

1st Public Speech

William Leo reference St Christopher's Drive

"Good evening. The Oundle NP lists five sites with good evidence they're available and deliverable for housing development.

So, it does not make sense for the Draft Local Plan part 2, and now 2 planning applications to develop 2 other sites – StCD and L off Cotterstock Road – which are poor development choices.

We are all fortunate to have a good national planning process from National Planning Policy Framework to Local and Neighbourhood plans and very encouraging, constructive Oundle community engagement in that process with ENC.

Thank you to Councillors for deferring the decision on LP Part 2 until the Oundle NP is formally examined.

It makes all the more DISAPPOINTING to see inaccuracies in important data and a lack of objectivity appear in documents commissioned by, or issued from, the planning office.

There are 5 good development sites in the Oundle NP. With the weight of inputs, it's good to stand back to "see the wood for the trees".

Let me share just 3 points why the St CD site is not in the NP, and should not be in the LP...

Firstly, it requires a very high level of mitigation vs other sites.

- **High NOISE next to A605 requires a 3 m-tall, high-density wall, high-spec acoustic vents and glazing (don't open the upstairs windows).**
Building the wall risks damaging the woodland strip alongside the which the Enviro Assessment recommends to maintain.
- **HIGH RISK of SURFACE WATER FLOODING requiring SUDS etc** connected to AW drains who 29th July stated "there is no capacity to receive surface water flows"
- **At the Extra Care Facility area of the site, the developer takes no responsibility for surface water flood control** or of maintenance and inspection commitments which form part of policy requirement.
- **14 houses have floor levels below the 25.5 m level that triggered FOUL WATER flooding in neighbouring properties in the past. Engineering input shows a risk - not explicit in ACL report - of water flow under, and subsidence of, existing properties west of the site.**

We'd all rely on Persimmon Homes to complete mitigation. Please check Aberdare, Newport, Pyle, Telford, Andover: months to years after residents moved in, Persimmon Homes have not completed mitigation and infrastructure, leaving documented flooding, sewage, unfinished roads, overgrown common areas.

Secondly, even after mitigation, several StCD site problems are still NOT resolved:

- **6 homes have gardens above upper noise limits.** WHO and British Std . Acceptable, to people who don't have to live in them
- CHA confirm the road is too narrow for a bus. The Call Connect bus service collapsed. **From the Extra Care Facility it's a kilometre to the nearest bus, with no viable alternative.**
- **Northants Fire and Rescue Service are clear: this site needs 2 access roads for emergency vehicles. It has one. It is unsafe.**

Lastly, the 2013 planning application for this site was rejected Nothing has changed.

There is still adequate 5-year land supply for Oundle housing. It's still a greenfield site outside the Settlement Boundary.

In the Item 7 document you received for this meeting, it tells you why the ENC planners believe Settlement Boundary could be changed. The evidence why there is NO substantive case for this is away in p. 42 of Document 4 of redacted Representations on the website. I don't believe you see a balanced view of inputs.

In fact, there are XX items noted in submissions, where this site conflicted with policy and guidance in the NPPF, RNOTP, or JCS.

Common sense says the site choices in the NP are superior.

Objectively, it makes no sense for the Draft Local Plan part 2, and planning applications for StCD and L off Cotterstock Road to develop these sites.

So, my request to the Councillors and Planning Committee is:

- **Please ensure the NP Examiner gets a full objective view of the inputs, to decide the right site selection.**
- **Please reject the StCD site and**
- **Please prioritise SUSTAINABLE development, with local communities, over SPEED of development**

Thank you."

2nd Public Speech

Ian Clark reference Cotterstock Road

"I ask you to keep in mind 3 important points in your Local Plan discussions of the Cotterstock Road site tonight-

Firstly RNOTP should not be treated as Holy Gospel- in the Oundle section alone, huge chunks of promises have not been delivered, especially "deficiencies in infrastructure". It has not delivered its own policies OUN2 and 5, some of OUN3, and the "townwide traffic strategy" in OUN1. Hence, mentioning Cotterstock Road in para 8.18 as a "possible longer term" location which "could" come forward during a future review process should not be treated as hallowed. Being strategically "possible" does not make it strategically "certain".

In fact, ENC had the words "possible" and "could" written **into** the "made" Glapthorn plan, and in para 107 of the Glapthorn examiner's report ENC officers noted " **as things stand this site is not an allocation**", and that any future decision " **would be dependent upon the quantum of need for further sites.**" Oundle's Neighbourhood plan shows that quantum of need has yet to be reached.

Secondly, developments in Oundle since 2011 make RNOTP outdated -

- It did not foresee moving both the Oundle area primary and middle schools to Cotterstock Road but it's impact, as seen in the Governor's recent objection to the predatory planning application on Cotterstock Road, has been huge.
- NCC Highways in August noted that bus route cuts make the site unsustainable; and "given an already constrained network", "the LHA has concerns with regards to the existing narrow streets" with the site's multi access opening up a rat run to Waitrose and the A605.
- Anglia water note that their Oundle sewage plant has a "long and difficult history of odour complaint", with sludge levels and movements now made worse by recent housing growth - it should have a 400 metres "cordon sanitaire" around it, and by suggesting development of housing right next to it, RNOTP underplayed the odour issue, a grave error for future residents, worsened by its failure "to ensure that development in one part of the town does not lead to adverse" infrastructure problems elsewhere - a failure that proves it is no longer fit for purpose.

