewhere. The development of this area provides opportunities to provide small scale flood interventions that will contribute towards the management of flood risk within the wider Great Ouse Catchment.
- Stagecoach Midlands - With care. Broadly, yes, in part. We are sceptical that as many as 300 additional units should be accommodated though it is unclear from the consultation whether this includes completed development at Radstone Fields and adjacent areas that account for about 1400 units already. The consultation document sums it up well in our view: "Whilst physically associated with the town of Brackley, further north-westerly expansion is increasingly remote from the town's core service and employment areas, adversely impacting upon the potential accessibility of these areas by sustainable modes, including walking and cycling." To this we would add public transport as we do not see any business case for creating an entirely new bus route to serve further expansion nor would we be amenable to re-routing the existing one. Both options that are subject to current planning applications suffer from their distance from immediately available local services including Brackley Town Centre, and also from established regular bus service principally provided by route 500. This is slightly mitigated by the fact that much of the use of public transport is likely to be for longer-distance trips. However, both risk being highly car-dependent and experience at Radstone Fields, through which the 500 runs, shows that when set against car use, the service is not seen as very attractive despite having been operating up to every 20 minutes at peak times, for several years, and being available to residents relatively early in the development trajectory, which was quite a notable achievement. Both land parcels under consideration need to be considered as extending the town about as far as it credibly can be. Significant further work must be done to optimise the potential to create relevant public transport choices, including, perhaps, an efficient route for longer-distance services, or optimised cycle links to purpose designed interchange/interchanges at the Market Place and the new Medical Centre.
- Various promoters of the sites covered by this Option submitted representations supporting the proposals which they consider meet the objective of the plan.

Those who objected to spatial option 4a - Brackley North West Expansion raised the following key points:

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- Several respondents considered the option to be too remote from existing centre with poor access and connectivity that they considered will be difficult to improve.
- Several respondents considered the scale of the option excessive in regard to existing size of Brackley and its infrastructure.
- How far do you go before it no longer becomes a part of the town - Brackley extensions have developed to such an extent the newer areas have nothing in common with the 'old town' and commuting within the town has reached epidemic proportions given the distances involved. Way beyond the local need in my view, regional needs should be addressed elsewhere such as Milton Keynes/Banbury rather than turning Brackley/Towcester into another Daventry - a town of endless housing estates and no accessible to all unless you have a car, centre.
- The proposed expansion in this large area of countryside will be remote from the town centre. Residents of these developments would need transport to visit the town centre as it would be too far to walk and using a car is not good for the environment. Parking is already difficult if you have no other option and bus services have been cut or rerouted over several years.
- Local surrounding residents should have say (vote) on this matter.
- Totally out of proportion size wise. Will ruin Brackley and make it a less attractive place to live.
- Traffic increase. Too far from town. We must use brown field sites first.
- Heritage. Landscape. Transport
- Developer-driven development has no place in strategic planning. Where is the genuine and publicly supported evidence of need?
- This would be the 'best of a bad job'. If Brackley gets more development dumped on it then these sites are probably better than elsewhere. But these would just be an urban sprawl and Brackley is going to end up like Bicester! In particular the weaknesses for building anywhere in Brackley outweigh any so-called strengths.
- The road network is already in a mess without the additional load from another development. Manor road is often close gridlock around school drop off and pick up times. Need to reduce number of cars getting close to the schools for child safety and to keep the traffic moving. Could make it one way, could use the old health centre land as a drop off area etc.
- Most of the sites have some potential, but I feel that there is not enough ambition in the plans for Northampton. Why not go for all the growth there? Go for it achieving City status! One big infrastructure development, including roads etc. Must be less expensive than all the meddling with small sites.
- Brackley is bursting already these places all high traffic areas with not much means for local amenities for local people
- No destruction of the natural environment should be planned.
- I think focus should be on regenerating existing built-up areas, not building on 'green space' in the interest of profits for developers. Building on such areas will affect biodiversity, pollution, traffic, and existing infrastructure.
- This is a skewed question. Yes of course has the potential but that doesn't mean it is the right decision

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- A development of half this size may be ok.
- Several respondents consider that there has already been too much development at Brackley.
- In terms of percentage increase, this is too big and will cause a fractured community.
- Brackley cannot cope with any more housing developments. Please stop inflicting housing states into existing residents. Chose a new site and start from scratch, build all of the new homes together in one new village with everything those people will need GPs, schools, shops, pub, parks etc.
- We need to stop building over our beautiful countryside. This impacts wildlife sites – aren't these supposed to be protected and enhanced not obliterated?!! We already have HS2 coming past us.
- It seems this development is too large for what the demand is it seems like the existing area is being swallowed whole and would lose its identity existing services would likely not cope, and with this councils track record of not developing them, or keeping their promises to do so, things will likely get worse instead of better
- A unique landscape much appreciated in the locality. The river valley in particular protects Northampton from flooding. This area has seen too much development and the build-up of traffic is unsustainable with regard to public health and(pollution) and delays in journey times. Please bear these considerations in mind when decision making.
- This development will have a serious detrimental effect on the environment, with increased use of cars and encroachment onto green field sites. The towns current infrastructure is not sufficiently robust to accommodate another large housing estate. Secondary school provision in particular would be overwhelmed. This plan will also see a further shift away from the core town centre and associated amenities. It seems that Brackley is becoming one very large housing estate with a severe erosion of the character associated with a small rural market town.
- All these developments mean we lose forever proper open countryside to be replaced by small pockets of themed green space. Our roads are already too busy, and services are overloaded. We do not need any more housing estates or warehouses. Use brownfield sites and protect our already endangered countryside.
- We are already at the limits, without inflicting further massive environmental damage on the environment.
- A great deal of highway infrastructure would be required. Adding to this the schools in this area are already full to capacity due to expansion already having taken place.
- Growth to the west of Brackley appears to be largely disconnected from the settlement with access only possible to the north and south. Unlike other recent development in Brackley which is well integrated with the settlement, growth to the west only looks to be included as an option due to constraints in other parts of the town – this does not mean it is suitable for development. The SHLAA assessment of Brackley west severely overstates the sites suitability for development, failing to recognise the open aspect of the site,

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

particularly to the south, where development would be a significant intrusion to the rural landscape.

- Several respondents raised concerns over the adequacy and ability of the roads around the area to support further development.
- As small market towns especially in the case of Brackley with significant growth in recent years it is now in danger of becoming overcrowded and losing its identity. Furthermore, with HS2 passing so close by this may actually put off future homeowners in the area if new houses are built ever closer to its location with significant loss to all the green space around and a danger of encroaching upon much smaller villages in the area
- The strategy should not create dormitory (housing) communities for more distant employment opportunities that do not exist locally. Without an integrated public transport system that links these towns with the major larger towns such as Northampton, Daventry, Milton Keynes, Banbury, and Bicester and to their local villages, further growth will just exacerbate reliance on private cars. It is known that implemented and committed growth at both Brackley and Towcester towns has already taken us to the limits of what is acceptable in terms of constraints and current infrastructure capacity. Roads and other infrastructure must be in place before development and the scale of development must be in line with growth in local need.
- The proposal to extend Brackley – not just to the west, but to the north as well, raises many issues – mainly, the lack of infrastructure. If this level of development (3,000 dwellings) is necessary to fund all of the highway and other improvements, and I am not sure whether that would be enough or not, it may prove a cost too high. First, this is a disproportionately large addition to the ancient town of Brackley, effectively moving the centre away from the historic core. Secondly, the financial pressure on the development, necessary to fund the infrastructure improvements may make the project less financially viable and so lead to a reduction in the level of affordable housing.
- CPRE is concerned that a significant SUE has already been developed in this area - further expansion in this direction is remote from the town centre and impacting on open countryside and the hamlet of Halse. There are also the issues of lack of infrastructure as mentioned in question 23 and the pressure that additional provision would put on other aspects of the town and countryside which have not been considered alongside this proposal. For these reasons CPRE would not support this site.
- Brackley has also suffered like Towcester with hundreds of new houses. People don't want it anymore. Look closely at what's there, bus services.
- Responses received by the promoters of additional sites at Brackley not considered through the options consultation confirming that they consider their sites to be suitable, available, and deliverable and appropriate alternatives to the option 4a.

Comments made by respondents who did not specify 'yes' or 'no':

- This option would need a northern ring road in place
- Don't know how much Brackley has taken recently. Brackley does have a proper bypass. Does have to many roundabouts on it.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- No comment on this area but would hope that our elected representatives will apply the objectives and points I have made related to the area that I know and live in, fairly and objectively to all considerations and maximise the benefits to all your stated and laudable objectives.
- Links to existing communities required. For a sports village a ring road around the town necessary.
- Sport England raises no comment about the suitability of the potential site allocation though it is considered that the need for a sports hub within the site needs to be reviewed. Further dialogue is required between the site promotor, Council, relevant club's and sporting governing bodies to establish the need for a sports hub and the deliverability of such a proposal. It should be noted that Sport England have engaged with a number of sporting governing bodies with several potentially occupiers of the sports hub indicating their desire to improve their existing sites as opposed to relocating. Further to this a new Playing Pitch Strategy would help to inform whether the hub site or off-site contributions would be required to meet the playing pitch demand generated from the growth planned up to 2050.
- Option 4a potentially impacts on the setting of the historic parkland of Steane which lies on the west side of the River Great Ouse, towards the village of Farthinghoe. Further assessment of the impact of Option 4a on this historic designed landscape is recommended.
- Buckinghamshire Council is less concerned about implications on Buckinghamshire from a northwest expansion of Brackley than an east or south direction of growth (which are not proposed) that would be likely to impact on the nearby villages of Turweston and Westbury. A more strategic consideration, however, would be the matter of flood risk from the River Great Ouse. It will be important to understand what potential there is for strategic growth at Brackley to increase flood risk in the town and so increase levels downstream into Buckinghamshire, for instance at the town of Buckingham. If a strategic growth option at Brackley is progressed, the Council would be keen to discuss traffic implications for routes towards Turweston and the A422 (east) and whether there would be increased flood risk at Brackley.
- Oxfordshire County Council - Option 4a is further away from the town's employment areas and therefore there is more likelihood of residents commuting externally, in particular to Banbury, but also potentially to Bicester and the Oxford area. It will be essential to assess how these connections could be made by sustainable modes to support climate action ambitions. In addition, the A422 approach to M40 Junction 11 is heavily congested, as are all the local roads coming into that junction. It would be beneficial to collaborate on how to relieve this situation by maximising the opportunities for non-car trips. For example, there is an aspiration to introduce a new Oxford – Bicester – Brackley – Towcester – Northampton bus service in the future, however Option 4a is in a location which could make it difficult to directly link to the proposed service. As a minimum, Option 4a should be linked to Bicester by bus for access to the rail network for connections to Oxford, Birmingham, and London. Should Option 4a come forward we would also welcome joint working on achieving an attractive inter-urban cycle route. Detailed comments are provided on the

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

Oxfordshire Strategic Active Travel Network (SATN). Finally, as there is some cross-boundary movement of pupils between Oxfordshire and West Northamptonshire (particularly the Brackley area), any significant housing development, and/or change in school capacity in this area could have an impact on the capacity of Oxfordshire schools. We would seek to continue to work collaboratively in order to manage this potential issue

Parish / Town Councils Responses

The following Parish and Town Councils supported spatial option 4a:

- **Blakesley Parish Council** - Yes this is possible site but the SHLAA had other sites being promoted. A proper set of links to this to existing communities would be required. Such a level of development could bring the sports village, but there would be a need to ensure that there is a ring road round the town.
- **Blisworth Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Brackley Town Council** - Brackley has already seen significant developments in recent years and any further development must be accompanied by improvements to infrastructure and services before largescale development. Brackley's Town Centre is offset to the south and west of the town and therefore not in the centre. This needs to be taken into consideration. Development to the North and West will require a new hub of shops, services, and amenities to avoid the area becoming isolated and disconnected from the rest of the town. We also need to maintain/protect our 'Market Town' status. An Arterial Road Structure is needed to accommodate ease of access around the town and to the town centre, and to reduce congestion and pollution on smaller roads within residential areas. In addition to adequate road networks, new development should be properly connected with footpaths and cycle lanes. An expanded Brackley should include an expanded bus services that is made up of electric buses. There needs to be decent spacing between houses with gardens and roads wide enough to cater for moving traffic and residential parking. With development of this size there will need to be significant healthcare expansion, which despite recent investment, is currently under great strain as Brackley acts as a centre for the surrounding villages. There will be a need for a new school, especially for Secondary Education, as Brackley currently caters for the surrounding area. The local hub should include local shops. Car Parking with electric car charging points is a must in the new hub. The town as a whole would benefit from a new Youth Facility. Adding Allotments to the new development would provide a valuable contribution to the town. There is a concern with the amount of traffic already on the A43. It is suggested that this should be turned into a 3-lane road. Therefore, consultation with Highways England would be suggested. It is important to recognise Green Spaces as good for the wellbeing of our residents and would expect this to be incorporated in any development.
- **Brixworth Parish Council** - This site is remote from the town centre, which is effectively near the southern edge of the town. This definitely will need effective connections for vehicles, cycling etc. Preserving the green areas and footpaths necessary.
- **Bugbrooke Parish Council** - If schools and health services are improved.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- **Cogenhoe and Whiston Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Culworth Parish Council** - but local facilities are not good. Already much development.
- **Evenley Parish Council** - The Plan flags the need for further work on constraints and infrastructure requirements. We would add the need for long-term work on community development, integrating existing communities in with communities in new areas of housing. Plus, a clear statement that Brackley would be bounded by A43 and A422, and that these would not be crossed by development in future, in order to contain the spread of the town.
- **Greens Norton Parish Council** - Yes this is possible site but the SHLAA had other sites being promoted. A proper set of links to this to existing communities would be required. Such a level of development could bring the sports village, but there would be a need to ensure that there is a ring road round the town.
- **Long Buckby Parish Council** - Supports the proposal, which increases the size of an already substantial conurbations with established facilities and takes advantage of excellent communications
- **Nether Heyford Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Syresham Parish Council** - While there is potential for further residential development, it is not desirable. Any further development will again swallow up vast areas of natural habitats and agricultural land. The recent developments have already put pressure on education and healthcare services and any further largescale growth would need to be accompanied by improvements to essential services, including the provision of a new secondary school and another new primary school. The current High Street is not vibrant and doesn't provide enough retail options to serve an even larger population. Public transport around the town and connecting Brackley to other towns and surrounding villages also needs to be incorporated, as well as improvements to footpaths/cyclepaths to encourage active travel. Increased traffic will impact further on the already busy A43, A422 and B4525. Brackley, the surrounding villages and landscape have also been detrimentally impacted by the construction of HS2 and solar farms for many years, with a great loss of mature habitat and again, valued agricultural land.
- **Woodford-cum-Membris Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Yardley Gobion Parish Council** - Yes, this is a possible site but the SHLAA had other sites being promoted. A proper set of links to this to existing communities would be required. Such a level of development could bring the sports village, but there would be a need to ensure that there is a ring road round the town.

The following Parish and Town Councils object to spatial option 4a:

- **Hinton-in-the Hedges Parish Meeting** - This would be the 'best of a bad job'. If Brackley gets more development dumped on it then these sites are probably better than elsewhere. But these would just be an urban sprawl and Brackley is going to end up like Bicester. In particular the weaknesses for building anywhere in Brackley outweigh any so-called strengths.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- **Daventry Town Council** - Brackley Town does not have the community infrastructure to support the increasing development, this would need to be considered to ensure community cohesion and provision of retail and other services to prevent it becoming a dormitory town.
- **Old Parish Council** - The Weaknesses outweigh the strengths.
- **Silverstone Parish Council** - This site is on the wrong side of Brackley with regard to employment sites which are mainly at Silverstone and further north on the A43. The site is also divorced from the town by the A422.

The following Parish and Town Councils did not specify ‘yes’ or ‘no’:

- **Kislingbury Parish Council** – Declines to vote for particular options.
- **Little Houghton Parish Council** - LHPC finds it difficult to agree with further expansion of the towns into rural areas without understanding the impact on heritage assets, conservation areas and existing infrastructure - in particular the highways network. Building on the flood plain **MUST** be avoided. The potential for using brown-fill sites and under used town centre buildings for both housing and employment should be urgently assessed, together with an exploration of the identified constraints. Sites already identified within the JCS should be progressed before further land is allocated for development.
- **Weedon Parish Council** - Brackley is a small service town for a very rural area whereas Banbury and Silverstone are the big employment centres. Sensitive development in local villages seems more appropriate rather than trying to make Brackley compete with Banbury or Silverstone. They have a head start and there is already an established pattern of commuting from surrounding villages to these two centres.
- **Whittlebury Parish Council** – difficult to comment.
- **Wootton Parish Council** – additional information required.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

Question 25: Do you agree that spatial option 4b – Towcester South and Racecourse Expansion – has the potential to deliver residential development?

- 148 respondents said 'Yes'
- 446 respondents said 'No'
- 460 respondents provided specific comments

Those respondents who supported spatial option 4b - Towcester South and Racecourse Expansion raised the following key points: (These are grouped under headings for ease of reference)

General

- All associated services and infrastructure should be in place prior to development.
- It would be leveraging an already successful town so that the benefit could be felt more readily and more significantly.
- Based on the desire to build commuting settlements for the Oxford - Cambridge Arc, then this works quite well. The problem is with the assumption the Arc will benefit Northamptonshire.
- Significant preliminary work has been undertaken in order to explore some of the principles of development that would deliver residential-led development at the former racecourse and to the south of Towcester.
- Productive developer collaboration has been undertaken, and parties have worked closely in respect of bringing the spatial option forward.
- The delivery of growth at South Towcester will complement the existing and emerging new community at the Towcester Southern Extension (TSE), delivering high quality homes and local services, with a focus on the creation of sustainable communities.
- The current Towcester South development has gone well and should be extended further.
- Growth in this location is fundamental in delivering the Council's 2050 vision and objectives.
- Developing existing urban and town areas, with their existing infrastructure, seems to be most compatible with the objectives, as it minimises carbon impact and retains the overall character of the region.
- There is space but pull factors are limited by poor access and by limited infrastructure / forward planning which discourage people from the wider area wanting to live in Towcester.
- The housing should be controlled to support people who work in West Northamptonshire, as opposed to Milton Keynes.
- A smaller site should be considered in this location.
- It benefits from being close to a range of services and to Milton Keynes.

Highway's issues/capacity

- It is critical that the road infrastructure is carefully considered and options for mitigating the existing backlogs of traffic through Towcester are given.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

Particularly as the A5 is an alternative route whenever there are issues on the M1, which then completely blocks the narrow high street with HGVs.

- It is critical that the road infrastructure is carefully considered and options for mitigating the existing backlogs of traffic through Towcester are given. Particularly in view of the other proposed developments around the town such as the DHL depot and the Podium, which will inevitably generate more traffic that won't be accommodated by the new relief road.
- An adequately designed Towcester bypass would need to be built, prior to additional development commencing, as traffic on the A5, including the pinch-point through Towcester town centre is abysmal.
- The relief road has created an opportunity for further growth: the current proposal does not seek to overburden that infrastructure, rather it will deliver complimentary infrastructure and services which will further enhance Towcester as a key growth location. Given the development would capitalise on committed road infrastructure, the scope exists to focus investment within the development areas to maximise social, environmental, and economic benefits.

Associated Infrastructure

- There is no mention of the provision of additional doctors, dentists, schools, police, fire, hospital, and ambulance services.
- It is clear that future growth within West Northamptonshire needs to be infrastructure led, ensuring key services and facilities are delivered when and where they are needed, taking account of existing capacity and the phasing of future development. The only way of achieving this objective is through large scale, well-coordinated development. The expansion / growth in South Towcester will maximise the potential of the existing investment in and committed to the Towcester South Expansion, which will provide confidence and certainty for future growth in this location.
- These proposals would have a significant impact on police and fire operations and would be served by Brackley and Towcester fire stations and Brackley and Campbell Square police stations. It should be noted that Towcester is served by a community policing team and a retained fire service only and any major incident would require attendance by the relevant service based in Northampton. Information is currently being sought on the capacity within these facilities, but it is expected that additional cover and investment will be required to meet the needs of these developments.
- Infrastructure already in place to support the development.

Racecourse

- The historical aspects of the racecourse should be incorporated within any future development.
- the Racecourse has too many heritage and setting constraints to be viable.

Flooding

- This area has parts that fall within Flood Zones 1, 2 and 3. Using a sequential approach development can be achieved ensuring future occupants are safe

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

from flooding. The two main areas contain, or are adjacent to, Ordinary Watercourse tributaries of the River Tove and to the river itself. The development of this area provides opportunities to provide small scale flood interventions that will contribute towards the management of flood risk on the River Tove and within the wider Great Ouse Catchment.

- There are Natural Flood Risk Management Options that would reduce flood risk and enhance the developments environment. If this area is allocated, we would expect the associated policy to support/require the development achieve net flood risk reduction in line with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the Environment Agency's Flood Risk Management Strategy.
- The sites are not in a groundwater Source Protection Zone (SPZ) but are underlain by secondary and principal aquifers. The regional use of groundwater in this area makes the site vulnerable to pollution. However, we understand that the sites comprise predominantly greenfield undeveloped agricultural land.
- The Water Companies will need to consider future growth giving regard to the capacity in the sewerage network, to allow them to make medium and long-term infrastructure plans, where necessary.
- Any new developments will need to follow the Water Framework Directive (WFD) requirements to demonstrate no deterioration of river quality and aim to achieve Good WFD status.
- Water cycle studies may be required/refreshed.
- Flooding will be mitigated through the completion of a flood risk assessment and the implementation of recommended measures including sustainable drainage techniques.

Those who objected to spatial option 4b - Towcester South and Racecourse Expansion raised the following key points: (These are grouped under headings for ease of reference)

General

- The impact of development would not be capable of sufficient mitigation to outweigh the level of harm that would arise.
- Other more appropriate sites exist in the administrative area, which should be considered for release for development prior to this land - as part of this process the LPA needs to demonstrate that all alternative options have been considered.
- The document brochure states that the site is being put forward for residential; however, within the spreadsheet supporting document it states, 'Part of the site is promoted for employment and subject to appropriate design and layout may be considered suitable provided that it respects the historic character of the registered park and garden'. The site is being consulted on as residential and if there is to be employment a further consultation should be undertaken.
- Query whether the site relating to Towcester Racecourse should have been allowed within this document at all, having only recently been submitted for consideration under the Local Plan Part 2 (adopted summer 2020) and

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

excluded due to its unsuitability and the impact on the local highway network amongst other issues. It appears no additional information or justification that would mitigate the concerns raised during the Local Plan Part 2 consultation and no material policy changes have come into force in the meantime that would change the previous stance.

- Query why both Towcester sites have been brought in as one, due to the separation between the two, they have very different constraints and implications. These should have been split for consultation as it is noted that many of the 'points' that each site had to comply with do not apply to the Towcester racecourse site (such as proximity to schools etc); whereas the site to the south does. This emphasises the Towcester spatial option should be assessed separately as two different schemes.
- The spatial objectives for 'Green and clean' are in direct conflict with the Towcester site.
- Towcester should not be further extended to become 3 times bigger than its original size – the approved extension already doubles its size. Now you are planning to add more. Towcester has had enough construction and can take no more without severely damaging the look and feel of a rural town.
- The scale of the proposed development here would be a disaster without infrastructure planning. Any residential development needs to be accompanied by associated infrastructure such as doctors' surgeries, medical facilities, schools, community centres, sports facilities etc
- Towcester is currently surrounded by fields, woods, etc which are important for recreation and mental health / wellbeing.
- Much is talked about wellbeing but, when it comes to it, all we hear about is physically challenging sport and nothing for the older residents.
- The quality of life of current residents should be considered.
- Air pollution would be increased.
- The proposed development is way beyond the local need: regional needs should be addressed elsewhere such as Milton Keynes rather than turning Towcester into another Daventry - a town of endless housing estates and no evident accessibility to services unless you have a car.
- Agricultural land is required to produce all of the food it can, in order to help the balance of payments, make available high-quality food produced in the right way and support our farmers who look after the countryside - future development should be focussed on brownfield sites.
- Sufficient affordable and social housing would need to be incorporated within any future development.
- The sewerage works near Cappenham Bridge is already over capacity resulting in large numbers of tankers moving sewage daily from this plant to the plant near Stoke Bruerne for treatment. Furthermore, the works routinely discharges raw sewerage into the River Tove as a result of the hundreds of new houses built in Towcester with thousands more already being built.
- If any part of this proposal is to proceed it must be a condition of planning that every house built must have solar panels for hot water and electricity and be fitted with ground source heat pumps for heating. They should also be fitted with an electric car charging point.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- The SUE does not reflect the diverse needs of a community. Many live with challenging health issues and many wish to downsize and move nearer to families as age takes its toll. There should be a proportionate number of bungalows which could accommodate these needs.
- Is the council only promoting this site as an aunt sally to remove it later and claim that they have listened to the responses in the consultation?
- Growth proposals need to be considered in conjunction with those proposed in Milton Keynes with cross border working.
- Proper consultation should include advising all residents and businesses in Towcester and the wider affected area to be fully appraised on this plan by personal correspondence/letter/ email etc. rather than relying on a chance encounter.
- the new West Northants Council are making decisions based on how much income they can grab through development, in order to demonstrate how they are so much better than previous failed councils.
- The National Farmers Union states we should not go below 60% of home grown produce, but with the pressure on land in this country from various types of development and its infrastructures it will be difficult to maintain that figure. Also, we cannot and must not rely on the imported foods long term. World populations are growing rapidly, and those food producing nations could need the produce for their own people. Therefore, it must make sense to safeguard good quality land to provide good quality food with high welfare standards for our own nation.
- A smaller site would be more appropriate in this location.
- No doubt in 50 years there will be further plans to develop the surrounding fields around Towcester and these associated issues should be addressed now to avoid problems for future generations.
- Michael Gove, the Housing Secretary said that the Government is looking at how “housing need” is calculated, amid fears it is based on out-of-date assumptions. Local planners would be well advised to wait the outcome of these latest government initiatives before committing us to something that is clearly neither wanted nor needed.
- Growth to the east of the A5 should be removed from the plan as this extensive area of parkland and agricultural landforms part of the essential character of Towcester and great care must be taken not to diminish it.
- Growth to the east of the A5 would be contrary to Corporate Priority 1 - Green and Clean; Strategic Priority 3 - Connected Communities, and Strategic Objectives 1 – Climate Change, 3 – Landscape and Strategic, 4 – Heritage, 8 – Connections, and 9 – Protecting and Building Urban Communities.

Highway issues/capacity

- Traffic is already too great for the town, including HGVs, causing noise and contaminated air quality.
- Towcester is struggling at present with only 600 of the Towcester South houses in place, no relief road and no quantifiable evidence demonstrating the relief road will make a significant impact to what is an appalling congestion and traffic problem through and surrounding Towcester. The traffic issue is

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

not making Towcester a 'great place to live, work, visit and thrive' with many boycotting the centre of Towcester and surrounding area due to traffic issues and even more working from home due to the impact the traffic has on their travel time and working day.

- It should be taken into consideration that if there are any issues/accidents/roadworks on the M1 Towcester is immediately gridlocked as the traffic is diverted down the A5.
- It is widely stated that the road network, on both links and junctions, in and surrounding Towcester is at capacity, with the congestion effecting local villages and the desirability to visit Towcester. This is the case with only 600 of the thousands of houses under construction at the Towcester Vale SUE - we are not in a position to make decisions on further future residential development in Towcester until the full impact of the 'relief road' is realised. At this point it is unclear whether further mitigation will be required once all homes are occupied, coupled with the recently submitted commercial/industrial developments at Tiffield and by Bell Plantation (the DHL site) which will have an enormous impact on the road network as we know it due to the proximity to Towcester, the A5 and A43.
- The objectives at the core of the Spatial Options Plan submitted includes impact on economy. The volume of traffic and congestion has a hugely negative impact on visiting economy. The proposals as put forward, alongside the recently submitted proposals brought in under allocated sites adopted in the Local Plan Part 2, will exacerbate this issue to a point where the High Street will be redundant. Towcester is becoming a place to avoid instead of a place to visit.
- The proposal will not only negatively impact the traffic through Towcester but surrounding villages, to both the south and north of Towcester. In particular, Shutlanger Stoke Bruerne, Alderton, Blisworth, Duncote, Paulerspury and Pury End will be severely affected by people using the route as a cut through/workaround to avoid the congestion hot spots. These villages already have issues with speeding which will be further aggravated.
- Turning out from the villages to the south of Towcester on the A5 can already take significant lengths of time at busier times, particularly if turning right across the carriageway, without adding further traffic.
- Without an integrated public transport system that links the town with the major larger towns such as Northampton, Daventry, Milton Keynes, Banbury, and Bicester and to their local villages, further growth will just exacerbate reliance on private cars.
- The proposals in Northwest Milton Keynes (5b) need to be considered alongside this proposal. The whole area would become grid-locked creating even more problems on an already over-crowded A5 towards Milton Keynes.
- Additional traffic will struggle to flow down the A5 which is already a busy and dangerous road. This will put pressure on the roundabout at Old Stratford. This is already a pinch point, and this is set to get worse with all the additional traffic coming from the road / rail terminal being currently built between the M1 west side and the village of Roade. Thousands of vehicle movements will head down the A508 to Old Stratford.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- There is a network of footpaths and bridleways which cross the site which would be lost and impact on the communities' health and enjoyment.
- The Grafton Way path would hardly merit being a country public footpath. It would be surrounded by garden fences.
- Will increase demand for commuting transport to London and elsewhere. This has implications for the station at Milton Keynes Central and other local stations, as well as the capacity of the railway line.
- There is no provision for an eastern bypass for Towcester just more development in the only area that could provide one.

