

Support for selection of the Herne Road and Benefield Road Sites

Based on ENC's Local Plan 2 assessment measures.

After the Oundle Neighbourhood Plan was submitted, ENC's draft Local Plan was published. That plan has several significant errors in housing site selection which resulted in a preference for development of sites off St Christopher's Drive and Cotterstock Road.

The following analysis uses ENC's scoring criteria and corrects the errors in their analysis. The result gives very strong support for the Oundle Neighbourhood Plan site selections off Herne Road and Benefield Road.

Development of sites at Miller's Field, South of Wakerley Close and Stoke Doyle Road are supported in both plans.

Colour codes

In Score sheet:-

Yellow, indicates a correction to the ENC Local Plan evaluation

In justifications

Blue, foot notes added by OTC

Red, erroneous score

Bold, corrected score

Site Selection Based on ENC Local Plan 2 Matrix

Assessment Measure	Range	Land South of Herne Road	Land off St Christopher's Drive	Land east of Cotterestock Road/North of St Peter's Road	Land off Benefield Road
		Policy 018	ENC Site SA 222	ENC Site SA 225	Policy 022
1.1 Availability of Bus routes	0 to +4	3	3	3	4
1.2 Proximity to Strategic highway network	0 to +4	2	2	3	4
1.3 Availability of PROW	0 to +4	2	2	2	2
2.1 Proximity to key services	0 to 8	6	3 (was 6)	6 (was 2)	5
2.2 Proximity to secondary services	0 to +4	3	3	1	3
2.3 Internet Connectivity	0 to +3	2	2	1	1
2.4 Proximity to town centre	0 to +6	4	4	2	2
3.1 Access to defined Employment Sites	0 to +4	4	4	3	3
4.1 Agricultural Land Classification	-4 to 0	-4	-4	-2	-2
4.2 Impact on previously developed land	-3 to +5	-3	-3	-3	-3
5.1 Impact on landscape character	-3 to 0	-2	-2	-3	-3
5.2 Site Specific landscape/townscape impacts	-4 to +4	-2	-4 (was 0)	-3 (was -2)	-4
5.3 Heritage sensitivity	-3 to 0	-1	-1	-2	-1(was -3)
5.4 Site specific impacts on local heritage assets	-4 to +4	0	0	0	0(was -2)
5.5 Impact on open spaces	-3 to 0	-2	-2	-2	-2
5.6 Site specific impacts on biodiversity	-4 to +4	0	-2	-2	0
5.7a Impact on open spaces	-4 to 0	2	0 (was 2)	0 (was 2)	2
5.7b Impact on playing fields	-4 to 0	0	0	0	0
5.8 Flood risk	-10 to 0	0	0	0	0
5.9 Surface water	-5 to 0	0	-5 (was -3)	-3 (was -3)	0
6.1 Access Infrastructure	-3 to 0	-3	-3	-3	0
6.2 Drainage infrastructure	-3 to 0	0	-3 (was 0)	0	0
6.3 Ground condition	-3 to 0	0	0	0	0
6.4 Ease of utility provision	-3 to +3	1	-1 (was 3)	-4 (was 1)	0
6.5 Bad neighbours	-5 to 0	-1	-1	-4 (was -1)	0
6.6 Physical constraints/permanent features	-5 to 0	0	-1	-1	0
7.1 Coalescence	-5 to 0	0	0	0	0
8.1 Community benefits	-3 to 3	3	0 (was 3)	0 (was 3)	3 (was 2)
9.1 Availability – Freedom from availability constraints	-5 to 5	5 (was -3)	5	5	5
10.1 Achievability – Market cost/delivery	-5 to 5	5 (was -3)	5	5	5
Total		24 (was 8)	3 (was 22)	4 (was 17)	25 (was 20)

Note. Yellow box indicates score correction from ENC Local Plan 2 Score

Justification of score changes for Herne Road site:

New Score	Assessment Measure	Scoring Method and Corrected Score with justification
5	9.1 Freedom from availability constraints	Score as follows on basis of site visits and correspondence with site promoter: Known to be in complex/multiple ownership, or no longer available: Score -5; no information, but thought to be in private and/or multiple ownership because of the nature of use: Score -3; No response to consultation: Score -3; No information, but thought likely to be in public ownership because of the nature of the use: Score 0; Held by developer/willing owner/public sector; score 5 Site owner has submitted outline site development plan to ENC
5	10.1 Achievability - Market / cost / delivery	Score as follows on basis of site visits and other known information (e.g. possible abnormal costs): very poor marketability and/or viability (assumed exceptional costs): score -5; poor marketability and/or viability: Score: -3; no response from the landowner to consultation Score -3 moderate marketability and/or viability: score 1; good marketability and/or viability: score 3; very good marketability and/or viability: score 4; excellent marketability and/or viability (no known exceptional costs): score 5. Site owner has submitted outline site development plan to ENC

Justification of score changes for St. Christopher's Drive site:

New Score	Assessment Measure	Scoring Method and Corrected Score with justification
3	2.1 Proximity to key services	For each of the following, score 1 point per category of service within 0.8km and 2 points per service within 0.4km (up to a maximum potential score of 10): (i) Oundle CofE Primary School, Cotterstock Road >0.8 km = 0 (ii) Convenience food store to Co-Op 0.8 km = 1 (iii) playing field/ park or public open space (Sutton Rd) = 2 (iv) health centre/ GP 1.7 km = 0 (v) Community centre 1.1 km = 0
4	2.4 Proximity to town centre	Unchanged, but suspect it should be changed depending on where exact town centre boundary is 0.95 km to Market Place)
-4	5.2 Site specific landscape/ townscape impacts	Score based on assessment of potential visual impacts of development and impact on settlement character/form made during site visits as follows: Site likely to have a significant negative impacts on local landscape/townscape: score -4 Site likely to have minor negative impact on local landscape/townscape; score -2 Site likely to have a neutral impact on local landscape/townscape: score 0 Mitigation requirements on roadway would remove green boundary and mature trees (potentially including the bridleway) and open direct views onto industrial work areas.
0	5.7a Impact on open spaces	Loss of 'high quality' open space (KKP assessment): score -4; loss of >75% of a designated open space: score -3; loss of 50-75% of a designated open space: score -2; loss of <50% of a designated open space: score -1; no loss of designated open space: score 0; Site provides opportunities for open space enhancement and/or a net gain in public open space:-2 There is no evidence this site will provide any practical improvement to open space of benefit to the current Oundle community.
-5	5.9 Surface Water	Risk of surface water flooding according to Government flood warning service: High risk of surface water flooding: score -5 Medium risk of surface water flooding: score -3 This site has HIGH risk of Surface Flooding. This score is independent of potential mitigation.
-3	6.2 Drainage infrastructure	Score on basis of Anglian Water advice as follows: extensive new drainage infrastructure required: score -3; extensive new drainage infrastructure not required: score 0- The Anglian Water Excel printout received 27 July shows "Enhancement to [WRC] treatment capacity may be required.", "There is no capacity to receive surface water flows" [although Anglian Water is proposing to delegate this to developer mitigation, separated from the current drainage infrastructure]. No comments on Foul Network Connection, but existing infrastructure is already insufficient [local residents' evidence] and 100 extra homes will demand additional infrastructure capacity.
1	6.4 Ease of utility provision	Score as follows using information obtained from land owner/site promoter: Site benefits from some services but upgrades and/or improvements required: score 0 Site is not fully serviced but capable of being so: score 1 Site is fully serviced: score 3 Land owner/site promoter is misleading: the site is not fully serviced. Even if Surface Water flow would not be connected to the existing network, Anglian Water Excel printout received 27 July shows "Enhancement to [WRC] treatment capacity may be required". Clean water: "Offsite network reinforcement will be required". No comments on Foul Network Connection, but existing infrastructure is already insufficient [local residents' evidence] and 100 extra homes will demand additional infrastructure capacity.
-1*	6.5 Bad Neighbours	Score as follows based on site visits: major bad neighbour constraints which are difficult to remedy/overcome: score -5.; bad neighbour constraints, but potential for mitigation: score -1; no bad neighbour constraints: score 0. There are serious A605 traffic noise mitigation demands. And drainage odour issues which extend across the Ashton Road estate not confined to the immediate area of the Anglian Water facility, and the existing infrastructure. This score is not valid unless Anglian Water undertake to mitigate this issue as Used Water duty increases.

New Score	Assessment Measure	Scoring Method and Corrected Score with justification
0	8.1 Community Benefits	<p>Ability of the site to support the provision of community benefits (i.e. provision of a policy compliant level of affordable housing, community facilities etc) Site likely to be incapable of providing wider community benefits due to constraints, viability or size: score -3 Site likely to be able to provide a limited level of community benefits: score 0 Site likely to be able to provide a good level of community benefits: score 3 No firm evidence has been shared of any community benefits offered for this site.</p>
5*	10.1 Achievability - Market / cost / delivery	<p>Score as follows on basis of site visits and other known information (e.g. possible abnormal costs): very poor marketability and/or viability (assumed exceptional costs): score -5; poor marketability and/or viability: Score: -3; no response from the landowner to consultation Score -3 moderate marketability and/or viability: score 1; good marketability and/or viability: score 3; very good marketability and/or viability: score 4; excellent marketability and/or viability (no known exceptional costs): score 5. *This site will definitely incur high mitigation COSTS including Surface Water, Noise. Access. These have not apparently been reflected in this score</p>

Justification of score changes for Cotterstock Road site:

New Score	Assessment Measure	Scoring Method and Corrected Score with justification
6	2.1 Proximity to key services	For each of the following, score 1 point per category of service within 0.8km and 2 points per service within 0.4km (up to a maximum potential score of 10): (i) Oundle CofE Primary School, Cotterstock Road 0.31 km = 2 (ii) Convenience food store to Waitrose 1.08 km = 0 (iii) playing field/ park or public open space (Snipe Meadow) 0.32km = 2 (iv) health centre/ GP 0.85 km = 1 (v) Community centre (Fletton House?) 0.85 km = 1
2	2.4 Proximity to town centre	Unchanged, but suspect it should be changed depending on where exact town centre boundary is 1.37 km to Market Place)
-3	5.2 Site specific landscape/ townscape impacts	Score based on assessment of potential visual impacts of development and impact on settlement character/form made during site visits as follows: Site likely to have a significant negative impacts on local landscape/townscape: score -4 Site likely to have minor negative impact on local landscape/townscape; score -2 Site likely to have a neutral impact on local landscape/townscape: score 0 Mitigation requirements on two entrances would remove green boundary and mature trees and whole site would have large impact on views from Snipe Meadows and very popular riverside walk. Amelioration measures would have limited nature due to steep nature of slope on site.
0	5.7a Impact on open spaces	Loss of 'high quality' open space (KKP assessment): score -4; loss of >75% of a designated open space: score -3; loss of 50-75% of a designated open space: score -2; loss of <50% of a designated open space: score -1; no loss of designated open space: score 0; Site provides opportunities for open space enhancement and/or a net gain in public open space: 2 There is no evidence this site will provide any practical improvement to open space of benefit to the current Oundle community.
-3	5.9 Surface Water	Risk of surface water flooding according to Government flood warning service: High risk of surface water flooding: score -5 Medium risk of surface water flooding: score -3 Site edges Flood ones 2 and 3, but also has site specific issues from issues of “prolific and incessant [groundwater] spring flow” on the Cotterstock Road site, to the tune of c.200,000 gallons per day from the interface of the Greater Oolite Limestone aquifer and clay bed on the site. The surface flooding risk from this would need significant mitigation.
-3	6.5 Bad Neighbours	Score as follows based on site visits: major bad neighbour constraints which are difficult to remedy/overcome: score -5.; bad neighbour constraints, but potential for mitigation: score -1; no bad neighbour constraints: score 0. There are serious odour mitigation demands due to sewage plant/water recycling facility. In a recent report to ENC, Anglian Water notes significant “risk” from “encroachment”, for houses that would be built only 95 metres from the plant. Odour mitigation a very significant issue. Furthermore, whilst the closeness of the Oundle Primary School is seen as advantage in the proximity score, it creates significant and hard to mitigate traffic, access and parking issues.
0	8.1 Community Benefits	Ability of the site to support the provision of community benefits (i.e. provision of a policy compliant level of affordable housing, community facilities etc) Site likely to be incapable of providing wider community benefits due to constraints, viability or size: score -3 Site likely to be able to provide a limited level of community benefits: score 0 Site likely to be able to provide a good level of community benefits: score 3 No firm evidence has been shared of any community benefits offered for this site.
5*	10.1 Achievability - Market / cost / delivery	Score as follows on basis of site visits and other known information (e.g. possible abnormal costs): very poor marketability and/or viability (assumed exceptional costs): score -5; poor marketability and/or viability: Score: -3; no response from the landowner to consultation Score -3 moderate marketability and/or viability: score 1; good marketability and/or viability: score 3; very good marketability and/or viability: score 4; excellent marketability and/or viability (no known exceptional costs): score 5. *This site will definitely incur high mitigation COSTS including Surface Water, Noise. Access. These have not apparently been reflected in this score

Justification of score changes for Benefield Road site:

New Score	Assessment Measure	Scoring Method and Corrected Score with justification
-1	5.3 Heritage Sensitivity	Score using RNRP assessments as follows: Within area of high Heritage Sensitivity: Score -3 Within area of Medium Heritage Sensitivity: Score -2 Within area of Low Heritage Sensitivity: Score -1 Not within area of Heritage Sensitivity: Score 0 No issues raise by Historic England or Natural England when consulted by ENC
0	5.4 site Specific impact on local heritage assets	Score based on likely impact on setting of heritage assets (eg listed Buildings. Conservation area. Scheduled Ancient Monument. Registered Parks and Gardens). Score as follows:- Site likely to have a significant negative impact on heritage assets; score -4 Site likely to have minor negative impact on heritage assets; score -2 Site likely to have a neutral impact on heritage assets; score 0 Site likely to have minor positive impact on heritage assets; score 2 Site likely to have a significant positive impact on heritage assets; score 4 No issues raise by Historic England or Natural England when consulted by ENC
3	8.1 Community Benefits	Ability of the site to support the provision of community benefits (i.e. provision of a policy compliant level of affordable housing, community facilities etc) Site likely to be incapable of providing wider community benefits due to constraints, viability or size: score -3 Site likely to be able to provide a limited level of community benefits: score 0 Site likely to be able to provide a good level of community benefits: score 3 Site give town a large community common green space, referred to in NP as "festival Field"