

Examination of East Northamptonshire Rural North, Oundle and Thrapston Plan (DPD).

Hearing Agenda – Housing Land Supply, Oundle policies and site allocations

- Paragraph 8.3 – Change H012;
- Policy OUN1 – Change H013;
- Paragraph 8.7 – Changes IN025 & 026;
- Policy OUN3 – Changes H016 & IN027 & 028
- New Policy OUN4 – Change IN029
- Paragraphs 8.8-9 – Change IN030
- Paragraph 8.10 – Change IN031
- Paragraph 8.11 – Change IN032

The purpose of the supplementary hearings is to consider whether the further changes to the submitted DPD, as contained in the Council's Schedule of Proposed Changes dated 13 February 2009, would, if made, remedy an element of unsoundness identified during the earlier part of the examination in October 2008. To this end, the over-arching questions are whether the change would ensure that the DPD is effective, in the sense that the proposed allocations are deliverable within the stated timeframe, and adequately justified taking account of the alternatives which have been evaluated. If the suggested change does not represent the most appropriate in all the circumstances, what change should be made and why would that result in a sound DPD?

The discussion must be contained within the scope of the change being put forward. I will not allow discussion of issues relating to the original submitted document which go beyond this remit.

In this context, I consider the outstanding issues to be:-

1. Transportation Survey and phasing.
 - a. *It appears from the representations of the NCC Sustainable Transport Unit that the wording of changes H012(2&3) does not reflect the correct position with regard to a town-wide transport strategy. Has a revised wording been agreed?*
 - b. *The NCC indicate that they would expect site-specific transport assessments to take account of the cumulative effect of the developments on transport movements in the town and draw attention to Paragraph 4.50 of the Department of Transport's guidance. Is that feasible? Does it represent an unnecessary burden on developers and would it be likely to delay delivery?*
 - c. *What is meant by the references in change H013 to the transport strategy "informing" the release of the Phase 2 development? Is this the same as the statement in IN028(2) that this, along with other infrastructure will be "required" before the release of the Phase 2 development? Does this add value to what is said in the text, change H012?*

- d. *How do these statements (H012, 13 and IN028(2)) relate to the 2013 date in new Policy OUN4? As it has been previously stated that the absence of a local transport strategy is not a constraint on development what is the basis for these statements? Is there any evidence to show that the transport position is any more or less critical for the "Phase 1" than the "phase 2" developments?*
- e. *Is the phasing approach compatible with current PPS3 advice?*

2. Land supply in Oundle.

- a. *The CSS requirement for Oundle is 610 dwellings to be completed 2001-21 (30.5 pa.). Proposed change IN030 states that the allocations in this DPD will leave a shortfall of 43 dwellings to 2021. Although it is also stated that this might be made good by windfalls at 3-4 dwellings a year, 43 dwellings represents only 1.41 years' supply. As at April 2008 there was still 13 years to 2021, by possible adoption 12 years. Thus, it cannot be said that the plan relies on windfalls within the first 10 years. In what way is this approach contrary to the advice in paragraph 59 of PPS3?*
- b. *The developers of the Creed Road site suggest that it might accommodate 145, not 125, dwellings. What consideration has the Council given to increasing the density assumptions for this, and other, sites?*
- c. *The advice in paragraph 55 of PPS3 is that "where possible" specific developable sites should be identified for years 11-15. Does the listing of possible longer term allocations in Change IN032 satisfy this requirement? If not, why not?*

3. The choice of additional allocations. (Policies OUN3 and 4)

Taking account of the further Roger Tym site appraisals (Doc. 923):-

- a. *In view of the constraints presented by the listed buildings is it reasonable to assume that the Dairy Farm site, Stoke Hill, is likely to be "deliverable" (PPS3. para. 54) by 2014?*
- b. *Change IN028(3) indicates that although the Glapthorn Road site is not "deliverable" it is considered to be "developable". As such, the advice in paragraph 56 of PPS3 is that it should be suitable for housing with a reasonable prospect that the site can be developed by the point envisaged (after 2013). What evidence is there to show that there is such a prospect, particularly in view of its current use as a playing field? What work has been done to establish that the requirements of PPG17 could be satisfied? Should a replacement playing field be identified?*
- c. *In view of the fact that the development of the sites is planned to be in different phases and they are not contiguous what is the justification for the requirement in Policy OUN4 (Change IN029(1)&(2)) for the*

Glaphorn Road site to be the subject of a joint masterplan with the Creed Road site? What exactly would such a masterplan cover?

- d. Given the uncertainties surrounding the developability of the Glaphorn Road site, what actions do the Council envisage to bring additional sites forward in the event that site proves not to be deliverable within the timescale envisaged, if at all. Were I to conclude from the evidence that the site is not deliverable then this DPD would still be unsound against PPS3 requirements. In that eventuality should one of the sites listed under change IN032, or any other site given a high score in the Roger Tym study, be given priority or specifically allocated?*

JRM 15.04.09