Historic Interest

- Towcester is a rural town of historic importance. It is being made into a characterless polluted large town/small city.
- Can we be assured that the local character of Towcester will be considered?
- The comment that 'valued landscapes have been preserved and enhanced' is in direct conflict with the proposal at Towcester Racecourse which is valued land within historic park and garden with ridge and furrow, as well as a mill mound and historic workings, which makes the area important in terms of historic land and archaeology.
- Sites that lie within Historic Park and Gardens were to be excluded at Stage 1 of this process in line with the process requirements of Planning Policy Guidance (PPG). The Towcester Racecourse site is within a Grade II* registered park and garden, includes a Grade I listed building and is within the setting of a number of other listed buildings and non-designated heritage assets. Heathencote village has two Grade II listed properties that would also be affected. These buildings are some of the most significant in the country and as required by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) should be preserved or enhanced (paragraph 200).
- The South Northamptonshire Local Plan Part 2 (LPP2), adopted only last year, has specific policies relating to Historic Park and Gardens (Policy HE3), Policy HE5 – Listed Buildings and Policy HE6 – Conservation Areas. It is difficult to understand how a site with such clear constraints and conflict with policy has been put forward: when considering the whole of the West Northamptonshire district. There must be more suitable locations than a historic park and garden, with numerous listed buildings, in close proximity to two Conservation areas (Towcester, Easton Neston Estate).
- Policy clearly states 'where harm is considered to be substantial those benefits must be substantial' which would not be the case with this development.
- The part of the proposal for residential development which lies within the nationally significant Grade II* Registered area of Easton Neston Park is of major concern. The damaging impact of such development upon this important heritage asset would be considerable and irreversible, effectively removing that entire southern section of historic park which lies beyond the River Tove. Development would also isolate the outstanding Grade I Listed Chain Lodge entrance gateway from its function and setting and would

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

remove parkland views from the historic parkland north of the River Tove to the south and east.

- No mention is made of the Roman Villa and potential temple site at Wood Brucite which is within the mapped area (SP685469). This has only been partially excavated and has the potential of being of national significance as there is some evidence to indicate that the “Towcester Head”, currently on display at the British Museum, may have been found when a small reservoir for the town’s water supply was constructed close to the Roman site in the late 19th century. The area covered by this Roman site has not been fully identified but the costs involved in excavation etc. is likely to mean that development would probably be financially unviable in this area.

Ecology

- You are making Towcester a polluted large town/small city and destroying the wildlife.
- The development of farmland, that is presently compliant with a number of schemes to improve and conserve natural habitats and biodiversity, would be in direct conflict with the objective as put forward under Objective 2: Green Infrastructure and Natural Capital.
- No net biodiversity could mitigate the impact of the development proposed at Towcester.
- The plans will lead to the loss of the diverse and rich habitat on this land with a wide variety of native mammals and birds, including Buzzard, Red Kite, and owl populations.
- The loss of ancient woodland cannot be mitigated.
- Taylors’s farm has a good environmental record with many species of flora and fauna being boosted by environmental schemes encouraged and promoted by DEFRA.

Landscape

- The proposals would result in harm to the landscape character and important vistas.
- The existing Towcester South SUE was planned and designed to create an appropriate new urban edge to the town, with the relief road forming the boundary of the extended settlement. Building beyond the relief road (whether on all or part of the area identified in the spatial option) will not only negate this previous design led approach but would result in significant visual intrusion further into the open countryside, exacerbated by the higher ground levels here which would make any new development extremely visible in distant views, whatever attempts were made to try and visually contain it.
- Towcester Racecourse - Significant intrusion into the open countryside on visually prominent land and it would be poorly related to existing housing development.
- Light pollution will adversely impact on both the landscape and ecology of the area.
- The proposed areas of development reside in the National Characteristics Area 91 (NCA 91) Yardley Whittlewood Ridge. Quoting from NCA 91 “Despite

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

being close to Northampton, Milton Keynes and Towcester, the Ridge retains a rural character due to its sparse population and lack of major settlements.” Continued residential development in the area will be to the detriment of the character of the area. Further detail of the devastating impact the proposed additional residential development would have can be found in Natural England’s Profile of NCA 91 on their website.

- This proposal is visually on the wrong side of Towcester and the buffer to the countryside provided by the Easton Neston Estate should be seen as an asset to be maintained and not circumvented.

Flooding

- Part of the site is liable to extensive flooding which has been widely documented over the years - only last year flooding from Wood Burcote ran down to the centre of Towcester.
- Part of the Stage 1 process of eliminating sites included those within a flood zone. It should be taken into consideration that the hundreds of acres of greenfield being proposed for development currently hold huge amounts of rainwater run-off.
- With winters getting wetter due to global warming, we are experiencing flash floods more frequently.
- With the topography of the land being higher such as Highfields to the south of the town centre, The Shires estate to the north, business to the west i.e. supermarkets and then the proposed development further extending to the east; the centre of Towcester will be surrounded and sat at the bottom of a bowl so it is inevitable that surface water will end up at the high street as well as the River Tove which already regularly bursts its banks into the Water Meadows and the bottom of the Shires estate, let alone the farm land by Twicketts Mill proposed to be developed.
- Much of the land around the Racecourse and Taylors Farm is needed as a flood plain and we haven’t yet seen how the River Tove will react and cope with current developments let alone further ones.
- The town’s runoff and flood water have a significant impact on what happens down river. On Taylors Farm there is a gauging station that is vitally important for the Environment Agency to monitor the river levels and flow to protect communities as far away as Bedford.

Siting

- The spreadsheet provided states that mitigation should avoid residential development on part of the site covered by the Registered Park and Garden, however this would then result in physical and visual coalescence that would harm the identity of the Town, in direct conflict with policy.
- At points of the site the housing will be closer to Shutlanger than Towcester Town.
- The spreadsheet provided notes that ‘the scale of development is out of keeping with existing settlement structure’. The Weaknesses stated in the booklet provided mentions that the southern relief road could additionally

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

adversely impact the potential permeability of much of the proposed expansion with the rest of the town.

- With this proposed development Towcester will be built into established historic settlements such as Heathencote and with only a short distance from Pury End and Paulerspury - concern that that this development will lead to further development into those areas. Towcester will lose its identity and will become sub divided into districts.
- The proposals are in direct conflict with Objective 12- Supporting rural communities.
- This possible development will destroy our rural environment as Silverstone, Towcester and Whittlebury all begin to merge into one built up area.
- Objective 15 supports rural employment, especially those relating to agriculture, the proposal as it stands builds over Taylors Farm in its entirety. The farm is occupied by generational tenant farmers who will lose their home and livelihood.
- Taylors's farm is highly productive, and the soil is in first class condition following many years of livestock farming.
- The strategy should not create dormitory (housing) communities for more distant employment opportunities that do not exist locally.
- This development is increasingly remote from the town's historical core and as such is undesirable.
- There are significant benefits both locally to Towcester but also to West Northamptonshire as a whole to recognise, allocate and support strategic employment growth to the north / north west of Towcester, as a key facet of the emerging Plan's spatial strategy and wider regional aims being delivered through the Oxford Cambridge Arc.

Loss of the racecourse

- Towcester's main asset by far is the racecourse. It is famous countrywide and is steeped in history. Before it got into financial difficulties it attracted top jockeys and trainers as a build up to the Grand National, AP McCoy won his 4,000th winner at the track in 2013. It would be devastating and irreversible to have this image of Towcester developed into houses.
- The racecourse should be considered a community asset, a sport and social venue that could bring a visitors to the Town, boosting the local economy and providing employment opportunities. It is presently not being utilised to its full potential.
- it is imperative that the racecourse does not just become a monument to the town's past and that it is carefully integrated to give greater public access with sports and recreational facilities for the wellbeing and benefit of the townspeople.
- The viability of the racecourse cannot be assessed over the COVID-19 period (as per government guidelines on community assets such as Public Houses) but it should be noted that as a largely outside venue there are endless opportunities to generate revenue.
- The Racecourse should be supported as a business to diversify and generate further income and opportunities rather than written off and developed over.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

Schools

- With Sponne School being the only secondary school and already at capacity any more residential development within the Towcester area would exacerbate this problem. Especially as other local secondary schools such as Roade and Deanshanger are undersubscribed.
- We have an oversubscribed secondary school which means children who formerly went to their nearest school are now being bussed many miles.

Comments made by respondents who did not specify ‘yes’ or ‘no’: (These are grouped under headings for ease of reference)

General

- The proposal requires careful reconsideration. There is a lack of employment opportunities in the area and significant associated infrastructure and community facilities would be required.
- As we look to create a more sustainable future, we will need to prioritise planning for houses closer to where jobs are.
- Consideration of potential impacts to the [Grand Union] canal, its users and associated infrastructure from increased vehicular movements and increased use of the canal for leisure / recreation purposes would be required.
- Land to the north-west of Towcester should be allocated for employment purposes in conjunction with the proposed residential development to enable organic growth.
- The concept of 20-minute neighbourhoods provides places in which most of people's daily needs can be met within a short walk or cycle (broadly a 20-minute travel time by cycle or on foot). The benefits of this approach are multiple.
- Developer section 278 and CIL contributions do not appear in any way significant enough to support appropriate provision of many elements which are critical to the success and sustainability of an enlarged Towcester.
- Planning has the potential to play a vital role in cutting carbon and preparing us for the impacts of climate change. The Committee on Climate Change is advocating a strong focus on effective planning to deliver the action we need. But the current English planning system is not delivering on its positive potential to tackle the climate crisis. The Secretary of State should issue a ministerial statement to galvanise action through planning and seize the opportunity of a resilient, net zero future.
- We need a masterplan for West Northants which is forward looking and accepting of the impending challenges which will be brought by climate change.
- Whilst it is agreed that there could be advantages for the proposal for an SUE on the south side of Towcester, it should not be for such a large number of dwellings. A reduced area should be proposed.

Historic Interest

- The racecourse probably has potential, but that's not the point is it? it's a heritage site and should be used for something more fitting.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- Whilst the site is some distance from the [Grand Union] canal, visual impacts may need to be considered as part of an LVIA.

Highway issues/capacity

- the traffic on the A5 is already very congested. If this proposal were to go ahead without the correct infrastructure in place, we will have a road that is constantly grid locked.
- The roundabout at the Old Stratford is already congested at peak times and often at non-peak times with traffic coming from Milton Keynes to the roundabout almost back to the Stacey Bushes turn.
- Most traffic from housing travels south on the A5 towards and into Milton Keynes, through the only northern entrance at Old Stratford roundabout, which is currently inadequate and Highways England, being aware of this, are trying to get the A5 de-trunked so it becomes a WNC problem. Serious money needed to resolve this issue - guesstimate £100m.
- Associated improvements to local bus services, cycleways and footpaths would be very welcome.
- Towcester has always struggled to maintain a meaningful public transport offer. This is an exceptionally hard to resolve - attempts to improve connectivity and frequency between 2005 and 2011 had some success, but insufficient to prove financially sustainable. COVID has had an especially serious impact.
- The Plan needs to advance a strategy that breaks the town free from some of the highest levels of car dependency and congestion anywhere in the plan area, and indeed in England, if it is to be soundly based. From the point of view of public transport integration, there are obvious potentially good opportunities, but this is highly dependent on master planning and the way that development relates to the existing settlement and the Towcester South Sustainable Urban Extension, across the Relief Road which by its nature is primarily intended to perform a strategic movement function.
- The broad swathe of proposed development at Towcester breaks down very clearly into 1) land south and west of the town – beyond the Southern Relief Road – and 2) that at the Racecourse to the South East.
- The Racecourse area seems especially hard to integrate into the built form and will provide what amounts to a lobate form of development, stretching away from the A5 which will be the logical route for any bus service towards Milton Keynes, as it was in the past. It will not support a bespoke bus service of any kind, and it will tend towards driving further demand for longer-distance car-borne commuting on the SRN.
- The existing SUE was always going to be exceptionally hard to provide relevant bus services to by virtue of its siting, extent, and lack of integration to the pre-existing urban edge. In fact, we have for many years been concerned that most of the western tranches will be impossible to directly serve by bus – a point made prior to the planning application being lodged and determined. However, there exists a clear opportunity to create a new direct link between the south western edge of the town and the SUE, and Silverstone through land under promotion, lying north of Wood Burcote Lane. This would tie

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

directly into the A413 and allow buses to run between Towcester and Silverstone relatively quickly. It is critical that urban design facilitates this, for this option to work. Such a link would then place both the new as well as the existing/committed developments directly on a logical route between Northampton and Silverstone, and potentially beyond to Brackley and Bicester. An alternative strategy – depending on how free-flowing the A43 remains – would be to use the relief road to facilitate a high-quality public transport spine with development on either side of it, and two or more high quality rapid-transit style facilities offering accesses from both the SUE on its north/east sides and any new development to the south and west. This is going to need revision of the consented master plan for the SUE such that development does not turn its back on the relief road. The challenge that this poses for both urban design and the way in which the relief road functions, is obvious, but the experience with the Sandy Lane Relief Road through Norwood Farm (elsewhere in the JCS area) gives the Council a head start in establishing how this might be resolved.

- There is a residual serious concern that large scale new development at Towcester will simply flood the existing network and the Relief Road with additional traffic all around the town. Grade separation of the Abthorpe and Tove Roundabouts has been examined in the past and ruled out. This means that any option for significant further expansion of Towcester must be led by a robust and deliverable vision for sustainable modes, including public transport. It may well be that the quantum that can be accommodated has less to do with physical constraints and more with the credible capacity of local highways infrastructure.

Ecology

- The proposed development area includes an ancient woodland. [Burcote Wood (grid reference SP 6937 4625). There is also an undesignated woodland at grid reference SP 6900 4661. Ancient woodlands are irreplaceable. They have great value because they have a long history of woodland cover, with many features remaining undisturbed. This applies both to Ancient Semi Natural Woodland (ASNW) and Plantations on Ancient Woodland Sites (PAWS). It is Government policy to refuse development that will result in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats including ancient woodland, unless “there are wholly exceptional reasons, and a suitable compensation strategy exists” (National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 175 amended July 2018).
- At a time when we are experiencing significant loss of biodiversity in the UK and globally, we should not plan to impact that which is in existence and forms part of the rural nature of the area (even if it can be potentially mitigated).
- If Spatial Option 4b is approved it is recommended that the residential development design allows for a buffer zone around the ancient woodland, in accordance with Government Guidance (specified).

Schools

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- The schools are oversubscribed, and it is difficult to get you child into a school in an area close to home, often requiring travel to a school out of the area.

Comments from neighbouring councils

- Buckinghamshire Council - Spatial Option 4b – could lead to increases in traffic from the A5 onto the A43 and so have an impacts beyond the border of Northamptonshire. There are a number of junctions into rural Buckinghamshire off this route and of course it runs close to Silverstone, a strategic employment, visitor, and education area. If this option is progressed, Buckinghamshire Council would wish to discuss transport implications, in particular with West Northamptonshire Council, to assess traffic levels and evaluate infrastructure improvements needed.
- Milton Keynes Council - There may be an associated impact on local infrastructure and an impact on Milton Keynes given the quantum of proposed development. There is particular concern that the cumulative impact of development at Towcester and Old Stratford (spatial option 5b) could worsen traffic congestion and adversely affect the functioning of the A5 and the Old Stratford roundabout and the local highway network unless properly planned and moderated. The junction is a key gateway to Milton Keynes. We would want WNC and National Highways (who control the A5 and Old Stratford roundabout) to work with us on modelling and assessing the implications of this development and with partners such as the Central Area Growth Board, SEMLEP and England's Economic Heartland to ensure that proper infrastructure and funding is in place for early, sustainable, and funded solutions, such as our proposed Mass Rapid Transport System (MRT).

Parish / Town Council Responses

The following Parish and Town Councils supported spatial option 4b:

- **Brixworth Parish Council** - A reduced allocation in this area would have less adverse impact. Concerns raised with respect to the impact on conservation areas and heritage buildings.
- **Cogenhoe and Whiston Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Culworth Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Long Buckby Parish Council** - Supports the proposal, which increases the size of an already substantial conurbation with established facilities and takes advantage of excellent communications.
- **Nether Heyford Parish Council** - Support - But only with significant investment in infrastructure such as roads and schools. This to include serious consideration for an eastern relief road.
- **Woodford-cum-Membris Parish Council** (no comments)

The following Parish and Town Councils objected to spatial option 4b:

- **A5 Alliance of Parish Councils (Cosgrove, Deanshanger, Old Stratford, Potterspury, Wicken and Yardley Gobion)** - Towcester Racecourse is historic registered parkland and a valuable asset to those living in Towcester and beyond. WNC are aware of this and the plan itself states that this would

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

be difficult to develop and have a lot of opposition from heritage bodies. Increasing the traffic using the already congested A5 would have a wide impact on the road system. The proposals in Northwest Milton Keynes (5b) need to be considered alongside this proposal. The concern is that any new development on that site would create even greater problems on an already overcrowded A5 southbound toward Milton Keynes.

- **Blakesley Parish Council** - This is a poor recommendation and given the history should not have been included - Towcester Racecourse is historic registered parkland. The proposed Towcester Southern Extension to the existing Southern Extension is excessive. The Towcester Relief Road would then become an estate service road and give no relief to Towcester at all. If it were expanded to a full dual carriageway, it would split the development and thus contradict Objective 9 of this plan. The spatial plan does not give any indication as to the traffic generated and its effect on the A43, A5 or other local roads. These are at capacity now. A proper vision would have addressed these issues and given residents the comfort that such things are being thought about, as it stands there is nothing to offer on the upside, just more housing. This extra extension would need to have a hard boundary with a full dual carriageway from the A43 to the A5 at Milton Keynes. This needs to be in place before any development. The proposals in north-west Milton Keynes / Old Stratford need to be thought about in relation to this. The area would be bookended with two allocations totalling 10,500 homes and no mention of the combined effect on the local roads.
- **Blisworth Parish Council** - Pressure will be placed on surrounding rural communities caused by excessive development.
- **Bugbrooke Parish Council** - The Racecourse is a grade II listed park and garden. It is a great asset to the area, and it should be used as a destination venue and expanded as a cultural centre in South Northants. The concerts, events, festivals are of great importance we need to ensure that this facility exists in South Northants. Any further development in Towcester should not take this away. There is the ancient woodland and the ecological impacts to consider. The road network around Towcester is already at breaking point with daily traffic jams. Further development does not seem viable.
- **Cosgrove Parish Council** - This is historic registered parkland and would be difficult to develop and further impact on the A5 towards Towcester, Old Stratford, and the local roads.
- **Daventry Town Council** - Towcester does not have the community infrastructure to support the increasing development. This would need to be considered to ensure community cohesion along with the provision of retail and other services to prevent it becoming a dormitory town.
- **Easton Neston Parish Meeting** - The Plan acknowledges that Towcester has had significant growth in the last 20 years, and it comments on the constraints and infrastructure requirements which will be needed. Towcester cannot carry any further development, yet the plan incorporates proposals for further expansion. The road network in the local area around Towcester is already at breaking point in terms of volume of traffic and the resultant pollution

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

problems. The concept that the southern relief road would service further new dwellings is a mistake as the National Highways report states that the relief road will be at capacity when the 2700 new dwellings to the south and west of the town are completed. Regular closures of the M1 motorway, and the resulting diversion of traffic into the Towcester area, reduces the area to gridlock. Further local development is simply not sustainable and will adversely affect the wellbeing of local residents unable to go about their daily routine. Residential development at Towcester racecourse would be inappropriate given the limitations of the Towcester and Easton Neston Conservation Areas. Conservation areas have special status and need protection. If change has to happen, the challenge is to manage it in a way that preserves, reinforces, and enhances the special quality of the area. Our belief is that development at the racecourse would have a significant impact on the nature of the conservation areas and the mitigation needed, if indeed possible, would be so substantial, it would be impractical. The WNJCS (2014) sets out a long-term vision and objectives for the whole of South Northants to 2029, including strategic policies for steering and shaping development. Policy BN5 says. 'Designated and non-designated heritage assets and their settings and landscapes will be conserved and enhanced in recognition of their individual and cumulative significance and contribution to West Northamptonshire's local distinctiveness and sense of place.' It appears that this new Proposed Strategic Plan has ignored this previous long-term vision.

- **Greens Norton Parish Council** - This is a poor recommendation and given the history should not have been included. The Towcester Racecourse is historic registered parkland. The proposed Towcester Southern Extension to the existing Southern Extension is excessive. The Towcester Relief Road would then be an estate service road and give no relief to Towcester at all. If it were expanded to a full dual carriageway it would split the development and thus contradict Objective 9 of this plan. The spatial plan does not give any indication as to the traffic generated and its effect on the A43, A5 or other local roads. These are at capacity now. A proper vision would have addressed these issues and given residents the comfort that such things are being thought about, as it stands there is nothing to offer on the upside, just more housing. This extra extension would need to have a hard boundary with a full dual carriageway from the A43 to the A5 at Milton Keynes. This needs to be in place before any development. The proposals in North West Milton Keynes/Old Stratford need to be thought about in relation to this. The area would be bookended with two allocations totalling 10,500 homes and no mention of the combined effect on the local roads.
- **Old Parish Council** - The weaknesses outweigh the strengths.
- **Old Stratford Parish Council** - This is historic registered parkland and would be difficult to develop and further impact on the A5 towards Old Stratford and the local roads.
- **Potterspury Parish Council** - Towcester Racecourse is historic registered parkland and valuable asset to those living in Towcester and beyond. Until recently it was being promoted as a tourist site. Developing it would be a

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

tragedy in terms of landscape and ecology. The stated weaknesses appear overwhelming. Furthermore, increasing the traffic using the already congested A5 would have a wide impact on the road system. There is no indication as to the traffic generated and its effect on the A43, A5 or other local roads. The strategy appears to simply add more housing. The proposals at Old Stratford (Option 5b) need to need to be considered. The A5 from Old Stratford to Towcester could have two allocations totalling 10,500 homes at the ends. A huge impact could be expected with the combined effect on the local roads. Already there is serious congestion at both ends of this stretch of the A5.

- **Shutlanger Parish Council** - Object to your spatial options consultation and in particular site ID 51. The northern section of area 51 appears to encompass the whole of Towcester racecourse with grade 1 listed structures and adjoining the grade 2 listed landscape north of Easton Neston House. Together with areas 235 and 236, area 51 will obliterate a significant part of the Easton Neston estate including loss of the amenities at Towcester water meadows. These amenities are enjoyed by residents of Shutlanger as much as residents of Towcester itself. The northern section of area 51 covers the meadows leading up to Cappenham Bridge. These meadows frequently flood in the autumn, winter, and spring, with many waterfowl staying on this area for prolonged periods. The plans will lead to the entire loss of the small farming community at Heathencote - some members of which have been farming this land for several generations. They are custodians of the diverse and rich habitat on this land with a wide variety of native mammals and birds, including Buzzard, Red Kite, and owl populations. The road infrastructure through Shutlanger is totally inadequate to cope with the volumes of traffic that area 51 will generate. The Main Road between Shutlanger and Heathencote is poorly surfaced with very narrow stretches through Shutlanger. Beyond Shutlanger the road meets very restrictive bridges over the Grand Union Canal at Stoke Bruerne or over the old railway line heading into Blisworth. Blisworth itself is already a traffic black spot at the two-way junction of Stoke Road, High Street, and the Northampton Road with a 3-tonne limit on a stretch of Stoke Road alongside the canal. Knock Lane from Blisworth to Roade is a minor country lane with very narrow stretches. Least suitable of all is the Showsley Road, an unadopted single track country lane leading from Shutlanger to the A43 and can be expected to generate significant traffic from people leaving the A43, driving through Shutlanger and into Area 51. There is almost no public transport in the area and access on foot to Towcester is at least one hour's walk over country footpaths or along the A5 with very high volumes of traffic and air pollution for pedestrians to endure. The A5 is already overloaded with commuter traffic heading into Milton Keynes in the morning and seeking to go into, or through, Towcester in the evenings. The A43 bypassing Towcester is at a standstill approaching the Abthorpe and Tove Valley roundabouts every weekday afternoon, and this is before the additional traffic associated with the giant DHL depot north of Towcester. The A508 is similarly overloaded with tailbacks to the Cosgrove junctions during the working week, seeking to converge with the A5 at the Old Stratford

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

junction. People living in area 51 will have no possibility of an acceptable commute by car to the local large population centres, or the rail stations at Northampton and in the Milton Keynes area. Residents of area 51 will be getting into their cars to go to work as there has been no growth in local employment in the Towcester area, with most of the light industry once based there already replaced by housing. The DHL depot is unlikely to generate local employment but instead see shift and zero hours contract workers commuting into Towcester. The other public amenities in the Towcester area are already overstretched. The sewerage works near Cappenham Bridge routinely discharges raw sewerage into the River Tove as a result of the hundreds of new houses built in Towcester with thousands more already being built. Both GP surgeries in Towcester report being completely overwhelmed by the number of new patients seeking to register there. Neither surgery has space to expand. Residents of area 51 will be part of this unmet demand. It is a similar picture with schools. Sponne School is oversubscribed, and Elizabeth Woodville school can soon expect to be with the population growth in Roade as well as Grange Park and Wootton. While there has been an expansion of shopping amenities in Towcester, the large supermarkets are inaccessible. Tesco and Aldi are on branch roads off the A5 in Towcester with no signal-controlled access. The Waitrose is only accessible through very small suburban roads in Towcester, themselves complicated by a one-way system. We understand the need to identify land for housing however the former district of South Northamptonshire led the way in providing such land, as shown in the Grange Park, Wootton, and Towcester Grange developments. This planned transformation of Towcester into a medium sized town is not compatible with the nature of this area. Perhaps a more suitable period would be a 15-year plan. In this way the projected numbers could be re-assessed, and a more accurate and meaningful calculation / assessment made.

- **Silverstone Parish Council** - These must be treated as two separate sites. The inclusion of the historic and beautiful racecourse cannot be permitted. As well as destroying such a site any development on it will destroy the vista from Towcester town centre's hinterland, in particular the council owned Water meadows area of nature, beauty and leisure. It must be a goal to get the racecourse reinstated as such. The southern area, which will greatly swamp the town with unsustainable housing will be divorced from Towcester town by the Relief Road and encroach on Silverstone Parish. No development should be considered here until the current SUE is completed and matured and the employment picture confirmed. Should this development go ahead it would be vital to upgrade the Relief Road to a full Towcester Bypass but ensure that it is bridged in such a way not to divorce any new development from the rest of the town. The extra traffic must be assessed as the existing A43 and A5 are already at capacity and commercial developments in the local plan will cause further major traffic issues.
- **Syresham Parish Council** - Development at the racecourse location is not desirable, to protect the landscape and the historic conservation area. The

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

only area that would be available for housing would be on the flood plain. Also, any further development around Towcester would impact on the character of the town and the current road infrastructure, which is already under intense pressure, particularly around the A5/A43. Commuters travelling between Towcester and Milton Keynes already suffer long tailbacks on the A5, with no alternative environmentally sustainable transport options.

- **Tiffield Parish Council** - The road network in the local area around Towcester is already beyond breaking point. We have repeatedly informed the County Council of traffic saturation and pollution problems, particularly at the A5 Saracen's Head crossing and Towcester High Street, which are regularly exacerbated by periodic closures of the M1 motorway and the resulting diversion of traffic into the Towcester area. It is a very strongly held view by local residents that the road network cannot carry its existing load and further local development will be catastrophic to their ability to go about day-to-day activities. Tiffield Parish Council would therefore like to see all proposed development around Towcester removed from the Strategic Plan.
- **Towcester Town Council** - Provide a comprehensive response which covers the following issues:
 - The weaknesses of Option 4b far outweigh any possible strengths.
 - Towcester has experienced significant growth over the last 30 years, most recently in the form of the Towcester South Sustainable Urban Extension, Within the current Local Plan, there are also significant allocations in place for largescale warehouse distribution centres and other mixed-use employment sites.
 - Towcester has a significant deficit in health service provision, public transport, secondary school places, and sports fields, including football fields with supporting infrastructure. There will also be a deficit in Leisure Centre facilities as current developments are constructed. The deficit in secondary school places will increase significantly, as new residents move to Towcester.
 - Key weakness of the existing planned SUE are set out in detail, including its remoteness for the town centre and the lack of S106 funding given the costs associated with the relief road. Both weaknesses identified in previous plans continue and are magnified within the current growth option for Towcester.
 - Option 4b would create an even larger-scale expansion of up to another 4,250 dwellings. These would be considerably detached from the town's core, making walking, and cycling to connect with the town centre unrealistic.
 - Existing town centre services couldn't cope with the scale of additional growth.
 - Option 4b would effectively create a new town, isolated from Towcester.
 - Option 4b would see large scale housing development very close to Paulerspury village and create a sense of coalescence with the hamlet of Pury End

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- National Highways have reported to Towcester Town Council that the Relief Road will be at capacity, without any diverted HGVs, by the time 2,750 houses are occupied. The A5 will also be close to capacity by the time the current Towcester SUE is completed.
- The relief road would need to be dualled to provide further capacity which would cut-off new housing developments, separating them even further from the town centre and its services.
- Option 4b will make safe walking and cycling to access services in an increasingly remote town centre, completely unfeasible.
- Building a significant number of additional houses in or close to Towcester will only exacerbate the issue of out commuting. Despite the move to homeworking since the pandemic, commuting continues to create congestion, pollution, and delays on local roads, including the A43 and A5.
- The Town Council agrees with the assessment that ancient woodland, wildlife sites, the Grafton Way and other existing public footpaths and bridleways would be adversely affected by large scale development within Option 4b.
- Given other proposals within the Strategic Plan for warehouse and distribution centres, in addition to major rail freight developments being constructed, traffic can be expected to grow significantly on both the A43 and A5, adding considerably to Towcester's traffic problems.
- There is concern that current developments are creating an increasing problem with flooding. Detailed comments provided regarding the River Tove.
- The area identified in Option 4b has significant weaknesses in relation to surface water
- As Option 4b identifies, further expansion of Towcester to the west and south would have a considerable adverse impact on long-distance views towards the town, creating an urban landscape.
- Towcester Town Council welcomes the opportunity to engage with West Northamptonshire Council to discuss options for growth that offer more sustainable development for the town, with options that contain far fewer weaknesses and many more strengths.
- Development of the racecourse presents major challenges, as it sits within a Grade II* registered park and garden, that includes a Grade I listed building. Anything other than small-scale development would, as WNC's report states, impact upon the setting of the Towcester and Easton Neston conservation areas, as well as other listed buildings.
- Detailed comments made regarding the sustainability of the racecourse and the suitability of alternative uses.
- **Wappenham Parish Council** - Option 4B looks just like someone has taken a map and decided that since Towcester South has already had some development let's just make the arc bigger and throw a further 4250 houses in there. This is by far one of the worst suggestions in the whole Spatial Plan. Reasons include: The Racecourse Historic Listed Parkland, Will run off go to River Tove and up in Cosgrove River Great Ouse?, Effects on the A5,

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

Towcester Relief Road splits the first and second extensions, effects on the village of Whittlebury, A43 is congested between Tove (Tesco) and Abthorpe (McDonalds) roundabouts now let alone the impact of further housing, Towcester Relief Road will be an estate road Towcester will need dual carriageway probably along Cowpastures Lane?, A5 will need dual carriageway from Towcester to MK TRR will form two communities divided by the road, Towcester lacks sufficient facilities now, buses, health, etc – cannot take more.