Finally Papers 5 and 7 in front of you underpin the request to carry on with the Local Plan but are disingenuous. The understandable concerns of 11 residents and some disgruntled developers are given undue weighting (3 substantial paragraphs), very different in format to the Rushden plan report to this body from Feb 19th 2018.

Were, I to give my history pupils these documents to study, they would no doubt detect partiality, predisposition, a willful obfuscation which openly disregards the views of nearly 200 people via the complex SmartSurvey, views supported by the 75+ objections from across Oundle to the recent Cotterstock Road planning application. Oundle does not want to "hold up" the Local Plan but it does not want the wrong solutions forced upon it in order to meet a timescale, when our NP is in the process of examination."

3rd Public Speech

Mike Sidthorp reference Benefield Road

“Chairman, My name is Mike Sibthorp and I represent the Biggin & Benefield Estate in Oundle. I am speaking in relation to Agenda Item 5.

At the last meeting it was resolved that Local Plan site selection in Oundle be deferred until the outcome of the Neighbourhood Plan was known.

The Committee will be very aware of the widespread and passionately held view that the Neighbourhood Plan should be enabled to run its proper course, and our comments tonight are made with a view to protecting the integrity of the plan, which is now at examination stage.

Firstly, we note from the revised timetable for the Local Plan, as set out in Appendix One to the report, that Pre-Submission consultation will not take place until May 2020. We accept that this should provide sufficient time for the Neighbourhood Plan to be examined and its allocations resolved. However, for the avoidance of any doubt, and in line with the decision of the Committee on 29 July, we feel that that this May 2020 pre-submission consultation date be contingent upon the Neighbourhood Plan having been resolved by that date. If this is not done, the impression may be left that if the Plan is not resolved by this date, the Local Plan will advance anyway and regardless. This is certainly not what was agreed on the 29th July, and to add this important rider is therefore not controversial or a change in approach. It simply clarifies.

Secondly, we need to highlight the harm to the Neighbourhood Plan process that would flow from any decisions on major planning applications that are odds with the Neighbourhood Plan. As you are aware there are two major housing applications in Oundle that have been submitted, that are at odds with the Neighbourhood Plan, and other speakers have spoken about these. Whilst we are aware that it is not the role of this Committee to adjudicate upon planning applications, one of the key functions of this Committee is to ‘implement spatial planning policy’. The Committee will be aware that the NPPF, at Paragraph 48, advises that a refusal of planning permission may be justified on the grounds of prematurity, where a development is so substantial, that to grant permission would undermine the plan making process of an emerging plan. We are now squarely into this territory chairman, and we feel that it is essential that the Neighbourhood Plan is not derailed by inappropriate planning decisions. It is in the remit of this Committee to ensure this. Indeed, the hands of this Committee would be tied by inappropriate decisions.

In this respect, we would urge this Committee to make a separate, additional resolution, to advise the Planning Management Committee that in view of the very advanced stage of preparation of the Oundle Neighbourhood Plan, any major development proposals in Oundle, at odds with the emerging Neighbourhood Plan, should be refused on the grounds of prematurity pending the resolution of the plan. The Committee is reasonably entitled to make such a resolution, which would be in line with national planning policy.”

4th Public Speech

Tony Robinson reference Neighbourhood Plan

“Members of this Committee, I have to report that Oundle remains a pawn in a game of power and money over communities. Surely this is exactly what the Neighbourhood Plan scheme was supposed to prevent. Yet tonight you are asked to receive a document entitled “Oundle Neighbourhood Plan– Regulation 16 Feedback”. You are entitled to believe that this document represents a fair and balanced summary of the 60MBs of submissions.

Unfortunately, it does not.

Missing is the very important headline that the people of Oundle overwhelmingly support the plan as submitted. Instead the report says that input from the town’s people is ‘balanced’. It is not ‘balanced’.

Whereas building this number of houses without any improvement in the road structure will cause problems, and objections, there is overwhelming support for the plan from the town’s people.

I’ll give you a line from the new BBC drama shown last night. It goes: - “You know what the Poles have got? Bicycles. You know what the Germans have? Tanks, panzers”. This is how it feels in Oundle at the moment.

Rich developers have been able to spend as much on any one of their wordy reports as Oundle have for the whole of our Neighbourhood Plan. To make things worse, money that we are paying through our local taxation is being used to support these developers.

We need this committee to help us, we only have bicycles. Gretton is a great example of what can be achieved when the district council works with the people.

We need ENC’s officers to be working for us, we cannot afford the cost of the technical experts that are being pitched against us.

As before, I’ve been given 3 minutes to present Oundle’s case. Your officers are given total freedom to talk for the next two hours; defending their chosen developers and attacking Oundle residents as much as they wish. Is this how a balance case is presented?

Then we have inconsistencies that seem to be there only to destroy our spirit.

On 9th July Mike Burton writes to us stating that Oundle’s Neighbourhood Plan “complies with all of the relevant statutory requirements”

Yet in the report in front of you this evening Richard Palmer writes “Of particular importance here is the failure of the Neighbourhood Plan to address extant strategic policy direction.”

Why is this game being played in such a cruel way?

We were told by Gladmans that they were being “encouraged” by ENC officers to make a planning application, and we had similar messages from Persimmon.

Please direct your officers to support the community in its fight to protect the district asset of Oundle. A successful Oundle Neighbourhood Plan will be the fastest way to get the viable Local Plan that we all want.

In Oundle we are a bunch of volunteer amateurs, trying our best to get houses built in the right place.

All that we ask this committee is to please help us.

Thank you.”