

**TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 (AS AMENDED)**

---

**Appeal: Croudace Homes Limited, The House Trustees Limited  
and Lower Thrupp Limited**

*Outline Planning Application:*

Comprehensive mixed-use urban extension comprising residential development (up to 4,000 dwellings) (including provision of affordable housing), provision of employment land, diversion of the B4036, access, roads, drainage, footpaths and cycleways, open space (including extension to Daventry Country Park), playing fields, landscaping, provision of social and community infrastructure including schools, district centre (including supermarket) and local centres.

**Land at Church Fields, Long Buckby Road, Daventry**

**REBUTTAL EVIDENCE: PLANNING MATTERS**

IN RESPECT OF

**PROOF OF EVIDENCE BY RICHARD BOYT**  
**DAVENTRY DISTRICT COUNCIL**

*On behalf of*

**Croudace Homes Limited, The House Trustees Limited  
and Lower Thrupp Limited**

PINS Ref: APP/M9570/A/08/2083327/NWF &  
APP/Y2810/A/08/2083322/NWF

LPA Ref: WNDC: 07/0001/OUTWND &  
DDC: DA/2007/0200



CHARLES PLANNING  
ASSOCIATES  
*Chartered Town Planners*

Charles Planning Associates Limited  
1644-1645 Parkway Solent Business Park Whiteley Hampshire PO15 7AH  
Tel: 01489-580853 Fax: 01489-580913 E-mail: admin@charlesplanning.co.uk

JANUARY  
2009

**Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (As Amended)**

**Appeal: Croudace Homes Limited, The House Trustees Limited  
and Lower Thrupp Limited**

*Comprehensive mixed-use urban extension comprising residential development (up to 4,000 dwellings) (including provision of affordable housing), provision of employment land, diversion of the B4036, access, roads, drainage, footpaths and cycleways, open space (including extension to Daventry Country Park), playing fields, landscaping, provision of social and community infrastructure including schools, district centre (including supermarket) and local centres.*

**REBUTTAL EVIDENCE: PLANNING MATTERS**

**IN RESPECT OF**

**PROOF OF EVIDENCE OF RICHARD BOYT  
DAVENTRY DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**Land at Church Fields, Long Buckby Road, Daventry**

---

**1.0 INSTRUCTIONS AND INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1. This rebuttal evidence has been prepared by William Anthony Charles of Charles Planning Associates Limited on behalf of Croudace Homes, The House Trustees and Lower Thrupp Limited (the Church Fields appellant).
- 1.2. The rebuttal evidence follows the same section and/or paragraph numbers as used in Mr Richard Boyt's Proof of Evidence (DDC16).
- 1.3. In the interests of brevity, references to Mr Boyt appear as RB.

**2.0 REBUTTAL**

- 2.1. **Paragraph 5:** Whilst it is correct that both WNDC and DDC have been working together on the applications/appeals, DDC has taken a back-seat and has let WNDC take the lead at all stages.
- 2.2. **Paragraph 8:** The reference to 'sweeping views' is an over emphasis, a more appropriate description would be 'general views'.