- **Whittlebury Parish Council** - The Towcester Racecourse is historic, registered parkland. The Council is aware of this, and the authors have stated that this would be difficult to develop and attracting a lot of opposition from heritage bodies. There is potential for further growth around Towcester, but the size of the proposed option 4b Towcester Southern Extension to the existing Southern Extension seems excessive. The Towcester Relief Road would simply become an estate service road and give no relief to Towcester at all. If it were expanded to a full dual carriageway, it would split the development and thus contradict Objective 9 of this plan. The spatial plan does not give any indication of the volume of traffic generated and its effect on the A43, A5 or other local roads, which are at capacity now. Such a massive second Towcester extension would overload the existing road infrastructure and would require the upgrade of the A5 from the A43 down to the Stony Stratford roundabout to a full dual carriageway. It would also put a significant strain on other local facilities which are already struggling to cope with the current Towcester SUE build-out. The proposals in north west Milton Keynes / Old Stratford need to be thought about in relation to this. The area would be bookended with two allocations totalling 10,500 homes with a massive impact on the local roads.
- **Wicken Parish Council** - The concern is that any new development on that site would create even greater problems on an already overcrowded A5 southbound toward Milton Keynes.
- **Yardley Gobion Parish Council** - No - Towcester Racecourse is historic registered parkland. The council are aware of this and the authors have stated that this would be difficult to develop and have a lot of opposition from heritage bodies. The Towcester Southern Extension to the existing Southern Extension is excessive. The Towcester Relief Road would then be an estate service road and give no relief to Towcester at all. If it were expanded to a full dual carriageway it would split the development and thus contradict Objective 9 of this plan. The spatial plan does not give any indication as to the traffic generated and its effect on the A43, A5 or other local roads. These are at capacity now. This extra extension would need to have a hard boundary with a full dual carriageway from the A43 to the A5 at Milton Keynes. The proposals in North West Milton Keynes / Old Stratford need to be thought about in relation to this. The area would be bookended with two allocations totalling 10,500 homes and no mention of the combined effect on the local roads.

The following Parish and Town Councils did not specify ‘yes’ or ‘no’:

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- **Cold Higham Parish Council** - Towcester is already a nightmare for traffic at times, and something would need to be done to alleviate this in advance of any further development. It must be recognised that the A5 is a very important highway to those living north of Towcester as well as those living in the town
- **Deanshanger Parish Council** - The proposals in Northwest Milton Keynes (5b) need to be considered alongside this proposal. The whole area would be bookended with two allocations totalling 10,500 homes with no mention of the combined effect on the local roads or any solutions proposed.
- **Evenley Parish Council** – Yes and no subject to caveats previously expressed about infrastructure provision. Strongly object to the proposal to develop the racecourse site, as this would lead to a very unfortunate precedent that in WNC, grade II* registered parks and gardens are available for housing development.
- **Hinton-in-the Hedges Parish Meeting** – see response to Q23 - plus everything has a 'potential' – the question is whether it is morally right to do it – do the council taxpayers already there want it?
- **Kislingbury Parish Council** - declines to 'vote' for particular options
- **Little Houghton Parish Council** - LHPC finds it difficult to agree with further expansion of the towns into rural areas without understanding the impact on heritage assets, conservation areas and existing infrastructure - in particular the highways network. Building on the flood plain MUST be avoided. The potential for using brownfield sites and underused town centre buildings for both housing and employment should be urgently assessed, together with an exploration of the identified constraints. Sites already identified within the JCS should be progressed before further land is allocated for development.
- **Milton Malsor Parish Council** - As a general point, the large developments at Towcester are not supported by sufficient facilities, particularly in the old centre, where the limited number of shops and parking spaces are inadequate for the enlarged town. Increased traffic to the larger centre of Northampton is inevitable, and much of it may use the former A43 through Blisworth and Milton Malsor
- **Weedon Parish Council** - This seems to be already taking place but there is a need for better transport options for those who cannot drive/cycle or walk to get to town centre services. The southern relief road is much needed to 'contain' the town.
- **Wootton Parish Council** - Additional information required

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

Question 26: Do you agree that new settlements have a potential role in delivering growth as part of the spatial strategy for West Northamptonshire?

- 202 respondents said 'Yes'
- 326 respondents said 'No'
- 364 respondents provided specific comments

Those who agreed that new settlements have a potential role made the following key points:

- New settlements are appropriate given plan housing requirements and period.
- Only in a limited capacity, not the 5,000 homes mentioned.
- Forward planning will be required; national policy states a vision for at least 30 years ahead.
- New settlements could relieve the pressure on villages and towns. Consider locations that offer good transport routes to Northampton and other towns. Houlton and Grange Park are possible models.
- At some point new settlements will be a must; use them now to lessen impacts on existing infrastructure and allow growth beyond 2050.
- Concerned about loss of farming land (high grade agricultural land).
- Consult all residents.
- Depends on the size, type, and scale of the development.
- Support new settlement but query where would be an appropriate location.
- Support new town that has its own green electricity, access to green space, near good major roads with a purpose-built internal road network.
- Identify more sites for new settlements; see Houghton in Rugby as example.
- Only if done well in locations which are not detrimental to local residents/areas.
- Several hamlets in the area have few features; development would provide a service structure that is currently lacking.
- Need green belt around them to create sense of community and heritage appeal. Should not be sprawl to Milton Keynes or impact historic village life.
- Urban extensions are inappropriate; increasingly hard to integrate development into the urban fringes, particularly for bus routes. Sceptical about significant sustainable growth at Northampton, Daventry, Towcester and Brackley being achievable.
- Some respondents outlined the advantages of new settlements including a lesser impact on existing infrastructure and roads within towns and villages compared with urban extensions; being planned in a more holistic way than piecemeal growth of settlements; ability to build-in sustainability measures and place making from the outset; assisting with delivery where options for urban extensions are limited; can be placed where communications are good requiring less new infrastructure and at distance from existing settlements, causing less disruption; providing new facilities and services (schools, recreation and retail) and improved transport options.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- Some respondents stated employment and residential uses should be developed alongside each other; only develop mixed new settlements (consider knowledge hub to support the Arc).
- Some respondents stated that without the criteria to assess the suitability of sites as new settlements the rationale for the two sites is unclear. New settlements need vision and commitment- not just a means of meeting housing targets. Should consider changing employment patterns and to meet climate change challenges; home working and reducing car usage do not seem compatible with the new settlement options.
- Some respondents stated that new settlements need planning specifically for the vision of the whole area – this is lacking in the document. Artificially planned new settlements are ripe for deprivation without employment in sectors which people want to work in.
- Several respondents agreed but only if they are separate new settlements and not attached to existing communities/settlements, or they do not result in the merging of existing communities/settlements. Current plans risk losing village identities/overwhelming the rural areas.
- Several respondents agreed but only if new settlements have sufficient infrastructure including transport, with road upgrades/public transport links/cycle ways (need to consider impacts on traffic flows); schools; green space; health/community centres; emergency services; car parking. These should be provided up front and enable them to be self-sufficient so there is no impact or additional pressure on existing infrastructure/services in nearby settlements.
- Several respondents stated the Council should await the publication of the AECOM new settlement report. Concerned that options/potential locations have been identified/selected prior to the evidence.
- Several respondents agreed but stated that the options proposed in the plan are not new settlements; they represent urban extensions to existing settlements. Reference made to examples of Mawsley and Moulton of models to be considered (build new settlements with their own character).

The following comments were made regarding the specific site options and new suggested sites/locations:

- Consider transit-oriented development (new and expanded smaller settlements alongside potential new public transport routes). Refers to specific corridors: A45 west of Northampton and the M1 including Weedon and Flore; north of Daventry on the A361 towards Kilsby; A43 west of Towcester and related to the Silverstone and Silverstone Park area; the A422 between Brackley and Banbury, including Fathinghoe and Middleton Cheney; the A5 north of Old Stratford; the A508 south of Road; between Daventry and Banbury on the A361; the A428 between Northampton and Crick.
- These areas have key transport links both roads and rail which aid economic and residential development; would allow local communities to be sustainable.
- Area south of Towcester the A5/A508 and A422 road networks cannot accommodate further traffic movements as they are already over committed.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- Arm Farm site development could support improvements to the A43 (e.g., express bus service) and a potential new railway station on the West Coast Main Line.
- HSGV can deliver a significant number of dwellings (over 5,000). Awaiting publication of the AECOM new settlements study before commenting further.
- HS2 through Brackley; consider new station/town on scale of Milton Keynes.
- Land to the South of the A14 Junction 2 for should be included for Strategic Development, including Harrington Airfield site and the Kelmarsh Estate Land site (supporting information provided).
- Land to the South East of Towcester (Site Ref. 54) is available and suitable for a new settlement. Query Strategic Land Availability Assessment analysis to date.
- Long Buckby: support for the proposal, but as new settlements have significant lead-in times and infrastructure requirements parts of the proposed allocation should be allowed as standalone developments and/or allow smaller scale developments in the rural area/villages e.g., Long Buckby; West Haddon; Land at Station Road, north of Long Buckby (part of new settlement).
- Long Buckby: support for the site. Support for the location with access to the railway station and the quieter sections of the A5. It's a suitable, deliverable, and developable site. Consider delivery issues at existing towns e.g., 5,000 homes already allocated at Daventry.
- Long Buckby: object to the site. It is not suitable- query emphasis on this site.
- Spatial Option 1a has far more weaknesses than strengths.
- Spatial Option 5: Would have a significant impact on police and fire operations (Long Buckby fire stations and Daventry police station). Information is being sought on the capacity within these facilities.
- Spatial Option 5a: object to the site. It is not a new settlement (is an extension to Long Buckby); needs significant infrastructure before expansion, but do not understand how and where such infrastructure would fit in the area.
- Spatial Option 5b/Milton Keynes North West: object to the site. Concerns regarding the A5; traffic congestion; not a new settlement as it would merge a number of villages into a single conurbation without adequate services or infrastructure; needs significant infrastructure before expansion but do not understand how and where such infrastructure would fit in the area; roads and access need to go in first and services need to be planned from the outset.
- Spatial Option 5b/Milton Keynes North West: support for the site. Is a suitable site for a new settlement; significant growth around Northampton is likely to be constrained. Infrastructure can easily accommodate this development.

Those who disagreed that new settlements have a potential role made the following key points:

- Patterns of employment and behaviours need to be radically altered to meet climate change challenges before 2030. The plan lacks any deep analysis of these factors, so the need for new settlements is questionable.
- Too much green space is surrendered to development in new settlements.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- Potential for new settlements but would need to be in the context of garden city ideas or zero carbon options.
- Need accurate information before putting forward the plan. Trains running from the stations are normally the slow ones.
- Contravenes Spatial Objectives 2 (Green Infrastructure and Natural Capital), 3 (Landscape), 15 (Rural Diversification and Employment). However, the use of suitable “Brownfield” sites for new settlements may be appropriate.
- New settlements will only attract persons from outside the county and do nothing to relieve internal matters.
- The Housing and Economic Needs Assessment shows that the future population growth will be almost entirely in the over 60s age group. The need to move into more sheltered accommodation falls much later in life due to healthcare progress. Illogical to create new settlements away from existing residential centres where health care is readily available.
- Artificial growth development leads to social and economic problems; growth should develop organically.
- There is no real clarity on what is meant by new settlements.
- Building new settlements is not a sustainable way for growth; Northamptonshire already has several significant satellite towns for its size.
- Would only support a new settlement if a sound need has been proven; do not consider this is the case with the existing housing numbers.
- Only build new towns if needed for West Northants housing requirements.
- Lack of benefits for existing residents.
- Ensure proposed developments are the correct type of dwellings and accessible by the people that need them most.
- Government policy is for a levelling of the country; if new settlements are needed, they should be in less well-off regions.
- Concerned with focus on economic growth; quality of life is what matters.
- Failure to comprehensively assess new settlements within the spatial options is a fundamental omission; question the ability to bring forward sites through the Sustainability Appraisal with appropriate ranking of Options.
- Milton Keynes is an example of successful new settlement; but do not believe a new settlement location could be identified in West Northants with similarly good road and rail links and located sufficiently far from existing towns.
- New settlements need vision and commitment, not just a means of meeting housing targets.
- Some respondents stated that new settlements require significant front-loaded infrastructure and have long lead in times for delivery. Would deliver limited housing numbers over the plan period. More effective housing delivery will be achieved through sustainable urban extensions.
- Some respondents stated that the current proposals are confusing and/or there was not enough information available at present.
- Some respondents stated the Council should await publication of the AECOM new settlements study and the Oxford-Cambridge Arc strategy.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- Some respondents stated the large-scale new settlements would adversely change the rural character of the area, including smaller towns and villages.
- Some respondents stated that the options did not represent new settlements; they are extensions to existing settlements.
- Some respondents stated that further engagement/consultation with residents on plans for growth was needed.
- Some respondents stated there was a risk of ribbon development.
- Some respondents stated that the council should have a set of criteria for any new settlement to assess its suitability. Potential sites need to be judged against that criteria; without this it is difficult to understand the rationale for the two sites.
- Some respondents queried the ability of the new settlement options to meet the climate change challenges, including creating and/or reflect new patterns of home and working life.
- Some respondents stated that the most appropriate housing strategy is combination of options; further growth to be achieved via growth at the market towns (larger strategic scale development) supplemented by small to medium scale developments in the rural area.
- Several respondents stated that new settlements result in losses of farmland, biodiversity, green spaces (that help reduce climate change and contribute to the character of the area).
- Several respondents stated that housing/investment should instead be directed to existing settlements (incremental growth or modest extensions to existing villages/towns) instead of new settlements - preferably on brownfield land. Increase densities and reuse empty houses/ existing office/retail vacant space (reference made to Northampton and the villages). Improve existing services/facilities at the same time and maintain community 'feel'.
- Several respondents stated that new settlements should not engulf/merge existing rural villages/communities/nearby urban areas (including Milton Keynes). Would be in direct conflict with the objective of preserving rural identity. Should be situated far enough away from other communities.
- Several respondents expressed the view that there had already been too much/enough development in the area with pressure on existing infrastructure/services, environmental impacts, and loss of character.
- Several respondents expressed concerns with impacts upon existing infrastructure and the need for any new development to be accompanied by supporting infrastructure up front (existing infrastructure is already under pressure). Some respondents expressed support for new settlements if they could be supported by appropriate infrastructure; were located nearby railways; were in proportion to existing settlements; minimised out-commuting.
- Several respondents expressed concerns with the adverse impacts of new settlements, including increased commuting (e.g., Mawsley is remote); increased traffic; located too far from towns; increased pollution; lack of community; lack of affordable housing. Lack of a mix of uses means they are not sustainable developments.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- Several respondents stated that the proposed new settlements were disproportionate to the local areas/excessive in scale.

The following comments were made regarding the specific site options and new suggested sites/locations:

- A5 (north and south of Towcester): several respondents expressed concerns with development in this area as it is incapable of supporting further traffic; will make it impossible for people in Towcester to get to Milton Keynes; A5 is already struggling to manage the increasing traffic from the Towcester development (road is constantly requiring repairs).
- Buckton Fields (Boughton): should be reconsidered as Northampton has grown considerably over the last 20 years. Roads and services already at capacity. No new development should be considered until the Northern Orbital Road and improved connection to the M1 are completed. Concerns regarding impacts of commuting traffic on nearby settlements (noise, pollution, and pedestrian safety).
- Ecton (specifically sites 38, 39 and 40): some respondents expressed concerns including that the sites lie outside West Northamptonshire and are not suitable/appropriate for development. Concerns regarding coalescence with Northampton.
- Spatial Option 5a- Long Buckby: several respondents expressed concerns including that it is not a new settlement but an expansion of Long Buckby (existing villages need to expand slowly so new infrastructure can be accommodated over time); the Victorian railway bridge would need to be enlarged; Long Buckby would lose its village/rural feel and identity; existing infrastructure is not suitable/would not be able to cope (road network, drainage, schools); location is in Flood Zone 3; the conservation area will be adversely impacted; would join with the extension of North East Daventry by the A5 (already a poor junction); risks turning Long Buckby into a suburb of Daventry.
- Spatial Option 5b - Milton Keynes North West/Old Stratford: several respondents expressed concerns including coalescence with Potterspurty and/or Deanshanger; creates an artificial community; creates a dormitory suburb for Milton Keynes; merges a number of villages into a massive conurbation without adequate services and infrastructure (is not a new settlement); would cut off villages such as Yardley Gobion and Potterspurty from the centres of Wolverton and Stony Stratford; existing infrastructure would be unable to cope (roads, water, sewage); out of proportion to existing villages, would be 150% the existing size of all of these villages (would lose individual identity); the A5 is already over used; noise, light and air quality along the A5 is already excessive; use of the A5 as a cycleway or footpath is impractical/unpleasant- inappropriate for it to dissect a new community (unsafe to cross); road safety concerns; the Old Stratford roundabout already struggles to function during busy period; concerns about where the new access roads would be located and impacts upon road safety/traffic (including on the A5, A442, A508); new cycleways and footpaths connecting villages to

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

Towcester or Stony Stratford would be unacceptably busy; results in loss of countryside and wildlife; results in loss of listed buildings (and non-listed assets) destroying the context in which many were built; A422 and A508 boundaries mean that the housing stock would be unnecessarily dense; Milton Keynes development should remain south of the A5/A508 roundabout to protect countryside; poultry unit on the lane towards Puxley does not fit well with residential development; Shrop Spinney and Ash Pole spinney need to be protected; land to the east of the A5 and north of the A508 lies below the level of those roads- housing would suffer traffic noise and overlooking; concerned about reality of the potential rapid transport system connections; adverse impact of new retail provision upon existing stores in Stony Stratford.

- Towcester should not be further extended, making a historic rural town a polluted large town/small city (destroying the character and wildlife). Road network is not fit for purpose, even with the relief road.

Other comments made by respondents who did not specify ‘yes’ or ‘no’:

- Should be a new settlement, not added onto existing communities.
- There would be no impacts on Buckinghamshire from the Long Buckby option due to distance.
- Not enough information to comment on the role of new settlements currently. Question whether new settlements can deliver sustainable development even when located close to a railway line. Rail travel has limitations regarding how convenient it is in relation to places of work.
- There is a role for existing settlements to deliver sustainable growth, but this is different to the proposals at Long Buckby or at Old Stratford.
- New settlements create growth but can also create ribbon developments that join up existing communities and add to congestion, environmental impact, and flooding.
- Why is growth from an adjacent authority being considered (Milton Keynes)?
- New settlements can create a well-planned community, but they can also destroy an area’s local character. Expand existing communities where possible instead.
- There is a role for existing settlements to deliver sustainable growth, but the large-scale development will be costly to achieve.
- Only in urban areas, realising Northampton’s infrastructure and resources.
- Take account of the concerns of those with genuine knowledge of the local area and existing communities.
- Support focusing residential building in one area; would provide homes for those who come to the area to work on the employment sites.
- The AECOM new settlement study should reassess the potential of Land at Kilsby for a new settlement. Additional land parcels have been brought together to deliver a larger site with 3,300 - 4,000 new homes, a 10ha business park, open space, community and education facility, local retail facilities, a new junction on the M45 and the potential to fund sustainable transport routes which link the site with Rugby, Daventry and DIRFT.
- Query how sustainable the approach is.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- Concerned about loss of green spaces and a new settlement should be far enough from other communities so they are not overwhelmed/ merged.
- Patterns of employment and travel behaviours need to be radically altered to meet climate change challenges before 2030; there is no analysis of this.
- Only appropriate if well designed and integrated into existing society and infrastructure.
- Need to demonstrate how new settlements will contribute to the overall spatial policy for West Northamptonshire.
- Potentially in an area close to the Oxford / Cambridge Arc.
- Failure to comprehensively assess new settlements within the spatial options is a fundamental omission; question the ability to bring forward sites through the Sustainability Appraisal with appropriate ranking of Options.
- Proposal not fully investigated so it's not appropriate to comment at this stage, however, there are likely to be more suitable sites than those consulted upon.
- Direct development and investment to existing towns to improve their services, rather than making villages into towns who do not have the facilities.
- New settlements may be appropriate if suitable sites can be found.
- New settlements avoid overwhelming existing settlements and are free of the constraints of existing development patterns.
- New settlements can accommodate growth, subject to infrastructure and funding (requires government investment and non-private sector housing delivery). However, a strategy of new settlements and large-scale urban expansion gives rise to housing delivery concerns. Consider how housing and economic growth can integrate with existing urban development and contribute towards other key spatial objectives e.g., Spatial Option 5a appears to be considered due to its relationship to a railway, rather than its ability to contribute positively to policy objectives. Consider strategic growth via additional sites at a range of existing settlements that have infrastructure and relationships with higher order settlements and can deliver in the Plan period.
- Several respondents stated the option of a new settlement(s) is a valid one. However, should await publication of the AECOM study which may identify other sites that are more suitable than the two consulted upon. Other new settlement proposals have been promoted but have been dropped without reasons e.g., south of Northampton; all the possible options should have been consulted on. New settlements should be distinct (existing settlements should not be merged into it). There should be criteria for any new settlement to assess its suitability. Potential sites need to be judged against that criteria; without this it is difficult to understand the rationale for the two sites.
- Several respondents stated that all infrastructure (including that which helps achieve carbon neutral status) must be considered and planned beforehand/provided at the outset (this can be an advantage of new settlements). Details on the infrastructure projects required are not included; should be provided and should guarantee delivery (no infrastructure to be lost at a later stage due to viability).
- Several respondents urged caution with reliance upon a new settlement's delivery to meet the overall quantum of housing and economic growth

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

necessary, particularly in the first half of the Plan period and if development requirements are increased to account for the Oxford Cambridge Arc. New settlements are difficult to deliver and require significant planning and infrastructure delivery prior to first development. The plan should allocate such sites above and beyond those required for development needs. Can be kept under review via Local Plan Reviews. Given lead in times, it is unlikely any development will be forthcoming on new settlements until the latter end of the Plan period; however, could provide supply in the long term. Reference to 'Start to Finish' (Nathaniel Lichfield's) report.

- A number of comments already expressed in relation to specific sites/locations above were repeated here. See above comments regarding Spatial Option 5b; sites 38, 39 and 40.

Parish/Town Council responses:

The following Parish and Town Councils agreed that new settlements have a potential role:

- **A5 Alliance of Parish Councils** - New settlement options should be held back until the AECOM study is published. Difficult to understand how two new settlements have appeared in this options consultation. Should have a set of criteria for any new settlement to assess its suitability. Any potential sites need to be judged against those criteria, in the absence of this it is difficult to understand the rationale for the two sites consulted on. New settlements are not just a means of meeting housing targets. The concept of new settlements should be reconsidered in the light of changing employment patterns and to meet climate change challenges. Home working and the need to reduce car usage do not seem compatible with new settlement options that are nowhere near employment locations. A new settlement needs to be distinct and not allow for existing settlements to be merged into it. Option 5b merges several villages (Deanshanger, Old Stratford, Potterspury and Cosgrove) into a single conurbation that is dissected by the A5, without adequate services or infrastructure (6,000 new houses would be 150% the existing size of these villages). Does not protect the rural areas or deliver a new settlement. Option (5b) is not thought through or planned. Roads, access, and public transport need to go in first. Services need to be planned from the outset. The transport solution seems linked to a proposition by Milton Keynes Council that is not confirmed, budgeted for, and has no clear timescales.
- **Brixworth PC** - Need careful siting with a fully worked up technical assessment to understand infrastructure needs. Infrastructure needs not to be limited to roads, cycleways, and footpaths, but to the wider interpretation.
- **Cogenhoe and Whiston PC** - As long as the infrastructure is in place first to support the developments
- **Daventry Town Council** - New settlements are beneficial if they are developed using technology to reduce the carbon footprint and are sympathetic with nearby neighbourhoods and landscape
- **Kingsthorpe PC** - Provided they are sited in appropriate locations.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- **Little Houghton PC** - The village of Mawsley in North Northamptonshire and Wixhams in Bedfordshire are good examples of creating new settlements.
- **Long Buckby PC** - Well-planned new settlements provide the best opportunity to deliver the maximum number of plan objectives.
- **Nether Heyford PC** - Only where they are genuinely new stand-alone settlements with all relevant infrastructure and facilities, not annexes to existing settlements.
- **Old Parish Council** - Subject to full study.
- **Overstone PC** - A new settlement similar to Mawsley straddling the Lilbourne/Yelvertoft border of about 10,000 new homes plus. Creating a new Parish could fulfil a third of the housing needs of 30,000. Would also address new housing in rural area. This area has good road links so requires limited highway infrastructure; could concentrate on other infrastructure such as schools, health centre etc. Ensure infrastructure is built prior to the houses.
- **Silverstone PC** - New settlements should be far enough away from existing settlements to avoid perceived coalescence.
- **Walgrave PC** - There are no objections to new settlements such as Mawsley, but full consideration should be given to road infrastructures, the effect on highways to other local environments and other infrastructure such as schools, health centre and other facilities. Ensure infrastructure is built prior to the houses.
- **Whittlebury PC** - A new settlement needs to be distinct and not merge into existing settlements. Should have clear criteria for any new settlement to assess its suitability. Any potential sites need to be judged against those criteria. New settlements must have good public transport, road, and rail links, together with other infrastructure and investment in local services/facilities.
- **Woodford-cum-Membris PC** (no comments)

The following Parish and Town Councils disagreed that new settlements have a potential role:

- **Blisworth PC** - Development should be centred around centres of existing urban density to allow for the support of communities.
- **Cosgrove PC** - Some potential in theory, but the work of the plan advisers has yet to be completed and the current proposals are confusing. To decide on any new settlements at this stage without the plans conclusions appears folly. The Arc conclusions are not due to be published until mid-2022 at the earliest.
- **Culworth PC** (no comments)
- **Hinton-in-the-Hedges PM**- Ruining greenfield land should never be an option. There would have to be an extraordinary strong case for brand new developments and at present the case is very weak.
- **Old Stratford PC** - Some potential in theory, but the work of the plan advisers has yet to be completed and the current proposals are confusing. To decide on any new settlements at this stage without the plans conclusions appears folly. The Arc conclusions are not due to be published until mid-2022 at the earliest.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- **Potterspury PC** - They could perhaps play a role if properly thought-out new developments in appropriate locations with good sustainable transport links. Unfortunately, the suggested sites are not.
- **Syresham PC:** - The impact on the landscape and natural habitats would be devastating. Should protect the space nature needs. Major new development should be kept to larger centres, where there is infrastructure and the potential for public transport.
- **Tiffield PC** - No, we do not agree with this statement. The HENA very clearly shows that the future population growth of the county will be almost entirely in the over 60s age group. Progress in health care has allowed more and more retired people to continue to live in their family homes well into their retirement. The need to move into more sheltered accommodation now falls much later in life. It therefore is illogical to create new settlements away from existing residential centres where health care is readily available. The potential to create new settlements is also seen as antagonistic to the local electorate where protest groups such as CPRE and 'Save our Village Landscapes' present a more sustainable view of the future.
- **Wicken PC** - Any new settlement would need to be situated sufficiently far from other communities so that they are not overwhelmed. Patterns of employment and behaviours need to be radically altered to meet climate change challenges before 2030. The paper lacks any deep analysis of these factors. The need for new settlements is therefore questionable.

The following Parish and Town Councils did not specify 'yes' or 'no':

- **Blakesley PC** - The option of new settlements is a valid one. It has the advantage, in theory, of having all the necessary services and infrastructure planned from the outset. The AECOM study may identify other sites in the area that are more suitable than the two consulted upon. A new settlement needs to be distinct and not allow for existing settlements to be merged into it. Should have a set of criteria for any new settlement to assess its suitability. Any potential sites need to be judged against those criteria; without this it is difficult to understand the rationale for the two sites.
- **Cold Higham PC** - In principle they might play a part, as might other areas, but need more information.
- **Deanshanger PC** - New settlement options should be held back until the AECOM new settlement report is published. A new settlement needs to be distinct and not allow for existing settlements to be merged into it. Option 5b merges several villages (Deanshanger, Old Stratford, Potterspury and Cosgrove) into a single conurbation that is dissected by the A5, without adequate services or infrastructure (6,000 new houses would be 150% the existing size of these villages). Does not protect the rural areas or deliver a new settlement. Should have a set of criteria for any new settlement to assess its suitability. Any potential sites need to be judged against those criteria; without this it is difficult to understand the rationale for the two sites. Option (5b) is not thought through or planned. Roads, access, and public transport need to go in first. Services need to be planned from the outset.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

The transport solution seems linked to a proposition by Milton Keynes Council that is not confirmed, budgeted for, and has no clear timescales.

- **Evenley PC** - Yes & No. Agree that this merits further study.
- **Greens Norton PC** - The option of new settlements is a valid one. It has the advantage, in theory, of having all the necessary services and infrastructure planned from the outset. The AECOM study may identify other sites in the area that are more suitable than the two consulted upon. A new settlement needs to be distinct and not allow for existing settlements to be merged into it. Should have a set of criteria for any new settlement to assess its suitability. Any potential sites need to be judged against those criteria; without this it is difficult to understand the rationale for the two sites.
- **Kislingbury PC** – declines to vote for particular options.
- **Weedon PC** - Possible role but only if done with the involvement of communities. New development at Long Buckby has been over promoted recently by Daventry District Council; plans were over ambitious and have caused damage to the village e.g., disruption by lorries and commuter parking. The station is an asset, but its development has caused problems. Against the character of Long Buckby village and wharf being destroyed; this is a risk if residents are not involved in planning developments.
- **Wootton PC** - In theory they have a role, but detailed information is required to comment.
- **Yardley Gobion PC** -The option of new settlements is a valid one. It has the advantage, in theory, of having all the necessary services and infrastructure planned from the outset. The AECOM study may identify other sites that are more suitable than the two consulted upon. Other new settlement proposals have been dropped without giving any reasons e.g., garden village south of Northampton; all the possible options should have been consulted on. A new settlement needs to be distinct and not allow for existing settlements to be merged into it. Should have a set of criteria for any new settlement to assess its suitability. Any potential sites need to be judged against those criteria; without this it is difficult to understand the rationale for the two sites. Site 5b cannot be considered a new settlement as it would effectively merge several villages into a single conurbation without adequate services or infrastructure.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

Question 27: Do you agree that spatial option 5a – Land to south of Long Buckby - has the potential to support a new settlement?