- 2.3. **Paragraph 12:** There are 4 access points proposed to the site, not ‘numerous access points’ as described by RB.
- 2.4. **Paragraph 18:** The proposals have made allowance for the potential to accommodate a canal arm should, at some point in the future, DDC proceed with the project. It is an over emphasis to say that the scheme ‘incorporates a corridor for a future canal arm’ as this implies that the canal scheme forms part of the appellant’s proposals, which it does not.
- 2.5. **Paragraph 26:** The reference to the Local Plan Inspector’s Report is very selective and fails to mention that the Inspector found the site to be a sustainable location for housing (paragraph 4.519 of the Inspector’s Report – see CD3.30).
- 2.6. **Paragraph 29:** This paragraph is incomplete in that it fails to acknowledge, in the sequence of plan making, that the appeal site was promoted by the appellant as a suitable site for a Strategic Development Area (SDA) through the structure plan review process. It also fails to acknowledge that the appeal site was promoted as a suitable location for strategic scale growth through the RSS8/MKSM process. Both of these factors are material and significant matters.
- 2.7. **Paragraph 33:** It should be noted that the reason the Church Fields appeals were lodged was directly related to the serving of an Article 14 Direction by the Highway Agency in August 2008.
- 2.8. **Paragraph 34:** The wording of this paragraph is inappropriate. DDC was not ‘forced’ to reach any decisions. It is a ‘normal part’ of the democratic process for Officers of an LPA to seek Members’ views on an undetermined planning application, which has become the subject of a non-determination appeal.
- 2.9. **Paragraph 58:** It is relevant to note that the Ancer Spa Report (CD3.15) employment recommendations proposed an ‘holistic’ approach to the quantum and location of future employment around Daventry town and went on to indicate the relevant ‘contribution’ towards the overall provision that was to be made by the new urban extensions. The Ancer Spa report has never proposed that the new urban extensions should be self-sufficient in relation to the homes to jobs ratio; rather that Daventry town as ‘an employment location’ should be considered holistically. Paragraph 17.63 of the SDOS (CD3.15) acknowledges that all the proposed growth areas in the SDOS were located so as to be able to easily access all the town’s employment areas.

- 2.10. **Paragraph 62:** Whilst identifying the differences between the Copela report (CD2.6) and the SDOS, the paragraph fails to explain how the differences arose and why.
- 2.11. **Paragraph 63:** It should be noted that the sources of the figures in this paragraph (which is the SDOS/Ancer Spa Report) (CD3.15), ie paragraph references, are missing. Further, the figures appear to have been ‘rounded’ by RB – see paragraph 1.5.2 Table and paragraph 1.5.3 of SDOS.
- 2.12. **Paragraph 64:** It is not clear where the 1,000 jobs reference comes from.
- 2.13. **Paragraph 65:** It is not clear where the figure of 1,300 jobs comes from.
- 2.14. **Paragraphs 67 and 68:** It appears implicit that RB accepts the approach set out in the Ancer Spa recommendations. This being the case, it is clear that it was never envisaged as part of the Ancer Spa employment strategy that the urban extension sites should be internally self-sufficient in relation to the provision of jobs, but rather it set out the approach and contribution expected from the urban extension sites to the town-wide holistic approach to meeting Daventry’s future employment requirements in a sustainable way.
- 2.15. **Paragraph 70:** The reason for and justification for the change in employment multiplier is set out clearly in paragraph 11.4.2 of the Church Fields Regulation 19, Part 1 response (CD7.33). The appellant calculates that the proposed development of up to 4,000 dwellings could generate an employment requirement of 5,080 jobs (CD7.33).
- 2.16. **Paragraph 71:** Whilst calculated in a slightly different way, RB’s estimate of the number of economically active persons as approximately 5,000 is close to the appellant’s calculation of up to 5,080 (see CD7.33, page 19).
- 2.17. **Paragraph 74:** It is noted that RB fails to set out and provide detailed information on the multipliers used for each land use and exactly how the figures have been derived, other than a reference to English Partnership’s guidance. Reference to the English Partnership’s Employment Densities: A Simple Guide (Arup Economics & Planning for English Partnerships) sets out the relevant multipliers (see Appendix 1 to this Rebuttal Statement). Using these multipliers the figures under each of RB’s headings would be:

Employment	8,300 sq m if all High Tech R&D	=	286 jobs
	8,300 sq m if all was B1	=	436 jobs
Supermarket	1,500 sq m/19	=	78.9 jobs
Other retail	1,440 sq m/20	=	72 jobs
Health Centre and Community Building	1,800 sq m to 2,500 sq m see appellant's Reg 19 Table 2, page 18 (CD7.33)		40 jobs
Schools	see appellant's Reg 18 Table 2, page 18 (CD7.33)		290 jobs
	<b>Total</b>		<b>767 to 917</b>

*Compared to RB's total of:* 785 to 955

However, RB fails to include related employment, ie Open Space, Public House, Commercial Crèche/Nursery, Recycling Facility and Police, which together total a further 75 jobs (see Regulation 19 Response: Part 1 – CD7.33, page 18).

The appellant has calculated this to a total of approximately 1,055 jobs – see Table of Regulation 19 response (CD7.33).