- 207 respondents said “yes”
- 415 respondents said “no”
- 490 respondents provided specific comments

Those who supported spatial option 5a – Land to the south of Long Buckby raised the following key points:

- Proposal is the most appropriate strategy for sustainable development in West Northamptonshire and could provide a significant element of the future housing need. It is consistent with national planning policy and Strategic Plan vision and objectives. New settlement would be deliverable and developable over the Plan period to 2050.
- New homes are needed for people wanting to stay in the local area. Could play an important role in development of Northamptonshire particularly if it integrated housing and employment and would benefit from properly planned green housing and social spaces.
- Scale of settlement would deliver environmental improvements, sustainability, and biodiversity net gains. It could also deliver an all-through school including 6th form, employment opportunities and neighbourhood centre and be capable of linking to Long Buckby Village, Daventry, and Northampton via sustainable modes. Could work if facilities and infrastructure are provided by developer contributions.
- The station has a relatively frequent service to Birmingham, London, and Northampton. Station is underutilised and provides opportunities for sustainable transport and connections to nearby towns and cities. Concept should be focussed on walking access to the station using a radius of 1000m.
- Opportunity might exist south of railway line to provide new bus spine road linking to A5 and Churchfields expansion at Daventry. Combined demands of sites between Daventry and Long Buckby could support a suggested 20-minute service between Daventry and Long Buckby, thereby linking Daventry to national rail services.
- There are good road connections to the M1 and A5, easy access to Daventry for employment and leisure and DIRFT, Rugby and Coventry. It is better for commuters and better located to serve the needs of West Northants than Milton Keynes as it is closer to Daventry and Northampton.
- Traffic congestion issues on A5 is not as severe as for option 5b. Potential to create better links with the existing trunk road system. Further work is necessary to determine the required off-site highway and infrastructure works.
- Finger of land south of the railway should be excluded due to potential conflict with the commercial and agricultural uses.
- The physical separation from the existing village centre is sufficient to ensure no adverse impact on the conservation area.
- If site is allocated, master planning should investigate opportunities to expand facilities at football and rugby clubs to accommodate demand.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

Those who objected spatial option 5a – Land to the south of Long Buckby raised the following key points:

- This is not really a new settlement, it's an urban extension which would increase the size of Long Buckby disproportionately, to the extent that it is no longer a village. Residents choose to live in Long Buckby because it is a village not a town. It would lead to loss of the setting, character, and identity of Long Buckby and Long Buckby Wharf. There may be potential for small scale expansion. May be potential for strategic scale development at Long Buckby, which should either be a true expansion rather than a new settlement. Development should not extend south of the railway line. 4000 new dwellings are planned at Daventry, this option would lead to coalescence with Long Buckby.
- Would be better to expand existing developments in Daventry, improve services there and provide better public transport to Long Buckby station.
- Should be part of a proper growth strategy not just a large housing development. Would be better planned as a standalone village/town with its own service, facilities and infrastructure including a purpose-built railway station. Potential for this site to compete with Houlton at Rugby due to proximity.
- Existing highway infrastructure and access to Long Buckby is poor. Three Bridges Road is narrow and winding and is constrained by the railway and motorway bridges. It is very busy and gets congested at a number of bottlenecks by the bridges and at Long Buckby Wharf. Increased traffic would hugely exacerbate the problem. Road would need significant improvement including widening and possibly traffic lights which would be costly. Alternative access option via Watford is problematic. The A5 crossing is already dangerous, a large increase in traffic would make it more difficult to cross, necessitating a roundabout/traffic lights, a new access onto the A5 or a bypass. Need for effective cycling link between LB, LBW and Daventry. New development should be in areas with an existing major road system not historic village centres.
- Local roads in the village centre are historically narrow, congested, in poor condition and unsuitable for a large increase in traffic. Parking is limited, traffic causes vibration and damage to buildings. Increased traffic would increase problems and lead to more pollution and noise. Concerns about road safety and impact of traffic on the historic centre and conservation area.
- Existence of a railway station does not justify this scale of development or mean Long Buckby should be turned into a commuter town. The rail service is poor, the station is outdated, inaccessible and needs significant investment and improvement. Many station users are not residents and the station will not help resolve the highway issues. There is limited rail capacity, more passenger trains could impact on operation of DIRFT. Considerable cost to improve road access, it would be better to build a new platform elsewhere or open a new one, such as at Althorp or Market Harborough to Northampton.
- Although served by a railway station there is potential for car-based trips to impact on roads in Warwickshire. WCC keen to work jointly with WNC at an early

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

stage to agree modelling assumptions, methodology and scope of a strategic transport assessment.

- There are limited employment opportunities in the village, most residents out commute and this development would lead to more, thus adding to the traffic issues. New residents are likely to commute by car due to lack of suitable cycleways, leading to increased traffic and carbon footprint. New settlements have a role to play in delivering growth providing they are linked to a strategy for commercial growth which delivers employment opportunities. No such linkage here.
- Long Buckby has had a lot of development and infrastructure is struggling to cope. There would need to be upgraded or new facilities, specifically GP surgery, schools, shops, library, community centres, police, and utilities. There is concern that new services/facilities will either not be provided early enough, or if the development was small it would have limited infrastructure or benefits, thus impacting further on existing services/facilities. It would significantly impact on fire and police resources.
- Site is within flood zones 1 and 3, it regularly floods, flood mitigation would therefore be required. Modelling is required; however, it should not prevent the site from being developed. Level 1 and 2 SFRA may inform an FRA. Water companies will need to consider future growth considering capacity of sewerage network. Water cycle studies may be required/updated.
- Loss of open countryside, green field agricultural land, natural habitats, trees, and impact on wildlife. There should be more focus on brownfield sites and regeneration of existing built-up areas. It is unsustainable and would negatively impact on climate change.
- Design of a large new estate would be out of character with existing village.
- Should wait for AECOM report to see if there is a better standalone settlement option, which would include a parkway station.
- A significant number of new houses would reduce local house prices and new businesses on the development could negatively impact existing businesses. A large new estate built onto an existing community would lead to increase in crime and antisocial behaviour, particularly quickly built poor designed estates, which don't have any of their own amenities. New housing likely to attract people from cities rather than local people.

Parish / Town Council Responses

The following Parish and Town Councils supported spatial option 5a:

- **Cogenhoe and Whiston Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Cosgrove Parish Council** - This is a better option than 5b due to its location, road, and rail links. It is more closely aligned to objective 8 (connections).
- **Culworth Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Daventry Town Council** - Due to its proximity to the rail network, it could be developed as a low carbon community.
- **Old Parish Council** - Good option with proximity of rail links.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- **Old Stratford Parish Council** - Better option than MK option, location, existing road, and rail links, more aligned with objective 8.
- **Potterspury Parish Council** - Has rail links and accords somewhat with objective 8.
- **Wappenham Parish Council** - Yes, close to A5 and M1 and has a railway station. Better than any option around Towcester. Better to serve Daventry and Northampton.
- **Woodford-cum-Membris Parish Council** - Need to consider local infrastructure and facilities before the housing. A local supermarket with parking would be beneficial.

The following Parish and Town Councils objected to spatial option 5a:

- **Blisworth Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Brington Parish Council** - Not an appropriate location for 5000 dwellings. Understand it's based on the presence of a railway station; however, this is a local service, not a hub and not appropriate for increased commuter use. Existing infrastructure would be unable to cope – roads, services/facilities, and utilities. No scope to improve highway or sewerage infrastructure. A5 junction is already problematic. Impact on surrounding roads of increased traffic.
- **Brixworth Parish Council** - AECOM report might reveal a better site. Existing railway station is an advantage, however, required highway improvements are complex. Would need a guarantee that highway issues would be addressed, otherwise option would be too large for Long Buckby to sustain.
- **Long Buckby Parish Council** - Objects in the strongest terms so it can be ruled out at an early stage. Representing views of Long Buckby community. A new settlement within West Northants should be carefully selected and underpinned by principles to make it successful. 5a does not fulfil these and is bound to fail. Lack of selection process, premature before new settlements study. Long Buckby has experienced significant growth as a primary service village, however, apart from a larger station car park and affordable housing there have been limited improvements to village infrastructure. Request that WNC undertakes a thorough review of infrastructure capacity before allocating additional land to the village. Council needs to appreciate development constraints and lack of opportunities to improve infrastructure and roads. Option unlikely to be viable due to highway constraints and distance from employment, cost of providing new road link. Most journeys would not be by public transport. Highway safety concerns. Village is close to capacity. Long Buckby PC has submitted a detailed response prepared by Land and Planning Consultants Ltd which includes the following conclusions:
 - WNC has yet to complete its study on new settlements and the publication of Option 5a within the Spatial Options Consultation document therefore is premature, lacks any careful site selection process based on any credible evidence and is thus contrary to

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

national guidance in the NPPF, causing unnecessary anxiety to Long Buckby residents

- Based on completions in Daventry town over the last 10 years, it is considered highly unlikely that a new settlement is viable at Long Buckby given it is severely constrained by poor road links and too far away from major economic centres.
- Long Buckby is not a sufficiently sustainable location for a new settlement. Less than 5% of journeys would be made using public transport and the expert evidence finds that the vast majority of journeys would be via private car.
- The same Tutum Consulting report commissioned by LBPC considers that a new road to the proposed new settlement would be necessary and ideally link the A428 with the A5. Given the constraints and need to cross the M1, Grand Union Canal and 2 railways; the cost of such a road would be financially prohibitive.
- LBPC additionally have grave concerns over highway safety. Three Bridges Road has blind bends and is narrow in places and its junction with the A5 has a history of serious road traffic accidents.
- Long Buckby is close to reaching its full environmental capacity following significant growth over the last 10 years. There are no solutions to improving roads or car parking within its already congested village centre. The development of 5000 homes would also cause substantial harm to the character and setting of Long Buckby/Long Buckby Wharf's heritage assets comprising 38 listed buildings, 2 conservation areas and a scheduled monument.
- Option 5a is severely constrained by large areas of land being located within flood plain zone 3 and thus not developable. In addition, there is significant risk of such a vast development causing more areas to flood including the village of Whilton.
- A cordon sanitaire around the sewage treatment works is a further constraint to the viability of a new settlement and the land necessary to make one sustainable.
- There are significant other constraints to development such as archaeological heritage assets, landscape impact and ecology.
- The weaknesses and constraints of Option 5a substantially outweigh any benefits and it is considered there are better, more financially viable and more sustainable locations for a new settlement. LBPC request that Option 5a is withdrawn as a new settlement forthwith.
- **Nether Heyford Parish Council** - Needs rethinking. If Long Buckby is seen as having growth potential it should have a fully thought out growth strategy.
- **Ravensthorpe Parish Council** - Strongly oppose. Railway station is an advantage, however, roads in the centre and surroundings are inadequate for increase in traffic.
- **Syresham Parish Council** - Size is too big, planners need to look at quantity and impact on infrastructure and how people will travel on an already struggling road network.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- **Watford Parish Council** - Option is likely to result in traffic issues which will impact Watford. Village already suffers from high traffic volumes, speeding, peak time congestion and people using it as a through road to reach the A5 and M1 via the services. Village roads also used as an alternative access to the A5 when Three Bridges Road is shut. Likely that development would result in increased traffic during construction and when it's finished. Existing road infrastructure is inadequate, difficult, and hazardous junctions to the A5, height and width constraints of road and rail bridges and Three Bridges. Concerned that heavy construction traffic will use road through Watford.

The following Parish and Town Council did not specify 'yes' or 'no':

- **A5 Alliance of Parish Councils** – WNC should wait for the Aecom report. Of the two new settlements being promoted, this site is the better option, it is close to the M1 and A5 and has a railway station and is more aligned to Objective 8: Connections than the second site 5b at NW Milton Keynes. This site is better placed to serve the needs of West Northants being closer to Northampton and Daventry than 5b which would serve the needs of MK. However, this is not really a new settlement rather an extension to Long Buckby that will increase the town disproportionately. There will need to be consideration to mitigate the flooding aspects this proposal may give rise to. The local infrastructure must be upgraded prior to any proposed expansion.
- **Deanshanger Parish Council** - This is the better of the two new settlements being promoted.
- **Evenley Parish Council** - Agree that this merits further study.
- **Hinton-in-the-Hedges Parish Meeting** – see answer Q26.
- **Kislingbury Parish Council** – declines to vote on particular options.
- **Overstone Parish Council** - Possibly although area should stay rural to provide lungs for Northampton.
- **Walgrave Parish Council** - Possibly, careful consideration should be given to impact on village environment and heritage.
- **Weedon Parish Council** - Possibly but needs full community involvement. New development has been over promoted at Long Buckby by DDC whose plans were over ambitious, caused damage and inconvenience to the village centre. Station is an asset, but development has caused problems. Would not like to see character of Long Buckby altered. It has been managed so badly in the past that time and money has been wasted in planning. Peace and safety of local community has been put at risk.
- **Whilton Parish Council** - Scale of proposal would have an adverse impact on historic village centre which is a conservation area. Not a new settlement, merely an urban extension, Long Buckby could become a small town. Scale is inappropriate. Road infrastructure from A5 is unsuitable, it struggles to cope with current demands. Construction traffic will be problematic. Roads in the centre of Long Buckby already suffer from congestion, additional traffic would cause chaos. No viable solution. Southern edge of proposal abuts flood zone 3, flooding is already an issue. Community infrastructure and services are just

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

sufficient for existing community, development would need include significant investment for additional services and facilities. Station is inadequate and inaccessible; it would require significant and costly redevelopment.

Community is already affected by Daventry development; this proposal would result in almost continuous development between Daventry and Long Buckby. Recognise need for new houses, Daventry development contributes towards this. Planning more development before Daventry extension is built and impact understood, is appropriate and unfair.

- **Yardley Gobion Parish Council** - Site is close to A5, M1 and West Coast Mainline. Better option of the two being promoted, it more aligned to objective 8. Not really a new settlement, but an extension to Long Buckby that will increase the town disproportionately. Division between old and new will not be clear, it will be one town. Proposal will lead to flooding. Local infrastructure must be upgraded.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

Question 28: Do you agree that spatial option 5b - Milton Keynes North West (Old Stratford) Expansion - has the potential to support a new settlement?

- 155 respondents said 'Yes' (including Parish/Town Council respondents)
- 473 respondents said 'No' (including Parish/Town Council respondents)
- 519 respondents provided specific comments

Those who supported spatial option 5b - Milton Keynes North West (Old Stratford) Expansion made the following key points:

- Requires mitigation to the rights of way network and the use of overbridges (not tunnels) to provide active transport links. Requires screening from neighbouring developments (tree corridors through which active travel routes can run). Break the development into smaller tree lined units to create a set of eco-villages.
- The strategic oil pipeline can be used as an area for recreation and leisure.
- The strategic oil pipeline will be less important as move to zero carbon/zero fossil fuels.
- Weaknesses outweigh the strengths; however careful development around ecological sites and conservation areas could be made.
- Industrial development is still required.
- Support new housing in Deanshanger so family can stay in the area.
- Land West of Old Stratford can come forward independent of other sites being promoted in this area and is the least constrained part of Spatial Option 5b (up to 2,500 dwellings and associated infrastructure/services). Supporting information put forward to promote the site (including landscape, heritage, transport, biodiversity net gain). Comments on the Sustainability Appraisal Assessment of the site (suggest some amendments).
- Eastern half of SLAA Site ID: 47 is suitable for development as part of the new settlement. Query results of the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA)- supporting information provided. Working with some adjacent landowners. Can support the delivery of Park and Ride, Mass Rapid Transit, and the Green City Gateway (important for Milton Keynes growth).
- Serves to emphasise the inappropriateness of Spatial Option 5a.
- Parts within Flood Zones 1, 2 and 3. Using a sequential approach development can be achieved. The Dogsmouth Brook (tributary of the Great Ouse) runs through the site. Development provides opportunities for small scale flood interventions that will contribute towards the management of flood risk within the Great Ouse Catchment e.g., surface water drainage scheme could restrict the rates and volumes of surface water discharged below the existing rate. There are Natural Flood Risk Management Options. The sites are not in groundwater Source Protection Zones but are underlain by secondary and principal aquifers. The regional use of groundwater in this area makes the site vulnerable to pollution. Need to consider capacity in the sewerage network. Need to follow the Water Framework Directive (WFD) requirements for river quality (water cycle studies may be required/refreshed).
- Support for a train line linked to Milton Keynes; need more transport.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- If the need for housing is to service areas both in and outside of the county this option rates highly given its location near the mainline rail/road networks.
- Must be carefully handled and with full cooperation of Milton Keynes.
- Policy SD15 of Plan: MK and a Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document produced for this spatial option would be the basis for engagement with Milton Keynes Council (wish to collaborate on the option). This would better integrate the development into the local surroundings and mitigate impacts it might have on Milton Keynes. Site would have an impact on Milton Keynes Strategic Infrastructure (e.g., University Hospital and Further Education Facilities). Welcome opportunity to work collaboratively on what infrastructure is required and possibly jointly commission studies. Reference to flooding and drainage issues that should be considered; see Policies FR1 – FR3 of Plan: MK for locally specific strategic flood risk management. Specific provision for leisure, community and sport facilities should be made (reference to Plan: MK standards and nearby development examples at Milton Keynes East). Need to model and assess the implications for the highway network (A5, Old Stratford Roundabout and other roads in Milton Keynes) and consider mitigation measures. Development should link into pedestrian, cycle, Redway and public transport routes into Milton Keynes including the Mass Rapid Transit (MRT) system Milton Keynes Council is seeking to develop (do not prejudice the provision of bus/ MRT vehicles serving a possible future park and ride site). Old Stratford is identified as where a Green City Gateway could be established (as extension of green infrastructure for Milton Keynes). Any retail provision should be commensurate to the needs of the new community.
- Milton Keynes is an example of where constraints were turned into opportunities e.g., numerous roads cross linear park system but includes pedestrian and cycle crossings; existing woods and historic villages were incorporated; new lakes for wildlife and amenity; communities based around the secondary school Campus. Same can be applied to this location.
- Milton Keynes North West is the most suitable location for a new settlement (concerns raised in relation Spatial Option 5a). Detailed supporting justification and technical information provided to support proposal. Justification includes its ability to respond to West-Northants and Milton Keynes relationship; housing and economic growth at the Oxford-Cambridge Arc; its suitability is recognised in the adopted MKS 2050; it can support the communities of existing settlements near to the site with benefits for the wider area e.g., providing a MRT interchange that is accessed by a new vehicular access point located further north than the Old Stratford Road junction will intercept car journeys before they reach this pinch point. Site area should be extended further to the north-east.
- Several respondents supported the principle of development in this area but stated that a smaller scale of development should be considered (otherwise there will be a loss of rural villages; would only be a satellite housing estate for nearby towns; will increase flood risk; adverse impacts on infrastructure including roads and education).

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- Several respondents supported the option and its location (particularly nearby Milton Keynes) as there is the space to accommodate new development (Milton Keynes is an existing new town); the area is already developed; infrastructure is already in place/good in this location; transport links are good (with the A5 and links towards the M1 and connectivity to London); it has better local employment opportunities close by; there are a range of services; location within the Oxford-Cambridge Arc area; links to Milton Keynes economy, retailing, railway station and Redway system (cycleway network)

Those who objected to spatial option 5b - Milton Keynes North West (Old Stratford) Expansion made the following key points:

- Sites in this vicinity were rejected by a Milton Keynes Area Development Potential Study (1998) because of the underground oil pipe, an underground gas pipe and electricity line above it. Also due to traffic impacts.
- Are public houses, community centres, health centres, schools, local shops, green spaces, pathways of tree lined avenues featured in current development plans where neighbours can interact?
- Some respondents suggested considering a smaller scale of development at this location to address the issues it raises. A sustainable urban extension would be more suitable (scale of the proposed new settlement would not support a strong service base and the viability of new public infrastructure is uncertain).
- Some respondents queried who would be responsible for the new settlements' administration as it would encompass five parishes.
- Some respondents stated the Council should await publication of the Oxford/Cambridge strategy and the AECOM new settlement study.
- Some respondents noted that the number of residents on this site would constitute 96% of the projected population growth between 2020 and 2050 which means that housing need elsewhere would be ignored.
- Some respondents queried if the houses were required for West Northants or Milton Keynes; may not fulfil housing needs of West Northants by providing for Milton Keynes.
- Several respondents suggested there were better options for development/growth, including Northampton; areas to the south of Milton Keynes; the site should be located as an extension to Deanshanger instead; Towcester; Brackley; Daventry; construct a new station between Wolverton and Northampton for future development; Milton Keynes (West); rural villages to accept some development but not that which results in them merging; existing towns and villages across the area which could accept growth; sites between Cosgrove and the A508 that support the employment allocation at Furtho Pits; urban high-density development only; a smaller urban extension at Old Stratford.
- Several respondents referred to issues with the existing road infrastructure/network (A5, A508, A422 and A508/A5/A422 intersection- Old Stratford roundabout, plus local access for surrounding areas/villages) that would be exacerbated by further development. Issues with congestion

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

generally and the A5/A508 acts as diversion when there are issues on the M1 causing further congestion; impacts upon local roads/junctions through the villages; implications for road safety (including pedestrians). Recent improvement project has not been successful (at Old Stratford roundabout). Further mitigation is/would be required to alleviate congestion (requires new solution to the roundabout/whole of A5 upgrading). Highways England are trying to de-trunk the road which is not compatible with growth and there are no plans or budget for upgrades in the Plan timeframe. It is not possible to upgrade the road through Old Stratford, particularly the section over the bridge for Stony Stratford. Using land for homes restricts options available for improvements. Towcester Relief Road is not designed to enable future development to the south of the area. The Farthinghoe Bypass and the northern Northampton ring road should be delivered as a priority.

- Several respondents stated existing local services and infrastructure were inadequate and unable to serve a new settlement including school/education capacity (have to travel out of the area for places); transport links (including public transport, nearest railway stations are only accessible by car, no pedestrian and cycle links/routes over the A5/A508 roundabout); medical/healthcare services (including Milton Keynes hospital); water supply and sewage network capacity (Cotton Valley Sewage Treatment Works); energy supply (current frequency of power cuts in the area); emergency services (impacts on Towcester fire and police stations- emergency cover would be from Northampton). There is no supermarket, convenience shop, or public house in walking distance.
- Several respondents stated that there should not be any large developments until infrastructure is in place before housing completions. Estimate the new settlement would require a new secondary school; three primary schools; additional 7 GPs and an extended community health workforce; upgrades to Milton Keynes hospital.
- Several respondents stated the development would be dependent upon infrastructure in Milton Keynes and there may be issues with relying on cross boundary facilities (e.g., fire and police forces rarely work cross boundary (except for major incidents). Response times will need to be considered from Northants facilities only).
- Several respondents were concerned that infrastructure promised in the past alongside new development has not been delivered/made improvements.
- Several respondents referred to other developments that are in progress or are planned and expressed concern these will result in cumulative impacts on traffic, pollution, ribbon development e.g., housing at Towcester south and the racecourse, rail freight terminal at M1 Junction 15, housing developments in the villages, south of Stony Stratford, site AL5 at Old Stratford (South Northants Local Plan Part 2). At Towcester, warehousing developments at sites north of the Bell Plantation on the A5; between the A43/A5 roundabout and Tiffield; between the A43/A5 roundabout and the Towcester Rugby Club; above the A43/Whittlebury junction.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- Several respondents referred to existing flooding issues in the area which would be exacerbated by the development (reference to River Ouse and tributaries). Unclear if any work has been undertaken with the relevant Lead Local Flood Authority and the Environment Agency to date.
- Several respondents expressed concerns with the loss of greenfield land (including Green Belt land), agricultural land, ancient woodland, and other natural assets. Mitigation will not be able to replace this.
- Several respondents expressed concern with the negative impacts on landscape character, including the Special Landscape Area. Would result in the loss of the rural character of West Northamptonshire, which is part of the heritage and a draw for tourists.
- Several respondents expressed concern with the loss of access to countryside and impacts upon the character of existing local rights of way/bridleways running through the site.
- Several respondents stated that the site would be for dormitory housing/commuter settlement serving the needs of Milton Keynes (there is no employment proposed on the site). Economic benefits for Milton Keynes only, not West Northants. Could direct investment away from Northampton.
- Several respondents stated the option would not meet the Plan objectives.
- Several respondents stated that the proposed settlement is out of proportion in size to the neighbouring villages and would overwhelm them/force coalescence between them and Milton Keynes. The villages have distinct identities; their character would be destroyed.
- Several respondents referred to the site being included within the Milton Keynes 2050 Vision which recommends a Mass Transit System (MRT) extending to the site. Concerns expressed that there are no plans, budget, timescales for the MRT. It would not be delivered in time resulting in the new settlement being a car only site. MRT should be operational before housing.
- Several respondents queried where the focal centre of the new settlement would be as it is dissected by the A5.
- Several respondents expressed concerns with the adverse impacts upon heritage assets, including buildings/conservation areas at the village of Furtho, Grafton Regis, Potterspury, Puxley. Reference also made to the Grade 2* River Bridge over the River Great Ouse; archaeological remains in fields nearby the A5; ridge and furrow; Cuttle Mill Battle Site.
- Several respondents expressed concerns with loss of privacy, increased light, and vehicle pollution, with impacts upon rural character and residents' health.
- Several respondents stated they chose to live in the area for its rural nature and do not wish to live in the suburban/urban location that would be created.
- Several respondents stated they were disappointed that the primary reason for considering this site is because Milton Keynes has instructed the Council to do so (see Milton Keynes 2050 Vision).
- Several respondents stated that without a West Northants Council policy on new settlements it is impossible to assess and judge this proposed site.
- Several respondents expressed concerns with regards to climate change. Upgrading roads will encourage more use of cars; less people will cycle due

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

to danger of vehicles, and less people will use public transport due to 'ease' of using car. The river valley/road network would prevent fully integrated footpath and cycle connectivity. Location of site is remote from Milton Keynes and Northampton, and the railway stations are not accessible via sustainable transport- will promote car use. The development will not be located well in relation to employment. Dwellings should be sustainably constructed. Plant trees around the development. Include electric charging points for vehicles.

Comments made by respondents who did not specify 'yes' or 'no':

- Would be economically damaging for the area (including Milton Keynes).
- Does not promise employment opportunities and it does not bring jobs.
- Concerned it will lead to ribbon development on the A422 and A508.
- Any development in this area must be coordinated with Milton Keynes Council to ensure adequate transport links and infrastructure.
- Option could have an impact on Buckinghamshire e.g., the A422 traffic and other unclassified roads across the villages in far northern Buckinghamshire. Should be subject to Duty to Co-operate discussions. Evidence on traffic forecasts and transport mitigation be shared.
- The site is close to the disused Stratford Arm of the Grand Union canal. Consult Buckingham Canal Society (BCS) on any proposals.
- Land within and around the settlement of Roade is as good if not better than that proposed as Old Stratford.
- Potential for significant impact upon the Grade II* church and Manor Farm Dovecote at Furtho, plus to the Conservation Areas at Cosgrove, Potterspury and Deanshanger and the Grade II Registered Park and Garden at Wakefield. There is high potential for archaeology adjacent to Watling Street and any allocation should consider the dominance of the linear character of Watling Street (avoid weakening this with the use of multiple roundabouts).
- Strategic oil pipeline (Buncefield to Blisworth) would need further assessment.
- The Plan should establish a fallback position in planning policy which would be triggered should the Option fail to come forward (if selected).
- Consideration should be given to the composition of the likely population so the housing proposed would relate to this. Consider a substantial percentage of the housing being rental housing owned and managed by the Council.
- Some respondents referred to proposed developments which will also have an impact e.g., warehousing development allocated in the South Northants Local Plan Part 2, AL5.
- Some respondents stated the option was contrary to the Plan objectives.
- Some respondents expressed concerns about the loss of agricultural land (resulting in increased flooding); loss of greenfield sites; woodland and other natural assets which new planting will not be able to mitigate for. Consequent impacts on climate change also referenced.
- Some respondents stated the development would be built to provide dormitory housing serving the needs of Milton Keynes only.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- Some respondents queried where the focal centre of the new settlement would be as it is dissected by the A5.
- Some respondents expressed concerns about the adverse impacts on existing public footpaths and bridleways running through the site.
- Some respondents queried if the housing proposed at this site would contribute to housing growth targets for Milton Keynes Council or West Northamptonshire Council; or a combination of the two authorities; or Cambridge-Oxford Arc growth. Any housing which meets the needs of Milton Keynes should not be double counted by West Northants, with any shortfall for West Northants addressed by making additional allocations elsewhere.
- Several respondents stated the development is disproportionate to the existing villages. Will result in the coalescence of the surrounding villages and with Milton Keynes. The rural character of the area will be changed.
- Several respondents referred to the existing local road infrastructure already being under pressure especially the A5/A508/A422 (Old Stratford) roundabout. Would require a whole new solution for that roundabout/upgrading along the A5. Pressure increases when issues occur on the M1. National Highways are trying to de-trunk the A5 whereas this option would need increased investment at national level. Consider a bypass to avoid more traffic through villages. Work with Milton Keynes Council to deliver a rapid transit solution to Milton Keynes.
- Several respondents referred to the option being linked to delivery of the Milton Keynes MRT system. Concerned there are no plans, budget, timescales for the MRT; that the development would become a car only site without MRT; it risks the area becoming a gateway and car park for north Milton Keynes and Buckinghamshire. Significant new evidence will be required to demonstrate delivery of the MRT in the plan period and that it is a viable alternative to the car. It must deliver sustainable travel benefits for existing local communities.
- Several respondents stated that the areas' existing infrastructure and services are unable to support further development including schools, doctors, road infrastructure. The development would require its own infrastructure and services including schools, GP surgeries, dentists, community centres, public open space, roads, parks, hospital facilities, employment areas, retail outlets, public transport links (including to Milton Keynes), services such as sewage treatment and disposal/water supply.