Further details of these figures and the way they have been derived can be found in the appellant's Regulation 19, Part 1 response at Table 2, page 18, and, in particular, the footnotes thereto (CD7.33, page 18).

Therefore, whilst RB's figures are not explained as to how they are calculated, in detail, the overall total does not vary significantly from that of the appellant.

2.18. **Paragraph 77:** This paragraph is misleading because it is based on the assumption that it is intended that the Church Fields site should be self-sufficient in meeting its employment needs on-site. This approach has never formed part of the Ancer Spa employment strategy (which has been accepted and taken on board by DDC), which looks holistically at the provision of both the quantum and location of future employment at Daventry town, and which sets out the approach and ‘contribution’ expected from the urban extension sites.

It is therefore quite misleading for RB to imply that their Church Fields development would result in a jobs deficit of 4,000 compared to the on-site employment generation of 5,080 persons. It is also relevant that RB refers to the ‘entire development’. The development will be implemented over a period of 15 years. The latest WNJPU LDS indicates that the West Northamptonshire Site Allocations DPD, which will allocate additional employment sites up to 2021, will be adopted by 2012. Further, the LDS indicates that the Daventry Town DPD will be adopted in 2014.

The appellant anticipates that the Church Fields development would begin providing completions in 2011 with 50 units, with 250 units in 2012, and 275 units in each of 2013 and 2014; a total of 850 by the end of 2012. This would generate an employment requirement of  $850 \times 1.27 = 1,079$  jobs, by the end of 2014, by which time it is expected that the first of the newly identified DPD West Northamptonshire Site Allocations (ie outside Daventry town) and Daventry Town DPD Site Allocations (ie within the town centre) will come forward.

A proportion of the job requirement would be provided on-site in Phase 1, as part of the local centre, the school, live-work units, workshops and other potential B1 provision. Such an approach is consistent with the Ancer Spa strategy. Further, it has been accepted by WNDC in evidence (WNDC16, paragraph 6.3.29) that WNDC accepts the appellant’s approach and has no objection to the proposed development on employment grounds.

2.19. **Paragraphs 78 to 81:** In addition to the response provided in paragraph 2.17 above, in respect of RB’s paragraph 77, it is relevant to note that, firstly, Phase 1 of the Church Fields development runs from 2011 to 2015, ie Years 1 to 5, a total of 1,125 dwellings rather than the 6 years assumed by RB, providing a total of 1,400 dwellings (source: Church Fields Replacement Design and Access Statement, Table 21, on page 160) (CD7.35).

This would generate the following employment requirements:

2011	Year 1	50 units x 1.27	=	63.5 workers
2012	Year 2	250 units x 1.27	=	317 workers
2013	Year 3	275 units x 1.27	=	349 workers
2014	Year 4	275 units x 1.27	=	349 workers
2015	Year 5	275 units x 1.27	=	349 workers
2011 to 2015	Years 1 to 5	Total		1,427.5 workers

The assertion in RB's paragraph 79 (DDC16) that only 100 jobs would be provided in the local centre as part of Phase 1 is not explained in so far as how it has been calculated is concerned. The appellant's view is that the number of jobs that could be provided would be in the region of 105, based on 1 primary school at 55 employees, plus 300 sq m of A1/A2/A3 uses/10 sq m = 30 jobs (based on English Partnerships' Employment Densities Guide which considers that small retail units are more likely to have higher densities, ie 1 employee per 10 sq m) and 0.2 ha as a nursery estimated at 10 employees, plus a small number of general industry workshops (10).

Further, if additional jobs were required to be provided on-site as part of Phase 1 of the development, in order to compensate to some extent for the delay in the emerging Site Allocations DPD, additional provision could potentially be made available in or adjacent to the local centre and/or as part of the 'Vision' for the Eastern Way/Southbrook interface (see Replacement Design and Access Statement, page 70, annotated as 3 No Buildings, '8' for mixed use purposes) (CD7.35).

Notwithstanding any potential additional employment provision as part of Phase 1 of the development, it is relevant to note that WNDC, in evidence, has confirmed that it has no objection to the employment provision made in the Church Fields development (WNDC16, paragraphs 6.3.20 to 6.3.32).