Parish/Town Council responses

The following Parish and Town Councils supported spatial option 5b:

- **Brixworth PC** - But have concerns. Will lead to coalescence of the surrounding villages. Must address connectivity that is not dominated by vehicles. Opportunity to showcase other forms of transport in a potentially enlarged garden "city".
- **Cogenhoe and Whiston Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Culworth Parish Council** (no comments)

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- **Long Buckby PC**- See comments regarding enlarging extensive conurbations.
- **Weedon PC** - Provided not too much open countryside is destroyed and the character of Old Stratford and surrounding villages is maintained. New residents will benefit from proximity to Milton Keynes. Development should not be disproportionate and engulf surrounding villages. The proposal is in keeping with the scale of Milton Keynes which is a more thriving community than West Northants/Northampton town. Residents may appreciate the improved connectivity and rise in house prices. This has been the pattern with expansion around Milton Keynes but should not be at the expense of the separation and character of existing villages as has happened elsewhere.
- **Woodford-cum-Membris Parish Council** (no comments)

The following Parish and Town Councils objected to spatial option 5b:

- **A5 Alliance of Parish Councils** - Should delay the consultation to await publication of the AECOM new settlement study and the draft Oxford Cambridge Arc Spatial Strategy- this will become national planning guidance and not taking it into account may mean the Plan will need to be revisited/face legal challenge. This option is wholly unsuitable. It develops greenfield sites, removes woodland and agricultural land, removing valuable natural assets which new planting will not be able to mitigate. The Council's aim of being a carbon neutral organisation by 2030 and a low carbon economy cannot be realised with this option. The scale is disproportionate to anything nearby, out of scale with the existing smaller, rural village way of life. The houses may accommodate 14,532 new people creating huge demand on local services. The site does not promise employment opportunities; would be dormitory housing serving the needs of Milton Keynes (not West Northants needs). Would bring excessive carbon emissions. Would generate an additional 8,477 cars and vans placing burden on the already overloaded local road network (especially the A5/A508/A422 roundabout). The A508 and A5 become a default diversion route should the M1 be experiencing problems. The A508 and A422 are used for vehicles moving between the M1 and M40. Would require a whole new solution for that roundabout (e.g., overpass or underpass). The A5 would need upgrading (all roads at capacity already). Small back roads in the area are poorly maintained and villages already struggle to cope with 'rat-run' traffic. There are no rail services easily accessible by public transport nearby. There will be warehousing development along the A5 to the south east of the Old Stratford roundabout (allocated in the South Northants Local Plan Part 2, AL5) that will add further pressure to the A5/A508 roundabout. Traffic issues on the A5 have not been part of the Councils' evaluation of potential sites and National Highways have not been consulted about their future plans for this interchange. Would destroy heritage assets at Furtho. Will put strain on the special landscape area that runs down the A508 through Yardley Gobion and Cosgrove parishes. The village of Grafton Regis will be impacted by the traffic; there is no bypass for this village. Listed properties without foundations will be subject

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

to more road vibrations which may lead to a loss of the heritage assets. The site seems to be promoted/predicated on the MK2050 ideas of a mass transit system, for which there are no plans at present. It is premature to bring forward this site now; if it was allocated/developed in the plan period, it would be a car-only site and contrary to Spatial Objective 1 on climate. Where would the centre or heart of this new settlement be? It is bound by the A508 on one side, A422 on the other and then dissected by the A5. Should consider if the A5 would be realigned to function as a new boundary to prevent coalescence with Deanshanger and to bypass Potterspury. It would require the building of one secondary school and three primary schools. Journeys to school need to be designed to be safe walking routes to combat climate change. Will need an additional 7 GPs plus an extended community health workforce. Milton Keynes Hospital is already trying to meet the need for developments- new funding is expected but is still in its early stages. No large developments/housing completions should occur until this is in place. There are flood zones and existing major flooding issues in the area; the development would increase surface water and exacerbate flooding issues in the area. Concerned about the inadequacy of the local water and sewerage systems and the frequency of power cuts. Would magnify the local sky glow thus harming the rural nature of surrounding communities. The presence of a strategic oil pipeline would need further assessment. Public footpaths and bridleways run through the site which would impact on their use and enjoyment. The option would not meet plan Objective 1 on mitigating risk of flooding and promoting sustainable travel modes; Objective 5 Education and Skills; Objective 7 Infrastructure; Objective 8 on Connections; Objective 12 on Supporting Rural Communities.

- **Blisworth Parish Council** (no comments)
- **Buckingham Town Council** - oppose a large number of homes being built so close to the A5 Old Stratford roundabout. A major weakness is that the site is bounded by the A422 and A508- an existing strategic highway pinch point. Buckingham is already heavily congested at peak times and this would substantially increase traffic through the town. There are currently no viable options available for increasing highway capacity through or around the town.
- **Cosgrove PC** - Disappointed that the primary reason for considering this site is because Milton Keynes has instructed the Council to do so (included in Milton Keynes 2050 Vision). It would be for dormitory housing serving the needs of Milton Keynes. It would not meet the objective 8 on connections, objective 6 on safety and objective 12 on protecting rural communities. Without a Council policy on new settlements, it is impossible to assess and judge this proposed site. New settlements must not allow the existing villages and communities to coalesce into one large conurbation; this option would merge Deanshanger, Wicken, Old Stratford, Potterspury, Cosgrove and Yardley Gobion. The scale is disproportionate and out of scale to the existing small rural village way of life. There is already pressure on the local infrastructure especially the A5/A508/A422 roundabout (recent National Highways pinch point work has not improved the junction). Would require a

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

new solution for that roundabout (e.g., overpass or underpass). Should consider if the A5 would be realigned to act as a new boundary to prevent coalescence with Deanshanger and to bypass Potterspury. The A5 would need upgrading to allow for the traffic and potentially traffic from the second Towcester Extension as per Spatial Option 4b. The site allocated in the South Northants Local Plan Part 2, AL5 will shortly be brought forward for warehousing, which add further pressure to the A5/A508 roundabout and will impact on the proposed site. Land adjacent to AL5 is being promoted in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment and any additional development in Cosgrove would see a continuous ribbon development from the A5 to the Grand Union Canal. The cumulative effect of all this needs to be considered. The site seems to be promoted/predicated on the MK2050 ideas of a mass transit system, for which there are no plans at present. It is premature to bring forward this site now; if it was allocated/developed in the plan period, it would be a car-only site and contrary to Spatial Objective 1 on climate change. There is no mention of Grade 1 and Grade 2 Listed Churches/buildings in the area (other than at Furtho) or the Conservation Areas. The Grade 2* River Bridge over the River Great Ouse is blighted by traffic from M1 or A5 diversions. Who would be responsible for a new settlements' grassroots administration as it would encompass five parishes? Will produce large amounts of surface water, possibly collected in attenuation ponds which would drain to the local water courses. Would generate additional flooding issues on the River Ouse. Consider the implications of flooding at Cosgrove, Stony Stratford and Deanshanger (should be modelled and assessed in conjunction with those affected). Potentially an additional 14,000 children from the development. Schools in the nearby villages are at, or near to capacity. Milton Keynes schools, especially secondary, are also over capacity. Bus services would be needed to transport children to school unless schools were constructed within the new settlement. High volumes of effluent waste will be generated. The areas' sewage system (constructed in forties/fifties) is pumped to Cotton Valley Sewage Treatment Works; doubt it could cope with such a large housing development. The area where this new settlement may be located has little or no sustainable public transport. The current bus service does not provide a sufficient service to gain access to national rail network systems. It would be a car only settlement- contrary to Spatial Objective 1 on Climate Change.

- **Deanshanger PC** - This site is wholly unsuitable. The scale is hugely disproportionate to anything nearby and would be massively out of scale with the existing smaller rural village way of life. The site does not promise employment opportunities and would be built to provide dormitory housing serving the needs of Milton Keynes (not West Northants needs). There is already pressure on the local infrastructure especially the A5/A508/A422 roundabout (recent National Highways pinch point work has not improved the junction). Would require a new solution for that roundabout (e.g., overpass or underpass). The whole of the A5 would need upgrading. The A508 to M1 is at capacity now and the pressures on the A5 and A508 are increased when

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

issues occur on M1. The A422 to/from Buckingham is also at capacity already. Queues to exit Deanshanger are lengthy at rush hours. Small back roads are badly maintained and Deanshanger and Passenham already struggle with 'rat-run' traffic. National Highways are trying to de-trunk the A5 whereas this option would need increased investment not downgrading. A warehousing development is due to take place along the A5 (allocated in the South Northants Local Plan Part 2, AL5) that will add further pressure to the A5/A508 roundabout. The site seems to be promoted/predicated on the MK2050 ideas of a mass transit system, for which there are no plans at present. It is premature to bring forward this site now; if it was allocated/developed in the plan period, it would be a car-only site and contrary to Spatial Objective 1 on climate change. Concerned about references in plan 'as part of a greater MK'. Villages such as Deanshanger are part of the new West Northants, not a greater MK. Do not want to become dormitory housing for Milton Keynes. There are flood zones and existing major flooding issues in the area. The development would increase surface water and exacerbate flooding issues in surrounding areas. Where would the centre or heart of this new settlement be? It is bound by the A508 on one side, A422 on the other and then dissected by the A5 (new settlement makes no sense when it is split in two by the A5). Should consider if the A5 would be realigned to act as a new boundary to prevent coalescence with Deanshanger and to bypass Potterspury. The option would not meet plan Objective 1 on mitigating risk of flooding and promoting sustainable travel modes; Objective 5 Education and Skills; Objective 7 Infrastructure; Objective 8 on Connections; Objective 12 on Supporting Rural Communities. It develops greenfield sites, removes woodland and agricultural land, removing valuable natural assets which new planting will not be able to mitigate. The Councils' aim of becoming a carbon neutral organisation by 2030 and a low carbon economy cannot be realised if this option is adopted. The consultation should be delayed awaiting publication of the draft Oxford Cambridge Arc Spatial Strategy. This will become national planning guidance and take precedent; not taking it into account may mean that the Plan will need to be revisited/face legal challenge.

- **Greens Norton PC** - Disappointed that the primary reason for considering this site is because Milton Keynes has instructed the Council to do so (included in Milton Keynes 2050 Vision). It would be for dormitory housing serving the needs of Milton Keynes. It would not meet the objective 8 on connections, objective 6 on safety and objective 12 on protecting rural communities. Without a Council policy on new settlements, it is impossible to assess and judge this proposed site. New settlements must not allow the existing villages and communities to coalesce into one large conurbation; this option would merge Deanshanger, Wicken, Old Stratford, Potterspury, Cosgrove and Yardley Gobion. The scale is disproportionate to anything in the local vicinity and out of scale to the existing small rural village way of life. There is already a pressure on the local infrastructure especially the A5/A508/A421 roundabout. Would require a new solution for that roundabout (e.g., overpass or underpass). Should consider if the A5 would be realigned

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

to act as a new boundary to prevent coalescence with Deanshanger and to bypass Potterspury. The A5 would need upgrading to allow for the traffic and potentially traffic from the second Towcester Extension as per Spatial Option 4b. The site at Old Stratford allocated in the South Northants Local Plan Part 2, AL5 will shortly be brought forward for warehousing, which add further pressure to the A5/A508 roundabout.

- **Nether Heyford PC** - Needs re-thinking. Old Stratford is an extension settlement to Stony Stratford, so any further development needs work with Milton Keynes Development Corporation. This area is also subject to significant flooding risk.
- **Old Parish Council** - Some potential, although also notable weaknesses.
- **Old Stratford PC** - Disappointed that the primary reason for considering this site is because Milton Keynes has instructed the Council to do so (included in Milton Keynes 2050 Vision). It would be for dormitory housing serving the needs of Milton Keynes. It would not meet the objective 8 on connections, objective 6 on safety and objective 12 on protecting rural communities. Without a Council policy on new settlements, it is impossible to assess and judge this proposed site. New settlements must not allow the existing villages and communities to coalesce into one large conurbation; this option would merge Deanshanger, Wicken, Old Stratford, Potterspury, Cosgrove and Yardley Gobion. The scale is disproportionate and out of scale to the existing small rural village way of life. There is already pressure on the local infrastructure especially the A5/A508/A421 roundabout. Would require a new solution for that roundabout (e.g., overpass or underpass). Should consider if the A5 would be realigned to act as a new boundary to prevent coalescence with Deanshanger and to bypass Potterspury. The A5 would need upgrading to allow for the traffic and potentially traffic from the second Towcester Extension as per Spatial Option 4b. The site allocated in the South Northants Local Plan Part 2, AL5 for warehousing will add further pressure to the A5/A508 roundabout. Land adjacent to AL5 is being promoted in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment and any additional development in Cosgrove would see a continuous ribbon development from the A5 to the Grand Union Canal. The cumulative effect of all this needs to be considered. The site seems to being promoted/predicated on the MK2050 ideas of a mass transit system, for which there are no plans at present. It is premature to bring forward this site now; if it was allocated/developed in the plan period, it would be a car-only site and contrary to Spatial Objective 1 on climate change. There is no mention of Grade 1 Listed Church and Tithe Barn at Passenham along with other Grade 2 listed buildings, also the Conservation Area in Old Stratford and Grade 2* River Bridge over the River Great Ouse. Who would be responsible for a new settlements' grassroots administration as it would encompass five parishes? Will produce large amounts of surface water, possibly collected in attenuation ponds which would drain to the local water courses. Would generate additional flooding issues at the River Ouse at Old Stratford. Consider the implications of flooding at Cosgrove, Stony Stratford and Deanshanger (should be modelled and assessed in conjunction with

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

those affected). Potentially an additional 14,000 children from the development. Schools in the nearby villages are at, or near to capacity. Milton Keynes schools, especially secondary, are also over capacity. Bus services would be needed to transport children to school unless schools were constructed within the new settlement. High volumes of effluent waste will be generated. The areas' sewage system (constructed in forties/fifties) is pumped to Cotton Valley Sewage Treatment Works; doubt it could cope with such a large housing development. The area where this new settlement may be located has little or no sustainable public transport. The current bus service does not provide a sufficient service to gain access to national rail network. It would be a car only settlement- contrary to the Spatial Objective 1 on Climate Change.

- **Potterspury PC** - Site comes from the MK2050 Vision (where its identified as a suitable site in the future as an offshoot of a Mass Transit System). MK2050 plans envisage a feeder road running alongside the A5 between Yardley Gobion and Potterspury and a Park & Ride with ancillary developments near Furtho. The plans locate development directly over the site of the former village of Furtho where there is a church and dovecote (both Grade II* listed). Have previously opposed the plans as they would negatively impact on a valuable heritage site; they would only feed Milton Keynes; and they would negatively impact on the rural environment of surrounding villages. Appears the plans have encouraged developer activity, and this has led to this site being an option. The proposal would dwarf neighbouring villages and be bigger than Old Stratford, Deanshanger, Cosgrove, Yardley Gobion and Potterspury combined. The villages have distinct identities, and they would be merged into one conurbation. The A5/A422/A508 interchange (Old Stratford roundabout) has already been identified as a transport pinch-point requiring substantial upgrading (recent upgrades have not brought improvements). Congestion and long delays are now a regular occurrence along the village main roads and "rat runs" are common. It would add little to the quality of life of those in West Northants and the residents of the new development would look to Milton Keynes for most services. The settlement would have little positive impact on Towcester and be of no benefit to the development and economic wellbeing of Northampton. Local plans for warehousing adjacent to the roundabout will add further congestion. The A5 would require a complete realignment; few feasible route options would be available because of the location of the new settlement/housing. Traffic issues on the A5 have not been part of the Councils' evaluation of potential sites and National Highways have not been consulted about their future plans for this interchange. There is no infrastructure for water, sewage, or roads to accommodate such growth at this site. The River Ouse at Stony Stratford regularly floods into the town. There are no rail services easily accessible by public transport close to this site. Local primary schools are at capacity and a new secondary school or a complete rebuilding of Elizabeth Woodville (South) would be required. Bus services would be needed to transport secondary pupils. This development would be built on greenfield sites, using agricultural land, remove ancient

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

woodland and impact other natural assets. Potterspury residents chose to live in countryside and rural area, not suburban area (references recent survey). The site would provide dormitory housing serving the needs of Milton Keynes and would rely on Milton Keynes for many services/facilities. The site will not meet the economic needs of West Northamptonshire in general and the development of Northampton as a city. This site does not meet the plan objectives for Objective 8 on Connections, Objective 6 on Safety, Objective 12 on Protecting Rural Communities, and Objective 1 on Climate Change (would rely on cars as any MRT system would be many years away). Decisions on the MRT system are outside the control of West Northants Council.

- **Silverstone PC** - How can this be a new settlement when it is adjacent to Old Stratford? Its location on some of the busiest roads in the area must be questioned (traffic, noise, and other environmental reasons). Goes against the principle of coalescence of settlements as it pushes Old Stratford and Stony Stratford together (extension to Milton Keynes) and causes issues on what is already a congested major road junction. Should show the development already planned in the area so the potential impact can be understood. The possible further urban extension to Towcester must also be considered in this context as vehicles from that would increase the pressure on the A5/A508/A421 roundabout.
- **Stony Stratford Town Council** - Not suitable. The site straddles the A5 which is already a heavily congested area (A508/A5/A422). The future of the Oxford to Cambridge Arc is uncertain and to allocate significant development in this location would be premature. The MK2050 document is a strategy document, not a planning document and to rely on this as a basis for significant growth is inappropriate and premature.
- **Syresham PC** - Concerned about flooding issues, increased traffic, and increased air pollution in close proximity to the new housing developments.
- **Whittlebury PC** - The scale is unsuitable. Would be dormitory housing serving the needs of Milton Keynes. It would not meet Objective 8 on connections, Objective 6 on safety and Objective 12 on protecting rural communities. New settlements must not allow the existing villages and communities to coalesce into one large conurbation; this option would merge Deanshanger, Wicken, Old Stratford, Potterspury, Cosgrove and Yardley Gobion. The scale is disproportionate and out of scale to the existing small rural village way of life. There is already pressure on the local infrastructure especially the A5/A508/A421 roundabout (recent National Highways pinch point work has not improved the junction). Would require a new solution for that roundabout (e.g., overpass or underpass). Should consider if the A5 would be realigned to act as a new boundary to prevent coalescence with Deanshanger and to bypass Potterspury. The A5 would need upgrading to allow for the traffic and potentially traffic from the second Towcester Extension as per Spatial Option 4b. The site allocated in the South Northants Local Plan Part 2, AL5 for warehousing will add further pressure to the A5/A508 roundabout. Land adjacent to AL5 is being promoted in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment and any additional development in Cosgrove would

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

see a continuous ribbon development from the A5 to the Grand Union Canal. The cumulative effect of all this needs to be considered. The site seems to be promoted/predicated on the MK2050 ideas of a mass transit system, for which there are no plans at present. It is premature to bring forward this site now; if it was allocated/developed in the plan period, it would be a car-only site and contrary to Spatial Objective 1 on climate change.

- **Wicken PC** - Site is unsuitable. A new settlement implies that the area will already have or will acquire before completion all parts of the infrastructure for it to integrate into the surrounding communities. This new settlement would force coalescence with neighbouring towns and villages removing their identity. It is likely to become a commuter community for Milton Keynes thus increasing carbon emissions. The houses may accommodate 14,532 new people driving demand on local services. This site is within the scope of the MK 2050 vision which recommends a mass transit system running up toward Potterspury. If this occurs, then it should be operational before a commitment to further housing in this area. Currently, the nearest railway stations are 3.3 and 5.3 miles away neither with direct public transport services. The houses would generate an additional 8,477 cars and vans which would place an excessive burden on the already overloaded road network at this junction. Additional vehicles will create extra pollution and affect residents' health. It would require the building of one secondary school and three primary schools. Journeys to school need to be designed to be safe walking routes to combat climate change. Will need an additional 7 GPs plus an extended community health workforce. Milton Keynes Hospital is already trying to meet the need for developments- new funding is expected but is still in its early stages. No large developments/housing completions should occur until this is in place. Site would accommodate 96% of the projected population growth (2020-2050) so any housing need elsewhere in the county would be ignored. The site has extremely poor transport connections (already overstressed). The A508 and A5 become a default diversion route should the M1 be experiencing problems. The A508 and A422 are used for vehicles moving between the M1 and M40. Yet to see the impact of the rail freight terminal at Courteenhall. The business park proposed at Old Stratford is expected to have 24/7 distribution leading to higher HGV journeys in this location. The new settlement would be dissected by the A5 diminishing the potential for a focal centre. The overall effect will be one of coalescence losing the distinctiveness of local communities. The ancient village of Furtho with its Grade II 12th Century church would be overwhelmed. Concerned about the inadequacy of the local water and sewerage systems, the frequency of power cuts and the risk from flooding in this location. Would magnify the local sky glow thus harming the rural nature of surrounding communities.
- **Yardley Gobion PC** - The site is unsuitable. Would be dormitory housing serving the needs of Milton Keynes. It would not meet Objective 8 on connections, Objective 6 on safety and Objective 12 on protecting rural communities. New settlements must not allow the existing villages and communities to coalesce into one large conurbation; this option would merge

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

Deanshanger, Wicken, Old Stratford, Potterspury, Cosgrove and Yardley Gobion. The scale is disproportionate and out of scale to the existing small rural village way of life. There is already pressure on the local infrastructure especially the A5/A508/A421 roundabout (recent National Highways pinch point work has not improved the junction). Would require a new solution for that roundabout (e.g., overpass or underpass). Should such a new settlement be built where would its centre be? It is bound by the A508 on one side and then dissected by the A5 on the other. Should consider if the A5 would be realigned to act as a new boundary to prevent coalescence with Deanshanger and to bypass Potterspury. The A5 would need upgrading to allow for the traffic and potentially traffic from the second Towcester Extension as per Spatial Option 4b. The site allocated in the South Northants Local Plan Part 2, AL5 for warehousing will add further pressure to the A5/A508 roundabout. Land adjacent to AL5 is being promoted in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment and any additional development in Cosgrove would see a continuous ribbon development from the A5 to the Grand Union Canal. The cumulative effect of all this needs to be considered. The site seems to be promoted/predicated on the MK2050 ideas of a mass transit system, for which there are no plans at present. It is premature to bring forward this site now; if it was allocated/developed in the plan period, it would be a car-only site and contrary to Spatial Objective 1 on climate change. Would destroy heritage assets at Furtho. Will put strain on the special landscape area that runs down the A508 through Yardley Gobion and Cosgrove parishes. The village of Grafton Regis will be impacted by the traffic; there is no bypass for this village. Listed properties without foundations will be subject to more road vibrations which may lead to a loss of the heritage assets.

The following Parish and Town Councils did not specify ‘yes’ or ‘no’:

- **Blakesley PC** - This site is unsuitable. Disappointed that the primary reason for considering this site is because Milton Keynes has instructed the Council to do so (included in Milton Keynes 2050 Vision). It would be for dormitory housing serving the needs of Milton Keynes. It would not meet the objective 8 on connections, objective 6 on safety and objective 12 on protecting rural communities. Without a Council policy on new settlements, it is impossible to assess and judge this proposed site. New settlements must not allow the existing villages and communities to coalesce into one large conurbation; this option would merge Deanshanger, Wicken, Old Stratford, Potterspury, Cosgrove and Yardley Gobion. The scale is disproportionate and out of scale to the existing small rural village way of life. There is already pressure on the local infrastructure especially the A5/A508/A421 roundabout. Would require a new solution for that roundabout (e.g., overpass or underpass). Should consider if the A5 would be realigned to act as a new boundary to prevent coalescence with Deanshanger and to bypass Potterspury. The A5 would need upgrading to allow for the traffic and potentially traffic from the second Towcester Extension as per Spatial Option 4b. The site allocated in the South Northants Local Plan Part 2, AL5 for warehousing will add further pressure to

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

the A5/A508 roundabout. Land adjacent to AL5 is being promoted in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment and any additional development in Cosgrove would see a continuous ribbon development from the A5 to the Grand Union Canal. The cumulative effect of all this needs to be considered.

- **Evenley PC** - Yes and No. Agree that this merits further study.
- **Hinton-in-the-Hedges Parish Meeting** – See answer Q26
- **Kislingbury Parish Council** – declines to vote on particular options.
- **Milton Malsor PC** - Housing areas north of Old Stratford will increase traffic along the A508 to Junction 15, and potentially overload the A5/A508 roundabout (already frequently congested).
- **Wootton PC:** - Additional information required.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

Question 29: What approach do you think the WNSP should take to development in the rural areas, in particular the level of growth that may be appropriate and where that growth could be best accommodated?

This question was answered 593 times and the following key points were raised: (They are grouped under headings for ease of reference)

Development in the rural areas

- Not in rural areas as they have over provided housing growth in recent years
- Least growth in rural areas
- Numerous responses to ensure no further development or expansion of Towcester
- No further development or expansion of Brackley
- Large scale development around major towns and larger suburban areas
- Numerous responses for no development near established villages that have already take a lot of growth e.g., include Long Buckby, Deanshanger
- Further expansion of towns, Northampton, Daventry, Brackley, Long Buckby where there is infrastructure
- WNSP will need to offer lifeline to smaller settlements to ensure that they 'thrive and survive'
- Avoid level of growth that tips villages into being small towns

Level of Growth

- Maintain current level (reflective of size)
- Small scale and consider amenities and facilities
- On Infill sites only
- Growth in rural areas should be driven by local housing need (market, rented social and affordable)
- Linked to development of town
- Residential development should be proportionate to settlement needs
- Large scale growth to be avoided
- Increase density on brownfield sites
- Small developments that do not alienate new housing from existing communities
- Sensible scale in a suitable place e.g., 5 - 10% of each settlement
- Restricted growth, rural areas do not have capacity for increased traffic nor space or infrastructure
- Small level of development as indicated in neighbourhood plans
- Villages that have previously had substantial growth should have smaller targets for new housing.
- The level of growth in the rural areas will need to be informed by:
 - o the overall housing requirement.
 - o the realistic supply within the Plan period from the strategic sites deemed suitable and appropriate for allocation.
 - o the realistic supply from existing commitments and windfalls within the plan period.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- the scale of local needs identified within the rural area.
- the availability of suitable land.
- Development should NOT be based on HENA but based on present need not future projections
- Even distribution of small-scale growth across the rural area
- Rural growth kept to a minimum
- Capped at 20 units per settlement
- Small- medium scale development at larger settlements in the rural area allowing housing choice and social and economic benefits. A blended approach with growth at Towcester and Brackley.
- Spread growth proportionately
- Limit growth to maintain rural nature of villages
- Small bespoke developments, maximum of 50 units
- Needs tangible vision for growth in the rural areas to meet the need and deliver the spatial vision.
- Growth relative to settlement hierarchy

Where to accommodate growth

- Allocate higher level of growth in rural areas to ensure that there is a contribution to affordable housing and ensure the viability of rural services
- Distribute housing growth across rural settlements, keeping relative size between bigger and smaller settlements
- All rural communities should be increased in proportion to their size and allow more or better facilities for local rural communities
- Linked to development of nearby towns
- Rural sites remote from towns lowest priority
- Several response that growth should be in areas of employment e.g., Northampton and motorway junctions not next to small villages with inadequate infrastructure
- Avoid coalescence with the main towns
- Create new village / new settlements similar to Mawsley
- Build a new towns
- Develop brownfield sites first
- Numerous responses for development only within village boundaries
- Low-cost housing within city centres and mass public transport
- No further development in old Stratford
- A14 east-west corridor e.g., Harrington Airfield site and Kelmarsh estate
- Sites promoted at Hartwell, Harpole, Roade, Barby
- Majority of growth should be at Northampton as major conurbations
- Focus development in the primary and secondary service villages
- Establish a tier above primary service villages 'sustainable villages' allowing level of service provision to meet day to day needs of residents and of scale capable of supporting proportionate and sustainable housing growth, with close physical links to 4 main settlements and assign a level of growth to each the sustainable villages e.g., Deanshanger.
- Mawsley areas as an alternative site for the full quota of housing

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- Large new settlements completely alter the historic identity and idiosyncratic character of an area and often have little character of their own.
- Avoid unrestricted growth without any additional provision of services
- Where there is infrastructure e.g., Long Buckby with electric railways a part to play in future developments
- Long Buckby would no longer be a village if proposals were carried out.
- New settlement should not subsume existing smaller settlements
- Mixed strategy approach welcomed to ensure there is delivery of growth.
- Not on the A5
- Public transport corridor focused strategy for growth can sustainably meet the rural growth
Not North of Northampton as this is at capacity
Take account where existing development has already occurred

Employment in rural areas

- Limit to areas where they can be served from major roads on the periphery of settlements
- Small scale employment only in rural areas, sympathetic to local character
- Over concentration of warehousing
- Negative impact of lorry movements (including air, noise, traffic impact)
- Over reliance on logistics and warehousing - there has to be a drive for balance to create a better and more sustainable community.
- Development in rural areas is not the answer. For sustainable growth to be achieved focus must remain on Urban areas and their delivery of balanced residential and employment objectives that support aspirations to be carbon neutral. there has to be a drive for balance to create a better and more sustainable community.