- 2.20. **Paragraph 83:** The WNJPU LDS states that the West Northamptonshire Site Allocations DPD will be adopted in 2012 and the Daventry Town DPD in 2014. These 'will' include new employment allocations in order to meet the District's regional employment requirement. RB speculates that they 'may' include new allocations, as if this was optional. The DPDs will have to make appropriate provision to meet the District's RSS8 requirements. Further, it is anticipated that as soon as the Inspector's Report is published, planning applications for the allocated sites would begin to come forward.

2.21. **Paragraphs 84 to 88:** Whilst RB accepts that the DDC's AMR 2006/2007 states that there is currently a 26 ha supply of employment land, he then asserts that, on analysis, only a small proportion of this lies within or around the town centre but fails to either produce the analysis or any other information to support his contention. As such, no weight can be attached to the statement.

It is also relevant to note that the Town Centre Vision sites are coming on stream and, indeed, Site 4/4a is almost complete, and although the retail units (including Homebase and Halfords) were expected to be open by Christmas 2008, they are now expected to open in January 2009, thereby providing new job opportunities, despite there being no structure plan, local plan or DPD policy allocation basis for them, which rather undermines the point RB makes in paragraph 85 of his evidence (DDC16).

It is clear that additional employment opportunities are currently coming forward, being granted planning permission and being implemented, despite the LDF/DPD policy vacuum, on the basis of the non-statutory Town Centre Vision and the DDC's Daventry Interim Master Plan (Site 4/4a, Town Centre East) (CD3.5 and 3.6).

Helpfully, RB's paragraph 87 (DDC16) illustrates the current time-scale envisaged by DDC for the completion of the Town Centre Vision sites varying from early 2009 for Site 4/4a to 2014 for Site 3; all of which could provide local employment opportunities for Church Fields residents during Phase 1 of the development. The Table at paragraph 1.5.2 of the Ancer Spa report (CD3.5) indicates that 3,000 additional jobs are expected to be provided in the town centre. This figure is repeated in the DDC's Pre-Submission Core Strategy Report (November 2005) (CD3.16).

2.22. **Paragraphs 89 to 93:** RB's assertion that the new town centre jobs would be dominated by new residents in the town centre cannot be substantiated. Whilst jobs can be provided in close proximity to homes, whether a close 'match' can be achieved in terms of the type of employment provided compared with the actual type of demand from new residents varies very widely. There is no reason why the town centre sites could not provide job opportunities for residents of the Church Fields development. Further, RB's assertion in paragraph 93 (DDC16) is not supported by WNDC who accepts, in evidence, that there are no employment objections to the Church Fields proposals (WNDC16, paragraphs 6.3.20 to 6.3.32).

- 2.23. **Paragraph 95:** It is considered that development at Apex Park will proceed. Whilst DDC may have reservations regarding the design currently applied for, it is contended that an acceptable form of employment development can be achieved on this site, which is identified in the DDC's Daventry Interim Master Plan for employment uses (CD3.6). RB estimates this site could provide around 700 jobs. There is no reason why this development could not provide job opportunities for the residents of the Church Fields development. In that regard, it is relevant to note that paragraph 13.73 of the SDOS (CD3.15) acknowledges that all of the urban extension sites are well located relative to all of the employment areas in and around Daventry town.
- 2.24. **Paragraph 96:** Taking into account paragraph 13.73 of the Ancer Spa Report (CD3.15), and the relatively short distance from the Church Fields site to The Marches Industrial Estate, there is no reason that any improved/extended employment offer on the estate ought not to provide job opportunities for residents of the Church Fields development.
- 2.25. **Paragraph 97:** It is well established that DIRFT is expected to expand considerably in the coming years. As RB records, planning permission exists for some 180,000 sq m of B8 uses. Access to DIRFT from Daventry could easily be improved through a Green Travel Plan and might include, for example, measures such as a subsidised dedicated bus, car sharing, etc. There is no reason why such employment opportunities should not be available to residents of the Church Fields development.
- 2.26. **Paragraph 98:** Whilst the past rate of DIRFT workers coming from Daventry may have been 21% of the total, there is no reason to think that such job opportunities would be in any way limited to a similar figure in the future, and RB's figure of 314 jobs is therefore no more than a historical projection, without foundation in so far as being a prediction of the future is concerned.
- 2.27. **Paragraph 102:** This paragraph is misleading because it suggests that little or no consideration has yet been given to the quantum and location of future employment sites around Daventry. This is a topic which has been thoroughly and robustly addressed through several reports, including the SDOS and Ancer Spa (CD3.15), the DDC's Pre-Submission Core Strategy (CD3.16), the DIS (CD4.2), the Town Centre Vision (CD3.5) and the DDC's Daventry Interim Master Plan (CD3.6), to such an extent that identified town centre sites are coming forward and being granted planning permission and being implemented, despite the lack of formal Development Plan Documents being in place. All of this work and the practical outcomes (ie the granting of planning permissions and their implementation) will have to be taken into account in the slowly emerging DPDs, in due course.

2.28. **Paragraph 103:** There is no requirement for the Church Fields development to seek to ‘mitigate’ the lack of on-site employment provision through an S106 Agreement. The provision being made at Church Fields is in line with the approach set out in the Ancer Spa strategy and there is no employment objection to the proposals from WNDC. Notwithstanding, the appellant has indicated a preparedness to consider making a contribution towards improving the availability and quality of employment training available in Daventry.

2.29. **Paragraphs 105 to 110:** RB appears to be arguing that Daventry town is not capable of absorbing all of the planned growth allocated to it and that it will not be possible to achieve local sustainability in employment terms. This runs counter to the Ancer Spa employment strategy (CD3.15) and the DDC’s Pre-Submission Core Strategy (November 2005) (CD3.16). The Ancer Spa report indicates that a total of 3,000 additional jobs are expected to be provided in the town centre.

The assertion in paragraph 110 appears to completely ignore the extensive appraisal work that has been undertaken in respect of Daventry, dating back to 1992, and more recently in the SDOS and Ancer Spa, the Pre-Submission Core Strategy, the Town Centre Vision, the DDC’s Daventry Interim Master Plan, the DIS and the LDF background work, which all address the issues of the quantum and location of future development. It is therefore somewhat disingenuous to seek to argue that such matters have not been, and are not capable of being, assessed in a ‘holistic’ manner, except through the LDF process.

2.30. **Paragraph 111:** RB appears to return to the theme that the Church Fields development should be internally self-sufficient in relation to the provision of jobs. This conflicts with DDC’s adopted strategy for employment to be addressed in a holistic manner as per the Ancer Spa report (CD3.15). There has never been any indication from either DDC or WNDC that the Church Fields development should precisely match the number of on-site job opportunities with the generated economically active residents. Further, the provision made as part of the Church Fields proposals is consistent with the approach in Ancer Spa (CD3.15) and it is noted that there is no employment objection by WNDC to the proposals.

2.31. In particular, Mr Owens (CD WNDC16) notes in paragraph 6.3.26 of his evidence that the most recent DDC AMR (CD3.17) indicates some 26 ha of employment land with planning permission in Daventry district, and that it is estimated that since the publication of the AMR, a further 20 ha of land is either committed or under consideration in formal planning applications.

- 2.32. Further, Mr Owens notes in his paragraph 6.3.30 that he considers that, *‘in the interim period prior to sites coming forward as a product of the DPD (he) considers that the existing employment land commitments and the anticipated provision from employment windfall sites, will provide for a level of job creation that will meet the needs arising from the likely rate of housing completions ....’* and that, *‘Accordingly, there would not be any short term implications for employment provision as a consequence of this proposal, whilst longer term issues would be appropriately considered through the DPD’.*
- 2.33. **Paragraphs 114 to 117:** There is no reason why, in planning terms, an element of employment development could not come forward at Danetree, adjacent to the A45, irrespective of whether the Danetree housing development proceeds. Further, there is no reason why such job opportunities as may be provided should not be available to residents of the Church Fields development, particularly taking into account paragraph 13.73 of the SDOS report (CD3.15).

**END**