Identified Rural Issues due to growth

- Proper engagement and consultation with rural communities
- Preserve identity of rural communities
- Preserve heritage and culture, including SLA and designated and non-designated heritage assets
- Protect and preserve green spaces – ensure not in use before developing, positive role for communities in terms of health, mental wellbeing, and preservation of the environment
- Ensure that rural housing developments do not act as dormitories for out commuting
- Coalescence between towns and smaller villages
- Provide a means of achieving thriving vibrant villages
- Biodiversity of the open countryside
- Ensuring rural character isn't harm and impacts tourism
- Community cohesion of new developments in rural settlements
- All development requires appropriate supporting infrastructure

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- Role of neighbourhood plans, identifying sites to meet need
- Village life will be eradicated by further development in rural areas
- Travel from villages very poor – lack of public transport and congested road network
- Flood plains around villages are needed
- Ensure development reflects housing needed by local villagers/ parishes to help identify need
- Consultation and engagement with local residents.
- More information required as to what the spatial strategy for the rural area is.
- Impact on climate change considerations esp. reducing carbon release and enabling reducing the need to travel. Implications of COP26.
- Importance of growth for smaller settlements to ensure that they continue to be vital and viable
- High quality development for a wide range of uses
- Well-connected local facilities and transport links
- Community integration and public space
- Risk of flooding e.g., at Deanshanger
- Agricultural needs should also be considered - need food as well as houses
- Educational needs of the area when large developments occur
- Northern Relief Road is essential
- Over supply of housing in rural areas
- Proposed levels of growth will have significant impact on emergency services and ability to cope
- Development to respond to local topography
- Undertake a rural 'health check' for all rural settlements

Parish and Town Councils who responded and the key issues raised:

- **A5 Alliance of Parish Councils** - The West Northants Strategic Plan notes that rural areas have over-provided in terms of additional dwellings provided and the current identity of rural communities should be preserved. Having some housing growth evenly spread across existing rural settlements could be considered keeping the relative size between the larger and smaller settlements as it is now. It could also better reflect the housing needed by local villagers and local parishes and towns should be involved to help identify need and consider planning options at an early stage. Encouraged to have local plans in which need is identified. Those villages that have already seen substantial growth should have a smaller target for new housing. The idea of spreading a little bit of growth evenly across existing settlements should be considered. This would keep the relative size between the larger and smaller settlements as it is now. The smaller settlements would not atrophy/wither but may get a welcome boost. It would also better reflect the housing needed by local villagers. Great care needs to be taken to ensure that the local infrastructure can cope.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- **Blakesley PC** - The idea of each village having a target to increase its housing should be considered but keeping the relative size between the larger and smaller settlements as it is now.
- **Boddington PC** - Level of growth in rural areas to continue to follow the level of identified needs. The parish would be happier with smaller, more bespoke developments aligned with our local housing needs
- **Braunston PC** - The strategy should recognise the value of agriculture in producing food locally to reduce food-miles. Braunston PC would like to see greater recognition in the strategy of the importance of agriculture in our rural areas and the benefits of protecting BMV land. The current views of Braunston PC on other aspects relating to development in rural areas are all effectively set out in the made Braunston Neighbourhood Development Plan. The objectives of local Neighbourhood Plans should be reflected more clearly in the vision and considered more transparently in the options appraisal.
- **Brixworth PC and Brixworth Strategic Planning Working Group** - The rural areas have had more than their “share” of developments in recent years, often developer rather than plan led. Neighbourhood plans have a part to play in recognising what is needed for their areas. Rural development should not be concentrated in the Primary Service Villages but should be spread in a proportionate manner across all settlements and of a type the community requires. It is noticeable that several communities have become more “dormitory villages” where the young or elderly cannot afford to live. As a result, rural primary schooling has some large schools at or near capacity whereas other smaller schools are advertising spaces. Rural areas do not have the facilities that urban areas have or SUEs should have. Connectivity is usually poor and bus services poor.
- **Bugbrooke PC** - There has already been a huge amount of growth in the Rural Areas in recent years and at the current rate it would meet half of the overall all housing need for the period 2050. This does not fit with the council’s overall strategy to develop the main towns and would be detrimental to Northamptonshire’s character and charm. The erosion of picturesque villages into sprawling suburbs contradicts the overall strategy to focus on creating urban hubs in the county’s towns. WNC must be mindful that in loading new developments into “service villages,” the services in those villages will become unable to support the larger communities. The opportunity to create a ‘new settlement’ maybe a critical tool in satisfying the demand for 7860 rural homes. Allowing parishes, the opportunity to accept or reject very small developments may also allow for manageable growth in the villages that meet the needs of the village. Most villages are happy to use very small patches of land to add a few new homes as they can keep smaller villages alive by bringing in young families, but parishes should play a large role in these developments as they know what is needed in the community.
- **Church with Chapel Brampton PC** - Allow modest extensions to rural villages (say circa 5%) so that village shops, pubs and schools can be supported and remain viable.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- **Cogenhoe and Whiston PC** - Infill housing that respects the current village confines but with consideration of effect on facilities & infrastructure.
- **Cold Higham PC** - Growth in rural areas should be organic, i.e., to fit the needs of the area, rather than 'planned' or imposed from above. If not then the County will be in danger of losing its rural character. We are largely a farming community after all.
- **Cosgrove PC** - Great care is required to ensure local infrastructure can cope with any new development.
- **Daventry Town Council** - Be visionary for the future, build on existing infrastructure rather than creating new. Sustainable transport and technologies to reduce the carbon footprint should be a priority consideration.
- **Deanshanger PC** - The idea of spreading a little bit of growth evenly across existing settlements should be considered. This would keep the relative size between the larger and smaller settlements as it is now. The smaller settlements would not atrophy/wither but may get a welcome boost. It would also better reflect the housing needed by local villagers. Those villages that have already seen substantial growth should have a smaller target for new housing. Deanshanger for example has seen massive development in recent years without upgrades to its infrastructure. Great care needs to be taken to ensure that the local infrastructure can cope, but a policy of 5 or 10% expansion may be worth pursuing. All parishes to develop a local plan and allow that to do the local allocation with the numbers being set in the Spatial Strategy.
- **Easton Neston PC** - The preservation of our green spaces as presented in the 'Vision' is vital and needs to be a priority, so that future generations benefit from the continued healthy environment that these spaces enable.
- **Ecton PC** - EPC believe that special consideration should be taken for rural areas. EPC recommends WNC adopt a similar policy as outlined in their Neighbourhood plan with a hierarchy of settlements agreed to protect and enhance the county's rural areas and limits new housing to small scale infill and rural exceptions sites in rural areas.
- **Evenly PC** - Development in the rural areas should maximise the use of sites within existing village envelopes before greenfield sites are considered. Good broadband connectivity is an important part of infrastructure in villages and rural areas, enabling people to work from home and reduce travel to work.
- **Eydon PC** - Significant house building projects should only be undertaken in the rural areas where the existing infrastructure and sustainability status are appropriate.
- **Flore PC** - Flore has accepted an increase in housing numbers in the last few years of approximately 20% without any increase in facilities (and the loss of some). We have in place a Neighbourhood Plan but are already considering the need to look beyond due to the known demand for affordable accommodation needs and single-storey accommodation for an elderly population needing to downsize. Any expansion will need to respect the need to retain the village identity and must be accompanied by a commensurate expansion of facilities. Villages like ours need to be able to offer spaces and

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

buildings on a scale which support and maintain a Community identity, whatever its size, if it is not to become a commuter suburb. It also needs to support its agricultural base which may well become more important in a future in which climate change may dictate a fresh look at what is locally produced and marketed. Other local businesses should be supported and encouraged, and the potential for attracting tourists' revenue considered.

- **Greens Norton PC** - Development in the rural areas should be allowed and planned to maintain the size of the villages in proportion with any development. Access to local infrastructure is paramount and the cumulative impacts considered.
- **Guilborough PC** - The rural housing need should be based on the needs identified in the Parish Neighbourhood/Village Plans where applicable.
- **Harrington PC** - There are two distinct sources of growth in rural areas: new building and conversions within villages and the construction of new settlements. Both are sensitive. Development within existing village boundaries should be determined by those living there, through a Neighbourhood Plan. Appendix 3 the Strategic Land Availability Assessment includes as item 24 Harrington Airfield. Despite concluding that it is unsustainable in the absence of a rail connection and further that it would adversely affect the significance and setting of existing heritage assets the site has not been ruled out. This should be determined as not suitable for development. The land South of Market Harborough, we support the WN Council intention of not pursuing this site. There needs to be a gap between settlements and development of this land would blur the distinction between the urban environment of Market Harborough and the rural openness of the villages of Great Oxendon and East Farndon.
- **Hinton-in-the-Hedges PC** - The approach taken by the old South Northants eventually had a good deal of acceptance. The concept of grading villages with sustainability being a consideration seemed widely accepted. The idea of village confines meant that everyone knew where they stood in respect of development. These principles should be carried forward into West Northants.
- **Holcot PC** - Adopt existing policies that protect rural communities (e.g., no building in open countryside)
- **King's Sutton PC** - Growth should not, as has been suggested by some, be calculated based on historic growth. That would mean those who have taken the pain to date, would be expected to take even more pain in future. Growth should be allowed outside of agreed village confines only in very exceptional cases. This should be strictly adhered to so as to preserve the rural nature of the villages and to ensure that whatever is allowed by way of expansion, is environmentally sound. Growth should primarily be to meet village requirements in terms of true affordability and house size e.g., smaller starter homes should be prioritised over larger 3/4/5-bedroom houses.
- **Kingsthorpe PC** - Local Parishes to give an input. Locations need to be sustainable and protect character of villages and conservation areas.
- **Kislingbury PC** - Kislingbury Parish Council is opposed to the use of the northern side of the A4500 at Junction 16 (on the other side of the road from

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

Panetone Park) as a 'spatial option' to meet economic need. To enable real housing need to be met, there should be construction of homes available on a variety of tenures including shared ownership. The use of the term 'affordable' on the Strategic Plan should be monitored and readers should be made aware that this really means prevailing market value. The use of Community Led and not-for-profit housing initiatives needs to be prioritised to address the needs of West Northants residents. The logistics-led development that has occurred along the M1 corridor despite objections. It has, created employment that is unskilled, insecure (zero contracts and agency work) and low paid. This makes it harder for people to afford houses locally. The use of the residual requirements for economic (employment) need should be carefully focused and aligned with the developing West Northants Anti-Poverty Strategy to develop to the greatest extent possible, well paid, permanent, and satisfying work.

- **Little Houghton PC** - LHPC support the wording in Spatial Option 6 – Rural Areas. 'The level of growth needs to recognise the need to protect and enhance the special environmental and social characteristics of the rural area. It is also important that the level of growth in rural areas is supported by appropriate levels of infrastructure'. LHPC is not averse to appropriate growth when it is supported locally. Growth in rural settlements should be based on local need.
- **Long Buckby PC** - To protect the rural environment by protecting rural communities. The communities are the custodians of the environment
- **Maidwell with Draughton PC** - Object to Spatial Option and Spatial Option 6. The main reasons for the objections are as follows: 1. Maidwell with Draughton Parish consists of two small rural villages. Maidwell already experiences problems regarding traffic, and this is the main issue of concern for the Parish Council and the residents. A residential development of this size at one or both ends of the A508 would put enormous pressure on this road and therefore the traffic travelling through the Parish would become unmanageable. 2. Maidwell and Draughton only have rural village services and are a large distance from any major town in West Northamptonshire. Both villages rely heavily on what Market Harborough, Brixworth and Northampton provide. A major investment would have to be made to these services to support the proposed development including roads, schools, health centres, flood control infrastructures etc. 3. The sites' proposed span across attractive hillside and open fields. The area proposed that borders East Farndon Parish is a popular walking spot, and it is this green, open space that is invaluable for supporting the mental health and wellbeing of residents of Market Harborough and all the surrounding villages. 4. Both sites are 'green space' and are vital in contributing to the reduction of climate change. This is highlighted as a key strategy for WNC.
- **Moulton PC** - Economic growth opportunities need to be within easy reach of residential development. This is indicated on P11, but this is not followed through.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- **Nether Heyford PC** - Scale is the key consideration for rural development. There is a tipping point where villages in effect become small towns and lose the characteristics of a true village with close community and social cohesion, aside from any negative visual impact. WNC is blessed with many beautiful villages which could easily be damaged through excess development and these are critical to the development of tourist business and visitor trade. The abiding development principles should therefore be meeting local need and protecting and enhancing existing assets. Particular attention in meeting local need should be on housing mix, ensuring adequate provision for younger and older residents. Older residents in larger family homes are especially challenged through the paucity of properties suitable for downsizing. This freezes out families and blocks the natural population cycle, which is damaging to village vitality. Also, where Neighbourhood Plans are 'made' these should be fully respected and where villages do not have Neighbourhood Plans WNC should support and encourage their development.
- **Old PC** - Rural areas should be respected as individual communities with their own identity, and any growth should be small scale and on sites clearly identified and approved at local (parish) level. Justification for abundant housing and business growth in, or adjacent to, villages is not made.
- **Old Stratford PC** - Great care is required to ensure local infrastructure can cope with any new development.
- **Overstone PC** - Lilbourne and Yelvertoft. A new settlement similar to Mawsley straddling the Lilbourne/Yelvertoft border of about 10,000 new homes plus. Creating a new Parish could fulfil a third of the housing needs of 30,000 as outlined. Would also address new housing in rural area. This area as stated previously has good road links, rail links so requires limited highway infrastructure.
- **Pitsford PC** – Full draft should include strategic priorities that protects the important rural areas to the north of Northampton, specifically Pitsford.
- **Pottersbury PC** - Potterspury is familiar with restricted growth rates and has seen an increase in housing stock of around 10% since 2011. The idea of encouraging growth across settlements has merit although providing growth where there can be sustainable facilities is important. Also, post-Covid the concepts of homeworking and the requirements of residents needs serious reappraisal. The crucial areas to consider must be the requirements for transport, education, and the location of health facilities.
- **Silverstone PC** - Daventry and South Northants are not only rural areas but also have their own unique character and beauty with many very pretty villages. This also serves to preserve nature and clean air and should not be turned into a built environment. For such brown field sites should be the primary choice for such sites.
- **Syresham** - Syresham village has already recently seen sizeable development, exceeding its housing growth allocation. Rural and town developments need to include the provision of bungalows, for residents needing to downsize or who need single storey dwellings due to physical health reasons.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- **Tiffield PC** - We propose that the Strategic plan should focus on the preservation of our green spaces as presented in the 'Vision', so that future generations benefit from the continued healthy environment that these spaces enable.
- **Walgrave PC** - Given the level of growth around us the growth within our rural areas should be protected. Emphasis should be given to how the rural environments can be supported to further support the main towns around them.
- **Wappenham PC** - Allow all villages and parishes a small amount of appropriate growth. Preserve in important rural aspect of Northamptonshire villages.
- **Weedon PC** - Weedon Bec is set in a rural area. Our Neighbourhood Plan, which was rejected by the examiner, included several sites where residents would be accepting of development. None were large scale, and no one would want to see a big development foisted on our (or any other) village so that village services become overwhelmed. Small scale development would be welcomed especially if it includes a sizeable proportion of affordable property for families plus bungalows or generously proportioned flats for older/disabled people.
- **Welford PC** - WPC is an enthusiastic supporter of Plan Lead Growth. It was one of the first Councils to prepare and have "Made" a Neighbourhood Plan. We support the premise that: 1. Past levels of rural growth should not be used as a forecast for the future needs where these have been shown to undermine the urban centric special strategy. 2. The focus of growth should be highly concentrated on existing urban areas where essential physical and social infrastructure can be better provided in a sustainable manner. 3. Recent experience has shown that dissipated growth throughout the massive rural area does not create the revenues to sustain infrastructure. 4. The existing JCS sees the housing needs of the rural areas already satisfied to 2029. The change in boundaries does not change that. Therefore, growth in rural areas should respect those targets and made Neighbourhood Plans until that date. Beyond that time growth needs in rural areas can be better judged against the progress made in focusing on urban growth.
- **Welton PC** – No comments supplied
- **Whittlebury PC** - Great care needs to be taken to ensure that any development in rural areas is sustainable. For example, it is no good allowing affordable housing to be built in a village with no local facilities and no public transport services as the residents will be isolated. The majority of growth should be focused on sustainable locations that have local facilities and public transport. We agree with Towcester Town Council that new housing should be provided where the demand is driven by employment growth.
- **Wicken PC** - The WNSP already recognises that rural areas have over-produced in terms of additional dwellings, but that growth may need to slow significantly now that the "low hanging fruit" has been picked. The current identity of rural communities is based on their cultural heritage which should be preserved and celebrated. Rural communities may well become the future

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

remote working hubs as digital connectivity is rolled out in these locations. The infrastructure needs become different when fewer individuals need to commute to a place of employment

- **Woodford-Cum-Membris PC** - We agree that the plan to build around existing strong highway infra structure is a good plan, whilst preserving the nature and character of existing marketing, villages, and rural areas.
- **Yardley Gobion PC** - The idea of spreading a little bit of growth evenly across every settlement has some merit. This would keep the relative size between the larger and smaller settlements as it is now. The smaller settlements would not atrophy but may get a welcome boost. Great care needs to be taken to ensure that the local infrastructure can cope, but a policy of 5 or 10% expansion may be worth pursuing. WNC should encourage all parishes to develop a local plan and allow that to do the local allocation with the numbers being set in the Spatial Strategy.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

Question 30: Are there any other spatial options that we should be considering?

- 241 respondents said 'Yes'
- 193 respondents said 'No'
- 343 respondents provided specific comments

Those who responded 'Yes' suggested that the following additional spatial options should be considered, or made other comments:

- Engagement with rural communities is needed including rural health checks.
- There could be a commitment to forests, woods, spinneys, and trees.
- A5 corridor between Towcester and Old Stratford should be made environmental with a focus on major tree planting.
- Emphasis is on new housing - existing housing should also be considered.
- Market Harborough cannot sustain an additional 2,000 houses.
- Wait for the draft Oxford Cambridge Arc Spatial Strategy to be published.
- Less logistics-based employment; attract more 'technical' based employment.
- Consider specific economic requirements for particular sectors or clusters in relation to the spatial strategy and Oxford-Cambridge Arc.
- Concerns regarding loss of farmland and land for sports activities, with impacts on mental health in rural areas.
- Mixed housing delivery is needed.
- Most appropriate spatial strategy is likely to comprise certain elements from all of the spatial options. Strategic warehousing needs assessment should be undertaken.
- Some respondents stated no further development should take place.
- Some respondents expressed support for further growth within the rural areas alongside growth at the main towns.
- Some respondents expressed support for spreading development across the West Northamptonshire area (mainly in and around the existing settlements rather than rural areas), reducing reliance on large sites and considering small sites (or smaller extensions to the existing settlements).
- Some respondents expressed concerns with a reliance upon strategic scale development sites.
- Some respondents referred to the need for grouping/zoning of different uses and separating them.
- Some respondents supported locating new housing near employment areas to reduce the need to travel to work.
- Some respondents referred to their answers under Question 29 regarding rural areas.
- Some respondents referenced the need to take account of changes arising from COVID-19 pandemic with changed working patterns (increased homeworking).
- Several respondents supported locating new developments near existing rail and public transport hubs/connections and improving such connections.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- Several respondents expressed support for the development of a new settlement as opposed to extensions to existing towns and villages, with reference being made to the example of Mawsley village in North Northamptonshire.
- Several respondents stated that brownfield sites should be prioritised over greenfield development, including within the town centres and existing conurbations with consideration given to higher densities and reuse of vacant/redundant premises.
- Several respondents expressed support for the redevelopment and regeneration of Northampton town centre and as a focus for new development.
- Several respondents expressed support for a greater focus on climate change, with specific reference to support for electric vehicles, sustainable construction, working from home/reducing the need to travel for work and sustainable transport improvements.
- Several respondents suggested further assessment and evidence base work was needed to justify and assess the spatial options/potential development sites, including the AECOM study and that further consultation with residents should be undertaken.
- Several respondents expressed concern that existing infrastructure could not support the proposed levels of development and referred to the need for additional supporting infrastructure to support new developments including woodland, public parkland, allotments, green spaces, swimming pools, hospitals, doctors, dentists, pharmacy, schools, shops, transport (including improvements to existing roads), electric vehicle charging infrastructure. Specific references to the need for a North/South dual carriageway bypass for Towcester and Park and Ride at Northampton.
- Several respondents suggested specific locations for new development (providing supporting information and with some querying the conclusions of the Council site assessments to date). These locations are:
 - 4/5 field areas on Sandy Lane Harpole, next to Larkhall Lane and opposite South View and next to A4500 and the current housing development.
 - Land at Staverton (90 dwellings).
 - Land to the South of the A14 Junction 2, including Harrington Airfield site and the Kelmarsh Estate Land site. New Strategic Settlement for 6,500 – 7,000 houses, 20,000 sqm of employment space and associated infrastructure/services. New Strategic Distribution Centre comprising up to 600,000 sqm of floor space partly on the Harrington Airfield site and on separate adjoining land.
 - Land between Old Stratford and Cosgrove for major development.
 - Land for a dedicated mid-box warehouse (B2/B8 uses) development at land to the south of Junction 1, A14.
 - Silverstone (new town).
 - South West Brackley (Site ID: 5) for circa 2,000 homes and associated infrastructure.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- Land north of Yardley Road, Yardley Gobion for circa 95 dwellings.
- Spatial Option 1e. Northampton South East for an enlarged allocation providing around 5,000 new dwellings.
- Possible further expansions at West Haddon or Kilsby.
- West Haddon to Guilsborough.
- Mawsley area for the full quota of required housing.
- Sharing development between the villages bordering on the A428 which has access to the A5, M1, and A14.
- New Town at Brackley, with new station on HS2 route.
- Roade- with an additional train station for connecting into Milton Keynes.
- Consider East Haddon, Kilsby, Crick, Barby, West Haddon, Guilsborough for some expansion.
- Urban extension directly adjoining the boundary between Milton Keynes and West Northamptonshire.
- Areas towards Weedon and Newnham.
- Near Flore, near the recently built a £41million extension to the A45.
- A45 Weedon bypass area, Daventry Development Link Road.
- Residential development near the M1, A45, M45 and A14.
- Site 178 (Dallington) for 200 dwellings.
- Site 59 (Weedon Bec)- land parcels should be considered separately.
- Development to south east of Daventry and west of Roade (within the new bypass).
- Land south of Harpole for residential development (3ha).
- Land to the south of Junction 16 of the M1 for logistics use (Site 57).
- Land south of Eldon Way, Crick for employment development.
- Public transport corridor focused development on the A43 south of Towcester – specifically at Silverstone Park (as a destination for employment, education, training, and leisure).
- Cross-boundary employment opportunities provided by nearby major urban areas, including Banbury. Logistics and warehousing close to the strategic road network, including the M40 corridor.
- Future growth at Silverstone Park as the centre of the Silverstone Technology Cluster.
- Land to the South East of Towcester for a new settlement.
- Land North of Mouton situated on either side of Holcot Road (approximately 65ha).
- Foxhill Road close to the northern edge of Long Buckby for residential development.
- Land to the North of Towcester Road, Towcester for employment development.
- Land to the North of the Brackley North SUE (Radstone Fields) for residential development.
- Land adjacent to Elizabeth Woodville School, Stratford Road, Roade for residential development.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- Land to the North of Greenway, Braunston, Daventry for residential development.
- Land at Hazelbrook, Denton Road, Horton for residential development.
- Land to the North of Towcester Road, Towcester for employment development.
- Land at Staverton Hill Farm, Badby Lane, Staverton for residential development.
- Land Off West Street/Hall Lane, Welford for residential development.
- Land at Upper Heyford, Main Road, Northamptonshire for residential/mixed use development.
- Final Phase, Waterside Way, Bedford Road, Northampton for employment development.
- Blakesley Hill, Greens Norton and High Street, Yardley Gobion for residential development.
- Land south of Market Harborough (Farndon Road, Market Harborough) for residential development.
- Land at Long Barrow, Chipping Warden for residential development.
- Landholding off St Johns Close, Rothersthorpe for residential development.
- Poldermere site, Red House Lane Hannington for employment development.
- Hardwick Road site, Hannington for employment development.
- Quinton Green Business Park for employment development.
- A fair distribution of development throughout the county; concerns regarding impacts on rural settlements.
- Need for development in areas of relative remoteness as far as possible from existing towns and conurbations- consider Cambridgeshire and Norfolk.
- Large developments Northampton and MK. Small expansions with correct need identified for small towns/villages. Support for Site A: Land to the East of Flore and Weedon and Site B: Land to the south and south east of Daventry.
- Sites within the Northampton area boundary; sites within the Northampton Related Development Area ('NRDA'); or sites adjacent to existing employment sites. Sites such as land north of Bedford Road, Northampton (Site ID 61) for up to 24,000 sqm (GEA) of employment floorspace.
- HSGV as a Garden Village settlement to provide over 5,000 dwellings.
- Land to the south of Milton Malsor for employment development is preferable to sites at Junction 15a and 16 of the M1. Combined with Northampton Gateway it has the potential to deliver a significant rail linked strategic warehousing space.
- Respondents also objected to the development at the following locations:
 - In and around Towcester, Brackley and rural villages.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- Several respondents expressed concerns with sites 38,39 and 40 (Northampton East – Ecton) and suggested they should be removed as an option.

Those who responded ‘No’ made the following key points:

- Level of housing need is overestimated- too much emphasis on the Oxford - Cambridge Arc.
- Keep residents informed.
- Towcester should not be further extended.
- Rural villages should not be developed further.
- Infrastructure should be improved before further new development.
- Choose the options that will have the least impact.
- Consideration to be given to climate change, locating development near sustainable transport links and the use of brownfield sites.
- Concerns raised regarding impacts upon green spaces, wildlife, agriculture, lack of amenities and services, poor transport links and congestion, parking issues, poor quality new housing, impacts on village life.
- Consider the carbon impact of large industrial warehouses particularly along the M1 corridor; carbon offsetting measures should be considered.
- Existing police and fire facilities will not have sufficient capacity to meet development needs. Northamptonshire Police consider that a new hub type facility will be required in the West; would expect developer contributions towards this.
- Northern Towcester, Silverstone and Daventry are ideal for housing and Northampton and Daventry for industrial. Housing in west Northants could be developed on existing developments at Wootton, Duston, Billing/Ecton, Upton and Kislingbury and north of Kingsthorpe.
- Concerns regarding impacts of new development at specific locations including sites 230, 229 and 228, Deanshanger, Silverstone, Towcester, Land south of Market Harborough (2,000 dwellings) near East Farndon, fields between Northampton and Ecton for 1,800 dwellings.
- Concern regarding inclusion of sites within North Northamptonshire Council area (at Ecton) (sites 38, 39 and 40 specifically referenced).

Other comments made by respondents who did not specify ‘yes’ or ‘no’:

- Consider the role of trees in delivering planning objectives.
- Place housing close to employment areas to avoid excess travel and reduce emissions.
- Flood risk is a great issue, particularly in the Ouse catchment.
- Careful consideration to be given to environmental impacts of development at site 230, 229, 228; specific information provided on key issues to consider.
- Affordable housing proportions need to be assessed in line with local needs.
- More single floor dwellings needed with shared ownership opportunities for first time buyers.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- Historic England would be concerned regarding potential impacts on the scheduled monuments at East Farndon and Little Oxendon deserted medieval village.
- Further information requested on Land to the South of Market Harborough, (2,000 dwellings). Concerns raised regarding this site.
- Concerns raised about further expansion at Bugbrooke including access to schools, mix of housing, community facility needs and sewage infrastructure.
- Keep to the larger already developed conurbations which are close to existing arterial roads of the M1, M4 and M6.
- Concern regarding inclusion of sites at Ecton (sites 38, 39 and 40) and impact upon Neighbourhood Plan.
- Rothersthorpe parish area: development should be in proportion to the housing stock requirement; be sensitive to the rural character of village; take account of other environmental considerations and infrastructure requirements; retain a green belt buffer between the village and the M1 or be in locations that would retain a village hub with a defined buffered boundary (consider land that lies to the west and North West).
- Unsure but perhaps consider growth towards Leicester.
- Stay within the council boundaries and only build where needed.
- Diversify the type of industries catered for e.g., Science/Engineering Parks.
- Concerned previous comments made not noted in relation to Spatial Option 4B. Concerns regarding existing road infrastructure issues; Towcester relief road will be inadequate and cause further congestion on the A43. Concerns regarding impacts of new housing under development in Towcester on existing infrastructure and access to services e.g., doctors, schools, shops, public transport. Difficult to comment on indeterminate line denoting (apparently 4,500) houses.
- See comments to question 29. Whilst the principal towns should deliver the majority of the housing requirement across West Northamptonshire, sustainable growth at rural settlements is important.
- Closer working relations with adjoining authorities is needed on cross boundary developments; these have had a detrimental effect on the Old Stratford roundabout and the existing local communities.
- Spatial objectives seem sound and impressive; difficult part is to follow through and create a legacy of innovative, harm-free solutions that will enhance West Northamptonshire.
- Some respondents suggested a combination of elements from all the spatial options is likely to be required. The distribution of housing growth should be focused at the urban/improved infrastructure areas/main settlement of Northampton followed by other key settlements of Daventry, Brackley and Towcester, but with greater consideration of sites in suitable rural settlements.
- Some respondents suggested the development of Northampton town centre, including old buildings within the centre.
- Some respondents stated the findings of further evidence were needed before commenting further, including the AECOM report, the Oxford to Cambridge Arc special capacity plan, the technical assessments of sites.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- Some respondents expressed concerns regarding the impacts of new developments and the need for additional infrastructure.
- Several respondents put forward supporting information for specific sites for new development (with some querying the conclusions of the Council site assessments to date), including:
 - Land at Adventure Ways Outdoor Activity Centre for residential development.
 - Land South of Kislingbury Road and adjacent to Champion School, Bugbrooke for residential development.
 - Milton Ham Farm, Towcester Road for residential development.
 - St Peters Way, Northampton for residential development.
 - Former Great Houghton School and Glebe Land, High Street, Great Houghton for residential development.
 - Land adjacent to Ivy House, Hardingstone for residential development.
 - Land at Crick Road, Yelvertoft for residential development.
 - Land off School Road, Pattishall for residential development.
 - Land at Hillcroft View, Blakesley for residential development.
 - Land at Beech Lane, Kislingbury for residential development.
 - Former Abattoir Site (Kalvec Limited) and Nursery Buildings, Blisworth for employment/residential/mixed use development.
 - Land off Naseby Road and to the rear of Marecroft, Clipston for residential development.
 - Land at Lingles Farm, West Haddon Road, Ravensthorpe for residential development.
 - Northampton Road, Blisworth for residential development.
 - Land at South East Daventry for employment development.
 - Land at Kilsby for a new settlement (3,300 - 4,000 new homes, a 10ha business park and associated infrastructure/services).
 - Landholding at Willow View, Kislingbury for residential development.
 - Land at Overstone Grange, Moulton, Northampton for residential development (as an extension to the North Northampton SUE).
 - Additional land parcels (193.71ha) to Spatial Option 1E - Northampton South-East for a further 2,500 to 3,500 dwellings.
 - Additional land (37ha) to Spatial Option 1E - Northampton South-East for a further 500-700 dwellings.
 - Land at Hulcote Crop Store, Hulcote for residential development.

Parish/Town Council responses

The following Parish and Town Councils responded ‘Yes’ (should be considering other spatial options):

- **A5 Alliance of Parish Councils** - Identify all sites which are brownfield before any greenfield sites. Climate change should prompt a reassessment of the proximity of places of employment to the residential location of its workforce. For those who cannot work remotely, journeys should be on enhanced, integrated public transport with a greater reliance on working within walking/cycling distance of one’s home. The spatial options should prefer

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

locations with existing rail and other transport links. The majority of houses built should be classified as “affordable” at the point of sale. Site 36 has been dropped from this consultation whilst Northampton has the infrastructure to support the development; should be included as an option.

- **Braunston PC** - sites 15 and 17 to the east and south east of Daventry should be reconsidered, with sizes reduced to protect the scheduled monuments. The sites are nearer to Long Buckby station than Spatial Option 2a and would be nearer to any new Daventry Parkway station developed in the Weedon area.
- **Brixworth PC** - Need to see the AECOM report and the technical assessments of the sites before commenting further. Affordable housing proportions need to be assessed in line with local needs. More single floor dwellings needed with shared ownership opportunities for first time buyers.
- **Cogenhoe and Whiston PC** - Protection of green spaces is essential.
- **Hinton-in-the-Hedges PC** - the document misses out on improving what is already here. Focuses on ‘new’ development and ignores the current population wants.
- **Overstone PC** - The £40 million A45 link road which bypasses Flore should have more development especially to the North of the bypass.
- **Tiffield PC** - In a period when the UK hosts COP26 it is entirely wrong that West Northamptonshire should present a Strategic Plan that does not adequately reflect the need to create a Zero Carbon County. To minimise environmental impact and embedded carbon the plan must examine spatial options that exist within the confines of current conurbations and small towns.
- **Wicken PC** - The spatial options must identify all sites which are brownfield before any greenfield sites are selected. The impact of climate change should prompt a reassessment of the proximity of places of employment to the residential location of its workforce. For those who cannot work remotely, journeys should be on enhanced, integrated public transport with a greater reliance on working within walking/cycling distance of one’s home. The spatial options should prefer locations with existing rail and other transport links. WNC should pursue a policy of the majority of houses built being classified as “affordable” at the point of sale.

The following Parish and Town Councils responded ‘No’ (should not be considering other spatial options):

- **Blisworth PC** - There are limited opportunities for growth without impacting the countryside and local infrastructure.
- **Woodford-Cum-Membris PC** - The provision of a completely new settlement is un-realistic in terms of providing the infrastructure to develop a whole new town or large village, particularly when there are suitable sites, as identified which will provide for housing, employment and industrial needs well into the future. Consideration should be given to ensuring that all un-used housing and available brown sites are used.

The following Parish Councils did not specify ‘yes’ or ‘no’:

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- **Ecton PC** - population growth in Northants is outstripping national growth. If the trend continues the 'Green and Clean' attributes and 'distinctive rural landscape' will come under unsustainable pressure.
- **Silverstone PC** - More thought must be given to the choice sites and not be driven by developers. Neighbourhood plans and careful surveying should identify suitable locations for appropriate development.
- **Wootton PC** - The potential of the connecting of communities, villages, and towns physically by new roads or new cycle or pedestrian ways should be established. Cycle routes within and across towns should be improved and created

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

Question 31: Are there any other comments you wish to make at this stage?

529 respondents submitted comments

Comments are grouped by broad subject areas below for ease of reference.

General Comments

- Outline planning should remain as close to what is outlined as possible (reference made to Overstone Leys development).
- Concerned with two tier approach to plan making; allocating only very large sites now will lead to delayed housing delivery. Include medium-sized sites.
- The Joint Core Strategy should not be a fixed starting point for a new Strategic Plan; should allow questioning of existing allocations of land.
- Remove the Council from the Oxford-Cambridge Arc.
- The Council should negotiate S106 agreements and hold developers to these conditions; the Council has the responsibility to implement the measures.
- Some existing businesses are bussing employees' long distances; should be required to offset the environmental impact of long-distance commuting.
- The plan should be coherent with North Northamptonshire plans.
- A review of the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy is overdue; the strategic plan should be kept on course for earliest possible adoption.
- The Duty to Co-operate remains in force; strategic planning matters must feature in regular engagement across local authority boundaries and should seek to be consistent on the proposed Plan periods.
- Homes England will seek to support growth and increase the rate of housing delivery through acquisition, development, infrastructure, investment, new settlement/garden communities and enabling activities as appropriate.
- Do not make the same mistakes as the South Northampton Local Plan (2).
- Farmland where there are working farms should be protected.
- Some respondents expressed general support for the approach to producing the emerging Spatial Options and its content/scope.
- Some respondents supported references to the Oxford/Cambridge Arc. Need to physically join it through developing transport, housing, and connectivity. Growth in the south of the county reliant upon alignment with the Arc.
- Some respondents supported the 2050 timescale.
- Some respondents stated the impact upon existing communities and the needs of existing residents needed further consideration.
- Some respondents referred to the Governments 'Levelling Up' agenda; this should be taken account of.
- Some respondents expressed the view that the plan needed to be more specific on how some of the objectives would be achieved.
- Some respondents stated the plans should have a process of regular re-assessment and monitoring to make sure the objectives are being achieved.
- Some respondents expressed concerns about the lack of quality design in new developments; new buildings should be an enhancement to the area (use

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

local conservation areas and traditional Northamptonshire styles to inform schemes).

- Some respondents stated the document does not have a clear/strong vision; the vision should link to other council initiatives. Consider delay in the consultation to develop a vision for the area from which spatial options/spatial strategy can be identified.
- Several respondents referred to taking account of the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on the economy and home/work patterns.
- Several respondents stated the importance of environmental and climate change considerations (including biodiversity gain) and support for the carbon neutral by 2030 pledge. Concerned the plan will not achieve climate change objectives and Net Zero target; should align with the Council's Climate Change Strategy. Reference made to examples of logistics and industry developments along the M1 corridor and elsewhere (e.g., Buckton Fields urban extension). Reference made to the need for new developments to incorporate sustainable design features e.g., solar panels, electric vehicle charging points, wildlife areas. Should specifically refer to the need to reduce carbon emissions. Objective 1 overlooks the role of the natural environment in building resilience to climate change. Biodiversity Net Gain approach/policy should be developed further; set a target (noting 10% will be the mandatory minimum- guidance provided).
- Several respondents stated the plan does not meet legal guidelines and it fails to embrace the sustainable development requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework; does not take account of the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic; there is inappropriate emphasis on economic growth and 'business as usual' development; it lacks a coherent strategy for the proposed sites (the locations appear to be driven by developer demand).
- Several respondents stated the plans were against the wishes of residents/communities and existing objections to local plans.

Consultation Documents and Process Comments

- If additional sites come forward the consultation will need to be repeated.
- Request consultation extended and advertised on local radio/in the press.
- Support for the structure of the Consultation Document and its brevity.
- The housing requirements for Northampton are poorly presented; cannot understand the figures.
- Additional staff/information needed at the consultation events.
- Some respondents expressed the view that decisions had already been made/ building work started before the consultations.
- Some respondents stated there wasn't enough detail to comment on.
- Some respondents stated that the mapping within the document was poor quality/poorly presented. Further detail should be included e.g., relationship to other sites/surrounding areas, woodland, historic sites, topography, clearer base mapping, and a clearer 'key'. Mapping should show all sites nearby one another on single map to give a better perspective.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- Several respondents stated that notifications/communication/advertising of the consultation was not adequate.
- Several respondents stated that the format/length/style of the consultation document, accompanying documents and questionnaire may deter people from responding. Information should be presented more clearly/more accessible/be more user friendly/in plain English/less use of jargon and abbreviations. Summaries of the accompanying documents should be provided. Access to the consultation via the website URL was difficult.
- Several respondents expressed concerns regarding the questionnaire including that the use of Yes/No options was not always appropriate; it leads the reader to answer 'yes'; some questions are 'loaded'; the length deters people responding, it is not user friendly; does not adhere to web accessibility criteria; the requirement to register first may deter people.
- Several respondents stated that there should be more consultation and engagement with residents and communities throughout the plan process/before the plan is taken further (including in specific areas affected by potential new developments and neighbouring areas outside West Northants). Some concerns that residents, local councillors, and parish councils have not been consulted adequately and have not been involved in the plan or in identifying potential development sites to date (including in specific areas affected by potential new developments and neighbouring areas outside West Northants). Respondents suggested the use of 'citizens' assemblies; taking account of that not everyone has social media/actively looks at the Council website; using sports clubs/gyms to engage younger people.

Evidence Base Comments

- Welcome further Duty to Co-operate discussions and the sharing of a Duty to Co-operate Paper to inform the next stages.
- Request confirmation that screening for the need for a Habitat Regulations Assessment has been undertaken.
- Any development proposals within the inundation zone of a reservoir dam could adversely alter the risk assessment for the reservoir. Detailed information and updated breach models needed to consider consequences of dam failure (should be part of the Flood Risk Assessment). The urbanisation of catchments is a risk; a change to the modelled hydrograph inflows to a reservoir could increase predicted water levels (mitigation required).
- The sites should be subject to Land Contamination Assessment in accordance with national policy and the Environment Agency Land contamination risk management (LCRM) guidance. Guidance links provided.
- Air quality monitoring is inadequate.
- The sustainability appraisal should be updated and extended to consider the options assessed in the AECOM new settlements study (once published).
- Traffic monitoring must take place at peak times of the day and year.
- Significant further heritage impact assessment required before the sites can be fully assessed; ensure Conservation Officers and Archaeological Advisors have been consulted. Guidance links provided.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- Query what research has been done on empty/substandard properties.
- There is no urban capacity study.
- Natural England is working with the Council on evidence to inform revision of the Upper Nene Valley Gravel Pits SPA Supplementary Planning Document and establish a mitigation strategy. Also investigating Functionally Linked Land for Golden Plover and Lapwing. Will expect sufficient evidence to be provided to justify the site selection process and to ensure sites of least environmental value are selected. Reference made to existing sources of information and guidance on areas of environmental value/protected sites and evidence base would expect to see prepared/used to support the plan.
- An up-to-date assessment of sport and recreation facilities (including quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses) and opportunities for new provision is needed.
- Milton Keynes Council would like to participate in any strategic warehousing needs study; see also SEMLEP offer on joint study.
- Some respondents expressed concern that the Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment only test site options; does not test the Local Plan objectives or spatial strategy options (including reasonable alternatives). Does not consider different combinations of spatial strategies (reference made to the West of England JCS plan from 2018/19). The high-level assessment should be updated based on forthcoming evidence base (for site specific assessments).
- Several respondents stated that the consultation should be delayed allowing the report on new settlements to be published (AECOM report) and a study on strategic warehousing needs to be undertaken.
- Several respondents stated the consultation should be delayed to wait for the draft Oxford Cambridge Arc Spatial Strategy to be published. This will become national planning guidance and take precedence; not taking it into account may mean the plan will need to be revisited or face legal challenge. The timetable does not have any mechanism to check draft proposals against this emerging policy.

Housing and Employment Needs/Requirements Comments

- The Standard Method housing requirement should be considered as a minimum.
- The estimate of housing needs is a model and unexplained in the paper.
- There are errors in the Housing and Economic Needs Assessment (HENA) which need to be corrected.
- More than one scenario on employment needs and housing needs should have been presented with flexible options for implementation.
- Estimates of population growth may be understated.
- HENA should be updated to reflect strategic trend changes in the logistics market. Indicates a need to allocate further land (supporting evidence submitted). Strategic warehousing needs should be considered by this plan.
- Ensure that houses are well built and have a variety of sizes and styles.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- There is insufficient consideration of the effects of Brexit on economic growth.
- Relying on landowners/agents to propose employment sites results in bias towards the logistics industry. Strategy should be to decide what kind of new employment is needed and deliver this.
- Add an objective to radically improve existing housing.
- Query the approach/assumptions of the HENA and data used; consider that land availability, not need, is driving the strategy.
- A higher approach to housing need that would support the level of job growth for the area should be adopted.
- The HENA should be reviewed and updated following the Government's Oxford-Cambridge Arc Spatial Framework consultations.
- The HENA does not fully acknowledge the Silverstone Technology Cluster and its benefits to the local and regional economy.
- Concerned about the speculative building of warehousing/office space.
- Some respondents stated there is shortage of social/affordable housing and the plan does not address affordable housing; houses will be too expensive for local young people.
- Some respondents asked for clarification what is affordable housing as current housing prices are very high.
- Some respondents stated that no further building should take place in the area and the evidence was not there to support further development.
- Some respondents stated that based on ONS statistics the overall number of new dwellings should only be 23,870 and South Northamptonshire's housing need is 6,317.
- Some respondents stated that the data appears to show that fewer new houses are required/more are being planned for than what is needed.
- Several respondents expressed concerns about the scale of development proposed and focus on housing/economic growth, rather than environmental/climate change matters.
- Several respondents expressed concerns with the focus on warehousing/logistics developments (and their environmental impacts) and lower paid/skilled jobs being provided. Higher value/paid/skilled jobs should be sought. Concerns that the plan does not address economic requirements for other sectors/clusters of business activity, including high performance and technology sector. Partners from Manufacturing, Information Technology, Health Care, Education, and others should consider ways to encourage new jobs with the minimum land footprint and reduced transportation needs. Reference made to Silverstone Park, Silverstone Technology Cluster, and the technology college.

Infrastructure Comments

- Minimum of 30% of development land should be left as green public space.
- Work to get a single infrastructure-led strategic plan.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- Consider the development land or infrastructure pressures that the Cambridge Oxford Arc may place on the area; set out how the emerging Arc growth may be accommodated.
- Infrastructure should not be limited to the needs of new residents. Existing communities must benefit from new developments.
- Why include new roundabouts with new developments; consider flyovers.
- Maximise the use of pre-existing infrastructure such as existing dual carriageways and motorways when deciding on site locations.
- New developments should incorporate sufficient and high-quality greenspace/blue infrastructure, recognising its multifunctional and contribution to policy delivery and strategic outcomes (e.g., supporting climate change adaptation and healthy communities etc). Reference made to Natural England's supporting guidance/standards/resources available.
- Concerned that infrastructure won't be provided in reality; reference made to current developments at Collingtree Park, Hampton Green and St George's Fields which have no facilities.
- Concerned about impacts upon Public Rights of Way; many have been cut through where new major trunk roads have been created e.g., A43, A14. Should have a plan to not allow public rights of way to become inaccessible or dangerous/difficult to navigate and improve links.
- The water supply resource issue is being ignored in strategic planning policy. Reference made to Anglian Water's Water Resource Management Plan and the Anglian Water Region being classified as an 'area of serious water stress'. Concerned that Anglian Water is not responding to consultations adequately; independent report needed on water resources.
- Look at Overstone Leys and the lack of roads west to east; £41 Million should have been spent where 4,000 homes were planned.
- Clarity needed on the status/plan for the Northampton Northern Orbital route.
- English Regional Transport Association wish to see old railway track beds protected and links reopened (specific locations referenced). Reference made to engineering study for Northampton – Bedford link. Range of benefits for Northampton identified. Support new stations/halts at Watermills (new University campus), Brackmills (industrial estate) and the old Bridge Street station. Re-opening of the Great Central Main Line would have number of benefits; connections could be made for Daventry. A new station should be built at Weedon on the West Coast Main Line close to Daventry International Rail freight Terminal. Grand Union Canal towpath should be upgraded.
- National Grid identify one or more National Grid assets within the Plan area (details provided). Guidance provided on development close to assets. Request a plan policy that respects existing site constraints including utilities.
- National Highways provide high level analysis of the spatial options; each of the options identified are likely to have a varying level of impact on the Strategic Road Network, leading to potential implications at key junctions and impacts on their operation. The cumulative impacts of sites should be considered. Specific reference made to Site 2 for 1,500 dwellings located in close proximity to the A5; Site 7 for 470 dwellings located adjacent the A43;

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

Site 23 for 90ha of employment located adjacent the M1; Site 25 for 4,000 dwellings located adjacent the A14; Site 33 for 2,000 dwellings located adjacent the A43; Site 35 for 35ha of employment located adjacent the M1; Site 47 for 2,800 dwellings located adjacent the A5; Site 43 for 900 dwellings located adjacent the M1; Site 48 for 3,255 dwellings located adjacent the A5.

- Network Rail is working with stakeholders on the current freight developments (DIRFT expansion and the Gateway project); promotes the benefits of transporting freight by rail. Working with West Midlands Rail Executive, England's Economic Heartland, and rail industry partners to investigate ways to integrate local train services in the area. Continuing the development of the England's Economic Heartland project. Working on optimising utilisation of capacity on the West Coast Main Line.
- Some respondents stated that the current road network is up to capacity (heavy congestions/traffic delays/pollution already) and solutions are needed before more development. Reference made to the A5 and specific areas in the north and north-eastern area, and potential impacts of new settlements at Towcester and Old Stratford. Analysis to understand the impacts is needed.
- Several respondents stated that new developments need appropriate infrastructure provision – schools, doctors, hospitals leisure facilities, electric vehicle charging points, energy, transport links, sewage network, water provision. Concerned about the impact upon existing infrastructure across the area and upon existing services within villages/that villages do not have the capacity to expand these existing services. Investment needed in services in existing areas before further development take place.
- Several respondents expressed support for active travel and reduced vehicle use. Support for more/enhanced cycle routes, and public transport improvements. Concerned about lack of reference to public transport in the plan. Concerned about lack of understanding on cycling infrastructure/use. Link up with the Public Transport Strategy and the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan. Lack of access to adequate cycling infrastructure in Northampton town. There is no plan to develop green infrastructure to take the place of car/lorry transport.

Spatial/Development Strategy Comments

The following comments regarding the overall spatial/development strategy were received. Site/location specific comments are summarised in the subsequent section.

- Consider locating development in new and expanded settlements directly related to existing and potential high quality public transport corridors.
- Locate development where there is opportunity for sustainable modes of transport to be utilised rather than sole dependence on private vehicle.
- Define a clear rural boundary between Milton Keynes and the West Northants border to prevent conurbation and ribbon development.
- Remaining villages on Old Stratford bounds should remain as Green Belt.
- Bias towards South Northants for extra development is disproportionate.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- Some respondents suggested removal of a ‘zoning’ approach (home and work in separate places) and developing mixed-use neighbourhoods (reference made to 15-minute neighbourhood). Locate employment/housing nearby one another/near town centres and services to reduce commuting/maximise public transport use.
- Some respondents supported development on sustainable urban extensions.
- Some respondents expressed concerns with the use of sustainable urban extensions on the edge of existing towns/strategic growth sites.
- Some respondents supported consideration of new settlements.
- Some respondents expressed concerns with new settlements.
- Several respondents expressed concern that the approach was developer-led/site-led/piecemeal and based on the ‘Call for Sites’ only (rather than being an overall strategy for development). Sites will not deliver the vision.
- Several respondents supported prioritisation of brownfield sites within existing settlements; green spaces to be built upon last.
- Several respondents stated developments should be focused on improving the existing urban areas/towns and their infrastructure rather than rural areas.
- Several respondents expressed concerns with the loss of countryside/rural areas to new developments and adverse impacts upon the rural nature/character of the authority/villages; loss of wildlife; mental health; increased traffic; increased pollution; losing the character and heritage of villages. Buffers should be used to maintain the individuality of existing settlements and for footpaths, bridleways etc to retain their rural feel.
- Several respondents stated the needs of the rural areas require further consideration and the individual nature of rural villages should be recognised. Support for sustainable/appropriate growth in the rural areas that complements the existing/ character/have appropriate infrastructure. Direct growth to a wider range of smaller sites and villages/spread development across villages to meet needs. Consider regeneration needs of villages. Plan focuses on Northampton/urban conurbation and not rural communities. Include an enabling policy to facilitate delivery of housing sites in rural areas (policy wording/criteria suggested).

Site/Area Specific Comments

In addition to the spatial strategy comments above, several respondents suggested or supported specific locations for new development (providing supporting information and with some querying the conclusions of the Council site assessments to date). These locations are:

- A14 east-west corridor: would recognize the role the whole of West Northants can play in the Oxford-Cambridge Arc and would be consistent with the Corporate Plan (2021-25). Support strategic development in the north of the Council’s area, including the potential for a new sustainable community.
- Site ID 16 (Daventry West) appropriate for residential development; will provide technical assessments to ensure robust assessment within the Sustainability Appraisal.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- Site ID 37 (Hardingstone Rise) should be assessed more positively in the Sustainability Appraisal.
- Site ID 59 (Weedon Bec): Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) analysis is unreasonable, and corrections are needed/additional evidence should be considered.
- Site ID 89 could deliver more dwellings and link to MRT corridor.
- Site ID 99 (DIRFT 4) appropriate for residential development; will provide technical assessments to ensure robust assessment within the Sustainability Appraisal.
- Site ID 40 appropriate for residential development (within North Northamptonshire but wish to work with both Councils).
- Site ID 247 for residential development- could include strategic open space and link to MRT corridor.
- Deanshanger: upgrade infrastructure to expand it into a town. Support for new development in vicinity.
- Drayton Gate Farm, north of the A45 (Braunston Road), Daventry appropriate for employment development.
- Eco-park@Daventry Interchange: spatial option 3b offers the best potential for meeting local employment needs.
- Ecton Brook: proposed development here is not included- why?
- Knotwood: add ecovillage by the A508/A5 roundabout (preserve green space/wildlife corridors between villages of Wicken, Furtho and Pottersbury).
- Land adjacent to Puxley Road, Deanshanger (Site ID 112) for residential development; sites should be considered separately.
- Land at Collins Farm, Flore (Site ID 21) comments on the SLAA assessment; smaller parcel of land should be re-assessed.
- Land at Holly Lodge (Site ID 29 and part of Spatial Option 1c) for development.
- Land at Hillcroft View, Blakesley for residential development.
- Land east and west of Junction 18, M1 (Site ID 133) for employment development; query Sustainability Appraisal findings.
- Land at Middleton Cheney for development.
- Land at Northampton Road, Brixworth (Site ID 112) for residential development; sites should be considered separately.
- Land at Station Road, Brixworth (Site ID 112) for residential development; sites should be considered separately.
- Land East of Ashby Road, Daventry (Site ID 98) for residential development; comments on SLAA analysis.
- Land east of Welton Lane, Daventry (Site ID 100) for residential development; comments on SLAA analysis.
- Land north of Yardley Road, Yardley Gobion for residential development.
- Land off A428 Harlestone Road/York Way at Dallington for residential development.
- Land off Wicken Road, Deanshanger (Site ID 112) for residential development; sites should be considered separately.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- Land on the north-east side of Holly Lodge Drive, Moulton Park, Northampton for residential development; comments on SLAA analysis.
- Land south-west of Crick (Site ID 14) for residential development; query SLAA analysis of the site. A smaller scale of development can be considered.
- Land to the South and West of Pitsford Road, Moulton appropriate for residential development (as part of a wider allocation 'Northampton North - West of Moulton' (spatial option 1c)).
- Land to the west of the existing settlement at Harpole for development.
- Land West of A5 and North of Towcester Road, Towcester for employment development.
- Middlemore Farm, west of the A361, Daventry for residential development.
- Milton Keynes: Option 4b and Option 5b align with possible future long-term development locations within the Milton Keynes Strategy for 2050; broadly supported but Councils to work together to ensure the potential impact of the allocations are assessed and mitigated, particularly in relation to infrastructure. New employment land should not be at a scale which competes with Central Milton Keynes as a major office/employment centre.
- Ministry of Defence sites at Yardley Training Estate and Kelmarsh storage depot: should recognise these are of strategic military importance and operational development should be supported. Consider 'agent of change' principle. Recognise their brownfield status and potential for sites to be declared surplus. Suggested policy wording provided.
- Northampton town: Several respondents stated the opportunities for development within the town should be considered, including former retail/industrial sites, building up and densification. Site options have been dropped from the SLAA and this consultation. Only 10% of the growth is toward Northampton. The recent bid for Northampton city status is not supported by any proposals in the spatial options. Needs redevelopment/regeneration.
- Phase 2 Shacks Barn, Whittlebury for employment development.
- Rothersthorpe Village: Support residential use of site 80 (with appropriate access, infrastructure, and design).
- Silverstone Park and Silverstone Circuit: should maintain the strategic policy support within the adopted West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy for further development/redevelopment.
- University of Northampton's Waterside Campus: importance should be recognised. The University's former Avenue and Park Campuses are proposed for residential development.

In addition to the spatial strategy comments above, several respondents queried the appropriateness/objected to specific locations or areas for new development (providing supporting information and with some querying the conclusions of the Council site assessments as set out in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) and/or Sustainability Appraisal). These locations/areas are:

- SLAA Site 210: further development on Lower Ecton Lane, Northampton needs to be accompanied by traffic measures (details provided).

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- SLAA Sites 221, 229 and 219 (all on the edge of Northampton): would decimate green spaces. Query the Sustainability Appraisal findings.
- Spatial Option 1: against further expansion of Northampton to the east due to infrastructure concerns; merging of Wellingborough with Northampton; impacts upon the Nene Valley. Expansion better centred on the west, as the proximity of the M1 means that expansion here spoils less countryside.
- Spatial Option 1a - Northampton North – North of Buckton Fields and Northampton Northern Orbital Route (NNOR): concerned about potential impact on the Brampton Valley Way (BVW) and the Northampton and Lamport Railway (NLR). The NLR organisation is expanding the existing heritage railway operation in Northamptonshire (extensions currently to the south and following that to the north- details provided). Wish to minimise potential for changes to existing infrastructure by feeding into the design and crossing locations of Option 1a/NNOR.
- Spatial Option 3a and 3b (Area at M1 at Junction 18) including SLAA Site ID 99 and 133: several respondents objected. The area has seen substantial development through DIRFT and housing developments. Concerned about increases in pollution and congestion; loss of Green Belt agricultural land; loss of character of the area; significant environmental impacts. Reference made to visual impact of development of elevated land. More appropriate sites are available in proximity to Daventry (detailed information provided). Has already adversely impacted Crick; would impact Yelverloft and Lilbourne. No evidence to support the scale of expansion at DIRFT (see also comments related to impacts upon Kilsby and DIRFT expansion below).
- Spatial Options 4a, 4b: concerns regarding transport infrastructure (A5 and Old Stratford roundabout already congested); flooding/drainage.
- Spatial Options 5a: concerns regarding transport infrastructure, flooding, and drainage
- Spatial Option 5b: several respondents objected due to concerns regarding education, medical, emergency services capacity and transport infrastructure; flooding/drainage; impacts upon the environment; pollution; road safety (crossing A5); impacts upon existing residents; loss of agricultural land; green and blue infrastructure; loss of village life; coalescence between villages; loss of rural/village character and loss of individual villages. Would become a dormitory estate for Milton Keynes. Scale of development inconsistent with local needs. No development without the full co-operation of Milton Keynes Council to jointly demonstrate how the infrastructure and services will be developed and improved. Include better/safer cycle links to local villages e.g., Pottersbury and Yardley Gobion (see also Cosgrove, Deanshanger and Pottersbury comments below).
- A5 and A508 developments: concerns regarding traffic and road safety; Yardley junction would need improvements.
- A5 area: there should be no more residential or business development alongside the A5, or in such a location that will draw more traffic along this road, until the road network is updated to take traffic away from Towcester, and all other residential or community areas.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- Brackley: developments to date have left Brackley minus infrastructure befitting a town its size. The High street should remain the focus of the Town. Development to the north will require new shop hubs and services. Improved road, footpath and cycle infrastructure is needed across the town. Consider electric bus service. Consider infrastructure needs and access to them including parking, healthcare, education, green spaces and play areas.
- Braunston: would be ruined by the proposed plans.
- Cosgrove: several respondents objected to size and scale of development in this area due to concerns regarding climate change, biodiversity, traffic, pollution, loss of access to leisure opportunities. Reference made to existing issues including traffic.
- Crick: concerned about loss of green spaces, traffic congestion, pollution, crime.
- North side of Daventry: Neighbourhood plans have been made and development has already impacted disproportionately.
- Deanshanger: several respondents objected as it would no longer be a village if the Old Stratford development took place. Should remain a village (see also Spatial Option 5b comments). Recent developments taken place with no village access improvement; this should be a priority before any further development takes place.
- DIRFT expansion: if takes place the infrastructure should be rethought e.g., the junction 18 and the A14 and landscaping should be scale appropriate.
- East Farndon (land south of Market Harborough): several respondents objected. Further large-scale development will adversely impact the character of the settlements (Market Harborough and East Farndon- reference to Lubenham also made). Concerns on infrastructure capacity; traffic issues; flooding issues; reduced separation between East Farndon and Market Harborough (East Farndon 'consumed' by Market Harborough); pollution; lack of public transport; potential impact of development on locally significant historic parklands to the south-west of Market Harborough (Thorpe Lubenham Hall and Marston Trussell Hall). Market Harborough town infrastructure and services have not improved with recent developments. Proposals are contrary to existing local plan policies. Concerns regarding potential changes to local authority boundaries because of the development. Support for not allocating the site; Harborough District Council is beginning to prepare a new local plan and will maintain dialogue under the Duty to Cooperate.
- East of Northampton / Ecton: should not be developed further (reference also made to Ecton Brook and Rectory Farm). Several respondents objected to SLAA sites 38, 39 and 40. Concerns regarding loss of open and green spaces (including pocket and linear parks); loss of Green Belt land (should be protected); wildlife losses; traffic issues on the A4500 and other roads (existing issues being exacerbated); school capacity; medical facilities capacity; pollution increases; impacts on local heritage assets/conservation area; impacts upon views; impacts upon local environment overall (including the river and brook); flooding/drainage issues; coalescence of Ecton with Northampton. The plan should not be considering sites outside its boundaries

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

and they should be removed as options. Regard should be had to the Ecton Neighbourhood Plan; the sites are contrary to the plan. Council Tax from developments on these sites will go to North Northamptonshire Council.

- Kilsby (warehousing development): several respondents objected. Any DIRFT expansion would adversely affect residents and the village. Reference made to visual impact of development of elevated land and infrastructure concerns. Concerns regarding traffic; increased noise and light pollution (HGV traffic has already increased); loss of greenfield countryside; impact upon heritage assets (Kilsby Tunnel); loss of rural/village life. Would not provide significant number of jobs/current developments are automated with minimal personnel. Kilsby Neighbourhood Plan consulted everyone living in the village.
- Land North West of Nasmyth Road Daventry: close to a railway cutting which must be protected for possible future use as a railway.
- Long Buckby: several respondents objected to development here. The housing developments do not contribute to the quality of our lives- poor quality housing. Concerns on wildlife losses; loss of village rural nature; impacts upon conservation area; impacts on infrastructure (already at capacity). A 'new settlement' here is not viable; it is not a new and separate settlement.
- M1 and A43: concerned will become corridor of warehousing with adverse impacts on landscape, character of villages, road infrastructure/traffic.
- Martins Yard Development, Northampton: should not go ahead as its close to the main railway line; could obliterate the old track-bed of the old Northampton - Bedford railway.
- Moulton: should work with Moulton College and adjacent landowners to create a cycle/ walking access route.
- North of Daventry towards Braunston: object to development here.
- North of Moulton: development options outside of the specific A43 SUE proposals- Planning Inspector has found them not justified. This has been omitted from the consultation document.
- North of Northampton: development is dependent on the Northern Relief Road but this, alone, will not be sufficient to deliver these areas.
- Northampton Northern Orbital Road: will shift traffic rather than remove it and will obliterate the track-bed of the old Northampton-Market Harborough railway line (wish to see re-opened).
- Potterspury: several respondents objected to development. Reference made to existing infrastructure issues e.g., capacity of schools, health, road network- further development would exacerbate issues. Concern at loss of rural character, green space, wildlife.
- Rothersthorpe: several respondents objected to SLAA sites 80, 228, 229, 230 & 330 (detailed comments made with reference to specific local issues). Consider the damage to historical sites/heritage assets; conservation area; landscape value; wildlife (including protected species); rural paths; the Grand Union Northampton Arm canal; increased flooding (exacerbating existing flooding issues); negative visual impacts; loss of amenity; increased noise pollution; loss of village community/identity (loss of quietness); loss of

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

agricultural land; negative impacts of additional traffic. Site 228 will only deliver small number of jobs. Site 229 provides green barrier to the M1 motorway. Rothersthorpe lacks existing services/infrastructure capacity (issues will be exacerbated). It is too far away from the main employment areas for those working in Northampton (for housing). Buildings would be out of keeping with the rural nature of the village and its surroundings; consideration should be given to bunding and landscaping that minimises the impact if development proceeds. Green area separation from Northampton should be maintained.

- St. James Inner Relief Road Northampton: will shift traffic rather than remove it and will obliterate the old track-bed of the old Northampton - Bedford railway. Must be provision for a potential level crossing where the road crosses the old track-bed.
- Towcester: several respondents objected to development here. Should not be further extended- making the rural town into a polluted large town/small city. Road network is not fit for purpose (including the new relief road). Concerns regarding environmental impact; loss of rural/village character; loss of agricultural land; impact upon heritage assets/historic character; impact on resident's wellbeing; infrastructure capacity and the need for improvements e.g., schools, medical facilities, sports facilities, and traffic (need a dual carriageway bypass around the town before further development). Towcester farming community and its greenspaces should be protected and supported. Concern about development from north west Milton Keynes stretching through to Towcester and impacts on Towcester infrastructure. Development is over and above what is required in the area. Current developments not providing affordable housing; jobs; sustainable transport. Concerned plans would locate employment development north of Towcester whilst there is a development of housing to the south (sustainability issues).
- Towcester racecourse: object to development. It adds to the county's quality of life; attracts visitors; is an area of open grade 2 listed parklands and open countryside containing listed buildings and heritage sites.
- Whittlebury: concerns about traffic through village; would be exacerbated by further developments. Towcester bypass will not be an attractive alternative.
- Yelvertoft: concerned about impacts on its rural setting.

Parish/Town Council responses

The following comments were made:

- **A5 Alliance of Parish Councils** - Concerned with the basis on which the consultation is taking place and the timing of the consultation. Plan fails to address key issues for the proposals. Its methodology of assessing suitable sites is no longer fit for purpose. The pandemic has changed patterns of working which this plan fails to consider. Creating new communities that lack any infrastructure to support them will increase in carbon emissions through greater use of private vehicles. Infrastructure must be in place before proceeding with housing expansion and the ability of developers to adapt a

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

proposal based on viability at a later stage should be withdrawn. The plan must be re-written to demonstrate precise steps as to how each proposed site will ensure the Council reaches net-zero carbon emissions by 2030. The use of brownfield sites is not discussed. Does not consider the needs of Northampton to grow “upwards” rather than “outwards”. Greenfield locations at the scale proposed should be the last resort. The Oxford-Cambridge Arc plan has not been published for consultation; there is a risk that the plan will be challenged because it did not consider current national policy which will take precedent over the WNC plan. Disagree with the housing projection; housing need is inflated using a weighting applied to provide affordability (should instead require a higher percentage of affordable housing). and figures on population growth may differ from those in the Oxford-Cambridge Arc plan. It should be re-written to reflect climate change commitments and re-selection of sites that are near employment opportunities and that can be accessed by sustainable transport. The Council should delay this consultation/withdraw the plan and take the approach by Milton Keynes council to develop a vision for the area from which spatial options in planning terms can be worked through. It should wait for the draft Oxford Cambridge Arc Spatial Strategy to be published; for work commissioned on new settlement options to be published; and its review of warehousing needs. The possibilities for development in Northampton town should be considered; these have been dropped from the SLAA and this consultation.

- **Billing Parish Council** - Comments made on Sites 38, 39 and 40 (Northampton East – Ecton). The Ecton Neighbourhood Development Plan has been adopted. The sites are all contained within the boundaries of the Ecton Neighbourhood Development Plan. Regard should be had to the Neighbourhood Plan; specific reference to paragraphs 5.5.4 and Policy 9 in respect of landscape character and maintaining the separate identity of Ecton village. Billing Parish and Rectory Farm form part of the eastern boundary of Northampton and the areas covered by these sites are extremely important to the local area as ‘green belts’. Development is contrary to the required climate change actions and for ‘clean air’. Concerned about the loss of green spaces for healthy living/mental health benefits. Concerned about the loss of wildlife species and a green wildlife corridor (Pocket Park in Rectory Farm and the Linear Park in Ecton Brook could both be severely damaged). Vehicular movements would be along a narrow country lane (Ecton Lane) and then predominately in a westerly direction heading for the motorway network via junctions 15, 15A and 16 all serving Northampton. Both the A4500 and the A45, currently experiencing problems particularly at peak traffic times would be further flooded with additional traffic. Concerned about Northampton General Hospital and its ability to cope with increased demand. Concerns regarding the demand on schools, doctor’s surgeries and leisure and community facilities currently in east Northampton (exacerbating existing problems). Concern about existing housing developments in the Moulton and Overstone areas with problems including an overburdened local road network; increased traffic movements; and a rise in numbers of patients accessing the

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

hospital. The three sites should be considered unsuitable for the negative impact on Northampton due to their location on the border of the borough of Northampton but not within West Northamptonshire's area of jurisdiction. Concern that Council Tax and developer contributions would go to North Northamptonshire when the impacts are on Northampton.

- **Blakesley Parish Council** - The approach needs review- consider approach taken by Milton Keynes council to develop a vision for the area from which spatial options in planning terms can be worked through. The plan needs to align/conform to the Oxford Cambridge Arc, which will take precedence. The WNC timetable does not have any mechanism to check its draft proposals against this emerging policy.
- **Blisworth Parish Council** - Recognise the need for sustainable local growth, however, this should not be at the expense of the health, rural community, or safety of surrounding impacted communities. Concerns surrounding proposed increases in housing density south of Northampton, surrounding Towcester and east of Old Stratford. Blisworth is used as a cut through for traffic from Northampton to the A43/A509 (identified as one of the Policing Regional teams' strategic priorities). Increased traffic and lack of compliance with speed limits through the village. Concerned that highways investment concentrates on major truck roads such as the A45, A509 and A5 but ignores the impact to minor rural communities and roads. Concern that funding is not available to address traffic impact. Increased housing creates further pressure on rural roads and communities which is not addressed by the plan. This is further aggravated by the proposed developments of industrial facilities at the M1 J15 Rail Central, Northampton Gateway at J15 and DHL on the A5. Whilst Blisworth, Milton Malsor, Gayton and Collingtree include a number of services which could be accessed on foot, the range of facilities is lacking e.g., supermarket, secondary school, employment opportunities. Limited local bus services and no appropriate cycle network. Discussions to date do not address lack of funding for traffic improvements initiated by residents and the lack of ability to solve traffic safety concerns in an existing constrained rural environment. Responsibilities are not aligned between enforcement and the Council owners of the infrastructure; makes addressing these issues difficult.
- **Brafield on the Green Parish Council** - More emphasis of important strategic issues that should inform the Council's future planning priorities is needed. These include the following. Pandemic consequences- in terms of homeworking the need for proportionate/supportive infrastructure in both rural and urban areas (broadband). Retail reinvention- the contraction of Core Business Districts in urban areas (Northampton) and the opportunity it offers for sustainable/affordable housing options and other uses. The tourist potential following ventures such as Northamptonshire Walks and the increase in cycling since the pandemic; there should be more promotion of cycle routes through quiet lanes and bridleways (together with more education on the use of various types of paths). The developing interest in environmental responsibility and improvement through community ventures such as Northamptonshire Wombles. Existing infrastructure

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

deficit/weaknesses e.g., roads, NHS (the hospital), education, broadband. Spatial relationships and potential partnership working in strategic alliances with neighbouring places - North Northamptonshire and Milton Keynes, Bedford, Olney, Market Harborough, Banbury, Stamford, Bedford, Leamington Spa etc. The value and importance of cultural infrastructure in improving community health and wellbeing. The specific nature, presence, and profile of the University of Northampton to the town of Northampton in particular and its future impact on the development of the area. Rural areas (see re Q29) – the need better to regulate development here to avoid overdevelopment of ‘executive’ housing units of limited affordability. The deficit of affordable homes delivered over the past plan period needs factoring into any future requirements and result in fewer young adults having to leave rural areas.

- **Braunston Parish Council** - The consultation appears premature when the new settlements study is ongoing and the ‘call for sites’ is being re-opened. Further consultation should be undertaken if there are any significant new sites.
- **Brixworth Parish Council** - The call for sites shows a significant number of smaller sites scattered mostly on the edges of existing settlements. This is not plan led. Need more “joined up thinking” in considering long term environmental impacts. Policies need to be flexible allowing for technology improvements. Developments must include vehicle electric charging points, solar panels/voltaic cells requirements. Classes B/E/sui generis developments require adequate SUDS provision for improved flood protection and environmental impact assessments. The Water and Resources Action Programme (WRAP) is a very useful model.
- **Bugbrooke Parish Council** - No provision for replacing/expanding and developing the General Hospital in Northampton. A plan for the next 15 years would be more effective; difficult to know what will be needed in 2050. The pandemic has shown how quickly needs and habits change, and the trends created are likely to remain such as working from home. Support for bold and radical plans going forward in terms of sustainability, environmental impact and creating thriving local communities linked with a network of small towns.
- **Cogenhoe and Whiston Parish Council** - Reference to flood risk should be included in the plan. Concerns over development from east & south west of Northampton encroaching towards the villages, increasing the flood risk. Neighbouring settlements must be consulted on developments of 10+ houses.
- **Cold Higham Parish Council** - Principles and visions are difficult to argue with, as they are so general. The next round of consultation will presumably be more detailed and easier to agree/disagree with. It is a matter of 'How will this be achieved?' - this is the most important issue for parish councils.
- **Crick Parish Council** - Spatial objectives are sound and impressive. Now follow through and create a legacy of innovative, harm-free solutions that will enhance West Northamptonshire, not ruin it forever.
- **Daventry Town Council** - The spatial strategy needs to have a vision and consider future transport needs in relation to future transportation technologies. There are no plans to expand any green infrastructure and

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

create a landscape; the plan should be to enhance them. There are no plans for burial grounds. The plan lacks vision into what future technologies will be available. Flexibility needed to change with emerging technologies, changes in community needs and to meet global event challenges.

- **Deanshanger Parish Council** - The Council should delay this consultation and wait for the draft Oxford Cambridge Arc Spatial Strategy to be published. This will become national planning guidance and take precedent; not taking it into account may mean the plan will need to be revisited or even face legal challenge. Delay would also allow work commissioned on new settlement options to be published. The possibilities for development in Northampton town should be considered; these have been dropped from the SLAA and this consultation.
- **Duston Parish Council** - Broadly support content of the consultation. Welcome employment and the local economy are considered just as much as housing growth. Welcome recognition of culture and heritage offer. It is inevitable that much of the new housing development will take place in Northampton, Daventry, Brackley and Towcester. However, some housing should also be directed to the larger villages and small villages should have “in-fill” developments. Enhancing Town Centres is welcome. Recognition should also be given to small amenity shops (e.g., the supermarket metro stores, community post offices). The existing target of 35% affordable housing for the Northampton Related Development Area (NRDA). This should be retained although the NRDA boundary may need to be revised. More consideration should be given to how each new development connects with existing communities e.g., cycle paths and pedestrian footpaths. Consideration also needs to be given to the environment such as enhancing biodiversity on public open spaces and additional tree planting. New community facilities should be fitted with solar panels etc to make them carbon neutral. Welcome the recognition for electric charging points and the need for high-speed broadband. Applaud the recognition to be carbon neutral by 2030 and the growing need for high quality green spaces. In S106 agreements the local Parish Council should be given the opportunity to adopt or decline the public open space on new build developments. Major improvements in road infrastructure needs to be put in place for further developments. Request to be consulted regarding all future developments on the fringe of Duston. The Duston area should be allocated S106 monies to improve infrastructure.
- **East Farndon Parish Council** - Object to the proposal for Land to the South of Market Harborough (2,000+ dwellings between East Farndon & Market Harborough). The rural village environment of East Farndon would be destroyed and engulfed by the town of Market Harborough. Residents have strongly expressed a desire to remain a separate settlement (see October 2021 residents survey and recent village meetings). East Farndon has only rural village services and is a large distance from any major town in West Northamptonshire. As the land borders Market Harborough, Harborough District Council (HDC) would have to make a major investment in additional

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

local services to support the proposed development site, including roads, schools, health centres, flood control infrastructure, etc. A development of this scale will have massive impacts on transport, landscape, and heritage, with hugely valuable green space and historic features lost for ever. Traffic is already a major problem in the village, with many following the route of Main Street to link up with the A14 and onwards to the M1 and M6 via Great Oxendon or Clipston. The new development will make this problem unmanageable. The sites proposed span very attractive hillsides and open fields- they are a popular walking area, supporting the mental health and wellbeing of residents. Retaining the proposed sites as green space is vital to reducing the impacts of climate change. Any further substantial development south of Market Harborough will have a potentially catastrophic flooding impact within the town. The site impacts areas of historic importance, including a substantial World War 2 air crash site and a wide expanse of ridge and furrow field landscape. The Parish Council has met with senior planning leaders from WNC and the Brixworth Ward Councillors and received correspondence (letter). This has helped to clarify the situation, but it does not guarantee that the proposed housing development will not go ahead. Concerned that WNC did not consult with the Parish Council, or notify in advance, that this major development would be considered in the plan and the lack of a consultation event held close to East Farndon. Concern that there could be a boundary change. The development is in contravention of WNC planning policies including Policy BN5 - The Historic Environment and Policy S1 - The Distribution of Development. Requests this option is removed as an offer to HDC. The Parish Council will write to HDC to formally request they decline this offer from WNC to develop housing on the site and exclude it as an option in the upcoming HDC strategic plan.

- **Easton Neston Parish Meeting:** Query if the National Planning Policy Framework been considered in drawing up this plan; it must legally be the basis of the plan. Easton Neston Parish Meeting rejects option 4b, relating to Towcester; not a viable option and does not reflect residents wishes.
- **Ecton Parish Council** - Strongly object to the inclusion of the section titled Northampton East. Should not be considering areas outside the boundary; SLAA sites 38, 39 and 40 should be removed from the plan and the SLAA/other supplementary material. The SLAA states it does not include land that is not part of WNC or including any land formerly part of Wellingborough District. Paragraph 5.3 recognises cooperation with North Northamptonshire Council for sites close to the boundary, not over the boundary. Paragraph 5.4 goes on to define the geographic area again to be West Northamptonshire only. The Neighbourhood Plan was recently adopted- extracts from the Vision, Policy 9 Maintaining the separate identity of Ecton village' and Policy 10 Important public views and vistas quoted (referencing area designated on the Policies Map as 'sensitive to coalescence' between Ecton Village and Northampton). These constraints are mentioned within the Consultation, but WNC also recognise that the sites are for North Northamptonshire Council to decide. Note site 210 on Lower

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

Ecton Lane within the SLAA. There is already significant traffic congestion at Lower Ecton Lane junction with Crow Lane and a traffic using the village as a cut through. Also experience pollution (odour, dust) from the existing businesses on the site. No development in site 210 should be agreed without significantly improved environmental engineering and improved traffic management.

- **Evenley Parish Council** - Support references to the need to work with adjoining authorities (North Northamptonshire, Harborough District, Milton Keynes). Would welcome a greater focus on a social/community development strategy, alongside this Plan. The population of the area will increase substantially if the Plan goes ahead, and there should be investment in working out how new people – families, single people, young and old - will be integrated with existing communities.
- **Grange Park Parish Council** - Whole concept is flawed; should be withdrawn and begun again. If housing need assessment data is accepted, then the requirement for new dwellings is 2,139 per annum. The existing JCS plus local plan part 2 is set to deliver 33,860 dwellings. This is approximately a 15-year supply. The existing JCS has a planning horizon of 15 years to 2029. If this is longer appropriate after 7 years this suggests that a 15-year planning horizon is too ambitious; a 30-year horizon is then unachievable. In Northampton, the Market Place, the Riverside Development, the Old Bus Station, and the High Street all offer great potential yet to be realised; the Town currently is uninviting. Keep the new strategic plan simple. Concentrate on meeting existing housing commitments and solving existing issues. Meet the spatial objectives within the developments underway. Set no more than a 15-year horizon and deliver on it. Reference to need for brownfield sites to be used. Concerned that the process is being driven by the landowners and developers rather than as a response to the needs of the community. All of the options around Northampton are outside of the NRDA and as such would have struggled to gain planning permission under the old JCS. When options are baked into a strategy document there will be a rush to develop them, and sustainable communities will not be the objective; the protection of rural communities will be overlooked (reference to recent application for 330 houses to the south of Grange Park made). Overall, do not support any of the spatial options around Northampton; finish what has already been committed; take time to develop a future strategy; once the existing commitments are approaching completion then carry out a new housing needs assessment (to include a description of what type of housing is needed, what type of community amenities are needed and what the infrastructure requirements are); then make the strategy. Confused by the consultation process; very little time to assimilate what the spatial strategy is and to engage with parishioners. Predetermined yes/no questions are too constraining.
- **Great Oxendon Parish Council** - Object to Spatial Option 1a – Northampton North – North of Buckton Fields and Spatial Option 6 – Land to the South of Market Harborough. Great Oxendon is small rural village. It is located alongside the busy A508, a main throughfare for traffic from Northampton to

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

Market Harborough as well as a link to the A14 and onwards to the M1 and M6. Great Oxendon already experiences problems regarding traffic (key concern of Parish Council and residents). A residential development of this size at both ends of the A508 would put enormous pressure on this road; traffic through the Parish would be unmanageable. Great Oxendon only has rural village services and is a large distance from any major town. It relies heavily on Market Harborough. A major investment would be needed to support the proposed development including roads, schools, health centres, flood control infrastructures etc. The sites span across attractive hillside and open fields. The area proposed that borders East Farndon Parish is a popular walking spot, and the green open space supports the mental health and wellbeing of residents. Both sites are 'green space' and are vital in contributing to the reduction of climate change.

- **Greens Norton Parish Council** - The approach needs review- possibly take the approach by Milton Keynes council to develop a vision for the area from which spatial options in planning terms can be worked through. The plan needs to align/conform to the Oxford Cambridge Arc, which will be senior to the WNC plan. The WNC timetable does not have any mechanism to check its draft proposals against this emerging policy.
- **Hackleton Parish Council** - Understand that there are 30 smaller sites designated for development- request details of these sites and how they have been selected. Strongly support the regeneration of Northampton as the County Town. Potential for inward investment to the County should be sought particularly from the opportunities arising from the Oxford Cambridge Arc. Should not settle for low skilled, low-cost jobs and building 4 or 5 bedroomed houses resulting in a spatial mix-match. Ensure that the HENA calculations are sound and up to date. To regenerate Northampton Town development should be to the north of the Town to prevent dormitory estates for Milton Keynes and beyond. South of the Town has already seen large amounts of development in the last 20 years and the loss of rural character; this cannot continue. Any development must be of a suitable design and construction, support the green economy and conserve and enhance the unique landscape.
- **Hardingstone Parish Council** - There should be no development without infrastructure in situ. Ideally new developments would be new areas with new infrastructure rather than being tagged onto an existing community whose infrastructure is at capacity. The Strategic Road network requires consideration/development to enable the development proposed in the plan. Query how the housing need has been calculated and if this should be amended given the change in recent working practices. The numbers have been established based on details from 2019; this is pre-Covid. More people are now working from home, meaning that access to major towns and cities may not be as important as before.
- **Hinton-in-the-Hedges Parish Meeting** - Get WNC out of the Oxford/Cambridge Arc. Take the views of the current taxpayers into account. Don't just accept government decrees. The Strategy seems designed to turn

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

most of WNC into urban sprawl – there will be very little of the ‘valued landscapes left’.

- **Holcot Parish Council:** - Difficult to effectively respond to a consultation with so many gaps in knowledge of WNC's strategic intentions. A single, comprehensive, and coherent plan where all the infrastructure, utilities, housing, and employment (etc) are covered should be prepared. A piecemeal approach means some aspect of the vision will not be achieved due to strategic tensions arising. Strategic plans cannot be achieved in isolation of national and other local plans. There needs to be a regional plan, perhaps including the Oxford-Cambridge Arc strategic plans, before any WNC strategic plan can be approved. Not clear how a strategic joined-up plan will be developed and approved, and what the effective governance will be to ensure that it is maintained throughout its life. There is a real risk that any plan developed now will not persist through to 2050. The HENA driving requirements is 'old world' and gives a flawed requirement. It does not consider the environmental and social drivers of Hybrid Working for instance, with the implied Northampton assumption being that people will travel to work. All proposals are greenfield sites with no apparent consideration of brownfield options. Options refer to the possibility of infrastructure development, but there is no sense of a particular option aligned to infrastructure changes required to achieve it. Infrastructure should be available as an intrinsic part of any development, not afterwards e.g., the route between Brixworth and the A43 through Holcot is used by excessive traffic, and HGVs. Adding large scale development exacerbates this. Every option should consider the impacts on existing communities, and how adverse impacts can be minimised. Environmental objectives are critical; non-compliance should cause that spatial option to be dropped. The potential options do not make sense when considering housing vs employment options; around Northampton the principal housing options are in the north, employment options in the south. There are no options where improved affordable public transport is built into proposals. There are no options that specifically focus on electric vehicles. Concerned that Sossles and other environment and heritage features will be blighted by proposals. An assessment should be undertaken of the whole local environment, not just the sites themselves - a location near to a community or environmental/heritage feature will have an impact. The objectives broadly make sense, but the information provided does not give comfort that those objectives will be met. Have the objectives been adopted for all WNC services and strategic activity? There is no commentary on the utilities needed e.g., water, sustainable energy. The options do not bring forward proposals in respect of these services; assumes that 'net-zero' services will be provided by third parties. Consider the impacts on air quality and existing road infrastructure How will the plan ensure sufficient affordable housing is built? How will it ensure every property, and its associated transport impacts, has a zero impact on climate? What sustainable building practices, design and materials will be required? There is a focus on Northampton in the proposals, without plans to represent how Northampton

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

will be able to cope. Developing housing to the north of Northampton will mean existing poor transport links will be overwhelmed. How will WNC ensure that proposals build in local priorities? How will CIL/S106/infrastructure levy proposals be built into plans to support financing of local community impacts?

- **Kilsby Parish Council** - Given the employment developments already taking place and proposed at M1 junctions including 15, 15a, 16, 18 and 20, it appears there may be a danger of over-supply of stated requirements if there is no proper co-ordination between the strategic plans of West Northants and those of other local authorities.
- **Kingsthorpe Parish Council** - Support expansion but essential to provide infrastructure at the beginning.
- **Little Houghton Parish Council** - Provides overview of key characteristics and valuable attributes of the Parish. The village has strong local connections with neighbouring villages such as Great Houghton, Brafield and Cogenhoe. These parish councils joined with local landowners and residents to resist the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy option to build 18,000 houses in this rural area. Disappointed the plan review is being undertaken again so soon and that strategic policies may be replaced. Conscious of the perpetual creep of development from Northampton into rural areas. Employment sites such as Brackmills and Houghton Gate, are spreading along the A428 spoiling the green corridor into the town, and housing development from the B526 Newport Pagnell Road engulfing Wotton and Hardingstone, coming ever nearer to Great Houghton with existing plans for up to 800 houses at The Green. The needs of the urban areas and the desire for growth should not always take precedent over the concerns and needs of the existing rural settlements. The references to the rural area are comparatively light in the Vision and Objectives. Would like to see some intent to protect and respect the nature and character of rural settlements.
- **Milton Malsor Parish Council** - Promotion of the OxCam Corridor as an advantage for development opportunities is unnecessary and unwelcome, as the 2017-20 average delivery of 23,000 dwellings p.a. in that area is slightly more than the Standard Method requirement. Although the NIC has identified 23-30,000 homes as a desirable aim for the “Arc”, this is not binding, and the Corridor is not nominated as an “Uplift” area. Any over-development would mean the loss of open land and the erosion of the benefits of village and rural life. Whilst acknowledging the statutory obligations implicit in producing the Plan, there is an impression of an eagerness to facilitate development, with the short consultation period adding to the feeling that most of the proposals are inevitable. In this, the wishes of South Northants residents could appear as secondary to the benefits accruing to developers and their partners.
- **Moulton Parish Council** - The residential justification for delivering potential employees to Moulton Park is specious; no further residential development can be justified by this argument.
- **Overstone Parish Council** - Comments made which are contrary to the plan must be reflected in the next version. Cannot carry on supporting badly

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

planned and designed developments that achieve a profit for the developer and provide poor overall value for money. WNC planners should follow through the conditions on approval to ensure quality is delivered. There should be accountability with WNC for achieving results. Local communities must be fully consulted on all planning issues that affect them. This vision is a set of noble statements backed by several documents. However, there is no substance showing how this will be implemented/achievable. How vibrant villages will be achieved. How the pandemic will change the nature of work/home life. No reference to Covid which has had such a marked effect. How the new developments will be served by new roads. There is no mention of highways; concerned about substandard road network. The document is an exercise to show residents how many new homes West Northants wish to build, with little or no thought for existing or future residents. There are areas that have good transport links and space to accommodate SUEs some of which are not included in this vision. The transport infrastructure must be the starting point for any future development. It is insufficient to say that we will improve a road such as the A43 North to South by building a large SUE. A lack of proper provision for those travelling East to West or vice versa, has adverse impacts on local roads such as, Holcot Lane and Billing Lane. Creating bottle necks and grid locks at the outset of a development should make the proposal void as it is unsustainable from the outset e.g., proposed school in Moulton – highway provision is non-existent. Will there be sufficient water for Northampton and the surrounding area? Comments provided on SLAA Sites 148, 149, 206 and 207. “Collective Vision for making West Northamptonshire a great place to live, work, visit and thrive.” “We want our new council to reflect the times we live in.” “As the national effort to fight Covid-19 continues, WNC must focus on playing our part to create a sustainable recovery.” It is unclear whether the spatial plan reflects these statements. ‘Connected communities’ means as much traffic on existing roads as possible.

- **Potterspury Parish Council** - The document lacks vision and has serious flaws and fails to offer clear choices. Aligning this consultation to a yet unpublished pan-regional strategy (Oxford-Cambridge Arc) appears bizarre. There is a risk the plan will face a challenge on the basis it is not sound because it did not consider current national policy. A well-considered plan based on firm government guidance, particularly concerning the Oxford-Cambridge Arc, would be better than one based on flawed consultation.
- **Rothersthorpe Parish Council** - Village Feedback & Public Open Session (November 2021)- agreement that official communication of the Strategic Plan Consultation by WNC had been poor and not well publicised, in particular for those residents who have no access to social media. For many residents the only knowledge they had of the consultation was via communication from the Parish Council. Would appreciate feedback or comments regarding both shortlist and longlist sites around the Rothersthorpe Parish. Wish to work closely with WNC in all aspects of future development to ensure positive benefits for the people, environment, and economy of Rothersthorpe.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- **Syresham Parish Council** - The UK will need to consider more self-reliance on food production in the future; prime agricultural land needs to be protected. Must consider transport infrastructure ahead of deciding on areas for development. There is no indication of how residents will be encouraged to become less dependent on the car and achieve the 'net zero' goal. Residential and employment developments need to be closer together to reduce commuting distance.
- **Tiffield Parish Council** - The plan does not reflect the wishes of the electorate and taxpayers of the county and seems to be focussed on the needs of powerful developers which subverts the worthy ambitions of the vision that opens the plan. Fundamental errors in the calculations of housing and economic needs must be corrected and the plan reissued with more realistic conclusions.
- **Towcester Town Council** - Towcester is an historic market town; vital that development respects its character and contribution to Northamptonshire's rural heartland. Concerns over the growth option for Towcester. Reject Spatial Option 4b as not a viable option. Residential development at Towcester Racecourse would not be appropriate given the limitations of its highly sensitive setting. Some very limited development might be possible, to help further secure the future of Towcester Racecourse, but development would need to be carefully considered and fully justified, considering its special landscape setting, loss of productive farmland, its proximity to residential areas, and the capacity of the A5 to take additional traffic. Welcome the opportunity to engage constructively with WNC to discuss options for growth that offer more sustainable development for the town.
- **Walgrave Parish Council** - Local communities must be fully consulted on all planning issues that affect them. Their opinions should matter and be fully reflected in any plans. Local Authorities are there to represent the constituents.
- **Weedon Parish Council** - Concerned the Strategy takes as its starting point the building of houses in urban areas. West Northants is a predominately rural area; disappointed that the Strategy says little about development in rural areas. Rising house prices and demand for houses in rural areas should tell you where people prefer to live. Most villages are prospering without, or perhaps despite of planning intervention, but there is scope more and often better-quality development than in towns, provided the historic landscape and countryside is reasonably protected. Development is regularly rejected because of what village residents perceive to be a pedantic application of planning/conservation, guidelines, and officer disregard of resident views e.g., the existing Depot buildings in Weedon Bec (for housing).
- **Whittlebury Parish Council** - The document has no vision, contains little strategy, and has few viable sensible options. The plan needs to align/conform to the Oxford Cambridge Arc, which will be senior to the WNC plan. The WNC timetable does not have any mechanism to check its draft proposals against this emerging policy; the plan therefore risks being challenged.

Appendix 1 – West Northamptonshire Strategic Plan – Spatial Options Consultation – Summary of Consultation Responses

- **Wicken Parish Council** - The projected population increase to 2050 is 57,288 in West Northamptonshire of which 15,106 is estimated to be within South Northamptonshire. Based on ONS statistics the overall number of new dwellings should only be 23,870 (2.4 per dwelling) and South Northamptonshire's housing need is 6,317.
- **Wootton Parish Council** - Biggest concern around this plan is climate change and the impact on natural resources and biodiversity. Building operations and construction account for nearly 40% of global energy-related CO2 emissions; building is often upon natural open green spaces so the natural capital and resources we need to combat pollution and climate change are being depleted. Warehousing development along the M1 is having a devastating impact on our natural environments. A 'climate lens' should be applied to future decisions to ensure we have a longer-term view of prosperity and wellbeing. Natural capital must be at the heart of any development decisions that are made. With regards to option 1e and 1f, concerned the immediate area is seeing so much development, there are problems with congestion, air, and noise pollution. Do not build on flood plains; already experiencing flooding issues which extend from J15a, through the proposed development area and up to Horton. The plan should be delayed allowing the completion of current projects such as The Market Place, The Waterside Development, the Old Bus Station, and the Town Centre regeneration project. Wish to be consulted on any plans which negatively alters the green biodiverse nature of our location adjacent to countryside, and changes to the traffic pollution levels or increased levels of traffic congestion. Consultation period (8 weeks) should be extended. The Covid-19 pandemic has changed the patterns of work and family life and a plan lasting 30 years is too long; it should be reviewed every 5 years instead to give a clearer impression of milestones hit or missed.
- **Yardley Gobion Parish Council** - The approach needs review- possibly take the approach by Milton Keynes council to develop a vision for the area from which spatial options in planning terms can be worked through. The plan needs to align/conform to the Oxford Cambridge Arc, which will be senior to the WNC plan. The WNC timetable does not have any mechanism to check its draft proposals against this emerging policy.